

SPC-BASED MODEL FOR EVALUATION OF TRAINING PROCESSES IN INDUSTRIAL CONTEXT

Cristiano Jesus, Adilson Marcorin, Rui M. Lima, Rui M. Sousa, Ingrid Souza, Eliana Oliveira

Authors' ORCID: ORCID 0000-0002-3620-2830, ORCID 0000-0001-7093-9054, ORCID 0000-0002-7991-0132, ORCID 0000-0003-2316-2793, ORCID 0000-0001-7144-6366, ORCID 0000-0002-2366-8228

Purpose: This article aims to present successful practices in the management of training processes based on virtual reality and augmented reality, namely a strategy for evaluating the process with the principle of continuous improvement in mind and monitoring its performance in terms of productivity and waste levels. It is proposed to apply Statistical Process Control (SPC) tools to develop control charts for monitoring individual events (i-charts).

Design/methodology/approach: The methodology is based on a case study developed in an industrial project and is guided by a literature review on Work-Based Learning (WBL) and SPC.

Findings: The developed work shows that SPC tools are suitable for supporting decision-making in situations where the data to be analyzed is generated by human-computer interactions, e.g., involving students and virtual learning environments.

Originality/value: The innovative aspect presented in the article lies in the evaluation of the effectiveness of pedagogical resources arranged in simulation environments based on virtual and augmented reality. The accumulated knowledge about the application of SPC in service areas, and others that demand data analysis, reinforces the hypothesis of the suitability of its application in the case presented. This is an original application of SPC, normally used in quality control of business processes, but which in this case is applied in an innovative way to the evaluation of industrial training processes, with the same spirit for which it was designed, i.e. to provide the means to manage the quality of a process.

Keywords: Industrial Training Evaluation, SPC – Statistical Process Control, Work-Based Learning; Engineering Process Control

34 1. Introduction

35 Business Process Management (BPM) research exhaustively discusses the
36 importance of process monitoring for performance analysis (Kohlbacher, 2010).
37 This may be seen as an essential activity for quality control in industrial
38 environments, supporting companies with the ability to keep entropy controllable
39 and to guarantee the capacity of reaction to events whose behavior is not
40 completely known or controllable. The referred business processes are performed
41 by functional companies' resources, which apply their different abilities in an
42 interconnected way to deliver intended outcomes (Lima, 2010), and as can be
43 foreseen, these processes are transversal to all company functional areas and
44 activities.

45 Usually, companies have to develop their own training processes (De Vin et al.,
46 2017), adaptable to their own production systems. In this case, companies struggle
47 with the evaluation of the quality of those processes and with the related
48 continuous improvement process. The evaluation of a training process aims to
49 provide information to support the decision-making of the trainer, the manager of
50 the process, and other decision-makers. Tools in data analysis are fundamental
51 requirements in digital learning environments for decision-making as they
52 presuppose learner autonomy for the exploitation of learning resources. For
53 learners to interact with the environment, trainers and managers need the means
54 to assess whether this communication is in accordance with the intended objectives
55 in order to decide on the most appropriate interventions to be undertaken when
56 they are needed. In addition, not only immediate corrective actions are necessary
57 to maintain the effectiveness of the model, but the learner's experience in the
58 learning environment as a whole is also important for the evolution of the model.
59 The tools adopted for these purposes, namely the SPC and statistical classification
60 of experiences, have proved adequate for this purpose.

61 Statistical Process Control (SPC) is an instrument used in the field of quality
62 management that has proven to be efficient in the management of professional
63 training processes in the workplace by providing the necessary means for
64 monitoring process performance and assisting in decision making for corrective
65 actions or reconfigurations to meet new scenarios.

66 According to Kenett et al. (2014), SPC is a technique that has as principle the
67 analysis of control limits, limits that can fluctuate and tend to stabilize as the
68 monitored process matures or can be started with parameters defined previously
69 according to the experience of practitioners. SPC is a traditional tool in Industrial
70 Engineering in the field of quality management and, nowadays, with the advance in
71 technological resources for data collection and analysis, is gaining new nuances of
72 importance in its role of enabling the coordination in process management (Mirzaei
73 et al., 2016).

74 SPC is a tool that, based on performance data collected from the process, enables
75 to set a pattern of its natural variability Öberg et al. (2017). Such a pattern is then
76 used to compare further outcomes of the process so that unusual variations can be
77 detected. In this sense, that's a tool that adjusts itself according to the system's

behavior. In other words, it learns from the system and offers managers the ability to articulate strategies based on factual data rather than planning actions to achieve goals concerning optimal scenarios (Banks, 1993).

These characteristics are quite appropriate for training processes because each training is ultimately unique as each participant responds to it in a particular way. The more the training processes manage to respond to the individual particularities of the participants, the more effective they are (Sousa & Dinis-Carvalho, 2020). Therefore, a significant challenge for training managers focused on competence development and for trainers, who are at the forefront of this activity, is precisely the identification of the individual needs of the trainees. Despite this characteristic, training programs are usually generic and applied to everyone indistinctly. As mentioned above, in business process management, each process is designed to achieve a goal, and its performance is continuously evaluated to enable decision-making in case of inefficiency. The objective of the training process in the work environment is the development of competencies related to the functions performed by the participants. However, unlike sales processes, for example, where a target such as reducing the number of missed delivery times by 5% is quite tangible, targets such as increasing the effectiveness of training or reducing training time without impairing its effectiveness are somehow abstract and too elusive to the many control tools available.

