

Wacław GIERULSKI\*

## THE METHOD OF DATA ENVELOPMENT ANALYSIS AS A TOOL FOR COMPILING A RATING LIST

The paper presents the method of Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) as a tool for compiling rating lists in tasks of ordering elements of assemblages. We describe the differences that result from applying a one-dimensional model and multi-dimensional model, where in the latter a so-called partial order is created for incomparable elements in the assemblage being ordered. The example used to illustrate the issues discussed is the analysis of teaching results in a student group.

**Key words:** *DEA method, ordering of assemblages, partial order, rating classes*

### 1. Introduction

Assemblages of data are often used to describe reality. This involves making a decision on how to select appropriate data and analyse them. The purpose of data analysis should act as a decisive selection criterion. One of those purposes could be the process of ordering a data assemblage, i.e. creating an array of elements or compiling a rating list. Ordering can be followed by assessment – finding better and worse, larger and smaller, major and less important elements, those located higher or lower on the rating list.

Ordering is easy when dealing with an assemblage of homogeneous comparable data of measurable values, e.g. with a numerical assemblage. In this case, the order is called linear or total. This term originates in the fact that the elements of such an ordered assemblage can be arranged in a series or line.

If it is possible for the assemblage to contain incomparable elements, we are dealing with a partial order. This is the case for assemblages of inhomogeneous complex

---

\* Faculty of Management and Computer Modelling, Kielce University of Technology, Al. Tysiąclecia Państwa Polskiego 7, 25-314 Kielce, e-mail: [waclaw.gierulski@tu.kielce.pl](mailto:waclaw.gierulski@tu.kielce.pl)

data, an example of which is an assemblage composed of matrix elements. In this case, order is to be created in multi-dimensional spaces, for which it is difficult to select a single, most appropriate method.

Sports results in some disciplines may provide an example of an assemblage of inhomogeneous and incomparable data. In biathlon races, the rating is based on cross-country ski racing (running time measured in seconds) and target shooting (performance measured by scoring). The task can be reduced to a linear order by adopting conventional weighting factors. Choosing other, equally good, weighting factors may result in another athlete becoming the winner.

For creating a partial order in an assemblage of incomparable data, it is advantageous to apply the method of Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA), also termed data boundary analysis or value weighting method. The scope of applications of this method has been continually increasing<sup>1</sup> [1], [3]–[14] ever since DEA was developed in 1978 [2]. Unfortunately, the method has not been very popular or widely used in Poland, while its applications have been restricted mainly to the analysis of processes and phenomena in economy.

DEA, like other mathematical instruments, makes it possible to analyse real issues and to precisely simulate phenomena at the abstract level, which explains why the method should be advocated and new applications sought.


## 2. The DEA method in a data ordering process

In DEA, object-related data assemblages are analysed. The object is understood to be an organisation, economic entity, action or process. A person or group of people can also be treated as an object. Order creation is based on the relations observed in objects between input signals, i.e. inputs (reasons, outlays, resources used, etc.), and output signals, i.e. outputs (effects, results, etc.). These relations delineate the efficiency of an object, whereas numerical measures of efficiency can act as a good instrument for creating an order. Analysis based on DEA modelling makes it possible to indicate which objects have the highest efficiency (those classified highest on the rating list) and then compare the remaining objects with the “best” ones, which constitutes a certain kind of benchmarking. In an order creating process, groups of objects, incomparable with one another, can be determined. These occupy the same place on the rating list, thus forming a rating class, which is specific to the DEA method. The concept of a rating list should therefore be understood in a special way.

---

<sup>1</sup> DEA, a mathematical programming method, has been described in many handbooks. The bulk of the literature demonstrates ways of applying the method. Only a few selected references have been quoted in the paper.

It is justifiable to apply the DEA method to a group of objects to which data matrixes have been ascribed by means of specifying multiple inputs and multiple outputs (figure 1).



**Fig. 1.** Object with  $m$  inputs and  $s$  outputs  
Source: the author

For each object, it is possible to compute many partial efficiencies as individual input to output ratios,

$$e_{r,i} = \frac{y_r}{x_i}, \quad (1)$$

where:

$m$  – number of inputs,

$s$  – number of outputs,

$i = 1, \dots, m$ ,

$r = 1, \dots, s$ .

The DEA method determines the efficiency of an object with multiple inputs and outputs in the form of the ratio of a weighted sum of inputs to a weighted sum of outputs. Thus such a measure of the efficiency of an object is a function of weights  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ .

$$e = \frac{\sum_{r=1}^s \mu_r y_r}{\sum_{i=1}^m \nu_i x_i}. \quad (2)$$

As regards a group of objects, for the DEA method it is necessary to solve a problem of mathematical programming (non-linear). Solving this problem is equivalent to determining the relative efficiency of objects. Relative efficiency refers to the efficiency of an object compared with the object of highest efficiency in a group. Hence, the objects of highest efficiency have relative efficiency equal to 1. For each object  $\phi$  in the assemblage  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , it is necessary to find the highest value of the ratio  $\theta_\phi$  which is a measure of the relative efficiency of successive objects. This is the objective function in the optimisation problem:

$$\theta_\phi \rightarrow \max, \quad (3)$$

where:

$$\theta_\phi = \frac{\sum_{r=1}^s \mu_r y_{r,\phi}}{\sum_{i=1}^m v_i x_{i,\phi}}, \quad (4)$$

under the following conditions:

$$\frac{\sum_{r=1}^s \mu_r y_{r,j}}{\sum_{i=1}^m v_i x_{i,j}} \leq 1, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, n, \quad (5)$$

$$\mu_r \geq 0, \quad v_i \geq 0, \quad \text{for } r = 1, \dots, s, \quad i = 1, \dots, m. \quad (6)$$

Solving this optimisation problem is equivalent to determining the relative efficiency value, which makes it possible to order objects. Relative efficiency takes values in the interval  $(0, 1]$  and can be given as a percentage  $(0, 100\%]$ . The objects with relative efficiency 1 are called efficient objects (regarded as the best in a given group of objects), the remaining objects are termed inefficient.

