

***PUBLICATION MANUSCRIPT***

**DETERMINATION OF KIP KULIAH SCHOLARSHIP RECIPIENTS USING  
THE AHP AND TOPSIS METHOD  
(CASE STUDY: UMKT STUDENT DIVISION)**

Arif Rahman Hakim, Asslia Johar Latipah, Arbansyah

**SUBMITTED BY :**

**ARIF RAHMAN HAKIM**

**1811102441105**



**INFORMATICS ENGINEERING S1 STUDY PROGRAM  
FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY  
UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH KALIMANTAN TIMUR  
SAMARINDA  
2023**

***Publication Manuscript***

**Determination of KIP Kuliah Scholarship Recipients Using the AHP  
and TOPSIS Method (Case Study: UMKT Student Division)**

Arif Rahman Hakim, Asslia Johar Latipah, Arbansyah

**Submitted By :**

**Arif Rahman Hakim**

**1811102441105**



**INFORMATICS ENGINEERING S1 STUDY PROGRAM**

**FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

**UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH KALIMANTAN TIMUR**

**SAMARINDA**

**2023**

# ***Publication Manuscript***

## **Approval Page**

### **APPROVAL PAGE PUBLICATION MANUSCRIPT**

**DETERMINATION OF KIP KULIAH SCHOLARSHIP RECIPIENTS USING  
THE AHP AND TOPSIS METHOD  
(CASE STUDY: UMKT STUDENT DIVISION)**

ARRANGED BY :

**Arif Rahman Hakim**

**1811102441105**

It has been approved for publication,

On January 16, 2023

Examiner




**Arbansyah, S.Kom., M.TI**  
NIDN : 1118019203

Advisor



**Asslia Johar Latipah, M.Cs**  
NIDN. 1124098902

Dean



**Prof. Ir. Sajiito, MT., Ph.D.**  
NIDN. 0610116204

Head of Study Program



**Asslia Johar Latipah, M.Cs**  
NIDN. 1124098902

# Determination of KIP Kuliah Scholarship Recipients Using the AHP and TOPSIS Method (Case Study: UMKT Student Division)

Arif Rahman Hakim<sup>1</sup>, Asslia Johar Latipah<sup>2</sup>, Arbansyah<sup>3</sup>

*Informatics Engineering, Universitas Muhammadiyah Kalimantan Timur  
Samarinda, Indonesia*

<sup>1</sup> RuizTML11@gmail.com

<sup>3</sup> asslia@umkt.ac.id

<sup>2</sup> arb381@umkt.ac.id

## **Abstract**

Student Division Universitas Muhammadiyah Kalimantan Timur manage various scholarship for student, one of them is Kartu Indonesia Pintar Kuliah scholarship, the process include is where UMKT Student Division need to estimate eligible student receiving scholarship based on 4 criteria, the problem may occur is to many scholarships applicant but scholarship quota is limited it's hard to choose eligible scholarship recipient among student applicant. By using AHP and TOPSIS to determine KIP Kuliah Scholarship Recipients, AHP used to given weight to all criteria, DTKS (0.539), Family Condition (0.086), Family economy (0.093), House Condition (0.282) and topsis used to process all student applicant year 2022 or alternatives, by using ahp and topsis to determine scholarship recipients the model gain 77% accuracy rates.

**Keywords:** Scholarship, AHP, TOPSIS, Criteria, KIP Kuliah

## **Abstrak**

Bagian Kemahasiswaan Universitas Muhammadiyah Kalimantan Timur mengelola berbagai beasiswa untuk mahasiswa, salah satunya adalah beasiswa Kartu Indonesia Pintar Kuliah, prosesnya antara lain dimana Bagian Kemahasiswaan UMKT perlu memperkirakan mahasiswa yang berhak menerima beasiswa berdasarkan 4 kriteria, permasalahan yang mungkin terjadi adalah banyaknya pendaftar beasiswa tetapi kuota beasiswa terbatas sulit untuk memilih penerima beasiswa yang memenuhi syarat di antara pendaftar beasiswa. Dengan menggunakan AHP dan TOPSIS untuk menentukan Penerima Beasiswa KIP Kuliah, AHP digunakan untuk memberi bobot pada semua kriteria, DTKS (0,539), Kondisi Keluarga (0,086), Ekonomi Keluarga (0,093), Kondisi Rumah (0,282) dan topsis digunakan untuk memproses semua pendaftar beasiswa tahun 2022 atau alternatif, dengan menggunakan AHP dan TOPSIS untuk menentukan penerima beasiswa model mendapatkan tingkat akurasi 77%.

