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#### Abstract

Purpose - The purpose of this paper is to provide a case study about the capacity utilization analysis in a small-sized manufacturing company through the application of time-driven activity-based costing (TDABC). After a brief overview of development of the TDABC system, a detailed application of TDABC and capacity utilization analysis in a bakery is given. Design/methodology/approach - This paper is based on a case study about the application of TDABC in a small-sized Greek manufacturing firm. In the case study, time equations were developed for the supporting, operating and manufacturing departments and product costs determined based on the model. Capacity utilization analysis made through the application of TDABC system. Findings - The study shows that TDABC is more applicable in small-sized manufacturing companies because of their labor-intensive nature. In contrast to previous studies, authors argue that even in small firms simple excel sheets are not enough to capture the complexity of the time equations and business intelligence software and programming coding is required. Research limitations/implications - Although the fundamental structure of TDABC is the same for all companies there is no strict form of application. Practical implications - The practical implication of this paper is that each firm has unique characteristics that need to be reflected in the application of the TDABC model. Originality/value - This paper contributes by providing insights into cost accounting in SMEs. More specifically, this paper contributes to the TDABC literature regarding the application of the system in small Originality/value - This paper contributes by providing insights into cost accounting in SMEs. More specifically, this paper contributes to the TDABC literature regarding the application of the system in small and medium sized manufacturing firms.
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## 1. Introduction

Managers of profit-seeking firms are tending toward cost reduction rather than cost control because of global competition, decentralization and decreased labor intensity. Cost reductions require maximum capacity utilization, so management of capacity and elimination of non-value-added activities are the most essential points. Traditional costing systems are not enough to meet the need for conducting capacity utilization analyses because they allocate overhead costs to products based on a volume-based cost driver, which leads to misinterpretation of results about product profitability.

The activity-based costing (ABC) system was developed in the 1980s to solve the
The activity-based costing (ABC) system was developed in the 1980s to solve the
problem of inaccurate allocation of overhead costs. ABC assigns overhead costs first to activities then to products or services (Bruggeman et al., 2005). Although the model has enabled managers to get better profitability information, firms faced many problems, such
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[^0]as time-consuming surveying and the system's data processing costs, inflexibility when modification is needed and behavioral resistance to the system by managers and employees while implementing the ABC model in their companies. Stout and Propri (2011) state that these problems are particularly acute for small to medium-sized companies that are not likely to have sophisticated information processing systems.

The time-driven activity based costing (TDABC) model was developed as an alternative to the ABC model. This new system drives general ledger costs directly to departments unlike conventional ABC , in which general ledger costs are driven to hundreds of activities. TDABC has simplified the costing process by eliminating time-consuming interviews and surveys with employees. Small firms can benefit from TDABC more because of the use of its simplified parameters (Somapa et al., 2012). Compared to ABC, TDABC provides management with a number of pragmatic solutions that can be used in small and medium-sized enterprises (Fladkjær and Jensen, 2011). The model allocates overhead and indirect costs to products or services according to the actual work demanded from the departments by these products or services. Allocation of costs under TDABC is mostly based on the firm's organizational structure - which department serves which. The design of the TDABC system changes from company to company to reflect the specific resource expense flows.

This paper discusses how TDABC can be applied in a small-sized manufacturing company with a different structure to large manufacturing firms. Musov (2017) claims that TDABC is an appropriate costing approach for SMEs because they are more labor intensive, and the system eliminates time-consuming interviews and surveys. There are few studies in the literature on the implementation of TDABC in small and medium-sized manufacturing firms (Öker and Adıgüzel, 2010; Stout and Propri, 2011; Barros and Ferreira, 2017; Wouters and Stecher, 2017; Lueg and Morratz, 2017; Ganorkar et al., 2018, 2019). Application of TDABC in such firms has some differences than that in larger firms. The most distinct difference concerns the calculation of capacity cost rates (CCR). Under TDABC, groups of resources are generally determined on a departmental basis, with CCR calculated for each department. In small businesses, however, departments are generally nested, so calculation of departmental CCR is not meaningful. On the other hand, the implementation of TDABC with the support of existing ERP systems in large firms allows easy updating as well as greater accuracy (Varila et al., 2007; Ruiz de Arbulo et al., 2012; Siguenza Guzman et al., 2013). In the case of SMEs with weaker ERP systems, TDABC can be built and maintained using relatively simple excel sheets (Somapa et al., 2012).

Application of TDABC differs across industries, most significantly between manufacturing and service companies. Because previous studies show that it is easier to apply TDABC in service companies because of their labor-intensive nature (Öker and Adıgüzel, 2010), the literature includes reports of many TDABC applications in service companies like hospitals (Demeere et al., 2009; Campanale et al., 2014; Kaplan et al., 2014, 2015; McLaughlin et al., 2014; Donovan et al., 2014; Akhavan et al., 2016; Laviana et al., 2016), hotels and restaurants (Dalci et al., 2010; Everaert et al., 2012; Riediansyaf, 2014) and libraries (Pernot et al., 2007; Kont and Jantson, 2011; Siguenza Guzman et al., 2014).

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. The next section discusses the case company's background. Section 3 describes the application of TDABC in this small-sized manufacturing company, gives time equations, CCR calculations and allocation of cost from supporting to operating and manufacturing departments and then to product batches. Section 4 describes the TDABC capacity utilization analysis. The last section gives concluding remarks.

## 2. Company background

This study analyzes the activities taking place in a small-size manufacturing company producing bakery products in Greece[1]. The main objective of the company is to create

Capacity
utilization analysis through TDABC
unique products with high nutrition value for the consumers. The company produces and distributes in its own retail shops products with short life cycles that are produced daily, such as bread, cookies, sweets, ice cream and others. The company also sells packaged products through its wholesale partnerships in order to be distribute them to retail shops in Greece or other countries.

There are five production departments that cover over 4.500 square meters, with each specialized to produce a different category of products. The company's daily production capacity can exceed 10 tones of finished products.

Until 2010, the company used a traditional costing system that gave inaccurate interpretations of the data and profitability calculations. Therefore, since 2011, the company has gradually migrated to the TDABC methodology, which provides correct calculations of the profitability per product, per product category, per client and per branch. This has enabled the company to continue expanding despite a difficult economic environment in Greece.

## 3. Application of TDABC

### 3.1 Application in small-sized companies

When implementing TDABC, the first step is identifying groups of resources that perform activities. CCR are then calculated by dividing the total cost of groups of resources by the practical time capacity of the group. Generally, groups of resources that are used to perform activities are classified in terms of departments. However, in most small businesses, departments cannot be classified accurately because generally one employee performs more than one function in the same area. This means that the calculation of CCR on a departmental (functional) basis does not produce meaningful results. For example, in the case company, one employee performs both the accounting and purchasing functions, so it is impossible to calculate different CCR for the two functions. We therefore calculated a single CCR for any employee who performs more than one function together. CCR is calculated as the total cost of resources divided by the practical time capacity of the employee. The total cost of resources includes the employee's salary and other support costs, like depreciation expenses or rent for the space used, depreciation of computers, machines or furniture used, electricity consumed in the area or by the computers, telecommunication expenses, etc. In this way, we can calculate the CCR for one employee rather than for a specific department, as we would do for larger firms.

