

The New Efficiency Frontier due to Possible variation Efficiency of Decision Making Units in Data Envelopment Analysis

Abasali Monzali¹

Department of Math. The Islamic Azad University at Ardabil Branch

Abstract

Data envelopment analysis (DEA) assigns a score to each production unit (Decision Making Unit—DMU) considered in the analysis. Such score indicates whether the unit is efficient or not. For inefficient units, it also identifies a hypothetical value as the target and thus suggests improvements to their efficiency.

These suggestions aren't applicable to some DMUs because they have lower efficiency values and thus it becomes very difficult to reach the efficient frontier. On the other hand based on an *DEA* analysis no further improvement for efficient units can be indicated. Nevertheless, it is important for management to assign applicable target for units.

Based on possible variations in the input and output levels of DMUs, for efficient DMUs, new units which are more efficient than DEA efficient units can be created to form a new improved frontier. In the new PPS inefficient DMUs, have new and high score efficiency. Available bank branch data was used to illustrate the applicability of this theoretical development. The sensitivity of the results to the parameters defined by management in the model was also examined, which proved the robustness of the proposed model.

Keywords: Data envelopment analysis; Productivity and competitiveness; Linear programming, Decision making unit.

1. Introduction

Data envelopment analysis (DEA) is a powerful technique in productivity management. It is a linear programming based methodology for measuring the relative efficiency of decision making units (DMUs) (introduced by Charnes et al. [1]). A DEA analysis provides a variety of valuable information. It assigns a single score to each DMU that makes the comparison easy.

The method has the ability to simultaneously handle multiple inputs and outputs without requiring any judgments on their relative importance, so it does not need a parametrically driven input and output production function. It establishes a best practice frontier among the units based on a comparison process. The units on this frontier are efficient units with

¹ Corresponding author. E-mail Abas_ali354@yahoo.com

an efficiency score of 1.0 and the rest are deemed inefficient. The level of inefficiency is measured by the unit's distance from this frontier.

One of the important advantages of DEA is its ability to identify performance targets for inefficient units and indicate what improvements can be made to achieve pareto-efficiency [2, 3]. In the real world, it might not be possible to adjust all inputs and outputs of inefficient units based on the DEA results; so we need to adjust all inputs and outputs for these DMUs such that it is feasible in practice to change their efficiencies.

For efficient units, no further improvement can be considered based on DEA, yet, increasing performance for even the best performers can be very important to management. Specifying targets for efficient units is of interest to operations analysts, management and industrial engineers. We have shown in our research that if the inputs and outputs of an efficient unit can be changed within a range, it is possible to find another combination of inputs and outputs within such constraints and define an artificial DMU that is more efficient compared to the DEA efficient unit from which it is derived. Therefore, although the "theoretical" frontier is not known, it is possible to define a "practical" one.

This new frontier envelops or touches the empirical frontier. The idea of introducing artificial ("unobserved") DMUs was used by Thanassoulis and Allen [12] to capture value judgments in DEA. To overcome the issues related to complete weights flexibility in DEA [13], they used unobserved DMUs as an alternative approach to weight restrictions.

These units were constructed by varying the input-output levels of real DMUs in order to extend the production possibility set. In this paper, artificial DMUs were created using a linear programming model, such that the new frontier identifies the adjusted efficiency measures for DMUs and indicates targets for empirically efficient units.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Sections 2 and 3 present the proposed model and methodology. Data, the production model and the results are presented in Section 4. Sensitivity analysis of the P-DEA model is reported on in Section 5. Section 6 closes the paper with some concluding remarks and further direction.

2. Model:

To explain the model, first consider the BCC ratio model:

$$\begin{aligned}
 Max h_0 &= \frac{\sum_{r=1}^s u_r y_{ro} + u_0}{\sum_{i=1}^m v_i x_{ij}} \leq 1 \\
 s.t. \quad &\frac{\sum_{r=1}^s u_r y_{rj} + u_0}{\sum_{i=1}^m v_i x_{ij}} \leq 1 \quad \forall j \\
 &u_r \geq \varepsilon, \quad \forall r, \\
 &v_i \geq \varepsilon \quad \forall i,
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

In the above model x_{ij} and y_{rj} are the inputs and outputs of the j th DMU ; and u_r and v_i are the output and input weights, respectively. The objective is to obtain those weights that maximize the efficiency of the unit under evaluation, DMU_o , while the efficiency of all $DMUs$ must not exceed 1.0. The efficiency score and input output weights are the variables of the BCC model. The inputs and outputs of DMU_o are known. If DMU_o is efficient then $h_o = 1.0$. In the real world, some of the factors (inputs and outputs) are fixed, and it is not possible to vary their values, e.g. a store's floor space. However, changes in other factors are permitted within certain ranges, i.e., $L_{x_{io}} \leq x_{io} \leq U_{x_{io}}$ and $L_{y_{ro}} \leq y_{ro} \leq U_{y_{ro}}$.