The optimisation problem presented above (3)–(6) can be converted into a linear form, which is advantageous for computing and makes it possible to solve the problem using linear programming. It becomes equivalent to solving, for each object  $\phi$  of the assemblage  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , the optimisation problem (seeking the minimum) of the value  $\theta_\phi$  which acts as a measure of relative efficiency,

$$\theta_\phi \rightarrow \min, \quad (7)$$

while maintaining the reality conditions:

$$\sum_{j=1}^n x_{i,j} \lambda_j \leq \theta_\phi x_{i,\phi} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, m, \quad (8)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^n y_{r,i} \lambda_j \geq y_{r,\phi} \quad \text{for } r = 1, \dots, s, \quad (9)$$

$$\lambda_j \geq 0 \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, n, \quad (10)$$

where  $\lambda_j$  are weighted coefficients (linear combination coefficients).

The DEA method is non-parametric, therefore it is not necessary to know the functional dependence between the input and output signals for an object. Neither is it necessary to know the values of the weight coefficients, which are determined, for each object, in the optimisation process. In this way, it is possible to avoid subjectively ascribing values to these coefficients, which frequently occurs in other methods.

The weight coefficients determined,  $\lambda_j$ , make it possible to set so-called patterns for inefficient objects. These patterns are efficient objects, which an inefficient object can come close to, by the smallest possible changes in the input and output signals. If the inefficient object were to approach other efficient objects (those which are not patterns), greater changes in the signals would be required.

The relative efficiency of an object in the group analysed depends on its input and output signals. Under certain circumstances, however, changes in a signal do not result in changes in efficiency. Such admissible signal changes are determined by the so-called slack variables (or residues) and are equal to, for input signals:

$$\delta x_{i,\phi} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n x_{i,j} \lambda_j - \theta_\phi x_{i,\phi}}{\theta_\phi - \lambda_i}, \tag{11}$$

and output signals:

$$\delta y_{r,\phi} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n y_{r,i} \lambda_j - y_{r,\phi}}{1 - \lambda_j}. \tag{12}$$

For objects characterised by two partial efficiencies, the results can be presented in graphical form. Due to the interpretation of the  $\Theta$  coefficient, it is advantageous to use inverse partial efficiencies as coordinates in the coordinate system.

Table 1 presents example data and the results of analysis for five objects<sup>2</sup> with two inputs ( $x_1, x_2$ ) and one output ( $y_1$ ).


**Table 1.** Example objects with two inputs and one output

|          | $x_1$ | $x_2$ | $y_1$ | $\Theta$ | $\lambda_1$ | $\lambda_2$ | $\lambda_3$ | $\lambda_4$ | $\lambda_5$ | $\delta x_1$ |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| Object A | 2     | 5     | 24    | 1        | 1           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0            |
| Object B | 7     | 8     | 30    | 0.52     | 0.48        | 0           | 0           | 0.45        | 0           | 0            |
| Object C | 4     | 10    | 38    | 0.79     | 1.58        | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0            |
| Object D | 6     | 4     | 41    | 1        | 0           | 0           | 0           | 1           | 0           | 0            |
| Object E | 7     | 3     | 21    | 0.68     | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0.51        | 0           | -2.5         |

Source: the author's work based on [8]

<sup>2</sup> This is an extended example based on [7].

The results of the analysis for the example discussed is presented graphically in figure 2.



**Fig. 2.** Assemblage of objects with two inputs and one output  
Source: the author's work based on [8]

In accordance with the computation results, objects A and D are efficient, whereas objects B, C, E are inefficient. The curve of efficient objects is a convex polygon  $v$ -A-D-u, of the least length (hence lines parallel to axes), the vertexes of which determine efficient objects. The inefficient objects (B, C, E) are located inside this polygon, their distance from the polygon (dependent on  $\Theta$ ) acts as an inefficiency measure.

For object C, efficiency can be increased by reducing the values of the input signals (both of them) so that they are 0.79 times their former values. The object will then be located at  $c'$  on the efficient object curve, just as the efficient object A. In the case of object B, it is necessary to reduce the values of the input signals to 0.52 times their former values to make the object efficient – point  $b'$  in figure 2. For object E, the values of the input signals have to be diminished to 0.68 times their former values. The object will then be located on the efficient object curve – point  $e'$  in figure 2, for which so-called weak efficiency is postulated. This means it is possible to reduce an input signal for this object while not increasing the efficiency. In the computation, this is manifested in the form of the slack variables. In this case, slack variable  $\delta_{x_1}$  shows that, for object E, reducing signal  $x_1$  by a value of 2.5 will not produce a change in efficiency.

The relative efficiency  $\Theta$  indicates how to convert an inefficient object into an efficient one by means of proportionally reducing all input signals or increasing the output signals. Certainly, it is also possible to modify the input or output signals in such a way so that the object is located on the curve of efficient objects. In the problem under consideration, for point B this is possible, for example, by reducing signals

$x_1$  and  $x_2$  to 0.45 and 0.64 times their original value, respectively. Consequently, object  $b$  will be positioned at  $b''$ , thus becoming an effective object.

Non-zero values of the  $\lambda$  coefficients indicate patterns for inefficient objects. Here, object A is a pattern for object C, object D – for object E, and objects A and D are patterns for object B.

If more than two partial efficiencies describe an object, it is not possible to present a problem graphically in the plane. Such a problem is multi-dimensional, the analysis of which is performed in multi-dimensional space. The multi-dimensional surface of efficient objects is constructed as the surface of the convex polyhedron of least area, the vertices of which are determined by the points corresponding to efficient objects. A relative efficiency of 1 is ascribed to points on the faces of this polyhedron, not just the vertices.

In the simpler case of objects with one input and one output, object efficiencies can be presented on a single axis, where the curve of efficient objects is reduced to a single point. In such a case, the use of the DEA method is little justified, as efficiencies can simply be computed as the ratio of output to input signals.