To identify how much of the cost of supplying capacity is spent directly or allocated to other departments, we classified activities performed as corporate level, and supporting, operating and manufacturing activities.

The costs of corporate-level activities are directly expensed in the $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{L}$ schedule and not included in the cost of production because these activities are independent from the volume and mix of business done. Activities are classified as supporting level if they are not directly influenced by the firm's production volume. Because supporting activities just serve other departments, their costs are allocated to the specific departments that demand this work based upon the actual work done by these departments.

Some activities are classified as operating if they directly serve the production departments or there is a connection between batches of products and these activities. The cost of the operating department's activities can be allocated either to production departments or batches of products directly depending on the nature of the activity. For example, product delivery to the branches is an operating activity, so its cost can be allocated to the products delivered.

Classification of activities of departments and how the costs of these activities flow are

| Department | Activities | Classification of activity | Allocation of cost | Capacity utilization |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accounting \& Purchasing |  |  |  | analysis through |
| Act. 1 | Checking outstanding balance for a client and receiving a payment | Operating | Batches of products | TDABC |
| Act. 2 | Checking outstanding balance for a supplier and making payment | Supporting | Departments served $^{\mathrm{a}}$ |  |
| Act. 3 | Monthly invoice archiving in folders | Corporate sustaining | Expensed | 195 |
| Act. 4 | Recording invoices (from supplier) on ERP | Supporting | Departments served |  |
| Act. 5 | Preparing monthly financial report | Corporate sustaining | Expensed |  |
| Act. 6 | Preparing monthly payroll and making payments to employees | Supporting | Departments served |  |
| Act. 7 | Preparing order list based on the demands from the departments | Supporting | Departments served |  |
| Act. 8 | Preparing the monthly cash flow statement | Corporate sustaining | Expensed |  |
| Sales \& Logistics Department |  |  |  |  |
| Act. 1 | Issuing invoices - sending documents to clients and retail shops | Operating | Batches of products |  |
| Act. 2 | Receiving orders from customers | Operating | Batches of products |  |
| Act. 3 | Notifying production departments about orders from retail shops | Operating | Production departments |  |
| Act. 4 | Driving the car to retail shops and distributing (plastic boxes of) products | Operating | Batches of products |  |
| Maintenance Department |  |  |  |  |
| Act. 1 | Performing machine maintenance and services | Operating | Production departments (machine) |  |
| Act. 2 | Performing maintenance for production departments | Operating | Production departments |  |
| Act. 3 | Performing maintenance for other departments | Supporting | Departments served |  |
| Quality Control \& HR Department |  |  |  |  |
| Act. 1 | Performing product quality control in departments | Operating | Production departments |  |
| Act. 2 | Hiring new personnel | Supporting | Departments served |  |
| Act. 3 | Giving seminars | Supporting | Departments served |  |
| Act. 4 | Conducting R\&D | Corporate sustaining | Expensed |  |
| Warehouses |  |  |  |  |
| Act. 1 | Receiving activity | Operating | Production departments |  |
| Act. 2 | Put-away activity | Operating | Production departments |  |
| Act. 3 | Picking activity | Operating | Batches of products |  |
| Act. 4 | Shipment preparation | Operating | Batches of products |  |
| Washing Department Table I. |  |  |  |  |
| Act. 1 | Washing plastic boxes for bread, pastries, sweets and ice cream departments | Operating | Batches of products | Classification of activities and resource |
| Note: ${ }^{\text {a }}$ See Table V for details about which departments benefit from these activities expenses flow |  |  |  |  |

### 3.2 Allocation of the cost of the supporting and operating departments

In the next step of applying the TDABC model, time equations were developed. The model assigns overhead costs to products or other departments through time equations. Rather than defining a separate activity for every possible combination of processes as in the ABC system, TDABC estimates time equations. These show the time consumed by an activity as

Figure 1.
Resource expenses flow in the case company

Direct Costs

a function of different characteristics, called time drivers (Bruggeman et al., 2005). TDABC captures the variability of activities by including the possible subtasks of these activities in the time equation (Siguenza Guzman et al., 2013).

The time equations of each department are set to include multiple drivers for a single activity. Different sub-tasks of an activity have a different cost driver to reflect the complexity of each activity. Table II illustrates the activities, subtasks, time drivers and time consumed by each driver for the Accounting \& Purchasing Department.

Through the activity analysis, time equations were made for the Accounting \& Purchasing Department. For example, for the activity checking outstanding balance for a client and receive payment, the sub-tasks and their time drivers were determined and the following equation created:

> 5 min [number of agreements if no error found]
> +20 min [number of agreements if error found]
> +3 min [number of bank transfers received from clients]
> +6 min [number of check payments received by clients]
> +3 min [number of payments].

This activity is an operating activity and its cost is allocated to the batches of products that demand work from the department. Checking each agreement with the client "if no error found" uses 5 min of the department's resources. If an error is found in the agreement, then an additional 15 min consumed. Collections from the customer consume 3 min while the bank transfer and check payments consume 6 min. Scanning, saving, printing the document and then recording on the ERP consume 3 min for each payment.

The total time demanded by each client was then multiplied by the CCR of the department.

Table III illustrates the activities, subtasks, time drivers and time consumed by each driver for the Sales \& Logistics Department.

For example, for the activity drive the car to retail shops and distribute the products in plastic boxes, the sub-tasks and their time drivers were determined, and the following equations established.

The departmental cost rate is valid only when the mix of resources supplied is the same for each activity and transaction performed within the department. However, it is not valid if

| Subtask | Time driver | Time consumed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
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Table II.
Time equations for accounting \& purchasing department
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Table III.
Time equations for Sales \& Logistic Department

the activities within the department use different resources. In the case of the Sales \& Logistics Department, separate CCR were calculated for employee resources and vehicle resources, so two different time equations were established for this activity because separate CCR were calculated for the different capacity resources.

Time equation 1[2] (CCR of employee resources):
$2.5 \min$ [numbers of 2 pieces of box type 1]
+2 min [numbers of 4 pieces of box type 2 ]
+2 min [numbers of box type 3 ]
+4 min [numbers of 4 pieces of box type 1]
+3 min [numbers of 6 pieces of box type 2 ]
+1.4 min [numbers of 2 pieces of box type 3 ].