Furthermore, some factors may have a specific relationship with some other factors. This information about inputs and outputs can be obtained from management. Suppose that there are upper and lower bounds for some or all inputs and outputs. Our goal is to look for the inputs and outputs of a new DMU within the specified range, but one that has an efficiency score greater than that of DMU_o , which is, at present, 1.0. We are attempting to create new $DMUs$ by adjusting the already efficient $DMUs$ input and output variables according to the limits determined by management. This should produce units that could be used as models for the efficient $DMUs$ from which they were derived. In the following models \hat{x}_{io} (inputs of the artificial DMU), y_{ro} (outputs of the artificial DMU), u_r and v_i are variables. The model then becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Max } h_o &= \frac{\sum_{r=1}^s u_r \hat{y}_{ro} + u_o}{\sum_{i=1}^m v_i \hat{x}_{io}} \\ \text{s.t. } \frac{\sum_{r=1}^s u_r y_{rj} + u_o}{\sum_{i=1}^m v_i x_{ij}} &\leq 1, \quad \forall j \end{aligned}$$

Efficiency of real units

$$1 \leq \frac{\sum_{r=1}^s u_r \hat{y}_{ro} + u_o}{\sum_{i=1}^m v_i \hat{x}_{io}} \leq 1 + \delta$$

Efficiency of the new units

$$\begin{aligned} L_{x_{io}} &\leq \hat{x}_{io} \leq U_{x_{io}}, \quad \forall i, \\ L_{y_{ro}} &\leq \hat{y}_{ro} \leq U_{y_{ro}}, \quad \forall r, \quad (2) \\ u_r, v_i &\geq \varepsilon, \quad \forall i, r, \\ u_o &\text{ free,} \end{aligned}$$

Note that in this model unlike the standard DEA model, inputs and outputs are also variables. The objective function is to maximize the efficiency of the artificial *DMU*, while the weights must be feasible for all other units and factors can vary within the specified ranges. To have an improved unit, the efficiency score of the artificial unit is set to be greater than or equal to 1.0. DEA models which result in an efficiency score of more than 1.0 have been reported in the literature. Andersen and Petersen [8] developed modified versions of the DEA models for ranking efficient units in which the unit, a super efficient unit, could obtain an efficiency score of more than 1.0 by excluding such unit from the analysis. [2] In this paper an upper limit, $(1 + \delta)$, is considered in the model for the efficiency of the new unit otherwise the model would be unbounded. The amount of possible increase in the efficiency of an empirically efficient unit, designated as δ , can be specified by management (for example: 5%).

The upper and lower bounds for factors and the possible improve in efficiency of an empirically efficient unit (δ) can be local or global based on the application; for example for comparing different branches of the same bank the information can be global, while it can be local if different banks are compared.

The ratio model, (2), can be transformed into a linear fractional programming model by substituting $\tilde{y}_{ro}u_r$ and $\tilde{x}_{io}v_i$ with new variables p_r and q_i , respectively, and replacing $L_{x_{io}} \leq \tilde{x}_{io} \leq U_{x_{io}}$ and $L_{y_{ro}} \leq \tilde{y}_{ro} \leq U_{y_{ro}}$ with $v_i L_{x_{io}} \leq q_i \leq v_i U_{x_{io}}$ and $u_r L_{y_{ro}} \leq p_r \leq u_r U_{y_{ro}}$, correspondingly. Then the linear fractional program can be transformed to a linear program [15], which is shown in (3), so that the linear programming method can be applied to solve the case. The process is relatively straightforward.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Max} \quad \sum_{r=1}^s p_r + u_0 \\
& \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^m q_i = 1, \\
& \quad \sum_{r=1}^s y_{rj} u_r + u_0 - \sum_{i=1}^m x_{ij} v_i \leq 0, \quad \forall j, \\
& \quad \sum_{r=1}^s p_r + u_0 - \theta \sum_{i=1}^m q_i \geq 0, \\
& \quad \sum_{r=1}^s p_r + u_0 + \theta^* \sum_{i=1}^m q_i \leq 0, \\
& \quad u_r L_{y_{ro}} \leq p_r \leq u_r U_{y_{ro}}, \quad \forall r, \\
& \quad v_i L_{x_{io}} \leq q_i \leq v_i U_{x_{io}}, \quad \forall i, \\
& \quad u_r, v_i \geq \varepsilon, \quad \forall i, r, \\
& \quad u_0 \quad \text{free.}
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Where θ is the efficiency value in *BCC* model and θ^* the new efficiency value for *DMU*. By solving the above model, $\tilde{x}_{io}^* = \frac{q_i^*}{v_i^*}$ and $\tilde{y}_{ro}^* = \frac{p_r^*}{u_r^*}$ can be calculated. These values are the inputs and outputs of the artificial unit. In order to improve the efficiency this model must be run for each unit.

3- example:

Consider the eight *DMU* which inputs and outputs are given in table 1. Each *DMU* consumes one input to produce one output.