**Kata Kunci:** Beasiswa, AHP, TOPSIS, Kriteria, KIP Kuliah

## I. INTRODUCTION

Universitas Muhammadiyah Kalimantan Timur student division manage various scholarship for student, one of them is Kartu Indonesia Pintar Kuliah scholarship, KIP Kuliah offer financial fund for student with condition willing to finish college and maintaining grade, there are several process for determining KIP scholarship recipient, one of the process is where UMKT student division need to estimate eligible student receiving scholarship based on 4 criteria ,DTKS status, Family Condition, Family economy, House Condition, The problem may occur is to many scholarship applicant but scholarship quota is limited it's hard to choose eligible scholarship recipient among student applicant.

AHP method is multi-criteria decision-making techniques that build hierarchy with different levels of importance to create weight with acceptable level of consistency[1]. TOPSIS or Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution are multicriteria decision-making methods. (Ramadiani et al., 2018), the method is simple and easy to understand, efficient computation, and has the ability to measure the relative performance of the alternatives in the form of simple mathematics[2].

There is similar study by A. Wardana “*Ahp-Topsis Pada Seleksi Penerimaan Bantuan Program Indonesia Pintar*”, using hybrid method ahp-topsis to determine kip scholarship recipient with 8 criteria and 5 alternatives, end result was ranking scholarship recipient 1-5 and the highest preference point was 0.5338[3]. The next study was conducted by P. Hasan “*Selection of Scholarship Acceptance Using AHP And TOPSIS Methods*” AHP-TOPSIS model to select recommendation students to get PPA scholarship based on 5 criteria, the results were students ranked 1-5 PPA scholarship recipients[4]. The caveat here was the difference between this study and previous study was the criteria was different and alternative quantity was different.

Then objective of this research is to build AHP-TOPSIS model to determine KIP Kuliah scholarship recipients, AHP was used to establish weight value of all criteria set by student division UMKT, while TOPSIS method used for ranking all alternative based criteria weight value set by AHP, the result was rank of KIP Kuliah scholarship recipient candidates the rank are based on TOPSIS ideal solution results value, then find out if AHP method combine with TOPSIS would fit to determine scholarship, judge based on method accuracy.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### A. Analytical Hierarchy Process

Analytical hierarchy process was developed in 1970's by Thomas Saaty[5], The AHP divides complex multi-criteria decision problems into sets of subproblems, associated through a hierarchical structure. The problems are then solved via pairwise comparisons on the relative importance of each subproblem and respective criteria/alternatives, the advantages of Analytical Hierarchical Process are the AHP technique does not require any other tool for evaluating weights of decision criteria as the tool can determine decision criteria weights and ranking of alternatives and the second is the approach with AHP is capable of utilizing both quantitative and qualitative data in the decision-making process[6]

The basic of analytical hierarchy process to solve problem is simple it can break into several steps first calculate the scale of relative importance using the original scale by Thomas L. Saaty the scale is consist of 1-9 odd number for importance scale and even number for scale in between, transform the scale into matrix, to build matrix  $A = a_{ij}/a_{ij}$  and for the reverse,  $A = 1/a_{ij}$

$$\lambda_{max} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(Aw)_i}{nw_i} \quad (1)$$

Based on formula (1) multiply the elements in  $A$  by the row, then calculate n times square of the obtained product, normalize the root square vector to get the final ranking vector  $w$ , last the maximum eigenvalue is lambda max calculated by the formula (2), where  $(Aw)_i$  means the  $i$  the elements of  $A_w$

The last step is to test consistency, after lambda max value obtained to find Consistency Index or C.I lambda max minus total criterion then divide by total criteria minus one, to get the Random Index value is by using R.I table value, then to find Consistency Ratio are C.I divided by R.I if the results less than 0.1 the whole consistent[7][4][1].