Therefore, the objective of this article is to present a proposal for evaluating the performance of a business process responsible for training newly hired operators. Thus, it is important to consider that the performance of the process is directly related to its ability to provide learning, that is, to the effectiveness of learning resources. This can be measured from the analysis of the data generated in the learners' interaction with these resources. In order to consider that such resources are designed to satisfy a frequent behavioral profile (which in the traditional form of training is identifiable only from the experience and competence of the trainers) the SPC-based model presented in this paper allows real-time monitoring of the learning process and agile decision-making. This is accomplished by identifying exceptions to control limits that are dynamically determined from historical data on learning resource usage.

This paper aims to demonstrate the applicability of SPC as a suitable tool for the evaluation of business processes for the management of training in the workplace, and therefore intends to answer the following questions:

(1) What is the SPC implementation roadmap to achieve the objective of analyzing data generated in learning environments with a view to decision-making for the maintenance or progression of the effectiveness of available resources for autonomous learning?

(2) What methodology should be adopted to evaluate training processes to represent their performance and assist in decision-making?

120 2. Theoretical background

121 Ellen & Boguslaw (2003) affirm that conventional approaches to dealing with
122 training, related to the professional environment, traditionally conceptualize this
123 issue to segment the roles of individuals, trainers, and managers. For the authors,
124 this segmentation is problematic because it does not consider the contexts of each
125 person involved in the training process and ignores the holistic and complex nature
126 of the relationships involved.

127 Therefore, training models oriented towards the simple execution of a program,
128 which considers everyone involved as passive agents in the process, are thus in
129 question. The evaluation of the effectiveness of the teaching and learning resources
130 has its relevance associated with the methods adopted by the trainer, who has
131 control and can directly perceive the reactions of the learners in their training path.
132 However, this aspect becomes critical in models that foresee the digitalization of
133 many tasks and the consequent increase of the participants' autonomy. For the
134 definition of an evaluation model of a digital teaching and learning environment
135 based on virtual reality and augmented reality, one must consider that this format
136 has specific characteristics and demands.

137 In the traditional teaching and learning model, the training programs are defined,
138 planned, and executed, so that participants are indiscriminately submitted to a
139 process of reproducing a program in such a way that their action, therefore, has a
140 passive character (Ellen & Boguslaw, 2003). In the digital model, participants play
141 an active role because the environment, as described, requires exploratory action
142 and foresees progressive levels of autonomy. Thus, the digital model does not deal
143 with the mechanical dynamics of events, but rather with the individual activity that
144 refers to a "social mechanism", since the system needs to identify the behavior of
145 individuals during their training journey and present relevant information to trainers
146 and managers for decision-making.

147 Rikku & Chakrabarty (2013) consider that one of the most important steps in the
148 development of training programs in the workplace is the analysis of existing needs
149 within the training process. The authors suggest the term Training Need Analysis
150 (TNA) to refer to efforts to continuously and permanently monitor the requirements
151 of training processes and therefore their performance. For this purpose, they
152 propose a model based on three dimensions: Organizational analysis, task analysis,
153 and person analysis.

154 In a similar approach to Rikku & Chakrabarty (2013), Bodily et al. (2017) defend
155 the use of learning analytics to support the engagement of participants to address
156 three perspectives involving teaching and learning processes: didactic
157 considerations, technological issues, and concerns about interface design, i.e. the
158 effectiveness of didactic resources in interactions with learners.

159 For the same purpose as Ellen & Boguslaw (2003), which is to consider the specific
160 demands of each stakeholder, while being part of a process that fosters dynamic
161 and complex relationships, Bodily et al. (2017) suggest the application of data
162 analysis resources, based on the results of interactions in teaching and learning
163 environments, to support decision making and maintain continuous improvement.

2.1 Training evaluation

According to León-Medina (2017), "Social Mechanism" is a term used to refer to the analytical spirit present in different traditions of sociological studies. According to this author, the aim of studies using the concept of mechanism is to avoid the black boxes that exist in explanations based on statistics. The black boxes exist in the state of a system, that is, in the macro perspective, when the causal link between two phenomena, which occurs in the micro perspective, is absent from the explanation concerning them. The black boxes contain social mechanisms that demonstrate the high-level explanations, so if we are careful to make the mechanisms evident in our explanations, we avoid the existence of black boxes and guarantee the clarity of our constructions. A mechanism-based model describes a system dynamic, i.e. the behavior of the causal chain of micro-level events that generate the macro-level behavior of the system.

León-Medina (2017) presents a telling example of the use of the mechanism-based approach that refers to the collective behavior of ants to decide between a longer and shorter path between the anthill and the food source. According to the author, experiments indicate that when ants discover a food source, it goes to the nest and leaves a trail of pheromones along the way. Initially, the ants that were in the anthill choose randomly among the various pheromone paths available and, as these trails evaporate, they realize which is the shortest path and thus the collective behavior of the ants tends to become more and more homogeneous. The mechanism-based approach, therefore, seeks the understanding of events from the micro perspective to bring out elements that promote the understanding of complex systems from a macro perspective.

