

Prioritising Factors Influencing Service Quality at Durban University of Technology: AHP Approach

Paul Green¹ and Shaun Ramroop²

¹*Durban University of Technology, South Africa*

²*University of Kwazulu-Natal, South Africa*

KEYWORDS Multi-Criteria Decision Making. University. Pairwise Comparisons. Brainstorming

ABSTRACT There have been numerous studies conducted on the evaluation of service quality at universities. However, there remains a deficiency on using a multi criteria decision making approach in determining factors to consider for the improvement of service quality at a university. The purpose of this paper is to report on the use of Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) as a decision making tool in determining factors to consider for the improvement of service quality at a university. The study adopted a mixed method methodology and an action research approach was employed using a case at the Durban University of Technology. A purposive convenient sample of 30 participants was used. Data was collected via questionnaires and face-to-face interviews. The data was captured in the software Expert Choice and the results were processed by taking the aggregated group judgements as the geometric mean of the individual comparisons. The findings reveal that organisational and educational issues are paramount to providing an effective service at tertiary institutions.

INTRODUCTION

Decision making can be regarded as one of the most important activities in any organisation and tertiary institutions are not an exception. In order to make decisions one requires reliable and accurate information that is readily available. Chamodrakas et al. (2010) state that a decision making problem, is often associated with selecting the most appropriate alternative according to at least one goal or criteria, from a group of alternatives.

Tertiary institutions remain competitive in attempting to attract and retain fee paying students (Koniet al. 2013; Khodayari and Khodayari 2011). Conversely, in this highly competitive environment, students have become more circumspect in their selection and more demanding of the tertiary institutions they choose (Stone 2005). Over the past decade, academic literature has demonstrated how tertiary institutions have concentrated particularly on service quality as a vehicle to attract and retain students. In a study conducted by Shaari (2014) on service quality in

Malaysia, the study reveals that only few higher education institutions will survive largely due to their ability to render a high quality service. However, the challenge remains as to which factors of service quality should managers of tertiary institutions consider and implement. In this paper, the researchers focus on prioritising factors that influence service quality at a university. For this, the researchers first conceptualize Organisational; Educational; and Student and Staff Issues as a second order construct. The researchers then apply the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) method to determine the relative importance of service quality issues, and finally prioritise these issues in the order of the overall scores. In order to implement this idea, we conducted an empirical case study at a university in South Africa known as the Durban University of Technology. The results of this study provide both a theoretical basis and empirical evidence indicating the relative importance of factors influencing improvement of service quality at universities.

Durban University of Technology

Durban University of Technology was formed as a result of a merger between ML Sultan and Technikon Natal in 2002 due to changes in the Higher Education landscape of South Africa. Initially the newly formed institution was called Durban Institute of Technology (DIT). In line with educational changes all Technikon's in

Address for correspondence:

Dr. Paul Green
Durban University of Technology
PO Box 101112, Scottsville
Pietermaritzburg
South Africa 3209
Telephone: +2733 845 8804
Fax: +2786 531 1069
E-mail: Paulg@dut.ac.za

the country were redesignated as Universities of Technology and DIT became known as Durban University of Technology (DUT) in March 2006. DUT is a multi-campus institution of seven campuses located in the cities of Durban and Pietermaritzburg providing education as an essential service to approximately 23 000 students.

Problem Statement

Service quality comprises of various criteria that are intangible and subjective which are therefore difficult to measure. Wanget al.(2012) echo the sentiment by stating that there is much uncertainty when using various evaluators who hold subjective and differing viewpoints. Furthermore, arriving at a group consensus regarding factors for improvement of service quality is particularly more difficult. Therefore, this problem requires more attention and an effective tool to detect and prioritize the factors for the improvement of service quality is required. Thus, the researchers use AHP as a decision making tool in prioritizing factors for improvement of service quality at a university.

The objectives of the study are: (1) generate ideas for the improvement of service quality (2) measure the judgements of the respondents through pairwise comparisons and (3) recommend area(s) for improvement.