### B. Technique for Others Reference by Similarity to Ideal Solution

Procedure of TOPSIS calculation it's quite simple first normalized decision matrix by using formula (2) alternative matrix or X value divided by square root of sum on every X matrix power by 2 as much as length of matrix columns or  $m$  value

$$r_{ij} = \frac{x_{ij}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m x_{ij}^2}} \quad (2)$$

Next step is to determine weighted normalized decision matrix or  $y_{ij}$  value by just multiply  $r$  and criteria weight value or  $w_m$

$$y_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} w_{11}r_{11} & \dots & w_{1n}r_{1n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ w_{m1}r_{m1} & \dots & w_{mn}r_{mn} \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)$$

Next step is to find  $y^+$  and  $y^-$  value from  $y$  matrix by using formula (4) to find  $y^+$  and formula (5) to find  $y^-$

$$y^+ = \{(\max y_{ij} | j \in J')(\min y_{ij} | j \in J'')\} = y_1^+, y_2^+, \dots, y_m^+ \quad (4)$$

$$y^- = \{(\max v_{ij} | j \in J')(\min v_{ij} | j \in J'')\} = y_1^-, y_2^-, \dots, y_m^- \quad (5)$$

Where  $j$  for benefit and  $J'$  for cost, if benefit on  $y^+$  take the maximal value on columns matrix  $y$  and if it is cost on  $y^+$  then take the minimal value on columns matrix  $y$ , The opposite applies for  $y^-$  like shown in formula (5), then calculate the ideal positive solution and the ideal negative solution

$$D_i^+ = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n (y_{ij} - y_j^+)^2} \quad (6)$$

$$D_i^- = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n (y_{ij} - y_j^-)^2} \quad (7)$$

Where to find positive ideal solution means square root of sum on every matrix  $y_{ij}$  minus  $y_j^+$  power by 2 as much as length of matrix rows or  $n$  value, almost identical solution to calculate ideal negative solution the different were  $y_{ij} - y_j^-$ , the last step is to calculate the ideal solution or  $V$  value by ideal negative divided by sum value of ideal positive plus ideal negative

$$V_i = \frac{D_i^-}{D_i^- + D_i^+} \quad (8)$$

Then rank the order Alternatives can be ranked based on sequence  $V_i$ . Therefore, the best alternative is one of the shortest distances to the ideal solution and furthest away with the ideal negative solution[8][9][10].

### III. RESEARCH METHOD

#### A. The Flowchart of Research

Research stages consist with many steps shown in research flow chart from start to finish.




Fig. 1. Research Flowchart

Literature Review, gathered information and fact check about AHP-TOPSIS method also studied previous research, gathering Data, obtaining data for this research main objective was to get criteria and alternatives, data Processing, process gained from set both criteria and alternatives, AHP, for processing all criteria the result was criteria with weight value, TOPSIS, process all alternatives with criteria and weight from AHP, results where is rank all list alternatives based on point TOPSIS, and the discussion were to test the results and discuss the research findings.

#### B. Data Collection

The data were gained through and interview to division unit of Universitas Muhammadiyah Kalimantan Timur that in charge of selection of candidate scholarship recipients, the criterion data then convert into hierarchal order that shown in Figure Criteria hierarchal order




Fig. 1. Criterion Hierarchy

There are 4 criteria groups, Family Condition contain 5 sub criteria, Family Economic contain 2 sub criteria and House condition contain 6 criteria, total was 13 criteria, 4 Criteria in layer 1 and 13 sub criteria in layer 2. The next data gathered from UMKT student division is KIP Kuliah scholarship applicant student year 2022 total student data are 170, and receive KIP Kuliah scholarship recipients report of year 2022.

### C. Criterion Processing

Process the criterion data then process first pairwise comparison matrix table:

TABLE I  
PAIRWISE COMPARISON

| Criteria         | DTKS Status | Family Condition | Family Economy | House Condition |
|------------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| DTKS Status      | 1.0         | 5.0              | 5.0            | 3.0             |
| Family Condition | 0.2         | 1.0              | 1.0            | 0.2             |
| Family Economy   | 0.2         | 1.0              | 1.0            | 0.3             |
| House Condition  | 0.3         | 5.0              | 3.0            | 1.0             |
| Sum Columns      | 1.7         | 12.0             | 10.0           | 4.5             |

The sum of the columns is w value divide per columns w and then sum each row the results then divided with n value to get eigen vector or weight value of each criterion:

TABLE II  
NORMALIZATION MATRIX AND EIGEN VECTOR

| Criteria         | DTKS Status | Family Condition | Family Economy | House Condition | Sum of Columns | Sum of Rows | Weight |
|------------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|--------|
| DTKS Status      | 0.58        | 0.42             | 0.50           | 0.66            | 1.733          | 2.155       | 0.539  |
| Family Condition | 0.12        | 0.08             | 0.10           | 0.04            | 12.00          | 0.343       | 0.086  |
| Family Economy   | 0.12        | 0.08             | 0.10           | 0.07            | 10.00          | 0.372       | 0.093  |
| House Condition  | 0.19        | 0.42             | 0.30           | 0.22            | 4.533          | 1.130       | 0.282  |

Then next step is to test the consistency, first find lambda by value of sigma Sum of Columns multiply by W value, then to get C.I value  $4.173 - 4$  then divided with 3, to get R.I value by using table Random Index[1]:

TABLE III  
RANDOM INDEX TABLE

| n | RI   | n  | RI   |
|---|------|----|------|
| 2 | 0    | 9  | 1.45 |
| 3 | 0.58 | 10 | 1.49 |
| 4 | 0.90 | 11 | 1.51 |
| 5 | 1.12 | 12 | 1.48 |
| 6 | 1.24 | 13 | 1.56 |
| 7 | 1.32 | 14 | 1.57 |
| 8 | 1.41 | 15 | 1.59 |

To calculate the C.R, divide C.I with R.I if the results is less than 0.1 the results is consistent, and if not consistent the eigen vector value can't be used for criteria weight value the and need

$$C.R = \frac{0.05776102}{0.90} = 0.06417891$$



*D. Alternative Processing*

The alternatives are total 170 alternatives to calculate the alternatives first convert the student data to weight value, the weight value are the results of AHP calculation the weight on layer two are sharing the value from layer one, for TOPSIS calculation weight layer 2 are the matrix W, and value on layer 3 is value for matrix x

TABLE IV  
CRITERIA WEIGHT RESULTS

| Criterion        | Weight(w)                   | Criteria                    | Weight | Description                   | Attribute |
|------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Status DTKS      | 0.539                       | DTKS Status                 | 12     | Registered                    | Benefit   |
|                  |                             |                             | 88     | Not Registered                |           |
| Family Condition | 0.086                       | Number of Family Dependents | 4      | 1 to 2 People                 | Benefit   |
|                  |                             |                             | 9      | 3 to 4 People                 |           |
|                  |                             |                             | 42     | 5 to 6 People                 |           |
|                  |                             |                             | 45     | More than 6 People            |           |
|                  |                             | Father Status               | 7      | Life                          | Benefit   |
|                  |                             |                             | 18     | Death                         |           |
|                  |                             |                             | 75     | Divorced                      |           |
|                  |                             | Father Job                  | 4      | Civil Servant                 | Benefit   |
|                  |                             |                             | 17     | Entrepreneur                  |           |
|                  |                             |                             | 19     | Private / Honorary Employee   |           |
|                  |                             |                             | 60     | Farmers / Labor               |           |
|                  |                             | Mother Status               | 8      | Life                          | Benefit   |
|                  |                             |                             | 13     | Death                         |           |
|                  |                             |                             | 79     | Divorced                      |           |
|                  |                             | Mother Job                  | 4      | Civil Servant                 | Benefit   |
|                  |                             |                             | 17     | Entrepreneur                  |           |
| 19               | Private / Honorary Employee |                             |        |                               |           |
| 60               | Farmers / Labor             |                             |        |                               |           |
| Family Economy   | 0.093                       | Father Income               | 5      | More Than IDR 10M             | Cost      |
|                  |                             |                             | 13     | IDR 5-10M                     |           |
|                  |                             |                             | 26     | IDR 3-5M                      |           |
|                  |                             |                             | 55     | IDR 0-2M                      |           |
|                  |                             | Mother Income               | 5      | More Than IDR 10M             | Cost      |
|                  |                             |                             | 11     | IDR 5-10M                     |           |
|                  |                             |                             | 19     | IDR 3-5M                      |           |
|                  |                             |                             | 65     | IDR 0-2M                      |           |
| House Condition  | 0.282                       | House Ownership             | 11     | Own by Family                 | Benefit   |
|                  |                             |                             | 26     | Indwelling in Relatives House |           |
|                  |                             |                             | 63     | Rent                          |           |
|                  |                             | Source of Electricity       | 8      | PLN                           | Benefit   |
|                  |                             |                             | 19     | Generator/Solar Panel         |           |
|                  |                             |                             | 74     | None                          |           |
|                  |                             | Water Source                | 14     | PDAM                          | Benefit   |
|                  |                             |                             | 43     | River                         |           |
|                  |                             |                             | 43     | Well                          |           |
|                  |                             | Large of Property           | 6      | More than 112M2               | Cost      |
|                  |                             |                             | 12     | 73M2 - 112M2                  |           |
|                  |                             |                             | 26     | 33M2 - 72M2                   |           |
|                  |                             |                             | 56     | 9M2 - 32M2                    |           |
|                  |                             | Restrooms Condition         | 11     | Private Restrooms             | Benefit   |
|                  |                             |                             | 26     | Family Sharing Restrooms      |           |
|                  |                             |                             | 63     | Public Restrooms              |           |