	INPUT	OUTPUT
DMU1	2	5
DMU2	4	5
DMU3	3	5
DMU4	3	6
DMU5	2	4
DMU6	5	3
DMU7	6	7

Table 1: Data for *DMUs*

By solving the new and BCC models we obtain table 2:

	INPUT	OUTPUT	Old Eff.	New Eff.
DMU1	1	4	1	1.02
DMU2	2	4	.5	.65
DMU3	2	4	.86	.8
DMU4	2	5.1	1	1.02
DMU5	1	3	1	1.02
DMU6	4	4	.4	.25
DMU7	4	8.49	1	1.02

Table 2: New Data and Eff. values for *DMUs*

The BCC and improved efficient frontiers are given in Fig 1:




Fig 1

References

- [1] Charnes A, Cooper WW, Rhodes E. Measuring the efficiency of the decision making units. *European Journal of Operational Research* 1978; 2(6):429–44.
- [2] Charnes A, Cooper WW, Lewin AY, Seiford LM. Data envelopment analysis: theory, methodology and applications. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publisher; 1997.
- [3] Cooper WW, Seiford LM, Tone K. Data envelopment analysis—a comprehensive text with models, applications, references and DEA-solver software. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publisher; 2000.
- [4] Kao C. Efficiency improvement in data envelopment analysis. *European Journal of Operational Research* 1994; 73:487–94.
- [5] Cooper WW, Park KS, Yu G. IDEA and AR-IDEA: models for dealing with imprecise data in DEA. *Management Science* 1999; 45(4):597–607.
- [6] Zhu J. Imprecise data envelopment analysis: a review and improvement with an application. *European Journal of Operational Research* 2003; 144:513–29.
- [7] Cook WD, Kress M, Seiford LM. Prioritization models for frontier decision making units in DEA. *European Journal of Operational Research* 1992;59:319–23.
- [8] Andersen P, Petersen NC. A procedure for ranking efficient units in data envelopment analysis. *Management Science* 1993;39(10):1261–4.
- [9] Torgersen AM, Forsund FR, Kittelsen SAC. Slack-adjusted efficiency measures and ranking efficient units. *The Journal of Productivity Analysis* 1997; 7:379–98.
- [10] Sinuany-Stern Z, Friedman L. DEA and the discriminate analysis of ratios for ranking units. *European Journal of Operational Research* 1998; 111:470–8.
- [11] Friedman L, Sinuany-Stern Z. Combining ranking scales and selecting variables in the DEA context: the case of industrial branches. *Computers and Operations Research* 1998; 25(2):781–91.
- [12] Thanassoulis E, Allen R. Simulating weights restrictions in data envelopment analysis by means of unobserved DMUs. *Management Science* 1998; 44(4):586–94.
- [13] Roll Y, Cook WW, Golany B. Controlling factor weights in data envelopment analysis. *IIE Transactions* 1991; 23(1):2–9.
- [14] Allen R, Athanassopoulos A, Dyson RG, Thanassoulis E. Weights restrictions and value judgments in data envelopment analysis: evolution, development and further directions. *Annals of Operations Research* 1997; 73:13–34.
- [15] Charnes A, Cooper WW. Programming with linear fractionals. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly* 1962;9(3,4):181–5.
- [16] Asmild M, Paradi JC, Aggarwall V, SchaMnit C. Combining DEA Window Analysis with the Malmquist Index Approach in a Study of the Canadian Banking Industry. *The Journal of Productivity Analysis* 2004; 21:67–89.
- [17] Banker RD, Charnes A, Cooper WW. Some models for estimating technical and scale inefficiency in data envelopment analysis. *Management Science* 1984; 31(9):1078–92.
- [18] SchaMnit C, Rosen D, Paradi JC. Best practice analysis of bank branches: an application of DEA in a large Canadian bank. *European Journal of Operational Research* 1997;98:269–89.

- [19] Pedraja-Chaparro F, Salinas-Jimenez J, Smith P. On the quality of data envelopment analysis. *Journal of Operational Research Society* 1999; 50:636–44.
- [20] Wilson PW. Detecting outliers in deterministic nonparametric frontier models with multiple outputs. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 1993;11(3):319–23.
- [21] Charnes A, Cooper WW, Lewin AY, Morey RC, Rousseau J. Sensitivity and stability analysis in DEA. *Annals of Operations Research* 1985; 2:139–56.
- [22] Charnes A, Neralic L. Sensitivity analysis of the additive model in data envelopment analysis. *European Journal of Operational Research* 1990; 48:332–41.
- [23] Zhu J. Robustness of the efficient DMUs in data envelopment analysis. *European Journal of Operational Research* 1996;90:451–60.
- [24] Seiford LM, Zhu J. Stability regions for maintaining efficiency in data envelopment analysis. *European Journal of Operational Research* 1998; 108:127–39.
- [25] Seiford LM, Zhu J. Sensitivity analysis of DEA models for simultaneous changes in all the data. *Journal of the Operational Research Society* 1998; 49:1060–71.
- [26] Sowlati Taraneh, Paradi J. C.” