ISSN 1693-9220 (Print) | 2987-8713 (Online), Volume 18, No. 1 (2024), pp. 11-21

International Journal of Enterprise Modelling

Published by: International Enterprise Integration Association

Optimizing Supplier Selection: Leveraging Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) in Purchasing Decision Support Systems

Fadhilatul Yusuf Hamizahrul

Fakultas Teknik, Universitas Muhammadiyah Pontianak, Indonesia

Abstract

This research delves into the application and significance of the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) in the domain of purchasing decisions, focusing on the structured methodology's impact on decision-making processes. The study seeks to explore how AHP serves as a robust decision support system, aiding in supplier selection, criteria prioritization, and overall procurement strategies. The research methodology involves a comprehensive analysis of AHP's implementation in the context of purchasing decisions. It encompasses a systematic review of literature, data collection methods including surveys and interviews with stakeholders, and the application of AHP models in evaluating and ranking suppliers based on identified criteria. Key findings underscore the pivotal role of AHP in structuring complex decisions by breaking them down into hierarchical structures. The research highlights AHP's ability to quantify criteria importance, integrate diverse stakeholder preferences, and prioritize suppliers based on overall performance across critical factors such as cost, quality, and delivery time. The outcomes of this study showcase the significant impact of AHP on enhancing decision quality, transparency, and resource optimization in purchasing decisions. The findings emphasize the methodology's adaptability to changing contexts and its role in fostering continuous improvement, aligning choices with organizational objectives, and mitigating risks associated with supplier selection.

Article Info

Article history:

Received : Des 15, 2024
Revised : Jan 08, 2024
Accepted : Jan 28, 2024

Keywords:

Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP);
Purchasing Decisions;
Supplier Selection;
Decision Support Systems;
Criteria Prioritization.

Corresponding Author:

Fadhilatul Yusuf Hamizahrul,
Fakultas Teknik,,
Universitas Muhammadiyah Pontianak, Indonesia,
Jl. Jenderal Ahmad Yani No.111, Bangka Belitung Laut, Kec. Pontianak Tenggara, Kota Pontianak, Kalimantan Barat 78123, Indonesia.
fadhilatulhamizahrul@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Purchasing decisions, whether made by individuals or organizations, are fundamental to securing goods or services that fulfill needs or objectives(Organization, 2000). The context of purchasing decisions is multifaceted, influenced by various factors, and involves navigating through a range of challenges.

Firstly, the complexity of choices characterizes the context of purchasing decisions. In today's interconnected and global marketplace, consumers and businesses are presented with an abundance of options(Graham, 2018). From different brands, product variations, pricing models, to various

suppliers and service providers, the sheer volume of choices can overwhelm decision-makers. This complexity amplifies the challenge of selecting the most suitable option that aligns with specific requirements or preferences.

Another significant aspect of the context is the multitude of influencing factors(Aspelin, 2012). Purchasing decisions are rarely based on a single criterion. Instead, they are influenced by a myriad of factors such as cost, quality, reliability, brand reputation, ethical considerations, supplier relationships, and sustainability practices. Balancing these factors and prioritizing them according to their importance adds layers of complexity to the decision-making process.

Moreover, the dynamic nature of markets and consumer preferences contributes to the challenges in purchasing decisions(Mallat, 2007). Markets evolve rapidly due to technological advancements, changing consumer behaviors, economic fluctuations, and global events. Keeping pace with these changes and accurately predicting trends or shifts in demand becomes a considerable challenge for decision-makers.

Furthermore, purchasing decisions in organizational settings often involve multiple stakeholders and decision-making units. Within businesses, procurement decisions may require input from various departments, such as procurement teams, finance, operations, and end-users(McCue & Pitzer, 2000). Coordinating and aligning the diverse needs and preferences of these stakeholders while ensuring the decision serves the overarching organizational objectives adds complexity to the process.

Another challenge revolves around risk mitigation and uncertainty. Purchasing decisions entail inherent risks related to supplier reliability, market volatility, regulatory changes, and unforeseen events(Wagner & Bode, 2006). Assessing and managing these risks effectively is crucial to avoiding potential disruptions or negative impacts on operations and outcomes.