Literature Review

Service quality is the extent to which a service meets or exceeds the expectations of customers (Jain et al. 2010). O'Neil and Palmer (2004) define service quality in higher education as the discrepancy between students expectation versus perception of delivery. The importance of service quality in higher education has attracted many researchers to empirically examine service quality with a wide array of studies undertaken at various tertiary institutions from countries across the world. Stukaline (2012) asserts that universities employ student satisfaction data to better understand and improve their educational environment with the aim to increase retention rates.

The framework utilized in this study known as Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) was initially developed by Thomas Saaty as a multi-criteria decision support technique (Saaty 1990).

AHP has been widely applied as a multi-criteria decision making approach in industry, government and academic institutions (see Saaty 1990). AHP allows decision-makers to structure a complex problem that involves subjective criteria as a decision hierarchy. The AHP method is based upon three principles: first, structure of the model; second, comparative judgment of the alternatives and the criteria; and third, synthesis of the priorities (Amiri 2010).

When dealing with a multi-criteria decision making problem, the first step is to identify the stakeholders associated with it, their assumptions and values. Then the actual problem needs to be structured. A suitable way for achieving this with many complex issues is to develop a hierarchy. A hierarchy has at least three levels. The top of the hierarchy is the main goal, which is decomposed at the second level into several sub-goals, reflecting different perspectives of the decision-making process. Each sub-goal may be affected by a number of factors, while at the lowest level of the model the alternative choices are introduced. Once the problem has been decomposed and the hierarchy is constructed, prioritization procedure starts in order to determine the relative importance of the criteria within each level. The elements in each cluster of the hierarchy are compared in a pairwise manner with relation to their importance with respect to the root of the same cluster. Such comparisons are simpler than having to evaluate the total contribution of a factor towards the main goal, taking into account all sub-goals simultaneously. The comparison scale used, as defined by Saaty (1990), has values from 1 – 9 depending on the degree of importance. It is a ratio scale measuring the ratios of intensities of importance of the factors.

The result of the pairwise comparison on n criteria can be summarized in an $(n \times n)$ evaluation matrix A in which every element; a_{ij} ($i; j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n$) the quotient of weights of the criteria, as shown below. Let

$$C = \{c_j | j = 1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & \dots & a_{1n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n1} & \dots & a_{nn} \end{pmatrix} a_{ii} = 1 \quad a_{ij} = 1/a_{ji} \quad a_{ij} \neq 0$$

At the final step, the mathematical process commences to normalize and find the relative weights for each matrix. The relative weights are given by the right eigenvector (w) corresponding to the largest Eigen value λ_{max} as:

$$A_w = \lambda_{max} = W$$

In the event of the pairwise comparisons being completely consistent, then the matrix A has the rank 1 and $\lambda_{max} = n$. In this instance; weights can be obtained by normalizing any of the rows or columns of A. It should be noted that the quality of the output of the AHP is related to the consistency of the pairwise comparison judgments. The consistency is defined by the relation between the entries of A: $a_{jk} * a_{jk} = a_{jk}$. The consistency index (CI) is: $CI = (\lambda_{max} - n) / (n - 1)$. The consistency ratio (CR), which indicates whether the evaluations are sufficiently consistent, is calculated as the ratio of the CI and the random index (RI).

$$CR = CI/RI$$

The consistency ratio should be less than 0.1.

Analytic Hierarchy Process and Group Decision Making

Aczel and Saaty (1983) established the basis for aggregating group judgments in the AHP. A group support facility is provided in Expert Choice and Team Expert Choice, a software package implementing AHP which was designed by Forman and Saaty (Expert Choice). Saaty (1994) and Dyer and Forman (1992) describe the theoretical problems related to the use of AHP as a group decision-making tool. They highlight that when it is possible to reach consensus or a compromise with the group, one may use the classical AHP procedure. Then the judgments are generated as if a single decision-maker is their originator.

In the event of a compromise not be attained inside the group, in order to apply consensus, Aczel and Saaty (1983) have shown the geometric mean is the uniquely appropriate rule for combining judgments, since it preserves the reciprocal property of the judgement matrix containing the pairwise comparisons.