Time equation 2 (CCR of vehicle resources):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 95 \text { min per } \mathrm{m}^{3} \text { [if products delivered to Branch 1] } \\
& +115 \text { min per } \mathrm{m}^{3} \text { [if products delivered to Branch 2] } \\
& +110 \text { min per } \mathrm{m}^{3} \text { [if products delivered to Branch 3] } \\
& +130 \text { min per } \mathrm{m}^{3} \text { [if products delivered to Branch } 4 \text { ] } \\
& +240 \text { min per } \mathrm{m}^{3} \text { [if products delivered to Branch 5]. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Table IV illustrates the activities, subtasks, time drivers and time consumed by each driver for the Warehouse Department.

For example, for the "put-away" activity the sub-tasks and their time drivers were determined to create the following equation. Two different time equations[3] were developed for this activity because two different CCR were calculated for different capacity resources.

Time equation 1 (CCR for employee resources):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 2 \text { min per pallet [if Warehouse 1] }+4 \text { min per pallet [if Warehouse 2] } \\
& +8 \text { min per pallet [if Warehouse 3] }+10 \text { min per pallet [if Warehouse 4] } \\
& +0.10 \text { [number of boxes if weight per box is up to } 15 \mathrm{~kg} \text { ] } \\
& +0.25 \text { [number of boxes if weight per box is more than } 15 \mathrm{~kg} \text { and up to } 25 \mathrm{~kg} \text { ] } \\
& +2 \text { min [number of boxes if full pallet]. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Time equation 2 (CCR for storage)[4]:
$([$ Date that a good was taken out from warehouse]-[Date that a good was stored] $) \times 1440$.
The subtask for transferring the accepted goods from the collection area to Warehouses 1, 2, 3 and 4 consumes 2, 4, 8 and 10 min , respectively. Storing goods on the warehouse shelves subtask consumes 0.10 min for the plastic boxes up to 15 kg , and additional 0.15 min required for boxes between 15 and 25 kg . However, for the full pallets stored in the warehouses, 2 min of the resources are consumed. The total time consumed, which is obtained from the first equation, was multiplied by the CCR calculated for employee resources. From the second equation, we obtained the total time inventory stay in the
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Table IV.
Time equations for
Warehouse


| Subtask | Time driver | Time consumed | Time equation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Activity 3: picking activity |  |  |  |
| Receiving (picking list) demands from production departments | Number of deliveries | 10 min per delivery <br> 2 min per delivery [if extra request is from PD3, PD4 and PD5) <br> 5 min per delivery [if extra request is from PD2] <br> 8 min per delivery [if extra request is from PD1] | 10 min [numbers of delivery] +2 min [numbers of delivery if extra request is from PD3 or PD4 or PD5) + 5 min [numbers of delivery if extra request is from PD 2 ] +8 min [numbers of delivery if extra request is from PD1] +1 min[number of lines] +0.10 min [numbers of boxes if weight per box is up to 15 kg ] + 0.25 [numbers of boxes if weight per box is more than 15 kg and up to 25 kg ] +2 min [numbers of boxes if full pallet] +5 min [numbers of pallets if driving trolley to PD3, PD4 and PD5) +10 min [numbers of pallets if driving trolley to PD 2] + 12 min [numbers of pallets if extra driving trolley to PD1] |
| Create a buying order list if stock on shelves is below critical levels (check, make note, record on ERP) | Number of lines | 1 min per line |  |
| Pick goods (raw materials, packaging materials) from warehouse shelves for distribution to production departments | Number of boxes | 0.10 min per box [if weight per box is up to 15 kg ] <br> 0.25 per box [if weight per box is more than 15 kg and up to 25 kg ] <br> 2 min per box [if full pallet] |  |
| Drive trolley with goods to production departments | Number of pallets transferred | 2 min per box [if full pallet] <br> 5 min per pallet [if driving trolley to PD3, PD 4 and PD5) +10 min per pallet [if driving trolley to PD2] +12 min per pallet [if extra driving trolley to PD1] |  |
| Activity 4: shipment preparation Pick final goods and load them to trucks to deliver to clients or branches | Number of boxes | 5 min | 5 min [number of boxes] +2 min [number of boxes if products are located in Warehouse 1] +4 min [number of boxes if products are located in Warehouse 2] +8 min [number of boxes if products are located in Warehouse 3] |
| Drive trolley to pick up products depending their storage location | Number of boxes | 2 min if Warehouse 1 <br> 4 min if Warehouse 2 <br> 8 min if Warehouse 3 <br> 10 min if Warehouse 4 | +10 min [number of boxes if products are located in Warehouse 4] +0.16 min [number of type 1 plastic boxes] +0.33 min [number of types $2 \& 3$ plastic boxes if not full pallet] +0.088 min [number of types $2 \& 3$ plastic |
| Pick up products depending on their packaging characteristics and number (full pallet or not) | Number of boxes | 0.16 min per plastic box (type 1) <br> 0.33 min per plastic box (type $2 \& 3$ ) <br> 0.088 min per plastic box (type $2 \& 3$ ) if full pallet) <br> 0.16 min per carton box <br> 0.08 min per carton box if full pallet | boxes if full pallet] +0.16 min [number of carton boxes if not full pallet] +0.08 min [number of carton boxes if full pallet of 25 carton boxes] |
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Table IV.
warehouses, which was multiplied by the CCR calculated for the storage resources (see Table VII for CCR calculations).

When applying TDABC in the company, the overhead costs of the supporting departments allocated to other departments were based on the actual work demanded from those supporting departments. Table V shows the actual work demanded from some of these departments for each activity performed.

Note that the cost of checking outstanding balance for a client and receive payment (Activity 1) of the Accounting \& Purchasing Department was directly allocated to batches of products because this activity is directly related to production volume. In contrast, monthly invoice archiving on folders (Activity 3) is a corporate level activity so its cost is expensed directly in the $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{L}$ schedule.

Table VI shows the assignment of the costs of support departments to the other departments based on the actual work demanded from each department. Through time equations, the total time demanded by other departments was determined and multiplied by the CCR of the department which is shown in Table VII.

TDABC generally assumes that capacity is measured by the time available from people and equipment. However, there are examples when time is not used to measure resource capacity, such as measuring a department's capacity in terms of area in square meters. Table VII shows the CCR calculations for the supporting and operating departments. When classifying departments, we adhered to the company's own classifications made. The total capacity costs of the departments, which include employee salaries, and supporting costs, like depreciation or utilities, were divided by total practical time capacity of the employees.

### 3.3 Cost allocation for production departments

The same procedures were also applied to the company's six production departments:
(1) Production Department 1 produces breads and double-baked breads.
(2) Production Department 2 produces cookies and biscuits.
(3) Production Department 3 produces pastry.
(4) Production Department 4 produces sweets and chocolate.
(5) Production Department 5 produces ice cream.
(6) Packaging Department.