A study using a similar approach was carried out by McEneaney (2016) to assess the effectiveness of evaluation based on simulation of hierarchical structures of learning objectives with instructional technologies. According to the author, instructional technologies are critically dependent on a systematic design of the training process and hierarchically presented learning objectives. A simulation-based environment continuously calibrated by data generated by the system itself can cause two implications: (1) various learning pathways can be equally effective in terms of learning, and, (2) the interaction between the skills demonstrated by the trainees and the learning pathways can disadvantage the less capable trainees. As demonstrated in the study, from statistical modeling of occurrences where mean and standard deviation are set within maximum and minimum limits it is possible to identify both the most efficient pathways and, like in the study of ants, the exceptions that should be treated with specific strategies.

Learning Analytics is the term used by Bodily et al. (2017) to define the process of selecting, collecting, analyzing, and reporting data on learning activities and interactions to promote improvement in the teaching and learning process. The authors recommend that the data be classified to allow assessment parameters and provide analysis at different levels, according to the needs of the stakeholders, who in training processes may be managers, trainers, designers, and trainees. Bodily et al. (2017) present the following possibilities of data nature presented according to the interests and needs of the stakeholders:

- 209 • Administrators: Finance, enrollment, student outcomes, student
210 engagement, satisfaction;
- 211 • Designers: Averages, assessment, student engagement;
- 212 • Instructors: Interaction data, assessment, student outcomes data, student
213 engagement; Students: Student assessment data, compare to class,
214 compare to students, student outcomes data.

215 Additionally, the authors recommend the presentation of evaluation reports on
216 dashboards using scatter plots, network plots, histograms, polygraphs, and others.

217 Carlucci et al. (2019) propose a framework to analyze adequately the quality of the
218 teaching process in the light of the imprecision and uncertainties present in
219 subjective assessments. The instrument integrates two methods, the u-control
220 chart and the ABC analysis using fuzzy weights. Using the control charts, students'
221 assessments are analyzed to detect courses that are outside the control limits, and
222 ABC analysis using fuzzy weights deals with the imprecision and uncertainty of
223 students' assessments to provide a risk map of potential areas for improvement. In
224 general, the authors present a management tool capable of indicating the need for
225 short-term corrective measures, using the control charts, and pointing to areas that
226 have the potential for improvement in the long term.

227 The main reason why the authors advocate data analytics for the evaluation of
228 training processes in place of the traditional self-reflection questionnaires answered
229 by the students, according to them, is that in general the problems that appear in
230 the surveys are related to infrastructure, materials, or specific occurrences. The
231 answers hardly help to solve problems in the training system as a whole. They
232 sought support in the literature and found that the evaluations of the trainees
233 should no longer be seen as a review of their educational experiences, which
234 undoubtedly serve as a reflection for the stakeholders, but are far from being
235 material enough to indicate actions that promote effective improvement in the
236 process.

237 Thus, Carlucci et al. (2019) present a framework for quality improvement analysis
238 and prioritization of problems occurring in higher education courses. This
239 framework proved to be effective and its decision flow is based on two dimensions,
240 namely, problems and opportunities for improvement. These opportunities are
241 classified as short and medium-term for the occurrences whose causes can be
242 mapped at the technical level, and as long-term for occurrences whose causes are
243 at the level of the system as a whole, involving new strategies and approaches.

244

245 **2.2 SPC applications**

246 Statistical Process Control (SPC) charts were created by Shewhart and first applied
247 in the early 1930s, for process control and process improvement in manufacturing
248 businesses (MacCarthy & Wasusri, 2002; Rungtusanatham et al., 1999; Krumwiede
249 & Sheu, 1996; Schippers, 2001; Shewhart, 1939).

According to Mirzaei et al. (2016), Vicentin et al. (2018), John & Singhal (2019), and Prata et al. (2020), SPC is an instrument made up of statistical procedures that aim to measure and analyze variations in processes. Together with diagnostic tools such as the Ishikawa diagram, cause and effect matrix, histograms, and others, SPC is able to identify problems with agility and reasonable assertiveness before the damage reaches a greater impact beyond those linked to its immediate cause. Although it is widely used in the goods industry, it is also an essential tool in the service sector where the concept of quality is not defined only by objective parameters, but mainly by the judgment of clients.

Carlucci et al. (2019) claim that Statistical Process Control Charts are divided into two categories: variable and attribute control charts. According to the authors, the variable control charts are used to evaluate processes in which quality is defined by numerical factors such as weight, height, etc., and in cases where quality is defined by "conformity" or "nonconformity", the attribute control charts should be applied. Of these control charts, the most commonly used are p-control chart, np-control chart, u-control chart, and c-control chart.

The control charts provided by SPC have wide application in production systems of both goods and services, besides being recognized as an effective resource for performance evaluation in process management, including in training processes for the evaluation of resources and teaching methods. Several authors have used SPC beyond its original usage, being the following ones, examples of such works published in the recent years:

- Demonstration of the usefulness of SPC for monitoring paradata for assessing the quality of data obtained in surveys (Jin et al., 2019).
- Proposal of a mechanism for process improvement in product design with the Internet of Things, statistical hypothesis testing, and process capability indices chart applied in a bicycle manufacturer (Lin et al., 2016).
- Application of SPC in Professional Service (PS) companies (Khan et al., 2019).

The literature review allowed the identification of significant experiences in the exploration and application of SPC beyond defect control in production lines in the manufacturing context. As can be seen, there are successful cases in the adoption of this instrument in circumstances that demand data analysis, but the experience of using SPC for the analysis of the effectiveness of educational resources is still a gap to be explored.