As mentioned by Petkova (1999), in group decision making it is often important to keep the data submitted by each member of the group, while allowing for their subsequent joint processing and integration. Then the most convenient approach for documenting the individual judgments is to use separate clusters of the model for each decision-maker. The separate clusters may be given equal weights, or the weight may

vary depending on the standing of the group member and his/her real influence over the final decision.

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a mixed method methodology and an action research approach was employed. A sampling technique known as purposive convenience sampling was employed as participants were selected for the study. The empirical work undertaken in the study involved a total of 30 participants who were senior members of the university and experts in the field of quality assurance. Participants were drawn from academic and administrative staff from academic departments. Two independent workshops were conducted, with the first workshop consisting of 15 participants from the Pietermaritzburg Campus, and the second consisting of 15 participants from the Durban Campus of the Durban University of Technology (DUT). The responses were collected from a questionnaire comprising of pairwise comparisons between the factors that constitute the objectives. The responses were captured in a software package called Expert Choice (Version 11) and the results were processed by taking the aggregated group judgments as the geometric mean of the individual comparisons using Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP). In addition, data was collected via face-to-face interviews. The study demanded that the participants be allowed to uninhibitedly express their views and opinions. The aim of the workshops was to determine the prioritisation of factors for the improvement of service quality at a university.

Brainstorming Issues Associated with the Evaluation of Service Quality

A brainstorming technique was employed to generate ideas for the improvement of service quality. A flip chart was used to document all the ideas generated from the participants of the workshops. The following are the main issues raised by the participants:

- Staff need to be more courteous and friendly towards students.
- There is a need to have an evaluation system/procedure in place at the university.
- Students need to be mindful of their contribution towards service delivery.

- There is a need to provide skills training to develop customer service.
- The new general education curriculum at the university should incorporate a module on service delivery.
- The quality of service is not consistent among the various departments and units of the university.
- There seems to be a lack of ownership in ensuring and evaluating service quality holistically.
- Staff feel they are answerable to “many bosses”.
- Subject and lecturer evaluation practices should incorporate elements of service quality of the institution as a whole.
- There is a need to create an organisational culture of efficient service.

The issues together with the rankings are found in the results section of this paper.

Prioritization of Factors Influencing the Improvement of Service Quality

After the brainstorming exercise which assisted in determining the important factors to consider in the improvement of service quality of a university, it was important to prioritise the criteria that were identified. The Multiple-Criteria Decision-Making (MCDM) model called the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), which was developed by Saaty (1990) was used for the prioritisation process. A 1 – 9 point scale of the original AHP was used in measuring the judgements of the participants through pairwise comparisons about the ratios of the weights of the criteria (Saaty 1990). The participants made comparisons using questionnaires. In order to proceed with the prioritisation process, the ideas identified were grouped into three broad issues, *viz.* Organisational; Educational; and Staff and Student issues:

Organisational Issues

- Develop and install a service quality evaluation system at the university.
- Lack of ownership in ensuring and evaluating service quality.
- Create an organisational culture of efficient service delivery.
- Quality of service is not consistent across the university.
- Subject and lecturer evaluation practices to incorporate elements of service quality.

Educational Issues

- Provide skills training to develop customer service.
- New General Education and Training (GET) curriculum to incorporate a module on service delivery.

Staff and Student Issues

- Students to know their part in co-producing the service.
- Staff feel answerable to many bosses.
- Staff to exercise courtesy towards students.

Based on the afore-mentioned information the hierarchical structure of the problem was developed and is shown in Figure 1.

The implementation of the Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) model for the evaluation of service quality at a university was conducted with the groups.

In determining the issues that are considered most significant to the improvement of service quality, it was essential to prioritise the criteria outlined in the second and third tier of the hierarchy. This was achieved by undertaking a pairwise comparison. The pairwise comparison was processed with the software, Expert Choice.

RESULTS

The participants were then asked to rank the above issues in terms of importance to the improvement of service quality at the university (see Table 1). A rating scale of 1 to 10 was used, where 1 represented little and 10 was extreme importance.

From the rating exercise it was deduced that the participants considered the following issues (ratings 9 and 10) as most important:

- To develop and install a service quality evaluation framework at the University
- To provide training to staff to develop proficiency in customer service
- To create an organisational culture of efficiency in service delivery
- Staff to exercise courtesy towards students
- To establish ownership in ensuring and evaluating service quality

Firstly, the priorities for the objectives that relate to the sub goal, *i.e.* Organisational, Educational and Staff and Student issues.