The following section provides example CCR calculations for Production Department 2 and the Packaging Department while the time equations are explained for two products in Production Department 2: cookies (ID 10320) and biscuits (ID 10325).

The cost model for this company was created under the philosophy of having multiple CCRs for single machines or groups of machines used in the production departments. Each production department has various machines that are not used together or for all tasks and steps in each product's production process. This enables us to measure costs more accurately, instead of using only one CCR for all the machinery in the department. A single CCR was calculated for those machines in the same department that perform identical tasks. For example, if a department has five ovens that are identical in their characteristics and production capacity, we used a single CCR. In this way, the productivity of a machine or group of machines can be measured and unused capacity managed. Tables VIII and IX show the CCR calculations for Production Department 2 and the Packaging Department.

Table X shows the time equation for the production of cookies (ID 10320) in Production Department 2.

|  | To： |  |  |  |  | $=\frac{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{5}}{\stackrel{H}{E}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { g } \\ & \text { 20 } \\ & \text { it } \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Activity 1： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 378 |
|  | Activity 2： |  | 594 | 537 | 80 | 192 | 938 | 160 | 1，093 | 886 | 1，557 | 1，199 | 63 | 938 | 892 |  |
|  | Activity 3： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4，500 |  |
|  | Activity 4： |  | 2，042 | 624 | 184 | 103 | 1，079 | 85 | 1，496 | 1，096 | 2，981 | 2，489 | 79 | 665 | 511 |  |
|  | Activity 5： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2，500 |  |
|  | Activity 6 ： | 230 | 574 | 230 | 400 | 0 | 230 | 230 | 2，856 | 1，410 | 3，003 | 1，392 | 115 | 467 |  |  |
|  | Activity 7： |  | 2 | 6 | 18 | 0 | 1，779 | 6 | 1，164 | 953 | 2，043 | 1，155 | 89 | 251 | 1 |  |
|  | Activity 8： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4，623 |  |
|  | Total（min） | 230 | 3，211 | 1，397 | 682 | 296 | 4，025 | 481 | 6，610 | 4，344 | 9，585 | 6，235 | 346 | 2，320 | 13，027 | 378 |
| \％\％矿 | To： |  |  |  |  | 的彦 |  |  |  |  | 亮镸 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Activity 1 ： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11，623 |
|  | Activity 2： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14，848 |
|  | Activity 3： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1，521 | 1，521 | 1，521 | 1，521 | 892 | 177 |  |  |
|  | Total（min） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1，521 | 1，521 | 1，521 | 1，521 | 892 | 177 | 0 | 26，471 |
|  | Activity 4（min） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 207，495 |
|  | Activity $4\left(\mathrm{~m}^{3}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25 |
|  | Total（ $\mathrm{min}^{*} \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ ） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5，187，375 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | To： |  |  |  |  | 上彦 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Activity 2 （min） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 499，320 | 473，040 | 446，760 | 341，640 | 367，920 | 131，400 |  |  |
|  | Activity $2\left(\mathrm{~m}^{3}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 450 | 500 | 520 | 100 | 50 | 150 |  |  |
|  | Total（ $\mathrm{min}^{*} \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ ） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 224，694，000 | 236，520，000 | 232，315，200 | 34，164，000 | 18，396，000 | 19，710，000 |  |  |
|  | Activity 1： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5，113 | 3，863 | 9，538 | 7，252 | 184 | 1，818 |  |  |
|  | Activity 3： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 44，289 |
|  | Activity 4： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25，308 |
|  | Total（min） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5，113 | 3，863 | 9，538 | 7，252 | 184 | 1，818 | 0 | 69，597 |

Note：${ }^{\text {a} A c c o u n t i n g ~ \& ~ P u r c h a s i n g, ~ S a l e s ~ \& ~ L o g i s t i c s ~ a n d ~ W a r e h o u s e ~ D e p a r t m e n t s ' ~ a c t i v i t i e s ~ a r e ~ g i v e n ~ a s ~ e x a m p l e s ~}$
Table V．
Actual time demanded from some of supporting and operating departments ${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$
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Table VI.
Assignment of cost of supporting and operating departments to other departments

| Part 1: Total time Dem | ded by | cr Depa | ments a | and Produc |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{2}{2} \\ & \text { 亮 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\underset{\substack{\text { Total capacity } \\ \text { used }}}{(\mathrm{A})}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total Practical } \\ \text { Capacity } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (\text { B-A) }) \\ \substack{\text { Unucsed } \\ \text { Haxecs } \\ \text { Capacity }} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Unused } \\ \text { Hxecs } \\ \text { Capacity } \end{gathered}$ |
| Accounting \& Purchasing Department ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $230^{\text {b }}$ | 3,211 | 1,397 | 682 | 296 | 4,025 | 481 | 6,610 | 4,344 | 9,585 | 6,235 | ${ }^{346}$ | 2,320 | 13,027 | 378 | 53,166 min | 117,445 min | 64,279 min | 54\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Sales \& \& Losisics } \\ \text { Deparment } \\ \text { capacity) } \end{array} \text { (Emplogee } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,521 | ${ }^{1,521}$ | 1,521 | 1,521 | 892 | 177 | 0 | 26,471 | 33,623 min | 117,445 min | 83,822 min | 71\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Sales \& Logistics } \\ \text { Department (vehicles } \\ \text { capacity } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,187,375 |  | $\begin{gathered} 7,986,284 \\ \min ^{2} \mathrm{~m}^{4} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2,79,909 \\ \min ^{2} \mathrm{~m}^{2} \end{gathered}$ | 35\% |
| Warchousc (employec capacity | ${ }^{0}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,113 | 3,863 | 9,538 | 7,252 | 184 | 1,818 | 0 | 69,997 | 97,365 min | 117,445 min | 20,080 min | 17\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Warchouse (storge } \\ \text { capacity) } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 224,694,000 | 23,520,000 | 232,315,200 | 34,164,000 | 18,396,000 | 19,710,000 | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 76,799,200 \\ \min ^{*} \mathrm{~m}^{3} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 930,312,000 \\ \mathrm{~min}^{*} \mathrm{~m}^{3} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 164,512,800 \\ \min ^{*} \mathrm{~m}^{3} \end{gathered}$ | 17\% |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50,400 | 24,360 | 31,920 | 21,420 | 3,360 | 21,840 | 0 | 0 | 155,300 min | 117,445 min | ${ }^{-35,855}$ min | -30\% |
| Quality Control \& HR Dcpartment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78,462 | 43,738 | 67,095 | 48,146 | 6,331 | 31,105 | 0 | 0 | 274.877 min | 234,892 min | $-39,985$ min | -17\% |
| Washing Department | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95,342 | 95,342 | 117,445 min | 22,103 min | 19\% |