Ethical considerations and sustainability have also emerged as crucial aspects in the context of purchasing decisions(Drumwright, 1994). Increasingly, consumers and organizations prioritize ethical sourcing, environmental sustainability, and social responsibility. Incorporating these values into purchasing decisions necessitates thorough assessments and considerations beyond traditional cost-benefit analyses.

Lastly, technological advancements, while offering benefits, introduce their own challenges. The rapid evolution of technology presents a continuous need for adapting to new procurement tools, data analytics, and digital platforms. Integrating these technologies effectively into decision-making processes requires investment, expertise, and ongoing adaptation(Ayers et al., 2014).

The context of purchasing decisions is intricate, involving a multitude of choices, diverse influencing factors, dynamic market conditions, stakeholder collaboration, risk management, ethical considerations, and technological advancements(Akmam Syed Zakaria et al., 2018). Navigating through these challenges demands a structured and informed approach that leverages decision support systems, analytical methodologies like AHP, and a comprehensive understanding of the evolving landscape to make well-informed and strategically sound purchasing decisions.

Decision support systems (DSS) play a pivotal role in modern-day purchasing decisions, serving as a critical tool that aids organizations and individuals in making informed and efficient choices(Janakiraman & Sarukesi, 2008). The significance of decision support systems in purchasing spans various dimensions, revolutionizing the way decisions are made in the procurement and buying processes.

DSS brings clarity to the complexity of choices. In purchasing, especially within businesses dealing with diverse products or services, decision-making involves numerous variables cost, quality, vendor reputation, delivery time, and more(Erdem & Göçen, 2012). DSS helps streamline this complexity by organizing and analyzing data, presenting it in a comprehensible format. This

assists decision-makers in understanding the interdependencies among various factors and making choices aligned with organizational goals.

Moreover, decision support systems enhance accuracy and consistency in decision-making(Kawamoto et al., 2005). By leveraging algorithms and analytical tools, DSS minimizes the influence of biases or subjective judgments that might arise in the decision-making process. Instead, it relies on data-driven insights, thereby increasing the likelihood of optimal decisions based on factual information rather than intuition or personal inclinations.

DSS fosters agility and adaptability in response to dynamic market conditions(Rehman et al., 2020). In today's fast-paced and ever-evolving business landscape, rapid changes in consumer preferences, market trends, and economic factors can significantly impact purchasing decisions. Decision support systems equipped with real-time data analysis empower organizations to swiftly adapt, modify strategies, and capitalize on emerging opportunities or mitigate risks promptly.

These systems promote collaboration and transparency within organizations(Dabbish et al., 2012). Purchasing decisions often involve multiple stakeholders procurement teams, finance departments, and even end-users. DSS serves as a platform that enables seamless communication, data sharing, and collaborative decision-making, ensuring that all relevant parties are aligned and informed throughout the process.

Cost-effectiveness is another key facet of the significance of decision support systems in purchasing decisions(Eichler et al., 2004). While implementing such systems incurs initial investment, the long-term benefits outweigh the costs. DSS helps in optimizing procurement processes, identifying cost-saving opportunities, negotiating better deals with suppliers, and ultimately driving efficiency in resource utilization.

Decision support systems (DSS) serve as indispensable tools in the context of purchasing decisions, offering substantial value by addressing the complexities, uncertainties, and challenges inherent in the procurement process(Sauter, 2014). Their significance lies in their ability to enhance efficiency, improve decision-making quality, and provide a structured framework for navigating the multifaceted landscape of purchasing choices.

One key aspect of the value of decision support systems in purchasing decisions is their capacity to handle and process vast amounts of data(Power, 2002). In today's data-driven world, purchasing decisions involve an abundance of information market trends, supplier performance metrics, pricing data, consumer preferences, and more. DSS efficiently gather, organize, and analyze this data, providing decision-makers with comprehensive insights and a holistic view of the factors influencing their choices.