Fig. 1. Hierarchical representation of the criteria for the improvement of Service Quality

Table 1: Ideas generated during the brainstorming sessions

	Issues	Rating
1	Staff to exercise courtesy towards students	9
2	Develop and install a service quality evaluation system at the University	10
3	Students to know their part in co-producing the service	8
4	Provide skills training to staff to develop customer service	10
5	New general education curriculum to incorporate a module on service delivery	7
6	Quality of service is not consistent across the university	6
7	Lack of ownership in ensuring and evaluating service quality	9
8	Staff feel answerable to many bosses	6
9	Subject and lecturer evaluation practices to incorporate elements of service quality	5
10	Create an organisational culture of efficient service delivery.	10

The results in Table 2 show that the organisational issues (0.532) and the educational issues (0.292) had the highest priorities as reflected by all the respondents. The inconsistency index was found to be 0.02 and this is acceptable within the context and analysis of the AHP.

The researchers then considered the global priorities in relation to the goal of evaluating the service quality of a university as depicted in Figure 2.

The inconsistency factor was found to be 0.08. The results reveal that the develop and install a quality service evaluation system at the university (0.235), provide skills training to develop customer service (0.129) and lack of ownership in ensuring and evaluating service quality (0.128) were the issues that were found to be the most important in contributing towards the overall goal of evaluating the service quality of a university. These variables account for just below 50%, that is, 49.2% of the importance in explaining service quality of a university.




Fig. 2. Global priorities with respect to the main goal: Evaluation of service quality of a University.

Table 2: Priority table for the second level: Organisational; educational; staff and student issues

	Organisational issues	Educational issues	Staff and Student issues	Priority
Organisational issues	1	2.4	2.2	0.532
Educational issues		1	2.3	0.292
Staff and student issues			1	0.175

DISCUSSION

The researchers then focused attention on the overall analysis between Pietermaritzburg and Durban campuses but separated out the priority scores pertaining to each campus. This was done using the group decision mode in expert choice.

It was evident from the Figure 3, that Organisational issues had the highest priorities in both Pietermaritzburg and Durban campuses with the Organisational priority at Pietermaritzburg (0.594) being higher than that of Durban (0.478). The second most important objective was the Educational issue with Durban having a higher priority (0.347) than that of Pietermaritzburg (0.249). Staff and student issues are of a similar magnitude across both campuses but are ranked the least important on both campuses as well.

The Findings

It was evident from the research as highlighted in Table 3 that the most important priorities for Pietermaritzburg Campus were develop and install a service quality evaluation system at the university (0.256), lack of ownership in ensuring and evaluating service quality (0.129) and create an organisational culture (0.126). These three factors constitute 51.1% of the importance in priorities in Pietermaritzburg. On the other hand, the most important priorities in Durban were develop and install a service quality evaluation system at the university (0.213), provide skills training to staff to develop customer service (0.155) and lack of ownership in ensuring and evaluating service quality (0.127). The three factors constitute 49.5% of the importance of the priorities for the Durban campus. One can see that there are also differences between priorities

Table 3: Durban versus Pietermaritzburg comparison

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Pietermaritzburg</i>	<i>Durban</i>
Develop and install a service quality evaluation system at the University	0.256	0.213
Quality of service not consistent across the university	0.113	0.115
Lack of ownership in ensuring and evaluating service quality	0.129	0.127
Subject and lecturer evaluation practices to incorporate elements of service delivery	0.063	0.069
Create an organisational culture	0.126	0.110
Provide skills training to staff to develop customer service	0.104	0.155
New GET curriculum to incorporate a module on service delivery	0.033	0.047
Staff to exercise courtesy to students	0.082	0.078
Students to know their part in co-producing the service	0.072	0.065
Staff feel answerable to many bosses	0.021	0.022




Fig. 3. Priorities for the Second Level Issues: Staff and Student Issues; Educational Issues and Organisational Issues (Durban versus Pietermaritzburg comparison)

of variables such as Create an organisational culture and Provide skills training to staff to develop customer service across both campuses. The findings of this research collaborate with research undertaken in the area of service quality see (Min and Khoon 2014; Stukalina 2012; Chow and Luk 2005) as well as in the area of AHP (see Tahrir et al. 2014).