| Part 2: Allocation of Support Departments ${ }^{\text {c Costs }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 导 } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{E} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\ & \text { E } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\underset{\substack{\text { Alloumt } \\ \text { Alocated }}}{(A)}$ | ${ }_{\text {Total Cost }}{ }^{\text {(B) }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { (B-A) } \\ \begin{array}{c} \text { Unallocated } \\ \text { (Expensed } \\ \text { Directly) } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Accounting \& } \\ & \text { Purchasing Department } \end{aligned}$ | $46.89 \mathrm{f}^{4}$ | $655.746^{6}$ | $285.27 \epsilon$ | $13927 \epsilon$ | $60.45 ¢$ | $822.02 \epsilon$ | ${ }^{98} 25 \epsilon$ | ${ }^{1,349.766}$ | 887.16 E | 1,957.34 | 1,273.19 | ${ }^{70.62 \epsilon}$ | 473.88 E | 2,660.28 $\epsilon$ | ${ }^{77.196}$ | 10,857.306 | 23,983.98 $\epsilon$ | ${ }^{13,126,686}$ |  |
| Sales \& Logistics <br> Department (Employee capacity) | 0.006 | 0.006 | 0.006 | $0.00 ¢$ | $0.00 \varepsilon$ | $0.00 €$ | 0.006 | 221.85 ¢ | $221.85 \epsilon$ | $221.85 \epsilon$ | 221.85 ¢ | 130.07 ¢ | $25.77 \epsilon$ | $0.00 \epsilon$ | 3,861.44 | 4,90467є | 17,132.00¢ | ${ }^{12,227.33 \epsilon}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sales \& Logistics } \\ & \text { Department (vehicles } \\ & \text { capacity) } \end{aligned}$ | 0.006 | ${ }^{0.00 ¢}$ | ${ }^{0.00 ¢}$ | ${ }^{0.006}$ | $0.00 \epsilon$ | ${ }^{0.006}$ | ${ }^{0.006}$ | $0.00 ¢$ | 0.006 | $0.00 €$ | ${ }^{0.00 ¢}$ | 0.006 | ${ }^{0.006}$ | $0.00 €$ | 44,507.68 $¢$ | 44,50487¢ | 68,518.00€ | 24,013.13 $\epsilon$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Warehouse (employee } \\ & \text { capacity) } \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{0.006}$ | $0.00 €$ | $0.00 ¢$ | 0.006 | $0.00 \epsilon$ | 0.006 | 0.006 | 387966 | $293.13 \epsilon$ | 723.69 E | 550.26 | 13.966 | $137.97 \epsilon$ | $0.00 €$ | 5,280.81є | 7,387786 | 8,911.39€ | 1,523.61 $\epsilon$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Warchousc (storge } \\ & \text { capecity) } \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{0.00 ¢}$ | ${ }^{0.00 ¢}$ | ${ }^{0.006}$ | ${ }^{0.00 ¢}$ | ${ }^{0.006}$ | $0.00 \in$ | ${ }^{0.006}$ | $69.40 \epsilon$ | ${ }^{35} 775$ | 244.81 € | ${ }^{65.77 \epsilon}$ | $0.62 \epsilon$ | ${ }^{21.04 \epsilon}$ | $0.00 \epsilon$ | 0.00 | $43739 \in$ | 55,953.36 | 55,517.97€ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Maintenance } \\ & \text { Department } \end{aligned}$ | $0.00 ¢$ | $0.00 ¢$ | ${ }^{0.006}$ | ${ }^{0.006}$ | ${ }^{0.006}$ | 0.006 | 0.006 | 6,751.98¢ | 3,263.46є | 4,276.25 | 2,869.59 $\epsilon$ | 450.13 E | 2,925.86 | $\epsilon$ | 0.00 | 20,537.27 $\epsilon$ | 15,73.906 | 4.80,37€ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Quality Control \& HR } \\ & \text { Department } \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{0.006}$ | ${ }^{0.00 e}$ | ${ }^{0.00 ¢}$ | ${ }^{0.006}$ | ${ }^{0.006}$ | 0.006 | $0.00 ¢$ | 16,023.08 $\epsilon$ | 8,931.89 | 13,701.70e | 9,832.05 | 1,29294e | 6,352.03 $\epsilon$ | $0.00 e$ | 0.006 | 56,133.68¢ | 34,955.43E | -21,178.25 |  |
| Wasting Department | 0.006 | 0.00 E | 0.00 E | 0.006 | 0.006 | $0.00 \varepsilon$ | 0.006 | ${ }^{0.006}$ | 0.006 | $0.00 €$ | 0.006 | ${ }^{0.006}$ | 0.006 | $0.00 \in$ | 21,500€ | 21,500 | 26,488 6 | 4,988 $\epsilon$ |  |

[^1]Table VI.

Table VII.
Capacity cost rate calculations

| Department | Types of capacity | Capacity costs (€) | Numbers of employees | Total time capacity provided (min) | $85 \%$ of capacity provided | CCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accounting \& Purchasing | Employee | 23,983.00 | 1 | 138,171 | 117,445 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | €0.2042 |
| Department |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Department | (office) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Drivers \& | 68,518.54 | 2 | 276,342 | $234,891 \times 34$ | €0.00858 |
|  | Vehicles |  |  |  |  | per $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ per |
| Maintenance Department | Employee | 15,733.00 | 1 | 138,171 | 117,445 | €0.1340 |
| Quality Control \& HR | Employee | 34,955.00 | 2 | 276,343 | 234,892 | €0.1488 |
| Department |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Warehouse Department | Employee | 8,911.39 | 1 | 138,171 | 117,445 | €0.0759 |
|  | Storage | 55,955.36 |  | 525,600 | $525,600 \times 1,770$ | 0.0000601 |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{m}^{3 \mathrm{c}}$ | per $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ per |
| Washing Department | Employee | 26,488.00 | 1 | 138,171 | 117,445 | $€ 0.2255$ |

Notes: ${ }^{\text {a }}$ CCR for employees was calculated based on the assumption that there are 52 weeks in a year and six working days in each week, which totals 313 days, including holidays. There are 288 net working days after deducting 25 days of holidays. Total working hours per year were calculated as $(288$ days $\times 8 \mathrm{~h})=2,303$ while there were a total of 138,171 working minutes per year. Practical capacity was assumed to be 85 percent of the theoretical capacity of employees $(138,171 \times 0.85)=117,445$; ${ }^{\text {b }}$ the total practical capacity of vehicle resources was calculated by multiplying the practical time capacity of two drivers $(138,171 \times 2)$ by the car's volume in cubic meters $\left(34 \mathrm{~m}^{3}\right)$. The CCR for vehicle resources was then calculated by dividing the capacity cost by the total $\mathrm{m}^{3} \times \min$ capacity; cthe capacity of warehouse storage was measured in $\min \times \mathrm{m}^{3}$. By assuming warehouses are available for the full year ( 365 days $\times 24 \mathrm{~h} \times 60 \mathrm{~min}$ ), the time capacity was calculated and multiplied by the storage capacity $\left(1,170 \mathrm{~m}^{3}\right)$