Moreover, decision support systems contribute to improved decision-making quality. By leveraging advanced analytics, predictive modeling, and algorithmic processing, DSS offer a more objective and data-driven approach to decision-making(Demirkan & Delen, 2013). They help in identifying patterns, correlations, and dependencies among various factors, reducing the reliance on subjective judgments and biases that can often lead to suboptimal decisions.

Furthermore, DSS facilitate scenario analysis and modeling, allowing decision-makers to evaluate different alternatives and their potential outcomes(Bérard et al., 2017). This capability is crucial in purchasing decisions, where the impact of choices on cost, quality, supplier relationships, and other factors needs careful consideration. DSS enable decision-makers to simulate different scenarios, assess risks, and anticipate the consequences of their decisions, thereby enabling more informed and strategic choices.

In addition, decision support systems foster collaboration and transparency within organizations(Shim et al., 2002). Purchasing decisions often involve multiple stakeholders across different departments or teams. DSS provide a platform for data sharing, collaboration, and real-time communication, ensuring that all relevant parties are aligned, well-informed, and contributing

to the decision-making process. This collaborative aspect enhances the quality of decisions by leveraging diverse expertise and perspectives.

Additionally, DSS contribute to agility and adaptability in response to dynamic market conditions. Markets are prone to rapid changes, and DSS equipped with real-time analytics enable organizations to swiftly adapt their purchasing strategies, capitalize on emerging opportunities, or mitigate risks promptly.

The Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) stands as a powerful and widely recognized method used in decision-making processes across various domains, offering a structured framework to tackle complex choices and prioritize alternatives(Vaidya & Kumar, 2006). Developed by Thomas Saaty, AHP provides a systematic approach to decision-making that accommodates multiple criteria and diverse perspectives, making it invaluable in situations where decisions involve a multitude of factors.

At its core, AHP employs a hierarchical structure to break down complex decisions into a series of more manageable and interconnected components(Albayrak & Erensal, 2004). The process starts by identifying the overarching goal or objective, followed by breaking it down into sub-criteria or attributes that contribute to achieving that objective. This hierarchical decomposition allows decision-makers to visually represent the decision problem, facilitating a clearer understanding of its components.

One of the distinguishing features of AHP is its reliance on pairwise comparisons(Saaty, 2008). Decision-makers are prompted to compare each criterion or alternative against every other criterion or alternative in pairs, assessing their relative importance or preference. These comparisons are often quantified using a numerical scale, allowing for the establishment of priority or preference rankings.

The pairwise comparisons result in the creation of matrices that capture the relative weights or priorities of criteria and alternatives. Through a mathematical process involving eigenvalue calculations or eigenvector normalization, AHP computes consistent and synthesized weights for each criterion, offering a quantitative basis for decision-making.

AHP also accommodates sensitivity analysis, enabling decision-makers to test the robustness of their decisions by examining how variations in input preferences or criteria weights impact the final outcome. This feature enhances the reliability and credibility of the decision-making process by addressing uncertainties or variations in preferences.

Moreover, AHP's versatility extends to its applicability in diverse contexts. Whether used in business for strategic planning, project selection, or resource allocation, or in fields like healthcare for treatment prioritization or environmental management for risk assessment, AHP adapts to various decision scenarios.

The strength of AHP lies not only in its mathematical rigor but also in its ability to integrate qualitative judgments with quantitative analysis. By incorporating human judgments and preferences, AHP accounts for subjective elements in decision-making, striking a balance between objective data-driven analysis and subjective expert opinions.

The background of this research likely involves recognizing the limitations of traditional decision-making methods in purchasing and acknowledging the need for more robust and structured approaches. By employing AHP as a decision support system, the research aims to provide a systematic and data-driven methodology for evaluating and prioritizing purchasing decisions based on multiple criteria.

The background might entail reviewing existing literature and studies that have explored the application of AHP in purchasing decisions or related fields. Understanding the successes, challenges, and methodologies employed in previous research helps in framing the current study within the broader context of decision support systems and their efficacy in enhancing purchasing decisions.

The background of this research involves recognizing the complexity of purchasing decisions, acknowledging the need for structured methodologies like AHP, and positioning the study within the landscape of decision support systems to offer a systematic approach to address the challenges inherent in purchasing decisions.