Carrying out analysis using the DEA method, it is possible to determine so-called rating classes. The first rating class is constituted by efficient objects (coefficient  $\theta = 1$ ). The second rating class is composed of objects determined to be efficient for the sub-group of objects excluding those belonging to the first rating class. Similarly, further classes, if such exist, can be established. It should be mentioned that objects in a single rating class of this kind are not comparable with one another, which is characteristic of a partial order.

### 3. Analysis of the efficiency of the teaching process

The same methods have been used for years in evaluating the results of the teaching process, especially the results of students in higher education institutions<sup>3</sup>. The arithmetic mean of grades obtained in a semester is computed and, on that basis, a rating list is compiled. Sometimes, some standardization measures are applied, in order to compensate for differences in the amount of work required by and the difficulty of particular subjects and semesters. Not denying in any way the importance of using such methodology, it is possible to look at the matter differently, i.e. to analyse the studying process in relation to the progress made by individual students<sup>4</sup>.

When studying is considered as a continuous process of gaining knowledge, it can be assumed that the grades in successive semesters depend on the knowledge gained in pre-

---

<sup>3</sup> For many years, the author was a Dean in a department of Kielce University of Technology. This is why he is interested in this subject.

<sup>4</sup> The DEA method has been applied in research into the efficiency of higher education institutions - in the Polish literature represented by Szuwarzyński [14].

vious ones. In this way, progress in studying in a given semester is defined by taking into account an initial state determined by the results from a previous semester. This is the essence of the methodology presented. A similar approach is used in the process of university admissions. Only high grades in one's high school exams can guarantee success in the first semester of studying and thus this is used as a criterion for admission.

### 3.1. Presentation of a tested group of students

A group of 24 students (St1, St2, ..., St24) was used for the research. They were students in a department of Kielce University of Technology in the academic year 2007/2008. The subjects of semesters 1 and 2 are presented in tables 2 and 4. The grades obtained in these semesters are given in tables 3 and 5. The traditional Polish grading scale (5.0; 4.5; 4.0; 3.5; 3.0; 2.0) is used, but the data presented in the table include the results of resit exams, hence other grades appear here (e.g. 1.7). Grades in English are not included in the analysis.

**Table 2.** Subjects in semester 1

| Symbol | Subject        | Type of class | Symbol | Subject                          | Type of class |
|--------|----------------|---------------|--------|----------------------------------|---------------|
| Pa1    | Linear Algebra | lecture       | Pa8    | Fundamentals of Computer Science | laboratory    |
| Pa2    | Linear Algebra | tutorial      | Pa9    | Fundamentals of Law              | lecture       |
| Pa3    | Calculus       | lecture       | Pa10   | Fundamentals of Law              | tutorial      |
| Pa4    | Calculus       | tutorial      | Pa11   | Mathematics Revision             | lecture       |
| Pa5    | Physics        | lecture       | Pa12   | Mathematics Revision             | tutorial      |
| Pa6    | Microeconomics | lecture       | Pa13   | Statistics                       | lecture       |
| Pa7    | Microeconomics | tutorial      | Pa14   | Statistics                       | tutorial      |

Source: the author's study

**Table 3.** Grades in semester 1

|      | Pa1 | Pa2 | Pa3 | Pa4 | Pa5 | Pa6 | Pa7 | Pa8 | Pa9 | Pa10 | Pa11 | Pa12 | Pa13 | Pa14 |
|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1    | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11   | 12   | 13   | 14   | 15   |
| St1  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5  | 3.5  | 3.5  | 3.5  | 3.5  |
| St2  | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0  | 4.0  | 4.0  | 3.5  | 3.5  |
| St3  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 4.5  | 5.0  | 5.0  | 4.0  | 4.0  |
| St4  | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0  | 4.0  | 4.0  | 3.0  | 3.0  |
| St5  | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5  | 4.0  | 4.0  | 4.0  | 4.0  |
| St6  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 3.0  | 4.0  | 4.0  | 4.5  | 4.0  |
| St7  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0  | 4.5  | 4.5  | 3.5  | 4.0  |
| St8  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0  | 4.0  | 4.0  | 4.0  | 4.0  |
| St9  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.5  | 5.0  | 5.0  | 4.0  | 4.0  |
| St10 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0  | 4.5  | 4.5  | 3.0  | 3.0  |



Table 3 continued

|      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1    | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | 13  | 14  | 15  |
| St11 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| St12 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| St13 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| St14 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| St15 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| St16 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| St17 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 |
| St18 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| St19 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| St20 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| St21 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| St22 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| St23 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| St24 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 |

Source: the author's study

Table 4. Subjects in semester 2

| Symbol | Subject              | Type of class | Symbol | Subject                          | Type of class |
|--------|----------------------|---------------|--------|----------------------------------|---------------|
| Pb1    | Calculus             | lecture       | Pb10   | Financial Mathematics            | lecture       |
| Pb2    | Calculus             | tutorial      | Pb11   | Financial Mathematics            | tutorial      |
| Pb3    | Physics              | lecture       | Pb12   | Fundamentals of Computer Science | lecture       |
| Pb4    | Physics              | tutorial      | Pb13   | Fundamentals of Computer Science | laboratory    |
| Pb5    | Physics              | laboratory    | Pb14   | Economic Law                     | lecture       |
| Pb6    | Engineering Graphics | lecture       | Pb15   | Economic Law                     | tutorial      |
| Pb7    | Engineering Graphics | laboratory    | Pb16   | Intellectual Property            | lecture       |
| Pb8    | Macroeconomics       | lecture       | Pb17   | Materials Science                | lecture       |
| Pb9    | Macroeconomics       | tutorial      | Pb18   | Materials Science                | laboratory    |