We calculated the indirect costs incurred in Production Department 2 and the Packaging Department for one batch of cookies (ID 10320) using the time equation and CCRs calculated for Production Department 2 and the Packaging Department as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
280 \mathrm{~min} & \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(production employees) }}+15 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(mixer 120 It) }}+60 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(oven) }} \\
& +40 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(trolley) }}+12 \mathrm{~min} \text { per } \mathrm{m}^{2} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(elevator 2) }} \\
& +135 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(packaging department's employees) }} \\
& +45 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(packaging machine mod } 850)}+10 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(production printer) }} \\
& =280 \mathrm{~min} \times 0.08171 € / \mathrm{min}+15 \times 0.01463 € / \mathrm{min} \\
& +60 \mathrm{~min} \times 0.11369 € / \mathrm{min} \\
& +40 \mathrm{~min} \times 0.001943836 € / \mathrm{min} \\
& +12 \mathrm{~min} \text { per } \mathrm{m}^{2} \times 0.000012 € / \mathrm{min} \text { per } \mathrm{m}^{2} \\
& +135 \mathrm{~min} \times 0.09524 € / \mathrm{min}+45 \mathrm{~min} \times 0.01905 € \\
& +10 \mathrm{~min} \times 0.00190 € / \mathrm{min}=43.73 €
\end{aligned}
$$

The total indirect cost of one batch of cookies (ID 10320) also includes costs allocated by operating departments. The cost of different batches produced for the different clients within the year vary because the costs of raw materials and packaging materials change,

| Resources | Capacity costs ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ( $¢$ ) | Total time capacity (min) | Capacity cost rate (CCR) ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stove | 1,260.01 | 302,400 | $€ 0.00417$ |
| Flour dosometric machine | 328.35 | 302,400 | $€ 0.00109$ |
| Mixer AR80 | 1,112.31 | 302,400 | €0.00368 |
| Mixer XBE60 | 286.93 | 302,400 | $€ 0.00095$ |
| Mixer 120 lt | 4,423.85 | 302,400 | €0.01463 |
| Cutting machine ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 3,236.93 | 302,400 | $€ 0.01291$ |
| Conveyor Belt 1 | 171.54 |  |  |
| Conveyor Belt 2 | 248.46 |  |  |
| Conveyor Belt 3 | 248.46 |  |  |
| Ice trimmer machine | 705.85 | 302,400 | 0.00233 |
| Machine for producing cookies | 748.46 | 302,400 | €0.00248 |
| Machine for grinding raw materials | 363.85 | 302,400 | €0.00120 |
| Film wrapping machine | 210.00 | 302,400 | €0.00069 |
| Oven $1^{\text {d }}$ | 4,793.83 | 1,814,400 | €0.11369 |
| Oven 2 | 5,916.91 |  |  |
| Oven 3 | 5,916.91 |  |  |
| Oven 4 | 5,916.91 |  |  |
| Oven 5 | 5,916.91 |  |  |
| Oven 6 | 5,916.91 |  |  |
| Almond crusher machine | 225.39 | 302,400 | €0.00075 |
| Recipe execution station | 303.54 | 302,400 | €0.00100 |
| Refrigerator | 1,647.26 | 1,051,200 ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | $€ 0.00157$ per min per m ${ }^{3}$ |
| Water cooler machine | 510.00 | 302,400 | €0.00169 |
| Production 2 employees | 56,278.47 | 688,800 | €0.08171 |
| Elevator $2^{\mathrm{f}}$ | 175.99 | 1,512,000 min $\times \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | 0.000012 per min per m ${ }^{2 \mathrm{~g}}$ |
| Trolley ${ }^{\text {h }}$ |  |  | €0,001943836 |

Notes: ${ }^{\text {a Capacity costs of resources include depreciation, electricity used by the machine, maintenance materials }}$ used for the machine etc. Some of these costs are direct costs like depreciation and maintenance materials used for the machines. To allocate indirect costs to the resources suitable cost drivers are used. For example; kws for electricity used. Capacity costs of resources also include cost allocated from supporting and operating departments to the production departments; ${ }^{\text {b }}$ the CCRs for the machines for every department were calculated based on the assumption that the machines are available 14 h per day and 12 months per year, since the factory produces daily bakery products. Thus, to determine how many minutes that a machine can operate (excluding five days for regular maintenance repairs per year), we calculated $14 \mathrm{~h} /$ day $\times 60 \mathrm{~min} / \mathrm{h} \times \times 360$ operating days. The CCRs for machines like refrigerators that store products were calculated by dividing the annual depreciation and operating expenses by their useable volume in cubic meters. This result was divided by converting the 365 days of the year into minutes to find the cost per $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ per min. The CCR for the production department for ice cream was calculated differently since this department does not operating throughout the year; ${ }^{\text {c we grouped these machines because the }}$ cutting machine does not work without the conveyor belts; ${ }^{\text {d }}$ we grouped these machines and obtained a single CCR because they have identical characteristics and perform identical work; ${ }^{e}$ the refrigerator has a storage capacity of $2 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ while its annual operating time is ( 365 days $\times 24 \mathrm{~h}$ per day $\times 60 \mathrm{~min}$ per hour) $=525,600 \mathrm{~min}$. The total capacity of the refrigerator is $\left(2 \mathrm{~m}^{3} \times 525,600 \mathrm{~min}\right)=1,051,200 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{m}^{3}$; ${ }^{\mathrm{f}}$ there are two elevators. One connects Production Department 1 with the lower floor where the Packaging Department is located while the second elevator connects the Packaging Department with the other departments below. Although Elevator 2 is also used by other departments, its CCR calculation is shown here; ${ }^{g}$ the CCR can be calculated based on the time and the space $\left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ that the trolleys occupy to send them from Production Department 2 to the Packaging Department, and send back the empty trolleys to Production Department 2 after the products have been packed in sealed bags. Elevator 2 has a maximum capacity of $5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ and can take six trolleys. The operating time per year (excluding maintenance) is 302,400 minutes. The total capacity of Elevator 2 is $\left(302,400 \mathrm{~min} \times 5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\right)=1,512,000$ $\min \times \mathrm{m}^{2}$; hthe trolleys are transferred from Production Department 2 to the Packaging Department. They remain in each department for variable times depending on the task. The CCR for the trolleys when they are in Production Department 2 is $€ 0.001943836$ while the CCR when they are in the Packaging Department is $€ 0.001277883$. For Production Department 2, the trolleys have an annual cost of $€ 595.98$. These costs derive from the department where they are located, based on the space that they occupy and any maintenance that they require. We assume that they are available for ( 14 h per day $\times 60 \mathrm{~min}$ per hour $\times 365$ days per year) $=306,600 \mathrm{~min}$ per year. To calculate the CCR, we divided the total annual cost by the time capacity ( $€ 595.98 / 306,600 \mathrm{~min}$ )

Table VIII.

