

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MARA

TECHNICAL REPORT

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON ENTROPY-TOPSIS AND
MERIC-TOPSIS METHODS TO SOLVE THE CLASS
REPRESENTATIVE SELECTION PROBLEM**

**NURUL AIN NAZIRAH BINTI AHMAD KHAIDIR (2021862182)
NURUL FARAHANA BINTI ADNAN (2020897754)
DANIAL BIN AHMAD (2021478004)
(P23M23)**

**Report submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirement
for the degree of
Bachelor of Science (Hons.) (Mathematics) And Bachelor of Science
(Hons.) (Management Mathematics) And Bachelor of Business
Administration (Hons) (Business Economics)
College of Computing, Informatics & Mathematics**

AUGUST 2023

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, we would like to express our sincere gratitude to Allah SWT, the Most Merciful and the Most Gracious, for His blessings, guidance, and unwavering support throughout preparing this project. We acknowledge that all knowledge and inspiration come from Him and we are deeply thankful for His wisdom and providence.

Secondly, we would like to express our heartfelt gratitude to our supportive supervisor, Miss Nor Faradilah binti Mahad for their unwavering guidance, mentorship, and support throughout the development of this project on the topic of a comparative study on Entropy-TOPSIS and MEREC-TOPSIS to solve the class representative selection problem. Then, we want to show our thanks to our MSP660 lecturers, Dr Zahari bin Md Rodzi and Noraimi Azlin binti Mohd Nordin for their expertise, valuable insights, and constructive feedback that have played a pivotal role in shaping the quality and direction of this project. We are truly grateful for their patience, encouragement, and dedication to our growth and success.

Next, we are also immensely thankful to our family members for their unconditional love, constant encouragement, and unwavering belief in our abilities. Their support and understanding have been the foundation of our strength and determination throughout this journey. Their sacrifices and reassurance have been instrumental in enabling us to pursue this endeavor wholeheartedly.

Moreover, we extend our deepest appreciation to our friends for their continuous support, motivation, and understanding. Their encouragement, insightful discussions, and willingness to lend a helping hand have been invaluable sources of inspiration and motivation. We were grateful for the moments of laughter, encouragement, and camaraderie that helped us stay focused and positive during challenging times.

Lastly, we were also grateful to all the individuals who provided their assistance, feedback, and encouragement. Their contributions, no matter how big or small, have been integral to the development of this project. We are also immensely grateful to each member of our group for their invaluable contributions, dedication, and collaborative spirit in preparing this project. Their diverse perspectives, expertise, and hard work have enriched the project with new ideas and insights.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
LIST OF FIGURES	v
ABSTRACT.....	vi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY	1
1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT	2
1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	4
1.4 SIGNIFICANCE AND BENEFIT OF THE STUDY.....	4
1.5 SCOPE OF THE STUDY	5
1.6 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY	6
CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND THEORY AND LITERATURE REVIEW	8
2.1 MULTI-CRITERIA DECISION MAKING (MCDM).....	8
2.2 ENTROPY METHOD	10
2.3 METHOD BASED ON THE REMOVAL EFFECTS OF CRITERIA (MEREC)	13
2.4 TECHNIQUE FOR ORDER OF PREFERENCE BY SIMILARITY TO IDEAL SOLUTION (TOPSIS) METHOD	14
2.5 CRITERIA SELECTION	16
2.6 CONCLUSION.....	18
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY AND IMPLEMENTATION.....	19
3.1 CONCEPTUAL DIAGRAM OF ENTROPY-MEREC-TOPSIS.....	19
3.2 THE FRAMEWORK OF THE ENTROPY METHOD	20
3.3 THE FRAMEWORK OF METHOD BASED OF THE REMOVAL EFFECTS OF CRITERIA (MEREC).....	23
3.4 THE FRAMEWORK OF TECHNIQUE FOR ORDER OF PREFERENCE BY SIMILARITY TO IDEAL SOLUTION (TOPSIS)	26
3.5 THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ENTROPY-TOPSIS METHOD.....	28
3.6 THE IMPLEMENTATION OF MEREC -TOPSIS METHOD	39
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	49
4.1 COMPARISON BETWEEN THE FINAL RANK OF CRITERIA USING ENTROPY AND MEREC.....	49
4.2 COMPARISON BETWEEN THE FINAL RANK OF ALTERNATIVE USING ENTROPY-TOPSIS AND MEREC-TOPSIS	52
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	54
5.1 CONCLUSIONS.....	54
5.2 RECOMENDATIONS	55
REFERENCES.....	57
APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE.....	61
APPENDIX B: ETHICS APPROVAL BY UiTM RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE.....	65