Source: the author's study

Table 5. Grades in semester 2

|     | Pb1 | Pb2 | Pb3 | Pb4 | Pb5 | Pb6 | Pb7 | Pb8 | Pb9 | Pb10 | Pb11 | Pb12 | Pb13 | Pb14 | Pb15 | Pb16 | Pb17 | Pb18 |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11   | 12   | 13   | 14   | 15   | 16   | 17   | 18   | 19   |
| St1 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5  | 3.5  | 3.5  | 3.5  | 4.0  | 4.0  | 3.0  | 3.5  | 3.0  |
| St2 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5  | 3.5  | 3.5  | 5.0  | 5.0  | 4.5  | 3.0  | 4.0  | 4.0  |
| St3 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 5.0  | 5.0  | 4.0  | 3.5  | 5.0  | 5.0  | 3.0  | 5.0  | 5.0  |
| St4 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.0  | 0.0  | 3.0  | 3.0  | 4.0  | 4.0  | 3.0  | 1.5  | 1.5  |
| St5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.0  | 3.0  | 3.0  | 5.0  | 5.0  | 4.5  | 3.0  | 4.0  | 3.0  |
| St6 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.5  | 4.5  | 4.0  | 2.5  | 5.0  | 5.0  | 4.5  | 5.0  | 5.0  |
| St7 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 2.3  | 1.0  | 3.0  | 3.0  | 4.0  | 4.5  | 3.0  | 1.8  | 1.7  |
| St8 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0  | 3.0  | 3.5  | 3.0  | 4.5  | 4.5  | 3.0  | 4.0  | 3.5  |

Table 5 continued

| 1    | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | 13  | 14  | 15  | 16  | 17  | 18  | 19  |
|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| St9  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| St10 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 |
| St11 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 |
| St12 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 1.3 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| St13 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 |
| St14 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 |
| St15 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| St16 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 1.8 |
| St17 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 2.3 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 |
| St18 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 |
| St19 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| St20 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| St21 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 1.8 |
| St22 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 |
| St23 | 2.8 | 1.8 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 3.0 |
| St24 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 1.5 |

Source: the author's study

Individual students (24 objects) are objects in the DEA analysis. The input signals are formed on the basis of the grades in semester 1 and the output signals - on the basis of the grades in semester 2. Efficiency, which is determined in this analysis, is a measure of progress in studying obtained by comparing the results in semester 2 to the inputs – the grades in semester 1.

### 3.2. One-dimensional analysis


The results of one-dimensional analysis are presented in table 6. Column 1 gives the identifier of an object-student as in tables 1 and 3. The average grades in the first semester are presented in column 2 (on the basis of table 3) and the average grades in the second semester are presented in column 3 (on the basis of table 5). Columns 4 and 5 present the ordered data arranged from columns 1 and 2, and columns 6 and 7 the ordered data from columns 1 and 3. As can be seen, student St19 got the highest average in the first semester, while student St23 obtained the lowest one. In the second semester, student St3 obtained the highest average whereas student St14 got the lowest one. This is a traditional way of analysing and compiling rating lists in successive semesters.

**Table 6.** One-dimensional analysis

| 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9     | 10    | 11    |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| St1  | 3.57 | 3.47 | St19 | 4.71 | St3  | 4.58 | St6  | 1.098 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| St2  | 4.07 | 4.00 | St9  | 4.46 | St19 | 4.56 | St24 | 1.078 | 0.982 | 1.019 |
| St3  | 4.36 | 4.58 | St15 | 4.43 | St6  | 4.47 | St3  | 1.052 | 0.958 | 1.044 |
| St4  | 3.18 | 2.83 | St3  | 4.36 | St15 | 4.31 | St5  | 1.035 | 0.942 | 1.062 |
| St5  | 3.79 | 3.92 | St21 | 4.25 | St9  | 4.22 | St23 | 1.033 | 0.941 | 1.063 |
| St6  | 4.07 | 4.47 | St2  | 4.07 | St2  | 4.00 | St10 | 1.017 | 0.925 | 1.081 |
| St7  | 3.54 | 3.04 | St6  | 4.07 | St11 | 3.97 | St22 | 1.005 | 0.915 | 1.093 |
| St8  | 3.96 | 3.72 | St11 | 4.04 | St5  | 3.92 | St13 | 0.991 | 0.902 | 1.108 |
| St9  | 4.46 | 4.22 | St8  | 3.96 | St22 | 3.81 | St17 | 0.986 | 0.898 | 1.114 |
| St10 | 3.61 | 3.67 | St5  | 3.79 | St8  | 3.72 | St11 | 0.984 | 0.896 | 1.116 |
| St11 | 4.04 | 3.97 | St22 | 3.79 | St10 | 3.67 | St18 | 0.984 | 0.896 | 1.116 |
| St12 | 3.63 | 3.54 | St16 | 3.71 | St13 | 3.61 | St2  | 0.982 | 0.894 | 1.118 |
| St13 | 3.64 | 3.61 | St13 | 3.64 | St12 | 3.54 | St12 | 0.977 | 0.889 | 1.125 |
| St14 | 3.10 | 2.72 | St20 | 3.64 | St1  | 3.47 | St1  | 0.972 | 0.885 | 1.130 |
| St15 | 4.43 | 4.31 | St12 | 3.63 | St18 | 3.44 | St15 | 0.972 | 0.885 | 1.130 |
| St16 | 3.71 | 3.24 | St10 | 3.61 | St24 | 3.39 | St19 | 0.966 | 0.880 | 1.137 |
| St17 | 3.36 | 3.31 | St1  | 3.57 | St17 | 3.31 | St9  | 0.946 | 0.861 | 1.161 |
| St18 | 3.50 | 3.44 | St7  | 3.54 | St21 | 3.29 | St8  | 0.939 | 0.855 | 1.170 |
| St19 | 4.71 | 4.56 | St18 | 3.50 | St16 | 3.24 | St4  | 0.891 | 0.812 | 1.232 |
| St20 | 3.64 | 3.19 | St17 | 3.36 | St20 | 3.19 | St14 | 0.878 | 0.799 | 1.251 |
| St21 | 4.25 | 3.29 | St4  | 3.18 | St7  | 3.04 | St20 | 0.877 | 0.798 | 1.253 |
| St22 | 3.79 | 3.81 | St24 | 3.14 | St23 | 3.03 | St16 | 0.872 | 0.794 | 1.260 |
| St23 | 2.94 | 3.03 | St14 | 3.10 | St4  | 2.83 | St7  | 0.861 | 0.784 | 1.276 |
| St24 | 3.14 | 3.39 | St23 | 2.94 | St14 | 2.72 | St21 | 0.775 | 0.706 | 1.417 |

