



**Application of Multi-Criteria Decision Making to Evaluate
Structural Performance Projects in Amman**

By

Mahdi Basel Abdel-Rahman

Supervisor

Associate Prof. Dr. Ibrahim A. Mohammed

**This Thesis was submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Master's Degree in Engineering Project Management**

Faculty of Engineering

Isra University

Amman-Jordan

May, 2018

Isra University

Authorization Form

I, Mahdi Basel Abdel-Rahman, authorize Isra University to supply copies of my Thesis to libraries or establishments or individuals on request, according to Isra University regulations.

Signature:

Date:

Dedication

I dedicate my work to my parents who helped me reach this remarkable stage of my education and who stood by until my successful completion, I also dedicate my work to my friends and family members who supported and encouraged me until the end.

Acknowledgment

I would like to express my gratitude to all those who gave me the support to complete this thesis. I want to thank the Faculty of Graduate Studies - Department of Engineering Project Management in the Isra University for giving me this opportunity to work on this thesis as I consider it essential to continue my academic education. Furthermore, I am thankful to the Professor "Dr. Ibraheem Abid" who helped me in taking decisions and encouraged me to work on this idea. In addition, I would like to give my appreciation to my colleagues in "Al-Baha consultant engineering company" for their support, especially the Projects Manager Eng. Basel Daoud. I would also like to thank all the Project Managers who helped me in gathering the data used in this thesis.

Application of Multi-Criteria Decision Making to Evaluate Structural Performance Projects in Amman

By

Mahdi Basel Abdel-Rahman

Supervisor

Associate Prof. Dr. Ibrahim A. Mohammed

Abstract

The construction sector is the main pillar of the national economy, on the other hand, it is facing many obstacles affecting its performance, because of merging several problems at the same time due to the complicated nature and uncertain environment of the project, and the multiplicity of factors that lead to the occurrence of a time delay in implementation and high cost of the project, and to address these challenges; it requires good project management methods in this area, in addition to smart and distinctive capabilities in making the right decisions.

The main aim of this thesis is to analyze the application of Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) to evaluate the structural performance of projects in the Capital Amman, using Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) and Analytic Network Process (ANP) to evaluate the structural performance of the projects. A list consisting of four construction projects were selected in Amman, in order to choose the project optimization of this study area, by selecting a list of primary and secondary evaluation criteria. To achieve the objectives of this thesis, the data has been collected from the literature reviews that related to MCDM methods (AHP and ANP), and the structural performance, and finally, through interviews, a questionnaire was distributed on

professional engineers and project managers who implemented these four projects and then analyzed the results.

The results of data analysis for the study sample showed that (quality criteria, criteria of factors related to owner satisfaction, cost, and time), are the most important criteria for pairwise comparisons between projects, respectively, and that the quality criteria is the most important criteria in the projects. Finally, by calculating the relative importance and priorities and of the projects, the results showed that the project which received the highest priority and importance among the other construction projects through the evaluation is the "The Jordan University Hospital expansion project".

In the end, its recommended to accelerate the application of techniques of Multi-Criteria Decision making (AHP and ANP) in the evaluation of projects performance, in addition to expedite the application of the proposed systems for Structural Performance by the researcher to help project managers make efficient decisions, which will lead to an effective control operation on the construction projects and enhance its performance.

Table of Contents

DEDICATION	I
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	II
ABSTRACT.....	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS	V
LIST OF FIGURES.....	IX
LIST OF TABLES.....	XI
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	XII
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 General Description.....	1
1.2 Research Problem	2
1.3 Research Objectives.....	3
1.4 Justification of the Research.....	4
1.5 Research Questions.....	4
1.6 Research Hypothesis.....	5
1.6.1 Main Hypothesis.....	5
1.6.2 Secondary Hypothesis	5
1.7 Research Methodology	5
1.7.1 Research Methodology Model.....	7
1.8 Thesis Structures.....	8
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1 Introduction.....	9
2.2 Previous Studies on Projects Performance in Construction Industry	10
2.3 Previous Studies on Multi-Criteria Decision Making Methods (MCDM), (AHP) And (ANP), in Different Topics.	12
2.4 Summary.....	18