2.3 SPC specification

Kenett et al. (2014) explain that variable control charts can be of many types, but the most common are $\bar{x}$ & R and I & MR. The first is used to identify quality problems in situations involving groups of individuals or lots that have been produced under the same conditions. The I & MR charts should be used for the evaluation of individual items, i.e. when their production involves individual conditions.

This process control approach provides for the use of two cards: one to monitor the average of occurrences and the other to monitor the variance. Both are complimentary for problem diagnosis. If values outside the control limits begin to

295 appear on cards IX, but the variance remains within expectations, this means that
296 the process has changed and individuals have started to behave differently than
297 they had been doing and therefore outside the control limits until these limits are
298 reconfigured. The cause may be a problem or a change in the process. In cases
299 where the variance also becomes very large, it may be an indication that the
300 process is not achieving the expected effectiveness due to instability caused by a
301 localized problem (Kenett et al., 2014).

302 According to Mirzaei et al. (2016), SPC's graphical control tools are used in the
303 services area to evaluate, for example, the level of consumer satisfaction, quality of
304 service, statistical survey of quality, and analysis of process results, benchmarking
305 for evaluation of competitiveness and others. Therefore, the quantification of the
306 evaluation starts with the identification of parameters that interfere with the
307 perceived quality. They suggest that the implementation of SPC follows 4 steps:

- 308 (1) Definition of the process;
- 309 (2) Diagnosis of the process;
- 310 (3) Actions and measurements;
- 311 (4) Definition of the control charts.

312 Abdul Halim Lim et al. (2017) explain that the classical application of the SPC is
313 through the charts (average) and (range) which show the average value of
314 occurrences related to process quality plus one estimate of the standard deviation
315 of the quality characteristic under analysis, based on the Range value of samples.
316 In this instrument, the Central Limit Theorem is basic for any of its applications.
317 Durmusoglu (2018) and Carlucci et al. (2019) mention the instrument called
318 Statistical Control Chart (SCC) composed of the variables that determine the limits
319 of analysis, namely Upper Control Limit (UCL) and Lower Control Limit (LCL).

320 It is important to note that the X/R control charts are indicated for the analysis of
321 observation subgroups, that is, for each sample several occurrences are considered.
322 This makes a lot of sense in industrial applications where the objective is the
323 identification in a production line of occurrences out of control limits, for example, a
324 significant increase of defects, which could mean a malfunction in a machine. In
325 these cases, the elements that make up the process have behavior that obeys a
326 specification and the trend is always stable in the process.

327 In the case of a training process, we cannot consider that each learner will always
328 have the same reaction before the learning objects and in the interaction with the
329 scenarios. Although there is the expectation of a minimum condition that enables
330 learning, in no way can a human individual be observed as a machine. Besides, as
331 opposed to the typical application of SPC in industry, especially in large-scale
332 production processes, in the process of training, the number of values measured or
333 counted is quite small, which, in general, could make a definition of large samples
334 or subgroups unfeasible. Another important aspect is that the I-MR chart allows
335 identifying the need for action targeted at an individual (trainee) specifically, either
336 to increase his or her skill or to give him or her more motivating tasks, for example.
337 This allows for individualized follow-up and personalized actions for each trainee
338 that the chart identifies as having atypical performance (above or below average).

Therefore, the proposal is the application of charts for individuals, instead of using charts for samples. Moving Range charts, known as X/MR or I-MR, are indicated in this case. The I-MR chart is then composed of two charts, the I-chart where the values for each individual are plotted, along with the MR-chart, where the moving range between two successive values is plotted. These values are then compared to the limit values for each of such charts to evaluate if each value can be considered as having the expected value. The calculation of the limit lines, as well as the central line of each chart, is based on the historical values recorded as the trainees are submitted to the learning objects and tasks.

The interpretation of any control chart is the same: given the usual variation patterns, the process has no "anomaly", or special cause of variation. In other words, the variations observed are random, without a specific cause, and therefore typical of the process. When the variations are random, the process is running as expected and does not require any corrective action. The process, then, would only be changed in case of need for improvement, which will then require the preparation of a new chart for the new process. Atypical variations, in turn, will be identified in the control charts by means of typical visual patterns of variation indication, for example:

- Points outside the control limits (trainee has not assimilated the content very well or has assimilated it so well that he or she is already skilled in performing the task).
- Consecutive points above or below the average, but still within control limits (the learning process has changed, such as a new instructor, changing teaching materials, etc., which causes the process average to vary up or down, and may require specific management action).
- Consecutive points varying consecutively in the same direction, i.e., consecutively rising, or consecutively falling (incremental improvements or "worsening" made in the process, intentionally or unintentionally, which also trigger alerts for a specific cause evaluation).