Source: the author’s study

In the rightmost part of the table (columns 8–10), groups of students are arranged on the basis of efficiency. The averages in semester 1 are assumed to be the input signals (outlays) and the averages in semester 2 – the output signals (results). Efficiencies computed in this way are then ordered in column 9. The relative efficiencies are presented in column 10. They are obtained on the basis of data from column 9 by calculating the ratio to the greatest efficiency in the group. Student St6 showed the highest efficiency, while student St21- the lowest one. Column 11 presents the inverse efficiencies calculated from column 10 and illustrated in the following graph (figure 3).



**Fig. 3.** The results of one-dimensional analysis presented geometrically.

Source: the author’s study

Due to the high density of points, only the two extreme points (objects) are highlighted on this graph. The distances between individual objects and the effective object (St6) indicate the degree of inefficiency. For example, the grades of St21 have to be increased by a factor of 1.417 to make object St21 as efficient as St6. This corresponds to an average in the second semester of 4.66. This object would also be effective if the average in the first semester (inputs) were 0.706 times the actual average, that is 3.001.

Optimisation procedures, resulting from the DEA method, are not used in the analysis presented. It is not necessary, because the objects only have one input and one output. Such procedures could obviously be applied here and the results would be the same.

### 3.3. Two-dimensional analysis

Three signals are ascribed to each object in the two-dimensional analysis presented here. This allows to determine two partial efficiencies (hence “two-dimensional analysis”). In the case considered, there is: one input signal ( $x_1$ ) and two output signals ( $y_1$ ,  $y_2$ ). These are:

$x_1$  – average grade for all subjects in the first semester

$y_1$  – average grade for basic and technical subjects in the second semester – table 5, subjects: Pb1, Pb2, Pb3, Pb4, Pb5, Pb6, Pb7, Pb12, Pb13, Pb17, Pb18.

$y_2$  – average grade for economic and law-related subjects in the second semester – table 5, subjects: Pb8, Pb9, Pb10, Pb11, Pb14, Pb15, Pb16.

In the DEA analysis, it is necessary to solve 24 optimisation problems for each  $\phi$  of the assemblage  $j = 1, \dots, 24$  in the form of:

$$\theta_\phi \rightarrow \min, \quad (13)$$

$$x_{1.1}\lambda_1 + x_{1.2}\lambda_2 + x_{1.3}\lambda_3 + \dots + x_{1.23}\lambda_{23} + x_{1.24}\lambda_{24} \leq \theta_\phi x_{1,\phi}, \quad (14)$$

$$y_{1.1}\lambda_1 + y_{1.2}\lambda_2 + y_{1.3}\lambda_3 + \dots + y_{1.23}\lambda_{23} + y_{1.24}\lambda_{24} \geq y_{1,\phi}, \quad (15)$$

$$y_{2.1}\lambda_1 + y_{2.2}\lambda_2 + y_{2.3}\lambda_3 + \dots + y_{2.23}\lambda_{23} + y_{2.24}\lambda_{24} \geq y_{2,\phi}, \quad (16)$$

$$\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{24} \geq 0. \quad (17)$$

The  $\lambda$  values can be different for each optimisation problem, but this is not indicated in the formulas above, since indexes are introduced (e.g, in the form of  $\lambda_{j,\phi}$ ). In the computational results, we get 24 values for the coefficient  $\Theta$  determining an object's relative efficiency, 576 values ( $24 \cdot 24$ ) for the weighted coefficients  $\lambda$ , and 72

values (3\*24) of coefficients determining the slacks ( $\delta x_1, \delta y_1, \delta y_2$ ). Fortunately, a significant proportion of the coefficients determined take a value of zero, which makes the interpretation of the results easier. Data for the two-dimensional DEA analysis and the results obtained can be found in Table 7.