The alternatives data after convert to the weight preferential value or the x matrix:

TABLE V  
MATRIX X TABLE

|             |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |
|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|
| <b>A1</b>   | 12 | 60 | 55 | 7  | 60 | 65 | 8 | 4 | 11 | 8  | 26 | 43 | 11 |
| <b>A2</b>   | 12 | 17 | 55 | 7  | 17 | 65 | 8 | 9 | 26 | 8  | 26 | 43 | 11 |
| <b>A3</b>   | 88 | 19 | 55 | 75 | 17 | 65 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 74 | 12 | 43 | 26 |
| :           | :  | :  | :  | :  | :  | :  | : | : | :  | :  | :  | :  | :  |
| <b>A169</b> | 12 | 17 | 26 | 7  | 17 | 65 | 8 | 4 | 11 | 8  | 56 | 14 | 11 |
| <b>A170</b> | 12 | 17 | 55 | 7  | 17 | 65 | 8 | 4 | 11 | 8  | 12 | 14 | 11 |

By using formula (2) matrix x divided with square root sigma x power by 2, the results are matrix R:

TABLE VI  
MATRIX R TABLE

|             |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <b>A1</b>   | 0.019 | 0.112 | 0.083 | 0.018 | 0.097 | 0.078 | 0.026 | 0.014 | 0.020 | 0.016 | 0.047 | 0.103 | 0.025 |
| <b>A2</b>   | 0.019 | 0.032 | 0.083 | 0.018 | 0.028 | 0.078 | 0.026 | 0.032 | 0.048 | 0.016 | 0.047 | 0.103 | 0.025 |
| <b>A3</b>   | 0.141 | 0.036 | 0.083 | 0.197 | 0.028 | 0.078 | 0.026 | 0.032 | 0.020 | 0.146 | 0.022 | 0.103 | 0.059 |
| :           | :     | :     | :     | :     | :     | :     | :     | :     | :     | :     | :     | :     | :     |
| <b>A169</b> | 0.019 | 0.032 | 0.039 | 0.018 | 0.028 | 0.078 | 0.026 | 0.014 | 0.020 | 0.016 | 0.101 | 0.033 | 0.025 |
| <b>A170</b> | 0.019 | 0.032 | 0.083 | 0.018 | 0.028 | 0.078 | 0.026 | 0.014 | 0.020 | 0.016 | 0.022 | 0.033 | 0.025 |

The next to calculate the matrix Y or normalization matrix are matrix R multiply by matrix W, then find the positive and negative of matrix Y using formula (4) and formula (5):

