Journal of Quality Measurement and Analysis
Jurnal Pengukuran Kualiti dan Analisis

JQMA 3(1) 2007, 1-8

KRITERIA PEMILIHAN KAKITANGAN AKADEMIK IPTS MENGGUNAKAN TEKNIK SENTROID TERTIB PANGKAT

AHMAD MAHIR RAZALI & ANG CHIU WOON

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini dijalankan adalah untuk menentukan kepentingan setiap kriteria dan subkriteria yang dipertimbangkan semasa pemilihan kakitangan akademik. Kajian ini merupakan satu kajian kes di UNITEN, sebuah IPTS bertaraf universiti yang telah dijalankan dari bulan April hingga Jun 2005. Temubual dijalankan dengan Pengurus Sumber Manusia untuk meneliti prosedur pemilihan kakitangan akademik di UNITEN. Borang soal selidik diedarkan kepada setiap pembuat keputusan dalam hal pemilihan kakitangan akademik, iaitu Dekan, Timbalan Dekan, Ketua Jabatan dan Pengurus Sumber Manusia di UNITEN. Skala pemangkatan digunakan untuk menyusun kepentingan kriteria dan subkriteria di mana nilai pemberat dikira menggunakan teknik sentroid tertib pangkat. Hasil kajian mendapati bahawa kriteria kelayakan akademik mempunyai pemberat yang paling tinggi, iaitu 0.4207, diikuti oleh pengalaman bekerja (0.2039), kebolehan mengajar (0.2030), aktiviti penyelidikan (0.1108) dan akhir sekali personaliti (0.0618). Kesimpulannya, maklumat kuantitatif ini boleh digunakan sebagai rujukan oleh pihak pembuat keputusan ataupun boleh diaplikasikan dalam proses pemilihan kakitangan akademik.

Kata kunci: pembuatan keputusan; kriteria pemilihan; sentroid tertib pangkat

ABSTRACT

This study was carried out to determine the importance of each criterion and sub criteria that are considered during academic staff selection. This is a case study which was carried out from April to June 2005 at UNITEN, a private institution of higher education with university status. Interview was conducted with the human resource manager to find out about their academic staff selection procedure. Questionnaire was distributed to every decision maker (Dean, Deputy Dean, Head of Department) in academic staff selection. Ranking scale was used to rank the importance of the criteria and sub criteria. Then, weight value for each criterion and sub criteria was calculated using the rank order centroid technique. Analysis shows that academic qualification criterion has the highest weight (0.4207), followed by work experience (0.2039), teaching ability (0.2030), research activity (0.1108) and lastly personality (0.0618). In conclusion, decision makers can use these findings as additional information to be applied in the decision making process regarding selection of the academic staff.

Keywords: decision making; selection criteria; rank order centroid

Rujukan

Barron F.H. & Barrett B.E. 1996. Decision quality using ranked attribute weights. *Management Science* **42**(11): 1515-1523.

Beynon M.J. 2005. A method of aggregation in DS/AHP for group decision making with non equivalent importance of individuals in the group. *Computer & Operations Research* **32**: 1881-1896.

Erwina Bakarrudin. 2005. Pembuatan Keputusan Multi Kriteria bagi Penjawatan Kakitangan Akademik di Institusi Pengajian Tinggi Awam. Tesis Sarjana. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Hsieh T.Y., Lu S.T. & Tzeng G.H. 2004. Fuzzy MCDM approach for planning and design tenders selection in public office buildings. *International Journal of Project Management* **22**: 573-584.

Ivancevich J.M. 2001. *Human Resource Management*. 8th Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.

Jefferies A. & Jones I. 2002. A review of the institutional impact of recently appointed teaching fellows. *Educational Development* **3**(1): 8-9.

Jia J., Fischer G.W. & Dyer J.S. 1998. Attribute weighting methods and decision quality in the presence of response error: a simulation study. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making* **11**(2): 85-105.

Joseph M. & Joseph B. 1997. Service quality in education: a student perspective. *Quality Assurance in Education* **5**(1): 15-21.

Kementerian Pendidikan Tinggi Malaysia. 2002. Jabatan Pendidikan Swasta. http://www.jps.moe.gov.my (20 Julai 2005).

Kirkwood C.W. & Sarin R.K. 1985. Ranking with partial information: a method and an application. *Operation Research* **33**: 38-48.

Koster B., Brekelmans M., Korthagen F. & Wubbles T. 2005. Quality requirements for teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education* **21**: 157-176.

Lam K. & Zhao X. 1998. An application of quality function deployment to improve the quality of teaching. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management* **15**(4): 189-413.

Lomas L. 2004. Embedding quality: the challenges for higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education* **12**(4): 157-165.

M. Sadiq Sohail, Jegatheesan Rajadurai & Nor Azlin Abdul Rahman. 2003. Managing quality in higher education: a Malaysian case study. *The International Journal of Educational Management* **17**(4): 141-146.

Mustafa A. & Goh M. 1996. Multi-criterion models for higher education administration. *International Journal of Management Science* **24**(2): 167-178.

Owlia M.S. & Aspinwall E.M. 1996. A framework for the dimensions of quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education* **4**(2): 12-20.

Patterson P., Ramm T. & Hill C. 1998. Consumer satisfaction as a process: a qualitative, retrospective longitudinal study of overseas students in Australia. *Journal of Professional Services Marketing* **16**(1): 135-157.

Srikatanyoo N. & Gnoth J. 2005. Quality dimensions in international tertiary education: a Thai prospective students' perspective. *The Quality Management Journal* **12**(1): 30-40.

Pusat Pengajian Sains Matematik
Fakulti Sains dan Teknologi
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
43600 UKM Bangi
Selangor, MALAYSIA
Mel-e: mahir@ukm.my, chiu_woon@yahoo.com*