**Table 7.** Two-dimensional analysis

| 1      | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5         | 6         | 7           | 8           | 9        | 10          | 11             | 12           | 13           | 14     | 15       |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|----------|-------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------|----------|
| object | $x_1$ | $y_1$ | $y_2$ | $e_{1,1}$ | $e_{2,1}$ | $1/e_{1,1}$ | $1/e_{2,1}$ | $\theta$ | $\lambda_6$ | $\lambda_{24}$ | $\delta y_1$ | $\delta y_2$ | object | $\theta$ |
| St1    | 3.57  | 3.50  | 3.43  | 0.980     | 0.960     | 1.020       | 1.042       | 0.891    | 0.49        | 0.38           |              |              | St6    | 1        |
| St2    | 4.07  | 4.14  | 3.79  | 1.016     | 0.930     | 0.984       | 1.075       | 0.908    | 0.18        | 0.94           |              |              | St24   | 1        |
| St3    | 4.36  | 4.59  | 4.57  | 1.054     | 1.049     | 0.949       | 0.953       | 0.962    | 0.76        | 0.35           |              |              | St3    | 0.962    |
| St4    | 3.18  | 2.91  | 2.71  | 0.915     | 0.854     | 1.093       | 1.171       | 0.822    | 0.2         | 0.57           |              |              | St5    | 0.956    |
| St5    | 3.79  | 4.05  | 3.71  | 1.069     | 0.981     | 0.936       | 1.019       | 0.956    | 0.19        | 0.9            |              |              | St23   | 0.956    |
| St6    | 4.07  | 4.41  | 4.57  | 1.083     | 1.123     | 0.923       | 0.891       | 1        | 1           |                |              |              | St11   | 0.939    |
| St7    | 3.54  | 3.05  | 3.04  | 0.861     | 0.861     | 1.161       | 1.162       | 0.787    | 0.52        | 0.22           |              |              | St22   | 0.937    |
| St8    | 3.96  | 3.86  | 3.50  | 0.975     | 0.883     | 1.026       | 1.133       | 0.869    | 0.11        | 0.95           |              |              | St10   | 0.927    |
| St9    | 4.46  | 4.45  | 3.86  | 0.998     | 0.864     | 1.002       | 1.157       | 0.885    |             | 1.26           |              | 0.092        | St13   | 0.919    |
| St10   | 3.61  | 3.64  | 3.71  | 1.008     | 1.030     | 0.992       | 0.971       | 0.927    | 0.74        | 0.1            |              |              | St17   | 0.912    |
| St11   | 4.04  | 4.27  | 3.50  | 1.059     | 0.867     | 0.945       | 1.153       | 0.939    |             | 1.21           |              | 0.288        | St12   | 0.911    |
| St12   | 3.63  | 3.73  | 3.26  | 1.027     | 0.898     | 0.974       | 1.114       | 0.911    |             | 1.05           |              | 0.047        | St2    | 0.908    |
| St13   | 3.64  | 3.77  | 3.36  | 1.036     | 0.922     | 0.966       | 1.085       | 0.919    | 0.02        | 1.04           |              |              | St18   | 0.904    |
| St14   | 3.10  | 2.77  | 2.64  | 0.894     | 0.853     | 1.118       | 1.173       | 0.808    | 0.28        | 0.44           |              |              | St15   | 0.898    |
| St15   | 4.43  | 4.45  | 4.07  | 1.006     | 0.919     | 0.994       | 1.088       | 0.898    | 0.19        | 1.03           |              |              | St1    | 0.891    |
| St16   | 3.71  | 3.35  | 3.07  | 0.901     | 0.827     | 1.110       | 1.209       | 0.805    | 0.16        | 0.75           |              |              | St19   | 0.891    |
| St17   | 3.36  | 3.44  | 3.11  | 1.024     | 0.928     | 0.977       | 1.078       | 0.912    | 0.1         | 0.84           |              |              | St9    | 0.885    |
| St18   | 3.50  | 3.50  | 3.36  | 1.000     | 0.959     | 1.000       | 1.043       | 0.904    | 0.38        | 0.51           |              |              | St8    | 0.869    |
| St19   | 4.71  | 4.45  | 4.71  | 0.945     | 1.000     | 1.058       | 1.000       | 0.891    | 1.03        |                | 0.092        |              | St20   | 0.841    |
| St20   | 3.64  | 3.45  | 2.79  | 0.948     | 0.765     | 1.055       | 1.308       | 0.841    |             | 0.97           |              | 0.277        | St4    | 0.822    |
| St21   | 4.25  | 3.30  | 3.29  | 0.776     | 0.773     | 1.288       | 1.293       | 0.709    | 0.54        | 0.25           |              |              | St14   | 0.808    |
| St22   | 3.79  | 4.00  | 3.50  | 1.057     | 0.925     | 0.946       | 1.082       | 0.937    |             | 1.13           |              | 0.046        | St16   | 0.805    |
| St23   | 2.94  | 3.15  | 2.86  | 1.071     | 0.973     | 0.933       | 1.028       | 0.956    | 0.1         | 0.76           |              |              | St7    | 0.787    |
| St24   | 3.14  | 3.55  | 3.14  | 1.128     | 1.000     | 0.886       | 1.000       | 1        |             | 1              |              |              | St21   | 0.709    |

Source: the author's study

Columns 1–4 present the data to be analysed: column 1 – the identifiers of objects, column 2 – the input signals, columns 3 and 4 – the output signals. Columns 5–8 present the partial efficiencies and inverse partial efficiencies computed. These are illustrated in graphical form in figure 4. Columns 9–15 of table 7 contain the results of the DEA analysis.

Column 9 – presents the coefficients  $\theta$ , which are a measure of the relative efficiency of individual objects. St6 and St24 are the efficient objects in the group tested. Object St21 has the lowest efficiency. To obtain the efficiency of object St21, the input signal has to be diminished to the level of 0.709 times the actual value or the out-


put signals have to be increased. This can be done by increasing both output signals to 1.41 times the actual value ( $1/0.709$ ) or by another (non-proportional) change in the values of the output signals. Similarly, the necessary changes for the other objects to become efficient can be determined.

Column 10 and 11 present the weighted coefficients  $\lambda_6$  and  $\lambda_{24}$  computed in the process of optimisation. The remaining weighted coefficients are not included in the table because they equal zero. The coefficients presented represent patterns for inefficient objects. St6 is a pattern for object St19 and object St24 – for objects St9, St11, St12, St20, St22. Both St6 and St24 are patterns for other inefficient objects.

Columns 12 and 13 contain the values of the slacks  $\delta y_1$ ,  $\delta y_2$ . The Slacks  $\delta x_1$  take the value zero (not included in the table). The slacks determine the ranges of changes in the output signals for which there are no changes in an object's efficiency. In the case analysed, non-zero slacks are ascribed to only six objects: St6, St9, St11, St12, St20, St22.

Columns 14 and 15 present objects arranged in descending order according to the coefficient  $\Theta$ , presented in their original order in column 9.

The results of the two-dimensional analysis are presented in graphical form in figure 4, this shows the mutual location of the objects.



**Fig. 4.** The results of the two-dimensional analysis in graphical form  
Source: the author's study

In this case, the curve of efficient objects is the polygon ABCD. The vertexes B and C are determined by the efficient objects St24 and St6. The sides AB and CD correspond to poor efficiency.