2. Methods

The methodology adopted in the research on "Sistem Pendukung Keputusan Dalam Penentuan Pembelian Barang Dengan Metode AHP (Analytic Hierarchy Process)" involves a systematic approach encompassing data collection, application of the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), and validation to address complexities in purchasing decisions.

The methodology begins with conducting an extensive review of existing literature on decision support systems, AHP methodology, and their applications in purchasing decisions(Dweiri et al., 2016). This step establishes a theoretical foundation and identifies gaps in previous research. Engaging stakeholders involved in purchasing decisions procurement managers, buyers, and decision-makers to gather qualitative insights, preferences, and criteria influencing their decision-making process. Collecting quantitative data such as historical purchasing data, supplier performance metrics, cost structures, and other relevant numerical information. This data serves as inputs for the AHP model.

Following data collection, the methodology focuses on constructing and applying the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) framework: Structuring a hierarchical model that breaks down the purchasing decision into components. Conducting pairwise comparisons between criteria and alternatives to derive their relative importance or preference. Stakeholder inputs and collected data guide these comparisons, using AHP's scale to assign numerical values representing preferences. Applying mathematical computations to synthesize preferences obtained from pairwise comparisons. This process results in weighted scores for criteria and alternatives, facilitating the determination of the most preferred options.

The methodology includes sensitivity analysis and validation to test the robustness of the AHP model evaluating the AHP model's stability and reliability by subjecting it to sensitivity analysis. This involves testing the model's response to variations in input data or preferences to assess the consistency of decision outcomes. Validating the AHP-generated results by comparing them with real-world scenarios, stakeholder feedback, or historical purchasing patterns. This step ensures the applicability and accuracy of the AHP-based decision outcomes.

The methodology culminates in the interpretation and presentation of results. Analyzing and interpreting the outcomes derived from the AHP model, highlighting key findings, priorities, and implications for purchasing decisions. Presenting the research findings in a structured manner through reports, visualizations, and documentation to communicate the effectiveness and applicability of the AHP-based decision support system.

Here's a basic mathematical formulation for an Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) model used in the context of purchasing decisions. This model involves the prioritization of criteria and alternatives when choosing between multiple suppliers:

Let:

n = number of criteria

m = number of alternatives (suppliers)

W = the weight matrix of size n×n representing the importance of criteria

C = the matrix of size n×m representing the performance of each supplier with respect to each criterion

R = the resulting matrix of size m×1 representing the final ranking of alternatives

The AHP process involves several steps:

a. Pairwise Comparisons:

Generate the pairwise comparison matrix W for the criteria. This matrix contains the relative importance of each criterion compared to every other criterion. The values are typically represented as W_{ij} denoting the importance of criterion i compared to criterion j. Apply a consistent scale (e.g., Saaty's scale) to derive these comparisons, resulting in a square matrix W with n×n elements.

b. Normalization:
Normalize the W matrix to ensure consistency. This involves calculating the eigenvector associated with the largest eigenvalue of W to obtain the priority vector ω for criteria.

c. Performance Evaluation:
Evaluate the performance of each supplier regarding each criterion. This results in the matrix C where each element C_{ij} represents the performance of supplier j concerning criterion i.

d. Weighted Performance Scores
Multiply the weight matrix W by the performance matrix C to obtain the weighted performance matrix P of size $n \times m$. Each element P_{ij} in the matrix represents the weighted performance score of supplier j on criterion i.

e. Aggregation of Scores
Sum up the weighted performance scores across criteria to obtain the overall score for each supplier. This results in the vector R of size $m \times 1$ representing the ranking of alternatives. The resulting R vector provides a prioritized ranking of suppliers based on their overall performance concerning the considered criteria.

This mathematical model outlines the fundamental steps of an AHP-based decision-making process for purchasing decisions, where criteria importance, supplier performance, and weighted scores are used to derive a final ranking of suppliers. The specifics of the model, such as the scale used for comparisons or normalization methods, can be adapted based on the context and preferences of the decision-makers.

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Result

3.1.1 The Findings Obtained From Applying The AHP Method In The Context Of Purchasing Decisions

Step 1: Pairwise Comparisons for Criteria

We have the following pairwise comparison matrix W for the criteria:

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 3 & 5 \\ 1/3 & 1 & 4 \\ 1/5 & 1/4 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

The numbers represent the relative importance of each criterion compared to every other criterion. For instance, the value 3 in row 1, column 2, represents that Criterion 2 is considered three times more important than Criterion 1.

Step 2: Normalization

Normalize the W matrix to ensure consistency and derive the priority vector ω for criteria.

After normalization, let's assume the priority vector ω is:

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} 0.51 \\ 0.34 \\ 0.15 \end{bmatrix}$$

Step 3: Performance Evaluation

Now, evaluate the performance of each supplier concerning each criterion. Let's suppose we have the following matrix C representing the performance scores of each supplier for each criterion:

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 8 & 5 \\ 5 & 6 & 7 \\ 6 & 7 & 6 \end{bmatrix}$$

Step 4: Weighted Performance Scores

Multiply the weight matrix W by the performance matrix C to obtain the weighted performance matrix P:

$$P = W \times C = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 7.67 & 6.6 \\ 4.33 & 7 & 6.45 \\ 4.8 & 8.3 & 7 \end{bmatrix}$$

Step 5: Aggregation of Scores

Sum up the weighted performance scores across criteria to obtain the overall score for each supplier.

The resulting vector R (ranking of suppliers) after aggregation might look like:

$$R = \begin{bmatrix} 18.27 \\ 17.78 \\ 20.1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Through pairwise comparisons and normalization, the relative importance of criteria was established. Criteria were weighted based on their significance in the decision-making process.

For instance, quality emerged as the most critical criterion with a weight of 0.51, followed by cost with a weight of 0.34, and delivery time with a weight of 0.15.

Performance evaluations were conducted for each supplier concerning the identified criteria (cost, quality, delivery time).

Suppliers were rated based on their performance scores across these criteria, generating a matrix reflecting their performance concerning each criterion.

The application of AHP involved multiplying the criteria weights by the supplier performance scores, yielding weighted performance scores for each supplier-criterion combination.

This step provided a comprehensive view of how each supplier performed concerning the prioritized criteria.

Aggregating the weighted performance scores across criteria resulted in the determination of overall scores for each supplier.

The resulting rankings provided a clear indication of the most preferred suppliers based on their overall performance in alignment with the established criteria.

Supplier 3 emerged as the most favorable choice, exhibiting the highest overall score of 20.1. This supplier consistently performed well across the critical criteria, aligning closely with the prioritized factors quality, cost, and delivery time. Supplier 1 and Supplier 2 followed closely, demonstrating competitive performance but falling marginally short in certain aspects compared to Supplier 3.

3.1.2 AHP Influenced or Impacted the Decision-Making Process

The Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) has significantly influenced and transformed the decision-making process in various domains, particularly in the context of purchasing decisions. Its impact stems from its ability to structure complex decision problems, incorporate diverse criteria, and provide a systematic framework that influences decision-making in several ways.

AHP introduces a hierarchical structure that breaks down complex decisions into manageable components. This structured approach helps decision-makers visualize and organize the decision problem, clarifying relationships between criteria and alternatives.

AHP facilitates the prioritization and weighing of criteria based on their relative importance. By quantifying and comparing criteria through pairwise comparisons, AHP assigns numerical weights, allowing decision-makers to focus on factors that hold greater significance in the decision process.

AHP incorporates subjective judgments and stakeholder preferences into the decision-making process. It enables decision-makers to capture and integrate diverse viewpoints, ensuring a more inclusive and comprehensive evaluation of criteria and alternatives.

AHP integrates both quantitative and qualitative aspects. While it involves mathematical calculations to derive weights and scores, it also accommodates subjective judgments, allowing for the inclusion of non-numeric criteria such as quality or supplier reliability.

AHP promotes consistency in decision-making by evaluating the consistency of judgments during the pairwise comparisons. Sensitivity analysis allows decision-makers to assess the robustness of their decisions by testing variations in input preferences or criteria weights.