TABLE VII  
MATRIX Y AND POSITIVE NEGATIVE TABLE

|                      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <b>A1</b>            | 0.010 | 0.010 | 0.008 | 0.002 | 0.008 | 0.007 | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.006 | 0.004 | 0.013 | 0.029 | 0.007 |
| <b>A2</b>            | 0.010 | 0.003 | 0.008 | 0.002 | 0.002 | 0.007 | 0.002 | 0.003 | 0.014 | 0.004 | 0.013 | 0.029 | 0.007 |
| <b>A3</b>            | 0.076 | 0.003 | 0.008 | 0.017 | 0.002 | 0.007 | 0.002 | 0.003 | 0.006 | 0.041 | 0.006 | 0.029 | 0.017 |
| :                    | :     | :     | :     | :     | :     | :     | :     | :     | :     | :     | :     | :     | :     |
| <b>A169</b>          | 0.010 | 0.003 | 0.004 | 0.002 | 0.002 | 0.007 | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.006 | 0.004 | 0.029 | 0.009 | 0.007 |
| <b>A170</b>          | 0.010 | 0.003 | 0.008 | 0.002 | 0.002 | 0.007 | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.006 | 0.004 | 0.006 | 0.009 | 0.007 |
| <b>y<sup>+</sup></b> | 0.076 | 0.010 | 0.002 | 0.017 | 0.008 | 0.002 | 0.022 | 0.014 | 0.033 | 0.041 | 0.003 | 0.029 | 0.041 |
| <b>y<sup>-</sup></b> | 0.010 | 0.001 | 0.008 | 0.002 | 0.002 | 0.007 | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.006 | 0.004 | 0.029 | 0.009 | 0.007 |

The next step is to find the ideal positive and ideal negative solution, then find the ideal solution value by ideal negative divide with results sum of ideal positive and ideal negative, ranking the alternative based on ideal solution or v value:

TABLE VIII  
TOPSIS CALCULATION RESULTS

| Alternative     | $D^+$  | $D^-$  | Ideal Solution | Rank |
|-----------------|--------|--------|----------------|------|
| Alternative 1   | 0.0921 | 0.0271 | 0.2272         | 101  |
| Alternative 2   | 0.0904 | 0.0262 | 0.2244         | 107  |
| Alternative 3   | 0.0445 | 0.0830 | 0.6511         | 43   |
| Alternative 4   | 0.0373 | 0.0903 | 0.7077         | 18   |
| :               | :      | :      | :              | :    |
| Alternative 169 | 0.0973 | 0.0046 | 0.0450         | 169  |
| Alternative 170 | 0.0941 | 0.0226 | 0.1935         | 140  |

## IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### A. Accuracy Test

To find the accuracy of AHP and TOPSIS model for determining KIP Kuliah Scholarship recipients using formula (11) first require to find the errors the model produce, to find it first slice the alternative results to the quota of scholarship based on scholarship recipient report from student division the quota were 111 so slice the data to 111 then compare to KIP Kuliah scholarship recipient report year 2022 if the n fame in the table does not exist in the report the data is count as an error, the results are there is 26 errors or 26 alternatives from 111 scholarship quota that should not in the scholarship recipients list, then calculate the accuracy:

$$\text{Accuracy} = 100\% - \left( \frac{26}{111} \times 100 \right) = 76.57657657657657$$

The results were 76.57657657657657 and if it is rounded up to 77%, so the results of the accuracy of the AHP and TOPSIS models in determining the KIP Kuliah scholarship recipients are 77%.