CONCLUSION

This paper has illustrated the application of AHP as a decision making tool in determining factors to consider for the improvement of service quality at a university. The AHP is both a flexible and relevant tool with a wide range of

applications in decision making. A pairwise comparison method was used to calculate the weight for each criterion based on data collected from the participants at the workshops. This study provides a platform for similar studies to be conducted across other public and private tertiary institutions. Similar studies using large samples with more intense criteria models would be useful in order to corroborate this study’s findings and to address the limitation of the small sample size.

RECOMMENDATIONS

There are some salient aspects of this research which need to be highlighted. The or-

ganisational and educational issues are considered as paramount in providing an effective service at a university. The most important variables noted overall were Develop and install a quality service evaluation system at the University, Provide skills training to develop customer service and Lack of ownership in ensuring and evaluating service quality. Pietermaritzburg and Durban campuses are similar with respect to their most important priorities but differ in that the Durban campus requires more training skills to be imparted to their staff. One of the recommendations to Durban is to have more training courses for their staff, provide incentives to staff for re-training and focus on training staff specific to where there are areas requiring attention.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is based on the research supported in part by the National Research Foundation of South Africa – Unique Grant No. 86437.

REFERENCES

- Aczel J, Saaty TL 1983. Procedures for synthesising ratio judgements. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 27: 93–102.
- Amiri MP 2010. Project selection for oil-fields development by using the AHP and fuzzy TOPSIS methods. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 37: 6218–6224.
- Chamodrakas I, Batis D, Martakos D 2010. Supplier selection in electronic marketplaces using satisficing and fuzzy AHP. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 37: 2879–2893.
- Chow CC, Luk P 2005. A strategic service quality approach using analytic hierarchy process. *Managing Service Quality*, 15(3): 278–289.
- Dyer RF, Forman EH 1992. Group decision support with the analytic hierarchy process. *Decision Support Systems*, 8: 99–124.
- Jain R, Sinha G, De SK 2010. Service quality in higher education: An exploratory study. *Asian Journal of Marketing*, 4(3): 144–154.
- Khodayari F, Khodayari B 2011. Service quality in higher education. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business*, 1(9):38–46.
- Koni A, Zainal K, Ibrahim M 2013. An assessment of the services quality of Palestine higher education. *International Education Studies*, 6(2): 33–48.
- Min S, Khoon CC 2014. Demographic factors in the evaluation of service quality in higher education: A Structural Equation Model (SEM) Approach. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 6(1): 90–102.
- O'Neil MA, Palmer A 2004. Importance-performance analysis: A useful tool for directing continuous improvement in higher education. *Quality Assurance Education*, 12(1): 39–52.
- Petkova O 1999. *A Framework for Evaluation of Factors Affecting Software Development Productivity*. Doctoral Thesis, Unpublished. South Africa: University of Pretoria.
- Saaty T 1990. *Multicriteria Decision Making –The Analytic Hierarchy Process*. 2nd Edition. Pittsburgh: RWS Publication.
- Saaty T 1994. *Fundamentals of Decision Making and Priority Theory with the Analytic Hierarchy Process*. Pittsburgh: RWS Publication.
- Shaari H 2014. Service quality in Malaysian higher education: Adult learners' perspective. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(1): 86–90.
- Stone G 2005. An educational institution's quest for service quality: Customers' perspective. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 13: 66–82.
- Stukalina Y 2012. Addressing service quality issues in higher education: The educational environment evaluation from the students' perspective. *Technology and Economic Development of Economy*, 18(1): 84–98.
- Tahrir F, Dabbagh M, Ebrahim NA 2014. Supplier assessment and selection using fuzzy analytic hierarchy process in a steel manufacturing company. *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports*, 3(10): 1319–1338.
- Wang Ch, Chou MY, Pang CT 2012. Applying fuzzy analytic hierarchy process for evaluating service quality of online auction. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 6: 590–597.