CHAPTER THREE: MULTI-CRITERIA DECISION MAKING	19
3.1 Introduction.....	19
3.2 Types of Decisions	20
3.2.1 Programmed and Non-Programmed Decisions	20
3.2.2 Strategic and Routine Decisions	20
3.2.3 Policy and Operational Decisions:.....	21
3.2.4 Individual and Organizational Decisions.....	21
3.2.5 Major (Primary) and Minor (Secondary) Decisions	22
3.2.6 Collective (Group) Decisions	22
3.3 Elements of Decision Making.....	22
3.3.1 Critical Environment of the Decision	22
3.3.2 The Impact of the Volume of Information on the Decision-Making Process.....	23
3.3.3 Flow of Decision	24
3.4 Concepts and Definitions.....	24
3.5 Decision Making Approaches	25
3.6 Strategies Of Decision Making	25
3.6.1 Optimization (Optimal Selection).....	25
3.6.2 Stratification	26
3.6.3 Optimist Strategy (Maxi-Max)	26
3.6.4 Pessimist Strategy (Max-Min).....	26
3.7 Procedure of Decision Making.....	26
3.8 Risk Management in Decision Making Process	29
3.8.1 Introduction	29
3.8.2 Definition of Risk Analysis	29
3.8.3 Uses of Risk Management.....	29
3.8.4 Risk Analysis Ways.....	30
3.8.5 Risk Management Ways	31
3.8.6 Controlling Risk	32
3.8.7 Summary.....	32
3.9 Decision-Making Tools and Techniques	33
3.9.1 T-Chart	33
3.9.2 Decision Tree.....	33
3.9.3 SWOT Analysis.....	33
3.9.4 PEST Analysis.....	34
3.10 The Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)	34
3.11 The Analytic Network Process (ANP).....	38
3.12 Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) and Analytic Network Process (ANP) Models	39
3.12.1 General Description of Models.....	41

3.12.2 Differences between AHP and ANP Methods.....	41
3.13 Decision Making Software	42
3.13.1 Introduction	42
3.13.2 Methods of Work.....	42
3.13.3 The Advantages and Disadvantages of Decision Making Software.....	42
3.14 Summary.....	43
CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DATA ANALYSIS	44
4.1 Introduction.....	44
4.2 General Description on Research Methodology.....	44
4.3 Structural Performance Criteria.....	46
4.3.1 Cost Criterion	47
4.3.1.1 Cost Elements.....	47
4.3.1.2 Factors Affecting the Cost of the Construction Project.....	48
4.3.1.3 Cost Control	49
4.3.2 Time Criterion	50
4.3.2.1 Methods of Scheduling Projects.....	51
4.3.2.2 Evaluation of Project Progress	51
4.3.2.3 The Mechanism of Delay in Construction Projects.....	51
4.3.2.4 Factors Causing Time Failures during Project Implementation.....	52
4.3.3 Quality Criterion.....	53
4.3.3.1 Strategies of Quality Management in Construction Projects	53
4.3.3.2 Classification of Building Elements.....	53
4.3.3.3 Charts and Specifications	53
4.3.3.4 Quality Control.....	54
4.3.3.4.1 Methods of Quality Control	54
4.3.3.5 Quality Assessment	55
4.3.4 Scope of Work	55
4.4 Questionnaire Validity.....	58
4.5 Questionnaire Building Steps.....	58
4.6 Data Collection.....	59
4.6.1 Information Gathering Mechanism.....	59
4.7 Building the Models of Analytical Hierarchical Process (AHP) and Analytical Network Process (ANP) Related to this Study	59
4.7.1 Projects Description.....	62
4.7.2 Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) Model	63
4.7.3 Analytic Network Process (ANP) Model	66
4.8 Data Analysis.....	67
4.8.1 AHP Method to Evaluate the Structural Performance of Projects.....	67

4.8.1.1 AHP Model Analysis Results Using Expert Choice Software	76
4.8.1.1.1 Pairwise Comparisons of the Main Criteria	76
4.8.1.1.2 Pairwise Comparisons of Sub-Criteria.....	77
4.8.1.1.3 Pairwise Comparisons of Alternatives (Projects) Compared to Sub-Criteria..	81
4.8.1.1.4 The Final Ranking of Alternatives With Respect to the Goal	89
4.8.2 ANP Method to Evaluate the Structural Performance of Projects.....	91
4.8.2.1 Problem Structuring	91
4.8.2.2 ANP Model Analysis Results Using Superdecision Software:	96
4.8.2.2.1 Pairwise Comparisons of the Main Criteria:	97
4.8.2.2.2 Pairwise Comparisons of Sub-Criteria:.....	98
4.8.2.2.3 Pairwise Comparisons of Alternatives (Projects) Compared to Sub-Criteria.	99
4.8.2.2.4 The Final Ranking of Alternatives With Respect to the Goal	100
4.8.3 Hypothesis Testing	103
4.8.4 Sensitivity Analysis Using AHP and ANP Methods	103
4.8.4.1 Sensitivity Analysis in AHP Using Expert Choice Program.....	104
4.8.4.1.1 Performance Sensitivity.	105
4.8.4.2 Sensitivity Analysis in ANP Using Superdecision Program.....	107
4.9 Summary.....	108
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	110
5.1 Conclusions.....	110
5.2 Recommendations.....	114
5.3 Future Work.....	115
REFERENCES.....	117
LIST OF APPENDICES	123