According to Kenett et al. (2014), for the calculation of the limit lines, given k history values of the measured values, the i -th value denoted x_i . The i -th value of the moving range is calculated as:

$MR_i = x_i - x_{i-1} $	(1)
--------------------------	-----

In the Individual graphics procedure, the central line is defined as the average value, estimated as follows (Kenett et al., 2014):

$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k x_i}{k}$	(2)
--	-----

Control limits must be calculated for both I and MR charts. The control limits for the I chart are calculated as:

$UCL_x = \bar{x} + E_2 \times \overline{MR}$	(3)
--	-----

$LCL_x = \bar{x} - E_2 \times \overline{MR}$	(4)
--	-----

where,

$\overline{MR} = \frac{\sum_{i=2}^k MR_i}{k - 1}$	(5)
---	-----

The control limits for the MR chart are calculated as:

$UCL_{MR} = D_4 \times \overline{MR}$	(6)
---------------------------------------	-----

$LCL_{MR} = D_3 \times \overline{MR}$	(7)
---------------------------------------	-----

The value of E_2 , D_3 , and D_4 depends on the sample size. Assuming that the chart for individuals (I-MR chart) is used since the Moving Range is calculated based on two successive values, the sample size is always fixed at 2, and then, E_2 , D_3 , and D_4 are constants, assuming the following values: $E_2 = 2.660$; $D_3 = 0$; $D_4 = 3.267$.

3. Methodology

The research is performed as an exploratory case study informed by the literature review for the purpose of theoretical background and study of precedents.

This case study was developed as a data research procedure and was integrated into a larger research project called Factory of the Future (FoF), which results from a partnership between the University of Minho and the company Bosch Car Multimedia Portugal. The project goal is related to the implementation of a more effective training process for new employees, based on gamification, and augmented and virtual reality.

The exploratory case study approach was adopted in response to the context of the project, which required immersion in the application environment, analysis and diagnosis of the problem, and the development of a solution based on the theoretical background, guided by the previous experiences of the researchers and experts. From tests and simulations of the developed solution, the evaluation model of the training process presented in this article was developed.

Therefore, the observation research procedure was adopted for data collection and subsequent process modeling. The time available for the research was a limitation that was partially overcome by using scenario simulation. Therefore, the results were obtained from supervised, expert-ratified simulations.

For the literature review, the knowledge bases JSTOR, Emerald Insight, and Springer were used. Guided by the experience gained during the immersion process in the application environment and by previous experiences, we searched for references using the following keywords: Adaptive learning, control chart, data analysis, Game-Based Learning, individualized learning, industrial training, serious game, Work-Based Learning, workplace learning, Statistical Process Control,

statistical quality control, virtual reality and augmented reality. The articles were chosen initially according to the titles, then by the abstract, and finally from the reading of the whole text. The process of collecting and selecting the articles was carried out collaboratively by the authors and supported by the Zotero software.

4. SPC Model for evaluation of the training process

The proposed approach to analyze the quality of the training process through the SPC forces the use of analytical methods for the individual study of phenomena, given the characteristics of the object of study that correspond to the interactions between learners and learning resources arranged in a virtual environment, in an exploratory way and with a high level of autonomy. These resources can be learning objects, through which content is studied in varied and combined formats, such as texts, videos, quizzes, texts-quizzes, videos-quizzes, texts-videos-quizzes, etc., and scenarios that represent real-world situations and problems and impose challenges on participants.

In this way, one can analyze each learner as a unique universe, although it is a goal of the process to maintain stability within the limits of control. For this, one should always use two combined graphs for monitoring process performance, namely, the graph for monitoring scenario execution time and interaction with learning objects and the graph for monitoring the moving range which should identify very large variations between different individuals in scenario execution or interaction with learning objects. Therefore, process improvement guided by the SPC follows the flow represented in Figure 1.




Figure 1. Process improvement flow with SPC

The system has the resources to perform continuous data collection on the interactions made by students with the learning objects, both those built to provide assimilation of content and instructions and those that are challenging to overcome. The control charts monitor the interactions according to the time in which they are carried out and when the time is not sufficient to draw conclusions, it is possible to correlate the times with points obtained in quiz-type assessments and thus obtain more refined parameters. In problems, the variance is re-established in the control limits after being corrected for faults, in cases where there has been a change in

the process, the control limits will be readjusted as the occurrences accumulate. An example of a problem is the performance of a student who has dyslexia when studying a five-page text, while an example of a change in the process is a trainer changing a learning object or altering it in such a way as to have an impact on interaction times and points.

The application of SPC aims at monitoring the performance of three important factors: (1) learning objects, (2) learning tasks (which are dimensions that concern short and medium-term decision making and the solution efforts take place at the technical and operational level), and, (3) expected quality of training (which is a long-term dimension for decision making and requires a way of prioritization because the needs for solution efforts are unclear and require further analysis and action).

It is important to mention that the learning objects can be of the following types:

- Simple, such as a video, a text, a quiz, an animation, etc.
- Composed, as in a virtual class composed of several simple objects, including a quiz or several quizzes.
- Scenario, which is a composite object with the difference that it is designed for the learner to solve a problem. In general, it corresponds to a virtual simulation of a situation that can be experienced in the real world.

The data structure has an entity for recording the tasks performed by learners. The tasks are carried out within the framework of the scenarios. This entity has an attribute to identify the points obtained in the accomplishment of the task and another attribute for the time employed. There is also an entity for the storage of data concerning the learning objects in which it is possible to obtain an average of the points achieved by the learners as they interact with them and with this attribute it is possible to identify the average performance of all the learners for each learning object. It is important to note that this assessment is only valid for composite learning objects in which they comprise a quiz element through which learners' performance is inferred.