The next stage of the analysis is to distinguish rating classes. Four rating classes are determined in accordance with the procedure described above (table 8). The remaining elements are in the fifth rating class

**Table 8.** Rating classes


| Class 1     | Class 2     | Class 3     | Class 4              | Class 5  |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|--|
| St6<br>St24 | St3<br>St23 | St5<br>St10 | St11<br>St19<br>St22 | St1, St2, St4, St7, St8<br>St9, St12, St13, St14, St15<br>St16, St17, St18, St20, St21 |

Source: the author's study


The four graphs below (figures 5–8) present the curves of efficient objects and the location of individual objects in the rating classes distinguished.




**Fig. 5.** The first rating class – St6, St24  
Source: the author's study



**Fig. 6.** The second rating class – St3, St23  
Source: the author's study



**Fig. 7.** The third rating class – St5, St10  
Source: the author's study



**Fig. 8.** The fourth rating class – St11, St19, St22  
Source: the author's study

### 3.3. Multi-dimensional analysis

Each object has two input signals and three output signals in the example of multi-dimensional analysis presented here. This allows to determine six partial efficiencies (six-dimensional analysis). The following input signals ( $x_1, x_2$ ) and output signals ( $y_1, y_2, y_3$ ) were used in the problem under consideration:

$x_1$  – average grade for fundamental subjects in the first semester – table 3, subjects: Pa1, Pa2, Pb3, Pa4, Pa5, Pa8, Pba11, Pa12, Pb13, Pa14.

$x_2$  – average grade for economic and law-related subjects in the first semester – Table 3, subjects: Pa6, Pa7, Pa9, Pa10.

$y_1$  – average grade for basic subjects in the second semester – table 5, subjects: Pb1, Pb2, Pb3, Pb4, Pb5, Pb12, Pb13.

$y_2$  – average grade for economic and law-related subjects in the second semester – table 5, subjects: Pb8, Pb9, Pb10, Pb11, Pb14, Pb15, Pb16.

$y_3$  – average grade for technical subjects in the second semester – table 5, subjects: Pb6, Pb7, Pb17, Pb18.

The optimisation problems defined by the DEA method are solved and selected data are presented in table 9.

Columns 1–6 contain the data analyzed: column 1 – the identifiers of objects, columns 2 and 3 – the input signals, columns 4–6 – the output signals. The values of the coefficient  $\theta$  determined are presented in column 7. Four objects: St3, St6, St11, St24 turned out to be efficient. Neither the values of the weighted coefficients  $\lambda$ , nor the slacks are included in the table. This solution has no graphical form which could be shown in three-dimensional space.



**Table 9.** Multi-dimensional analysis

| 1      | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7        | 8          | 9          | 10    | 11    | 12    | 13    |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------|------------|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| object | $x_1$ | $x_2$ | $y_1$ | $y_2$ | $y_3$ | $\theta$ | $\theta_2$ | $\theta_3$ | $k_1$ | $k_2$ | $k_3$ | $k_4$ |
| St2    | 3.90  | 4.50  | 4.07  | 3.79  | 4.25  | 0.930    | 0.95       | 1          |       |       | St2   |       |
| St3    | 4.20  | 4.75  | 4.36  | 4.57  | 5.00  | 1        |            |            | St3   |       |       |       |
| St4    | 3.15  | 3.25  | 3.00  | 2.71  | 2.75  | 0.863    | 0.89       | 0.943      |       |       |       | St4   |
| St5    | 3.60  | 4.25  | 3.93  | 3.71  | 4.25  | 0.993    | 1          |            |       | St5   |       |       |
| St6    | 4.20  | 3.75  | 4.07  | 4.57  | 5.00  | 1        |            |            | St6   |       |       |       |
| St7    | 3.55  | 3.50  | 3.00  | 3.04  | 3.13  | 0.807    | 0.84       | 0.936      |       |       |       | St7   |
| St8    | 3.95  | 4.00  | 3.86  | 3.50  | 3.88  | 0.895    | 0.93       | 0.982      |       |       |       | St8   |
| St9    | 4.55  | 4.25  | 4.29  | 3.86  | 4.75  | 0.915    | 0.97       | 1          |       |       | St9   |       |
| St10   | 3.65  | 3.50  | 3.57  | 3.71  | 3.75  | 0.954    | 1          |            |       | St10  |       |       |
| St11   | 4.25  | 3.50  | 4.29  | 3.50  | 4.25  | 1        |            |            | St11  |       |       |       |
| St12   | 3.58  | 3.75  | 3.71  | 3.26  | 3.75  | 0.928    | 0.97       | 1          |       |       | St12  |       |
| St13   | 3.70  | 3.50  | 3.79  | 3.36  | 3.75  | 0.966    | 1          |            |       | St13  |       |       |
| St14   | 3.04  | 3.25  | 2.79  | 2.64  | 2.75  | 0.830    | 0.86       | 0.906      |       |       |       | St14  |
| St15   | 4.30  | 4.75  | 4.29  | 4.07  | 4.75  | 0.928    | 0.96       | 1          |       |       | St15  |       |
| St16   | 3.70  | 3.75  | 3.79  | 3.07  | 2.58  | 0.929    | 0.97       | 1          |       |       | St16  |       |
| St17   | 3.45  | 3.13  | 3.26  | 3.11  | 3.75  | 0.944    | 1          |            |       | St17  |       |       |
| St18   | 3.40  | 3.75  | 3.50  | 3.36  | 3.50  | 0.937    | 0.97       | 1          |       |       | St18  |       |
| St19   | 4.60  | 5.00  | 4.29  | 4.71  | 4.75  | 0.942    | 1          | 1          |       |       | St19  |       |
| St20   | 3.50  | 4.00  | 3.14  | 2.79  | 4.00  | 0.960    | 0.98       | 1          |       |       | St20  |       |
| St21   | 4.45  | 3.75  | 3.71  | 3.29  | 2.58  | 0.834    | 0.92       | 0.982      |       |       |       | St21  |
| St22   | 3.80  | 3.75  | 3.86  | 3.50  | 4.25  | 0.958    | 1          |            |       | St22  |       |       |
| St23   | 2.86  | 3.13  | 3.16  | 2.86  | 3.13  | 0.970    | 1          |            |       | St23  |       |       |
| St24   | 3.05  | 3.38  | 3.50  | 3.14  | 3.63  | 1        |            |            | St24  |       |       |       |