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.7.1	Definition of terms and abbreviations	7
Table 2.1.1	Application of MCDM.....	9
Table 2.2.1	Application of Entropy Method	12
Table 2.2.2	Application of Entropy Method	12
Table 2.3.1	Application of MEREC	13
Table 2.3.2	Application of MEREC	14
Table 2.4.1	Application of TOPSIS	15
Table 3.5.1	Definition of criteria	28
Table 3.5.2	Decision matrix of criteria.	30
Table 3.5.3	Normalisation of decision matrix	31
Table 3.5.4	The result of Entropy value.....	32
Table 3.5.5	The degree of divergence of the information.....	32
Table 3.5.6	The weight of criteria.....	33
Table 3.5.7	Decision matrix.....	34
Table 3.5.8	Normalised decision matrix	35
Table 3.5.9	Weighted normalised decision matrix.	35
Table 3.5.10	Value of distance between each alternative and PIS and NIS	37
Table 3.5.11	Value of CC_i	37
Table 3.5.12	Ranking of the alternatives	38
Table 3.6.1	Performance evaluation decision matrix.....	39
Table 3.6.2	Normalised decision matrix using MEREC.....	40
Table 3.6.3	Overall performance values using MEREC.....	41
Table 3.6.4	Values of S'_{ij}	42
Table 3.6.5	Values of absolute deviation for each criterion.	42
Table 3.6.6	Final weights of each criterion.....	43
Table 3.6.7	Decision matrix.....	44
Table 3.6.8	Normalised decision matrix	45
Table 3.6.9	Weighted normalised decision matrix.	46
Table 3.6.10	Value of distance between each alternative and PIS and NIS	47
Table 3.6.11	Value of CC_i	47
Table 3.6.12	Ranking of the alternatives	48
Table 4.1.1	Comparison of criteria weightage between Entropy and MEREC	49
Table 4.2.1	Comparison of the alternatives between Entropy-TOPSIS	52

ABSTRACT

This study is about selecting the best class representative in a public university. In this study, it is focused on the application of Entropy-Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS) and Method Based of the Removal Effects of Criteria (MEREK)-TOPSIS in solving class representative selection problem. This study discusses the problem that a class of a public university commonly has, which is choosing the best candidate for their class representative. The objectives of this study are to integrate the Entropy method and MEREK with TOPSIS methods in solving the class representative selection problem, to select the best class representative by using the Entropy-TOPSIS method and MEREK-TOPSIS method and to compare the outcome between Entropy-TOPSIS method and MEREK-TOPSIS method in solving the class representative selection problem. Four criteria are considered in this study which are experience (C_1), communication skills (C_2), personality (C_3) and leadership skills (C_4). There are five alternatives to be ranked and selected which are A_1 , A_2 , A_3 , A_4 and A_5 . The data was collected through a questionnaire and the calculations were done using Microsoft Excel. Entropy and MEREK are the weight calculation methods for the criteria and TOPSIS is the method to rank the alternatives. The ranking order for the most to the least-preferred criteria using both methods are $C_4 > C_1 > C_2 > C_3$. The most preferred criteria was leadership skills (C_4) and the least preferred criteria was personality (C_3). The result for Entropy-TOPSIS and MEREK-TOPSIS revealed that $A_5 > A_4 > A_3 > A_1 > A_2$. It indicates that the best candidate is A_5 while A_2 is the least-preferred candidate to be chosen as the class representative. This result reflects the real situation as the students also chose A_5 as their class representative. Thus, the objective of the study was achieved.