5. Analysis of results

Learning objects are designed and created to suit the learning styles. For example, a video whose aim is to present the overview of a procedure should meet profiles of learners who find it easier to learn techniques presented by a contextualization narrative than by simply demonstrating them. It is therefore necessary to monitor the performance of learners as they interact with learning objects designed to meet their respective profiles.

I-MR control charts should be used to identify learners' behavior when interacting with a learning object or implementing a scenario. In this way, these charts can be used both to assess learners' performance and evaluate teaching resources, i.e. learning objects and scenarios. On learners' performance, we will return to this question in the next section.

For the evaluation of learning objects and scenarios, the I-charts in Figure 2 show a pattern of learners' behavior in their interaction with one of these resources. Each control chart is the representation of the recorded times of learners in interaction with a learning object or scenario so that the time histories of all learners are used for plotting the Central Line (LC) and the lower and upper limits (UCL and LCL).




Figure 2. I-chart example for learning objects (scenario)

This control chart can serve as parameter for trainers and managers to evaluate whether learning objects have been properly designed. It is expected that learning objects will be architected to suit the learning styles. It is a plausible hypothesis that the interaction with these artifacts takes place in a time range effective for assimilation. An interaction at a very low time or at a very high time may indicate that the learning object does not meet the trainer's objective and therefore should be reviewed.

It is possible to observe how long a particular learning object is used by learners. In all occurrences except one, the times have varied within the control limits, which means that the learning object under analysis is complying with the object that is expected from it. The recurrence of times outside the control limits can mean a high level of obviousness, a high level of difficulty, or still can indicate deviations in the learning profile of the learner in question so that it needs to be redone. For example, if the learning profile informs that the learner has a textual profile and the learner does not perform well with learning objects intended for this characteristic then it is necessary to confirm if the style is still the same or if the learning object does not fit this profile. In any case, therefore, these control charts are instruments so that the trainer or the manager can carry out his investigations about problems in the process.

However, as the average and control limits are established by historical data, they may not reflect the quality of the resources as if they are poorly done, everyone will


515 have times consistent with that low quality. To solve this problem, we suggest
 516 using the I-chart in Figure 3 that demonstrates the ratio between times and points.

517 In fact, it is reasonable to assume that a correlation exists between the time a
 518 trainee dedicates to learning a subject using a learning object, like a video or a
 519 text, for example, and the trainee's performance in a test related to that subject. A
 520 ratio between the time dedicated by a trainee to that learning object and the
 521 performance in the test could be a good indicator of the ability of that learning
 522 object to "aggregate" knowledge in the learning process.

523 Unlike the chart per time which is applicable in any kind of learning object,
 524 including scenarios, the chart of the ratio between times and points will be possible
 525 only for analyzing scenarios and for analyzing learning objects that end with a quiz.
 526 An example of this last case is a learner that reads a PDF document and to finish
 527 this operation he/she must answer some questions to measure their understanding
 528 of the text. With this, it is possible based on the history to draw a pattern and
 529 control limits that take into account the correlation between time and points.

530 Another point is that with the I-chart of correlation with point and time it is possible
 531 to identify learning objects or scenarios with bad quality. In fact, if the learners
 532 need to hold on to a learning object for a long time to achieve a good performance,
 533 an investigation may be necessary to verify if this factor is inherent to a possible
 534 complexity of the operation or if there are problems that need to be corrected.

I - Control Chart - ratio points achieved / time dedicated




535

536 Figure 3. Ratio times and points for Learning Objects or Scenarios

537 Both charts are therefore supposed to complement each other. Through the
 538 correlation chart, it is possible to identify the time in which learning objects can
 539 provide good performance. After this indication, it is possible to use charts with
 540 these times plotted.

541 An important complement to I-chart is the MR-Chart, illustrated in Figure 4. Control
 542 charts for variables, such as X-R, X-s, and I-MR charts, for example, always come
 543 in pairs. The first of the pair (X or I) tracks the value of the variable itself (with the
 544 mean $\bar{X}$ of a sample, or with the individual value I). The second in the pair (R, s or
 545 MR) measures the variance in some way (for samples, we use the R amplitude or
 546 the "s" standard deviation of the sample; for individual values, we measure MR, the
 547 variation between two successive I points).



548

549 Figure 4. MR-chart for learning objects

550 In this specific case, MR charts should be used for the observation of time variance
 551 and correlation times and points in the training process as a way to identify
 552 changes in the behavior of the process that deserves to be investigated. Variance is
 553 the measure by which one evaluates how far away a value is from the expected
 554 value. In a common situation, it is normal that sporadic cases of variation outside
 555 the limit of control occur. However, in situations where these occurrences became
 556 frequent and subsequent, they might indicate that an investigative action needs to
 557 be carried out because something happened in the process that made it have an
 558 atypical behavior, or the process changed in such a way that its behavior from that
 559 time on has changed, i.e. it became another process. In a training process, this can
 560 occur in cases where the learning objects or scenarios are revised, or some change
 561 in the training path of which you are a part has also caused a change in the
 562 learning outcomes.

563 With this instrument, the trainer can carry out a more detailed investigation about
 564 these learning objects like to do more tests in controlled environments, and
 565 simulations, to verify if they meet the objectives for which they were created.

566 The management implications of applying SPC for learning objects evaluation are
 567 equivalent to a shift in strategy from push to pull production. In the conventional

training process, its design provides for the planning of a program to transmit content. Thus, the evaluation of its effectiveness is on the ability to reproduce that content. This approach is equivalent to the pushed production model because it is based on an expectation of capacity.

