# THE APPLICATION OF AHP TO EVALUATE TEACHER'S PERFORMANCE IN CHINA

G

C)

 $\mathbf{a}$ 

3

Li Shu-fang Chen Jia-ju Education Institute Fianjin China Guan Jia-yu Textite Engineering Institute Tianjin China

#### (I) Introduction

Evaluating a teacher's performance is of great significance to improve teaching quality and teaching management level. Especially in our country there is a special significance of evaluating teacher's title. At the present time in evaluating the titles there is no scientific mothod and an objective standard to follow in evaluating the level of teacher's. So it is often the case that opinious vary each stresses on his own strong point. Pester with the leaders and it is really hard for anyone to make a decision. If their contradictions can not be solved to the satisfactory of every one it will eventually bring loss to work and spoil one's feelings. In order to change this situation, we must tearn to evaluate the titles scientifically and reasonably. Therefore we adopted a method called "AHP" which can better reftect the speciality of man's judgement and design an easy evaluating model that is convincible.

As you know there are a lot of complex factors to influence the teaching level. So that the appraised problem may be composed of a complex system. This paper determines the factors of a teacher's performance and establish the hierarchic system with innerdependence. By [2] we have obtain the priorities of alternatives with respect to the overall goal.

## (II) Structure of the Evaluation System

In order the influences of people's preferences on the result of decision are decreased. We adopt the Detphi's method, when the criteria of the system are determined. We gave sisteen criteria and establish the system, with innerdependence within the components of a level.

There is dependence among the four criteria. There is also dependence among the alternatives with respect to each criteria. However, the criteria do not depend on the alternatives.

344

The System is illustrated in Figure O



(Figure 0)

The goal, criteria and alternatives are defined as follows, Goal (e), Standard of teaching.

Criteria (a), Altitude towards teaching work.

(b), Teaching and guidance.

(c), Teaching result.

(d), Scientific research.

Atternatives

С

ъ

ଚ

δ

(1) The mastering of teaching materials.

(2) Preparing lessons well or not.

(3) Teaching and educating.

(4) The ability of organizing lectures.

(5) The depth and width of teaching material and proficiency.

(6) Teaching method which can arouse student's interest.

(7) Guidance and answering question.

(2) Student's interenst in the subject they are tearning.

345

1

(9) The range of improvement of different levels of students

(18) Student's ability in teaching themselves and pulling theory into practice.

(11) Are there any thesis papers on teaching research ?

(12) Are there any scientific thesis papers ?

If i and j are not at the same tevel, such as  $W_{1,a}$ ,  $W_{2,a}$ ,  $W_{3,a}$  denote the weight vectors that they are obtained through pairwise comparison for the elements 1, 2, 3 under the criteria a. If i and j are at the same tevel, such as,  $W_{a,c}$ ,  $W_{b,c}$ ,  $W_{c,c}$ ,  $W_{d,c}$  denote the weight vectors that they are obtained through pairwise comparison for elements a, b, c, d, under the criteria C.

Thus we have,

 $W_{L(2),e} \equiv (W_{a,e} W_{b,e} W_{c,e} W_{d,e})^T \equiv (0.16, 0.36, 0.39, 0.09)^T$ 

 $W_{L(3),a} \equiv (W_{1,a} \ W_{2,a} \ W_{3,a})^T = (0.382, 0.344, 0.234)^T$ 

 $\mathbb{M}_{L(3),b} \cong (\mathbb{M}_{4,b} \ \mathbb{M}_{5,b} \ \mathbb{M}_{6,b} \ \mathbb{M}_{7,b} \ \mathbb{M}_{7,b})^{\mathsf{T}} = (0.153, \ 0.323, \ 0.303, \ 0.221)^{\mathsf{T}}$ 

 $\mathbb{W}_{L(3),c} \equiv (\mathbb{W}_{8,c}, \mathbb{W}_{9,c}, \mathbb{W}_{10,c})^{T} = 0.253, 0.391, 0.356)^{T}$ 

 $\mathbb{W}_{L(3), d} \equiv (\mathbb{W}_{11, d} \ \mathbb{W}_{12, d})^{\mathsf{T}} = (0, \delta, 0, 4)^{\mathsf{T}}$ 

,

346

Ċ,

$$\begin{split} & \mathbb{W}_{L,(3)}(c) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{W}_{83} & \mathbb{W}_{93} & \mathbb{W}_{810} \\ \mathbb{W}_{98} & \mathbb{W}_{99} & \mathbb{W}_{910} \\ \mathbb{W}_{108} & \mathbb{W}_{109} & \mathbb{W}_{1010} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0.2 & 0.1 \\ 0 & 0.8 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.9 \end{pmatrix} \\ & \mathbb{W}_{L,(3)}(d) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{W}_{11,11} & \mathbb{W}_{11,12} \\ \mathbb{W}_{12,11} & \mathbb{W}_{12,12} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} . \end{split}$$

## (III) Resolution of the System and Overall Priorities. ζ,

We see easily that it is a hierarchic system with innerdependence and that there is not relation of circular dominance among elements. The impact role of any elements come from its lower level and each element at the same level By [2] this systme (Figure O) can resolve into five subsystem as follows,

-



(figure 1) (figure 2) (figure 3) - (figure 4) (figure 5) Where,

The systems denoted with Figure 2 and 5 are independence hierarchic system. The system denoted with Figre 1 (3 or 4) are equivalent with a independence higrarchic system that their weight values are  $W_{L(2)} \times W_{L(2),n}(W_{L(3)}(c) \times W_{L(3),c})$ or  $W_{L(3)}(b) \times W_{L(3),b}$  ) under criteria e (borc), respectively.

The overall priorities for alternatives with respect to the criteria in each subsystem as follows,

347

ð

6

ð

ъ

ıl.

We define the matrix W<sub>z</sub>



Finally, the overall priorities for the alternatives in the system that is represented by Figure O are calculated by multiplying W by W<sup>e</sup>L(2).

0

C

ଦ

r

 $W \times W_{L(2)} = (0.092, 0.080, 0.068, 0.086, 0.129, 0.097, 0.089, 0.092, 0.078, 0.080, 0.066, 0.044)^T$ 

### (W) Conclusion

It is of universal opplied value that method mentioned in this paper is as follows. The factors evaluating are determined, the weight values of each factor under single criteria are calculated and evaluating model is built.

Even in those wrees of units whose conditions are special and completated, we can get scientific and reasonable evaluing factors and weight vectors and then make the evaluating standards of marks in accordance with the actual conditions. In this may we get the lotal marks reflecting the teaching level of a cortain teacher. If there is any dispute we may try to find the sensitive factor and solve it correctly with the help of a reference [4] published by the some anthor As soon as the software of this method is put forward it was immediately adopted by many units and att received a good result.

### References

[1] Saaty T. L. The Analytic Hierarchy Process. McGraw--Hill? 1980.

'n,

- [2] Saaty T.L. Dependence and Independence, From Linear Micrarchies to Nonlinear Networks.
- [3] Shubo Xu, 1988, The Principle of The Analytic Hierarchy Process, Tianjin University Press

2

[4] Guan Jiayu etc. The sensitivity analysis method for composited priorities in the hierarchic systems, SISANP, 1988.

348