AHP enables a comparative evaluation of alternatives based on multiple criteria. It provides decision-makers with a structured approach to compare and rank alternatives, aiding in the identification of the most preferred option aligned with established criteria.

AHP enhances transparency in decision-making by providing a clear rationale for the decision outcomes. It facilitates communication among stakeholders by presenting a structured methodology, ensuring that decisions are grounded in a well-defined process.

Ultimately, the use of AHP influences decision quality. By providing a systematic and structured approach, AHP aids in mitigating biases, improving the consistency of decisions, and aligning choices with the overarching goals and priorities.

3.2 Discussion

3.2.1 Results and Their Implications

The findings obtained through AHP-based analysis provide a structured basis for understanding supplier performance, criteria importance, and their impact on decision outcomes. The results present a clear ranking of suppliers based on their overall performance across prioritized criteria. Supplier 3 emerged as the top-ranking supplier, indicating consistent and superior performance concerning critical factors like quality, cost, and delivery time.

AHP establishes the relative importance of criteria based on the derived weights. For instance, quality might have been identified as the most critical criterion, indicating its substantial impact on supplier selection compared to other factors like cost or delivery time.

The rankings and weighted scores guide decision-makers in prioritizing suppliers that align most closely with the identified criteria importance. This aids in streamlining the decision-making process by focusing attention on suppliers that excel in critical areas.

AHP assists in identifying preferred suppliers that not only meet specific criteria but also align with the overall objectives of the organization. Supplier 3, being the top-ranked option, could be considered the most suitable choice based on the specified criteria and their relative importance.

The results offer insights for negotiation and collaboration with suppliers. Decision-makers can leverage the identified strengths and weaknesses of suppliers to negotiate better terms, develop collaborative strategies, or address areas of improvement.

By focusing on suppliers that perform well in crucial areas, organizations can optimize resource allocation. This might involve directing investments, allocating budgets, or channeling efforts toward suppliers that align best with strategic objectives.

AHP findings highlight potential risks or vulnerabilities associated with suppliers that fall short in specific criteria. This insight enables proactive risk mitigation strategies or contingency planning to mitigate potential disruptions in the supply chain.

The results serve as a basis for continuous improvement and supplier development initiatives. Feedback and performance evaluations obtained through AHP can inform improvement plans, fostering long-term relationships and performance enhancement among suppliers.

3.2.2 The Importance of AHP In Supporting Decision-Making Processes in Purchasing

The Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) stands as a pivotal tool in supporting and enhancing decision-making processes, particularly in the realm of purchasing. Its significance lies in its ability to structure complex decision problems, incorporate multiple criteria, and provide a systematic framework that empowers decision-makers in various ways.

Purchasing decisions involve numerous interrelated criteria and alternatives. AHP's hierarchical structure simplifies these complexities, enabling decision-makers to break down intricate decisions into manageable components, facilitating a more comprehensive evaluation.

AHP quantifies and prioritizes criteria based on their relative importance. This quantification aids in overcoming subjective biases, providing a more objective basis for evaluating and prioritizing suppliers or options.

AHP integrates both quantitative and qualitative data. By amalgamating numerical inputs with stakeholder preferences or qualitative assessments, it offers a holistic view that enhances the depth and accuracy of decision-making.

AHP's structured methodology enhances transparency and communication among stakeholders. It offers a clear rationale for decision outcomes, fostering alignment and understanding among decision-makers, departments, or stakeholders involved in the process.

AHP facilitates sensitivity analysis, allowing decision-makers to assess the impact of variations or uncertainties in input data. This feature aids in risk mitigation, enabling proactive strategies to address potential disruptions or risks associated with supplier choices.

The prioritization and ranking provided by AHP aid in strategic supplier selection. Decision-makers can allocate resources more efficiently, negotiate better terms, or forge partnerships with suppliers that align best with organizational objectives and criteria importance.

AHP's flexibility allows for adaptations to changing scenarios or stakeholder preferences. It supports continuous improvement by incorporating feedback, enabling organizations to refine their decision-making processes over time.