List of Figures

Number	Figure Caption	Page No.
1.1	Adopted Research Methodology	7
3.1	Decision Making Process	28
3.2	General AHP Model	40
3.3	General ANP Model	40
4.1	Triangle Management in construction projects	47
4.2	Tree view of AHP Model using Expert Choice	63
4.3	Hierarchy View of AHP model using Expert Choice	64
4.4	Network view of ANP Model using SuperDecision	65
4.5	The results of the pairwise comparisons of the main criteria using the expert choice program	77
4.6	The results of pairwise comparisons for the sub-criteria of Cost factors	78
4.7	The results of pairwise comparisons for the sub-criteria of Time factors	78
4.8	The results of pairwise comparisons for the sub-criteria of Quality factors	78
4.9	The results of pairwise comparisons for the sub-criteria of Productivity factors	79
4.10	The results of pairwise comparisons for the sub-criteria of Factors related to owner satisfaction	79
4.11	The results of pairwise comparisons for the sub-criteria of Staff Factors	79
4.12	The results of pairwise comparisons for the sub-criteria of Safety and Security Factors	79
4.13	The results of pairwise comparisons for the sub-criteria of Factors Related to Progress, Growth, and Innovation	80
4.14	The results of pairwise comparisons for the sub-criteria of Environment Factors	80
4.15	The results of pairwise comparisons for the sub-criteria of Factors Related to the Satisfaction of Systems and Society	80
4.16	The results of Pairwise comparisons of alternatives (projects) with respect to "Profit rate of the project" sub-criterion	81
4.17	The results of Pairwise comparisons of alternatives (projects) with respect to Cost Factors sub-criteria	82

4.18	The results of Pairwise comparisons of alternatives (projects) with respect to Time Factors sub-criteria	83
4.19	The results of Pairwise comparisons of alternatives (projects) with respect to Quality Factors sub-criteria	84
4.20	The results of Pairwise comparisons of alternatives (projects) with respect to Productivity Factors sub-criteria	84
4.21	The results of Pairwise comparisons of alternatives (projects) with respect to Factors related to owner satisfaction sub-criteria	85
4.22	The results of Pairwise comparisons of alternatives (projects) with respect to Factors related to Staff Factors sub-criteria	86
4.23	The results of Pairwise comparisons of alternatives (projects) with respect to Factors related to Safety and Security Factors sub-criteria	86
4.24	The results of Pairwise comparisons of projects with respect to Factors Related to Progress, Growth and Innovation sub-criterion	87
4.25	The results of Pairwise comparisons of projects with respect to Environment Factors sub-criteria	88
4.26	The results of Pairwise comparisons of projects with respect to Factors Related to the Satisfaction of Systems and Society sub-criteria	88
4.27	The final ranking of projects using Expert Choice	89
4.28	Final AHP Model Using Expert Choice Program	90
4.29	The results of the pairwise comparisons of the main criteria using the expert choice program	97
4.30	The results of pairwise comparisons for the sub-criteria of Cost factors	98
4.31	The results of Pairwise comparisons of alternatives (projects) with respect to "Profit rate of the project" sub-criterion	99
4.32	Final Ranking of Projects using SuperDecision	100
4.33	Final Priorities using SuperDecision Part I	101
4.34	Final Priorities using SuperDecision Part II	102
4.35	Ways of sensitivity measures using Expert Choice	105
4.36	Dynamic Sensitivity using Expert Choice	106
4.37	Performance Sensitivity using Expert Choice	106
4.38	Node Sensitivity Barchart using SuperDecision	107
4.39	Sensitivity on Node PieChart using SuperDecision	108

List of Tables

Number	Table Caption	Page No.
3.1	Saaty Comparison Scale	35
3.2	Random Index	37
4.1	The adopted criteria for structural performance evaluation of projects	56
4.2	Proposed Names of Adopted Projects	60
4.3	Projects Description	63
4.4	Saaty Evaluation Scale	67
4.5	Pairwise comparisons matrix of the main ten criteria	68
4.6	The normalized pairwise comparison decision matrix for the main ten criteria	69
4.7	Weightage of the main ten criteria	70
4.8	Pairwise comparison matrix for the Sub-Criteria group of the main criterion Quality Factors	71
4.9	The normalized pairwise comparison matrix for the Sub-Criteria group of the main criterion Quality Factors.	72
4.10	Weightage of Quality Factors Sub-Criteria group	72
4.11	Pairwise comparison matrix of alternatives (projects) with respect to Quality Factors / Quality of Construction	73
4.12	The normalized pairwise comparison matrix of alternatives (projects) with respect to Quality Factors / Quality of Construction	73
4.13	Weightage of Alternatives (Projects) with respect to Quality of Construction Sub-Criterion in Quality Factors Main criterion	73
4.14	Total priorities of the Quality Main criterion	73
4.15	Overall Results (Final matrix)	75
4.16	Final Ranking of Alternatives (Projects)	75
4.17	Pairwise comparison matrix for the Sub-Criteria group of the main criterion Quality Factors.	93
4.18	Unweighted supermatrix	94
4.19	Weighted supermatrix	95
4.20	Limit Matrix	96
4.21	Study Projects	108
4.22	Final Ranking of Alternatives "Projects"	109

List of Abbreviations

AHP	Analytic hierarchy process
ANP	Analytic network process
BSC	Balance Score Card
CI	Consistency index
CR	Consistency ratio
IC	Intellectual capital
KPIs	Key Performance Indicators
MCDM	Multi-criteria decision making
RI	Random consistency index
SEM	Structural Equation Model