Table IX.
CCR calculations for the packaging department

|  | Capacity costs <br> $(€)$ | Total time capacity <br> $(\mathrm{min})$ | Capacity cost rate (CCR) <br> $(€)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Resources | $11,624.08$ | 302,400 | 0.06631 |
| Packaging machine mod.Sim ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $4,640.17$ |  |  |
| Packaging machine mod.250 | $1,370.94$ |  |  |
| Check weightier machine | $1,823.95$ |  |  |
| Vertical belt | 594.05 | 302,400 | 0.00400 |
| Round movable table | $1,209.43$ | 302,400 | 0.01905 |
| Metal detector | $5,760.80$ | 302,400 | 0.001563 |
| Packaging machine mod.850 | $4,726.56$ | 302,400 | 0.09524 |
| Horizontal packaging machine | 573.95 | 275,520 |  |
| Production printer | $26,241.40$ |  |  |
| Employees in packaging |  |  |  |
| department |  |  |  |
| Note: ${ }^{\text {a }}$ We grouped these machines since they do not operate independently |  |  |  |

Table X.
Time equation for the production of cookies (ID 10320) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ in
Production
Department 2
$\left.\begin{array}{llll}\hline & & \text { Cookies } & \\ \text { Time } \\ \text { driver }\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{lll}\text { Time consumed }\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l}\text { Calculation of cost for } \\ \text { cookies }\end{array}\right]$

Notes: ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Only one of the different types of cookies produced in Production Department 2 given as an example. Each type has different time equation
specific clients have different waiting times in the warehouses and the frequency and volume of clients' orders fluctuate. Table XI shows the average cost for a single product produced in Production Department 2 and packaged in the Packaging Department.

Table XII shows the time equation for biscuits (ID 10325) production in Production Department 2.

| Activity location | Cost per batch (€) | Cost per unit (€) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Raw materials | 169.26 | 0.6994 |
| Production Department 2 | 30.00 | 0.1240 |
| Packaging Department | 13.73 | 0.0567 |
| Accounting \& Purchasing Department | 22.35 | 0.0924 |
| Sales \& Logistics Department | 34.89 | 0.1442 |
| Warehouse Department | 29.48 | 0.1218 |
| Washing Department | $0.00^{\text {a }}$ | 0.0000 |
| Total product cost | 299.71 | 1.2385 |

Note: ${ }^{\text {a The }}$ Washing Department was not involved in the process for this specific product

Table XI.
Total cost of one batch/unit of cookies
(ID 10320)

| Subtask | Time driver | Biscuits <br> Time consumed | Calculation of cost for biscuits |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Collect raw materials from department's daily storage shelves | Number of <br> batches | 8 min (production employees) | $8 \min \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(production }}$ employees) |
| Prepare recipe by checking the weight of each ingredient in the scale. Put raw materials in mixer |  | 8 min (production employees) | $8 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(production }}$ employees) |
| Mix raw materials in the mixer |  | 18 min (mixer 80 lt ) | $18 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{(\text {mixer } 80 \mathrm{lt})}$ |
| Take out mixed materials and place in dough divider machine. |  | 35 min (cutting machine and conveyor belts) +114 min | $35 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(cutting machine and }}$ conveyor belts) |
| Lay pieces onto metal sheets. Load metal sheets onto trolleys |  | (production employees) | 114 min $\times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(production }}$ employees) |
| Put trolleys into ovens to bake |  | 40 min (oven machine) +12 min (production employees) | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(oven) }} \\ & 12 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(production }} \end{aligned}$ |
| Take trolleys out of the ovens and leave to cool |  | 40 min (product stays on the trolley) +4 min (production employees) | employees) <br> $40 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(trolley) }}$ <br> $4 \min \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(production }}$ <br> employees) |
| Load trolleys into elevator and transfer to Packaging Department |  | $12 \mathrm{~min}($ elevator 2$)+4 \mathrm{~min}$ (production employees) | 12 min per m${ }^{2} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(elevator 2) }}$ <br> $4 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(production }}$ |
| Place products into sealing bags and then into cartons |  | 35 min if packaging is $380 \mathrm{gr} /$ package (employees in packaging department) +45 min $\times$ packaging machine mod.850) +10 min (printing labels for cartons, employees in packaging department) 20 min if package is $5 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{box}$. (only employees time, no packaging machines needed) | $55 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(packaging }}$ <br> department's employees) $45 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(packaging }}$ machines) $+10 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}$ <br> (production printer) |

Table XII. Time equation for biscuits (ID 10325) production in production department 2

We calculated the cost of one batch of biscuits (ID 10325) by using the time equation and CCRs calculated for Production Department 2 and the Packaging Department as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
150 \mathrm{~min} & \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(production employees) }}+18 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(mixer 80lt) }}+35 \mathrm{~min} \\
& \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(cutting machine and conveyor belts) }} \\
& +40 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(oven) }}+40 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(trolley) }}+12 \mathrm{~min} \text { per } \mathrm{m}^{2} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(elevator 2) }} \\
& +55 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(packaging department's employees) }}+45 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(packaging machines) }} \\
& +10 \mathrm{~min} \times \mathrm{CCR}_{\text {(production printer) }} \\
& =150 \mathrm{~min} \times 0.08171 € / \mathrm{min}+18 \mathrm{~min} \times 0.00368 € / \mathrm{min} \\
& +35 \mathrm{~min} \times 0.01291 € / \mathrm{min} \\
& +40 \mathrm{~min} \times 0.11369 € / \mathrm{min}+40 \mathrm{~min} \times 0.001943836 € / \mathrm{min} \\
& +12 \mathrm{~min} \text { per } \mathrm{m}^{2} \times 0.000012 € / \mathrm{min} \text { per } \mathrm{m}^{2} \\
& +55 \mathrm{~min} \times 0.09524 € / \mathrm{min}+45 \mathrm{~min} \times 0.01905 € \\
& +10 \mathrm{~min} \times 0.00190 € / \mathrm{min}=23.50 €
\end{aligned}
$$

## 4. Capacity utilization analysis

Perhaps the most beneficial tool of TDABC is the capacity utilization analysis conducted through the model (Öker and Adıgüzel, 2010; Stouthuysen et al., 2010). When applying the model, the practical capacities of resources like machines, equipment and employees are determined and compared with the actual usage of the capacities at the end of the measurement period. The last two columns of Table VI show the unused or excess capacities of the supporting and operating departments. Table VI compares the total capacity used with the practical capacity of the departments. Capacity is generally measured thorough the employee time available for the supporting and operating departments apart from the storage capacity of the "Warehouse" Department and the driver and vehicle capacity of the "Sales \& Logistics" Department. These are measured as "minute*m". The findings indicate that all the employees of the supporting and operating departments are working under capacity except for the "Maintenance" and "Quality Control \& HR" Departments. These findings can be used by management when making performance evaluations.