The model presented in this paper evaluates the ability of learning objects to simulate the real-life environment and their effectiveness in promoting learning. The evaluation is based on data that is generated in the interaction of learners with this simulation environment, i.e., it is based on action data. Therefore, it corresponds to a pull model in which actions aimed at correcting the fit between prediction and execution are reduced to a minimum.

In this way, it is estimated that both the training time of an operator and the dedicated time of a trainer to the process will decrease, as the operator performs fewer adjustment actions to correct gaps between the training environment and the working environment, and trainers spend less time on retraining procedures and other forms of rework. Examination of this hypothesis should be undertaken in the future when sufficient data is available to make the necessary comparisons.

6. Final remarks

The Factory of the Future (FoF) program, carried out in partnership with the University of Minho and Bosch Car Multimedia Portugal, is composed of several innovation projects, among them the design and implementation of a training and evaluation process with the application of virtual and augmented reality for the training of new employees to work on the production line of automatic insertion.

The case in question corresponds to a training activity that is complex because its effectiveness is expected and necessary; the process has a high level of informality where evaluation occurs by means of subjective estimates. It is not clear how all the stakeholders understand the whole process and its relationship with the organization's strategic objectives.

Faced with this scenario, a reconfiguration of the training process that would transform a conventional method from end to end to a method that is innovative in all senses would be a reckless leap. Thus, the following strategy was chosen:

- Introduction of the company in the universe of investigations, discussions, and initiatives guided by the Work-Based Learning (WBL) theme for the development of the perception of professional training as a critical factor for success in highly qualified environments and at the same time unique in terms of competence requirements.
- Adoption of Instructional Design to effectively enable a training process as it is a framework that defines dimensions, interdependent procedures, monitoring, roles, and responsibilities.
- Application of Bloom Taxonomy to research and plan necessary competences in a way directed to the particularities of each trainee's profile. In addition, a Storytelling approach associated with Game-Based Learning (GBL) was

610 adopted as a guideline for the development of content in the virtual reality
611 environment.

612 So, the article can answer the initial questions as follows:

613 (1) What is the SPC implementation roadmap to achieve the objective of analyzing
614 data generated in learning environments with a view to decision-making for the
615 maintenance or progression of the effectiveness of available resources for
616 autonomous learning?

617 In section 4, Figure 1, a roadmap for the implementation of SPC for the evaluation
618 of training processes can be observed. In section 5 it is presented in detail the
619 procedures for implementation. It is important to note that the control charts
620 present the behavior of the process as learners interact with the content and
621 scenario learning objects. These charts should be used for the identification of
622 occurrences that present results beyond the limits of control, so that from the
623 competencies of trainers, managers, and other stakeholders, the causes can be
624 assessed, whether of problems or changes in the process, and decisions can be
625 made. Therefore, it is an instrument for monitoring the process and supporting
626 decision-making and continuous improvement measures.

627 (2) What methodology should be adopted to evaluate training processes in order to
628 represent the performance of the processes and assist in decision making?

629 The adopted control charts allow the performance of learning objects and scenarios
630 to be monitored as learners interact with them. Initially, evaluation can be carried
631 out on the basis of the correlation between points and times, and when there is
632 sufficient experience to consider the appropriate time for the appropriate
633 achievement of points, the charts controlling time can be sufficient for analysis.
634 Changes in the process, or in the artifacts of the process, may produce occurrences
635 in the control charts which monitor the values as a function of the control means
636 and in the variation, in order to stabilize when the new results become standard, or
637 when there are no changes, the results indicate difficulties with the learners, either
638 by specific and localized problems which must be investigated with each individual
639 or problems in the identification of the learning profile, which in this case must be
640 remade, since the learning objects and the scenarios are designed and selected by
641 the augmented reality and virtual reality environment for application in order to
642 meet particular skills.

643 The resources adopted guaranteed the capacity to monitor the process in critical
644 factors for different stakeholders, such as administrator, designers, instructors, and
645 learners, such as the performance of learning objects, the performance of the
646 trainees, and the capacity of each task to promote learning through challenges as
647 advocated by GBL. With these resources, the training process has regulatory
648 mechanisms to respond in an agile manner to both localized and larger problems.

649 The study time is a limitation of the research presented in this article, which implies
650 the analysis of data generated in simulations. The exploratory nature of the
651 research in the case study minimizes this problem because the simulations are
652 performed in the application environment and ratified by process experts.

The work done also raises new research opportunities as the solution gains in maturity; among them, one should highlight the expansion of the system's autonomy in adjusting to the particularities of each individual in the learning process from data analysis and intervention when control limits are exceeded.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

This work was supported by: European Structural and Investment Funds in the FEDER component, through the Operational Competitiveness and Internationalization Programme (COMPETE 2020) [Project nº 39479; Funding Reference: POCI-01-0247-FEDER-39479].

This work was partially supported by FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia within the R&D Units Project Scope: UIDB/00319/2020, and by operation NORTE-06-3559-FSE-000226, funded by Norte Portugal Regional Operational Program (NORTE 2020), under the PORTUGAL 2020 Partnership Agreement, through the European Social Fund (ESF).