## V. CONCLUSION

In this study successfully found how to determine scholarship recipients by using Analytical Hierarchy Process combined with TOPSIS method with accuracy rate of 77%, another find was criteria weight value affected accuracy results.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Thanks to Allah SWT, also tanks to both my parents with all financial and mental support, Asslia Johar Latipah, S.kom, M.Cs as a supervisor, also thanks to Arbansyah, S.Kom., M.TI for the guide, thanks to Student Division of Universitas Muhammadiyah Kalimantan Timur that welcoming author to do the research and provide the data, within the author's prayer for everyone that's mentioned gets happiness and grace from Allah SWT.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Marfuah and S. Widianoro, "The Implementation of Analytical Hierarchy Process Method for Outstanding Achievement Scholarship Reception Selection at Universal University of Batam," *IOP Conf. Ser. Earth Environ. Sci.*, vol. 97, no. 1, 2017, doi: 10.1088/1755-1315/97/1/012003.
- [2] A. S. Meriani Catur Utami, Yuni Sugiarti, Ahmad Melani, Yusuf Durachman, "Implementation of TOPSIS method in the selection process of scholarship grantee (case study: BAZIS South Jakarta)," *2017 5th Int. Conf. Cyber IT Serv. Manag.*, 2017, doi: 10.1109/CITSM.2017.8089277.
- [3] A. K. Wardana, "AHP-TOPSIS PADA SELEKSI PENERIMAAN BANTUAN PROGRAM INDONESIA PINTAR," *J. Masy. Inform. Indones.*, vol. 4, no. April, pp. 49–58, 2019.
- [4] P. Hasan, E. Utami, S. Yunita, E. Pawan, and Kaharuddin, "Selection of scholarship acceptance using AHP and TOPSIS methods," *2019 Int. Conf. Inf. Commun. Technol. ICOIACT 2019*, pp. 920–925, 2019, doi: 10.1109/ICOIACT46704.2019.8938533.
- [5] N. Özeyranlı Ergenç and Barış, "Prioritization of hazard profile for Istanbul using Analytical Hierarchy Process," *Nat. Hazards*, vol. 90, no. 1, pp. 325–336, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s11069-017-3041-x.
- [6] J. J. Jara *et al.*, "Ranking of Placer Gold Prospects in Chile Through Analytic Hierarchy Process," *Nat. Resour. Res.*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 813–832, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s11053-018-9420-5.
- [7] W. Dong, J. Fu, Z. Jie, and J. Wang, "Study on Operation Evaluation of Charging and Discharging Network Based on Improved Analytic Hierarchy Process and Fuzzy Synthetic Evaluation," *Proc. 2018 2nd IEEE Adv. Inf. Manag. Commun. Electron. Autom. Control Conf. IMCEC 2018*, no. Imcec, pp. 1991–1995, 2018, doi: 10.1109/IMCEC.2018.8469406.
- [8] A. Hajjah and D. Oktarina, "Decision Support System To Recommend Scholarships Using AHP TOPSIS Methods In Education And Culture Office Of Pekanbaru," *Am. J. Eng. Res. (AJER)*, no. 7, pp. 61–67, 2018.
- [9] Y. S. Bagi, S. Suyono, and M. F. Tomatala, "Decision Support System for High Achieving Students Selection Using AHP and TOPSIS," Oct. 2020. doi: 10.1109/ICORIS50180.2020.9320823.
- [10] A. D. Setiawan, A. Hidayatno, B. D. Putra, and I. Rahman, "Selection of Charging Station Technology to Support the Adoption of Electric Vehicles in Indonesia with the AHP-TOPSIS Method," *2020 3rd Int. Conf. Power Energy Appl. ICPEA 2020*, pp. 85–88, 2020, doi: 10.1109/ICPEA49807.2020.9280125.

# Naspub: Determination of KIP scholarship recipients using the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) and TOPSIS method (Case Study: Kemahasiswaan UMKT)

*by* Arif Rahman Hakim

---

**Submission date:** 25-Jan-2023 11:37AM (UTC+0800)

**Submission ID:** 1998908052

**File name:** ARIKEL\_JOURNAL\_ARIF\_RAHMAN\_HAKIM\_1811102441105.docx (112.35K)

**Word count:** 3064

**Character count:** 15828

## Naspub: Determination of KIP scholarship recipients using the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) and TOPSIS method (Case Study: Kemahasiswaan UMKT)

### ORIGINALITY REPORT

|                  |                  |              |                |
|------------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|
| <b>10%</b>       | <b>7%</b>        | <b>8%</b>    | <b>2%</b>      |
| SIMILARITY INDEX | INTERNET SOURCES | PUBLICATIONS | STUDENT PAPERS |

### PRIMARY SOURCES

|          |  |           |
|----------|--|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>link.springer.com</b><br>Internet Source  | <b>3%</b> |
| <b>2</b> | Wenlue Dong, Jun Fu, Zhiyi Jie, Jun Wang.<br>"Study on Operation Evaluation of Charging and Discharging Network Based on Improved Analytic Hierarchy Process and Fuzzy Synthetic Evaluation", 2018 2nd IEEE Advanced Information Management, Communicates, Electronic and Automation Control Conference (IMCEC), 2018<br>Publication | <b>1%</b> |
| <b>3</b> | <b>www.researchgate.net</b><br>Internet Source   | <b>1%</b> |
| <b>4</b> | Septya Maharani, Heliza Rahmania Hatta, Afif Nur Anzhari, Dyna Marisa Khairina.<br>"Paskibraka Member Selection Using A Combination Of AHP and TOPSIS Methods On The Office Of Youth And Sports Of Kutai   | <b>1%</b> |