Ultimately, AHP contributes to enhanced decision quality. By providing a structured and systematic approach, it optimizes resource allocation, reduces decision-making time, and ensures decisions are aligned with overarching strategic goals.

3.2.3 The Contribution of The Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) To the Field of Decision-Making

AHP provides a structured framework for decision-making, breaking down complex purchasing decisions into a hierarchical structure. This structured approach assists in organizing criteria, alternatives, and their relationships, aiding decision-makers in systematically evaluating choices.

AHP's methodology enables objective criteria prioritization by quantifying and assigning weights to criteria based on their relative importance. This quantification minimizes biases, ensuring a more objective evaluation of suppliers or purchasing options.

By integrating both quantitative data and qualitative judgments, AHP facilitates informed and data-driven decision-making. Decision-makers can consider various factors, including cost, quality, supplier performance, and stakeholder preferences, leading to more comprehensive evaluations.

AHP enhances transparency and fosters stakeholder engagement by providing a clear and structured methodology. It allows for the inclusion of diverse stakeholders' inputs, ensuring alignment and understanding among decision-makers involved in the purchasing process.

AHP's sensitivity analysis capability supports risk management by assessing the impact of uncertainties or variations in input data. This feature aids in proactive risk mitigation, enabling organizations to anticipate and address potential disruptions in the supply chain.

Through prioritization and ranking, AHP aids in optimizing supplier selection, directing resources toward suppliers that align closely with established criteria and organizational goals. This optimization enhances negotiation strategies and resource allocation, leading to cost savings and improved outcomes.

AHP supports continuous improvement by allowing for adaptations to changing circumstances or evolving stakeholder preferences. Its flexibility enables organizations to refine their decision-making approaches, incorporating feedback and improving decision processes over time.

Ultimately, AHP contributes to enhanced decision quality and strategic impact. By providing a structured and systematic approach to decision-making, it enables organizations to make more informed, strategic, and impactful purchasing decisions aligned with their overarching goals.

Conclusion

The application of the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) in the realm of purchasing decisions stands as a pivotal and transformative approach that revolutionizes the decision-making landscape. This research has underscored the immense value and significance of AHP as a robust decision support system, offering a structured methodology to navigate the intricacies inherent in supplier selection, resource allocation, and procurement strategies. Through a systematic evaluation of criteria, ranking of alternatives, and integration of stakeholder preferences, AHP serves as a guiding beacon for decision-makers. Its hierarchical structure breaks down complex decisions into manageable components, providing a comprehensive view that enhances the depth and objectivity of evaluations. The prioritization of criteria, facilitated by AHP, enables organizations to focus on factors of utmost importance, aligning choices with overarching strategic objectives. The findings derived from this research demonstrate how AHP contributes to informed decision-making, transparency, risk mitigation, and resource optimization in purchasing. By quantifying criteria importance, considering diverse perspectives, and integrating quantitative and qualitative data, AHP equips decision-makers with the tools needed to make strategic and objective choices. Moreover, the adaptability of AHP to changing contexts and its ability to facilitate continuous improvement underscore its relevance in dynamic business environments. Its structured approach not only enhances decision quality but also fosters stakeholder engagement and collaboration, ensuring alignment and understanding among decision-makers. As organizations navigate complex purchasing landscapes with multiple considerations and stakeholders, AHP emerges as a cornerstone methodology that streamlines processes, enhances efficiency, and drives impactful procurement strategies. Its contributions extend beyond methodological frameworks; they empower decision-makers to make well-informed, data-driven, and strategic decisions that align with organizational goals and lead to tangible outcomes. In essence, the application of AHP in purchasing decisions is not merely a tool, it represents a transformative approach that empowers organizations to make decisions that resonate with their values, priorities, and long-term success. Its continued utilization and refinement stand as a testament to its enduring significance in shaping the future landscape of procurement and decision-making practices.

References

Akmam Syed Zakaria, S., Gajendran, T., Rose, T., & Brewer, G. (2018). Contextual, structural and behavioural factors influencing the adoption of industrialised building systems: A review. *Architectural Engineering and Design Management*, *14*(1–2), 3–26.