References

- Abdul Halim Lim, S., Antony, J., He, Z., & Arshed, N. (2017). Critical observations on the statistical process control implementation in the UK food industry: A survey. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 34(5), 684–700. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQRM-03-2015-0035>
- Banks, D. (1993). Is Industrial Statistics Out of Control? *Statistical Science*, 8(4), 356–377. JSTOR.
- Bodily, R., Graham, C. R., & Bush, M. D. (2017). Online Learner Engagement: Opportunities and Challenges with Using Data Analytics. *Educational Technology*, 57(1), 10–18. JSTOR.
- Carlucci, D., Renna, P., Izzo, C., & Schiuma, G. (2019). Assessing teaching performance in higher education: A framework for continuous improvement. *Management Decision*, 57(2), 461–479. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-04-2018-0488>
- De Vin, L. J., Jacobsson, L., Odhe, J., & Wickberg, A. (2017). Lean Production Training for the Manufacturing Industry: Experiences from Karlstad Lean Factory. *Procedia Manufacturing*, 11, 1019–1026. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.promfg.2017.07.208>
- Durmusoglu, A. (2018). Updating technology forecasting models using statistical control charts. *Kybernetes*, 47(4), 672–688. <https://doi.org/10.1108/K-04-2017-0144>
- Ellen, B. M., & Boguslaw, J. (2003). Job training as business and community development: Reframing theory and practice. In D. B. Bills (Ed.), *The Sociology of Job Training* (Vol. 12, pp. 103–137). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-2833\(03\)12005-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-2833(03)12005-5)
- Jin, J., Vandenplas, C., & Loosveldt, G. (2019). The Evaluation of Statistical Process Control Methods to Monitor Interview Duration During Survey Data Collection. *SAGE Open*, 9(2), 2158244019854652. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019854652>
- John, B., & Singhal, S. (2019). An application of integrated EPC–SPC methodology for simultaneously monitoring multiple output characteristics. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 36(5), 669–685. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQRM-04-2018-0104>

Kenett, R., Zacks, S., & Amberti, D. (2014). *Modern industrial statistics: With applications in R, MINITAB and JMP* (2. ed). Wiley.

Khan, S. A., Kaviani, M. A., J. Galli, B., & Ishtiaq, P. (2019). Application of continuous improvement techniques to improve organization performance: A case study. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma*, 10(2), 542–565. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLSS-05-2017-0048>

Kohlbacher, M. (2010). The effects of process orientation: A literature review. *Business Process Management Journal*, 16(1), 135–152. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14637151011017985>

Krumwiede, D., & Sheu, C. (1996). Implementing SPC in a small organization: A TQM approach. *Integrated Manufacturing Systems*, 7(1), 45–51. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09576069610108435>

León-Medina, F. J. (2017). Analytical Sociology and Agent-Based Modeling: Is *Generative Sufficiency* Sufficient? *Sociological Theory*, 35(3), 157–178. JSTOR. <https://doi.org/10.2307/26541772>

Lima, R. (2010). Integrating Production Planning and Control Business Processes. *International Journal of Productivity Management and Assessment Technologies*, 1, 172–193. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-60566-856-7.ch009>

Lin, H.-C. K., Su, S.-H., Chao, C.-J., Hsieh, C.-Y., & Tsai, S.-C. (2016). Construction of Multi-mode Affective Learning System: Taking Affective Design as an Example. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 19(2), 132–147. JSTOR.

MacCarthy, B. L., & Wasusri, T. (2002). A review of non-standard applications of statistical process control (SPC) charts. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 19(3), 295–320. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02656710210415695>

McEneaney, J. E. (2016). Simulation-Based Evaluation of Learning Sequences for Instructional Technologies. *Instructional Science*, 44(1), 87–106. JSTOR.

Mirzaei, N., Niroomand, S., & Zare, R. (2016). Application of statistical process control in service industry: A case study of the restaurant sector. *Journal of Modelling in Management*, 11(3), 763–782. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JM2-06-2014-0046>

Öberg, A. E., Hammersberg, P., & Fundin, A. (2017). Factors influencing control charts usage of operational measures. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 21(3), 225–238. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MBE-08-2016-0041>

Prata, E. R. B. de A., Chaves, J. B. P., Gomes, S. G. S., & Passos, F. J. V. (2020). Statistical quality control in the food industry: A risk-based approach. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print). <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQRM-08-2019-0272>

Rikku, R., & Chakrabarty, N. (2013). Training Needs Analysis: A Case Study of Loco Pilots. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 104, 1105–1111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.11.206>

Rungtusanatham, M., Anderson, J. C., & Dooley, K. J. (1999). Towards measuring the “SPC implementation/practice” construct: Some evidence of measurement quality. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 16(4), 301–329. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02656719910239938>

Schippers, W. A. J. (2001). An integrated approach to process control. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 69(1), 93–105. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-5273\(98\)00243-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-5273(98)00243-6)

Shewhart, W. A. (1939). *Statistical Method: From the Viewpoint of Quality Control* (The Graduate School, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.).

Sousa, R. M., & Dinis-Carvalho, J. (2020). A game for process mapping in office and knowledge work. *Production Planning & Control*, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2020.1742374>

Vicentin, D. S., Silva, B. B., Piccirillo, I., Bueno, F. C., & Oprime, P. C. (2018). Monitoring process control chart with finite mixture probability distribution: An application in manufacture industry. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 35(2), 335–353. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQRM-11-2016-0196>