Table XIII shows the capacity utilization of resources per year in Production Department 2.
According to the analysis, the cookies producing machine, grinding machine and film wrapping machine had the greatest excess capacities at 38,15 and 5 percent, respectively. Because these machines are not used by other departments, the unused capacity cannot be transferred to other departments. The company cannot reduce their excess capacity because there is only one of each machine, and they are all required for production.

The capacity utilization of employee resources was 88 percent. The products produced in each production department require different skills from the employees. Therefore, although employees that can work in Production Department 1 can also work in Production Department 2, they cannot work in Production Department 3 (pastry), Production Department 4 (sweets) or Production Department 5 (ice cream) without retraining.

In the TDABC model of the case company, only the cost of the capacity used is allocated to products while unused capacity is directly expensed in P/L. The costs of the excess capacities of the machines are not included in the inventoriable product costs. The overhead of unused capacity is expensed immediately as it is incurred whereas the overhead of used capacity is inventoried until the accounting period during which the manufactured goods are sold. In the TDABC model of the case company, there is no variable-fixed cost

| Resources | Available capacity (min) | Consumed capacity ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (min) | Capacity utilization (\%) | Capacity utilization |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stove | 302,400 | 235,872 | 78.00 | analysis through |
| Flour dosometric machine | 302,400 | 276,817 | 91.54 | TDABC |
| Mixer AR80 | 302,400 | 205,632 | 68.00 |  |
| Mixer XBE60 | 302,400 | 166,320 | 55.00 |  |
| Mixer 120 lt | 302,400 | 214,704 | 71.00 | 213 |
| Cutting machine | 302,400 | 205,632 | 68.00 |  |
| Conveyor Belt 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Conveyor Belt 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Conveyor Belt 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Ice trimmer machine | 302,400 | 214,704 | 71.00 |  |
| Machine for producing cookies | 302,400 | 114,912 | 38.00 |  |
| Machine for grinding raw materials | 302,400 | 45,360 | 15.00 |  |
| Film wrapping machine | 302,400 | 15,120 | 5.00 |  |
| Oven 1 | 1,814,400 | 1,614,816 | 89.00 |  |
| Oven 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Oven 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Oven 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Oven 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Oven 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Almond crusher machine | 302,400 | 214,704 | 71.00 |  |
| Recipe execution station | 302,400 | 276,817 | 91.54 |  |
| Refrigerator | 302,400 | 287,885 | 95.20 |  |
| Water cooler machine | 302,400 | 286,675 | 94.80 |  |
| Employees in production | 688,800 | 610,208 | 88.59 |  |
| Department 2 |  |  |  | Capacity utilization |
| Notes: ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Consumed capacity of each resource calculated according to actual production during one-year period. Based on the time-equations developed (see Tables X and XII as examples), we determined how many minutes of each asset required making production during one-year period |  |  |  | analysis for Production Department 2 |

segregation. Separating variable and fixed components of overhead and calculating a different CCR for each could be a better way of costing. Figure 2 illustrates how the direct and indirect costs were allocated in the case company.

Tse and Gong (2009) also state the benefits of the recognition of idle resources in TDABC. Under traditional volume-based costing models and the ABC model, all overhead costs of the


Figure 2.
Allocation of cost in the case company
period are recognized as product costs. Any difference between the total overhead cost and allocated overhead is regarded as an error in the allocation process and adjusted at the end of the period. However according to TDABC, only resource costs consumed by the products are treated as product costs while idle resource costs are treated as period costs (Tse and Gong, 2009).

Capacity analysis through TDABC provides two benefits to companies. First, because TDABC does not allocate the cost of unused capacity to products, it provides more accurate information on product costs. Second, companies can improve operational efficiency by reducing idle capacity, either through increased production volume or elimination of idle resources.

## 5. Conclusion

This study has offered a comprehensive application of TDABC in a small-sized manufacturing company. Siguenza Guzman et al. (2013) suggest that it is important that TDABC is implemented by independent researchers rather than its creators to provide unbiased evaluations of the system. Previous studies have discussed the advantages and disadvantages of TDABC. One of the most important advantages is its simplicity because it only requires two parameters: CCR and time consumptions. The second advantage mentioned in previous studies is the ability of the time equations to reflect complex operations. Third, TDABC allows for a capacity utilization analysis. However, there are also many criticisms. One is that TDABC can be subjective and requires a considerable amount of data. Having conducted our own implementation, we agree with most of the advantages. Especially for small-sized companies, determining time consumption through estimations or direct observations is easier than for larger firms, which decreases the subjectivity of employees. On the other hand, in contrast to previous studies, we argue that simple excel sheets are not enough to build and maintain a TDABC model even in small firms. Rather, business intelligence software and programming coding is required to capture the complexity of the time equations.

Finally, although the fundamental structure of TDABC is the same for all companies in the use of time equations and calculating CCRs, there is no strict form of application. Instead, it can vary from company to company according to the organization chart and resource expenses flows between departments and from departments to products. That is, each firm has unique characteristics that need to be reflected in the application of the model.

## Notes

1. The company is real but the quantities have been changed to maintain confidentiality.
2. Subtasks of "Drop off the plastic boxes at retail shops," "Load empty plastic boxes into car" "Drop off empty plastic boxes at washing department" performed by employees. So, only these subtasks' times are included in time equation 1.
3. The first equation shows pushing the costs of the warehouse employee to the departments that he/she serves and the second equation shows pushing the costs of storage of the raw materials onto the batches.
4. Days stored multiplied by $1,440(24 \mathrm{~h} \times 60 \mathrm{~min})$ to convert it to the number of minutes.
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[^0]:    ## JEL Classification - M41, M11, M49

[^1]:    Notes: ${ }^{\text {a }}$ We ignored reciprocal allocation between supporting and operating departments because only Accounting \& Purchasing Department serves to other departments and amounts are very small to affect the results. In the contrary case, reciprocal allocation of supporting and operating departments' cost is needed; ${ }^{b}$ these numbers are obtained from Table $V$ which shows detailed activity analysis; ${ }^{c}$ total costs of departments are determined from the trial balances of the company. The cost of resources like electricity, depreciation or water allocated to the departments by using suitable cost drivers. For example; kws for electiricity, square meters for depreciation of the building, numbers of employees for water etc; total time demanded by the Sales \& Logistic department from Accounting \& Purchasing Department multiplied with the CCR of Accounting \& Purchasing Department (see Table VII for CCR calculations of Supporting and Operating Departments)