Source: the author's study

Rating classes have been distinguished in this example as previously. The first rating class consists of four objects determined to be efficient (column 10). After their removal, DEA analysis was repeated for the remaining 20 objects. The values of the coefficient  $\theta$  determined can be found in column 8. Seven objects are efficient in this group. They belong to the second rating class (column 11). After removal, DEA analysis was carried out for the group of 13 objects remaining. The values of the coefficient  $\theta$  obtained are located in column 9. The third rating class consists of 8 objects determined to be efficient (column 12). The remaining 5 objects are ascribed to the fourth (last) rating class (column 13).

#### 4. Conclusions

The analyses carried out show the complexity of ordering assemblages. Depending on the approach used, different, though not contradictory, results can be obtained.

One-dimensional analysis leads to a linear ordering. The averaging of signals is required for such an order, which means that the differences arising from the specific character of different subjects are omitted. For example, physics and macroeconomics are treated similarly, without taking into consideration the differences between the distributions of grades in these subjects within a group of students. This is not the case for multi-dimensional analysis which, to some extent, takes into account the differences between subjects.

In the two-dimensional analysis presented, weighting has been performed by classifying subjects in the second semester into two groups. In the case of six-dimensional analysis, such a weighting was achieved by classifying two groups of subjects in the first semester and three groups of subjects in the second semester.

A greater number of effective students is the result of taking variety into account. Here, a greater number of students are considered to be “the best” or belong to one rating class in accordance with the measure used. It should also be added that students in the same rating class cannot be compared with each other in a direct way and they still occupy the same position on the rating list, despite having different partial efficiencies.

The analysis, to which the concept of efficiency and the DEA method are applied, enriches the information about a tested group of students. It indicates progress in studying and can be complementary to traditional rating lists.

It must also be mentioned that for the presented case of analysis we should take into account specific limitations related to the values of signals. They cannot increase freely and their highest possible value is 5, which results from the established grading scale.

## References

- [1] BARAN J., *Efektywność spółdzielni i pozostałych form prawnych działających w przemyśle mleczarskim z wykorzystaniem metody DEA*, Roczniki Nauk Rolniczych, Series G, 2007, Vol. 94, is. 1, 103–110.
- [2] COOPER W.W., SEIFORD L.M., *Handbook on Data Envelopment Analysis* (International Series in Operations research & Management Science), Lavoisier (Chapter 1, Data Envelopment Analysis, History, Models and Interpretations), 2004.
- [3] DOMAGAŁA A., *Przestrzenno-czasowa analiza efektywności jednostek decyzyjnych metodą Data Envelopment Analysis na przykładzie banków polskich*, Badania Operacyjne i Decyzje, 2007, No. 3–4, 35–56.
- [4] DOMAGAŁA A., *Metoda Data Envelopment Analysis jako narzędzie badania względnej efektywności technicznej*, Badania Operacyjne i Decyzje, 2007, No. 3–4, 21–34.
- [5] FERUŚ A., *Zastosowanie metody DEA do określania poziomu ryzyka kredytowego przedsiębiorstw*, Bank i kredyt, 2006, No. 7, 44–59.
- [6] GIERULSKI W., OKNIŃSKI A., RADZISZEWSKI B., *Metoda wyważania wartości w analizie i ocenie efektywności*, Politechnika Świętokrzyska, Zeszyty Naukowe, Nauki Ekonomiczne No. 32, Kielce, 2008, 153–162.

- [7] GIERULSKI W., OKNIŃSKI A., RADZISZEWSKI B., *Częściowy porządek w wyważaniu wartości i rankingach – studium przypadku*, Innowacyjno-Efektywnościowe Problemy Teorii i Praktyki Zarządzania, Uczelniane Wydawnictwa Naukowo-Dydaktyczne AGH, Kraków, 2009, 149–159.
- [8] GIERULSKI W., *Modelowanie z wykorzystaniem metody DEA*, Innowacyjno-Efektywnościowe Problemy Teorii i Praktyki Zarządzania, Uczelniane Wydawnictwa Naukowo-Dydaktyczne AGH, Kraków, 2009, 49–58.
- [9] GUZIK B., *O pewnej możliwości uwzględnienia substytucji nakładów w modelach DEA*, Badania Operacyjne i Decyzje, 2007, No. 3–4, 71–92.
- [10] KACZMARSKA B., *Badanie efektywności Akademickich inkubatorów przedsiębiorczości z wykorzystaniem metody DEA*, Efektywnościowe Problemy Teorii i Praktyki Zarządzania, Uczelniane Wydawnictwa Naukowo-Dydaktyczne AGH, Kraków, 2009, 167–173.
- [11] KACZMARSKA B., *Modelowanie działalności AIP w procesie badania ich efektywności*, Uniwersytet Szczeciński, Zeszyty Naukowe No. 525, Ekonomiczne Problemy Usług, No. 28, 141–154.
- [12] KACZMARSKA B., *Klasyfikacja i ocena efektywności ośrodków innowacji i przedsiębiorczości*, Problemy Zarządzania, Vol. 7, No. 2 (24), Wydawnictwa Naukowe Wydziału Zarządzania Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2009, 71–86.
- [13] MIELNIK M., ŁAWRYNOWICZ M., *Badanie efektywności technicznej banków komercyjnych w Polsce metodą DEA*, Bank i Kredyt, 2002, No. 5, 52–64.
- [14] SZUWARZYŃSKI A., *Metoda DEA pomiaru efektywności dydaktycznej szkół wyższych*, Nauka i Szkolnictwo Wyższe, Uniwersytet Warszawski, 2006, No. 2(28), 78–88.