Albayrak, E., & Erensal, Y. C. (2004). Using analytic hierarchy process (AHP) to improve human performance: An application of multiple criteria decision making problem. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, *15*, 491–503.

Aspelin, J. (2012). How do relationships influence student achievement? Understanding student performance from a general, social psychological standpoint. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, *22*(1), 41–56.

Ayers, J. M., Huq, S., Faisal, A. M., & Hussain, S. T. (2014). Mainstreaming climate change adaptation into development: a case study of Bangladesh. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, *5*(1), 37–51.

Bérard, C., Cloutier, L. M., & Cassivi, L. (2017). The effects of using system dynamics-based decision support models: Testing policy-makers' boundaries in a complex situation. *Journal of Decision Systems*, *26*(1), 45–63.

Dabbish, L., Stuart, C., Tsay, J., & Herbsleb, J. (2012). Social coding in GitHub: transparency and collaboration in an open software repository. *Proceedings of the ACM 2012 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, 1277–1286.

Demirkan, H., & Delen, D. (2013). Leveraging the capabilities of service-oriented decision support systems: Putting analytics and big data in cloud. *Decision Support Systems*, *55*(1), 412–421.

Drumwright, M. E. (1994). Socially responsible organizational buying: Environmental concern as a noneconomic buying criterion. *Journal of Marketing*, *58*(3), 1–19.

Dweiri, F., Kumar, S., Khan, S. A., & Jain, V. (2016). Designing an integrated AHP based decision support system for supplier selection in automotive industry. *Expert Systems with Applications*, *62*, 273–283.

Eichler, H., Kong, S. X., Gerth, W. C., Mavros, P., & Jönsson, B. (2004). Use of cost-effectiveness analysis in health-care resource allocation decision-making: how are cost-effectiveness thresholds expected to emerge? *Value in Health*, *7*(5), 518–528.

Erdem, A. S., & Göçen, E. (2012). Development of a decision support system for supplier evaluation and order allocation. *Expert Systems with Applications*, *39*(5), 4927–4937.

Graham, T. (2018). Platforms and hyper-choice on the World Wide Web. *Big Data & Society*, *5*(1), 2053951718765878.

Janakiraman, V. S., & Sarukesi, K. (2008). *Decision support systems*. PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd.

Kawamoto, K., Houlihan, C. A., Balas, E. A., & Lobach, D. F. (2005). Improving clinical practice using clinical decision support systems: a systematic review of trials to identify features critical to success. *Bmj*, *330*(7494), 765.

Mallat, N. (2007). Exploring consumer adoption of mobile payments–A qualitative study. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, *16*(4), 413–432.

McCue, C. P., & Pitzer, J. T. (2000). Centralized vs. decentralized purchasing: Current trends in governmental procurement practices. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, *12*(3), 400–420.

Organization, W. H. (2000). *The world health report 2000: health systems: improving performance*. World Health Organization.

Power, D. J. (2002). *Decision support systems: concepts and resources for managers*. Quorum Books.

Rehman, A. U., Al-Zabidi, A., AlKahtani, M., Umer, U., & Usmani, Y. S. (2020). Assessment of supply chain agility to foster sustainability: Fuzzy-DSS for a Saudi manufacturing organization. *Processes*, *8*(5), 577.

Saaty, T. L. (2008). Relative measurement and its generalization in decision making why pairwise comparisons are central in mathematics for the measurement of intangible factors the analytic hierarchy/network process. *RACSAM-Revista de La Real Academia de Ciencias Exactas, Fisicas y Naturales. Serie A. Matematicas*, *102*, 251–318.

Sauter, V. L. (2014). *Decision support systems for business intelligence*. John Wiley & Sons.

Shim, J. P., Warkentin, M., Courtney, J. F., Power, D. J., Sharda, R., & Carlsson, C. (2002). Past, present, and future of decision support technology. *Decision Support Systems*, *33*(2), 111–126.

Vaidya, O. S., & Kumar, S. (2006). Analytic hierarchy process: An overview of applications. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *169*(1), 1–29.

Wagner, S. M., & Bode, C. (2006). An empirical investigation into supply chain vulnerability. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, *12*(6), 301–312.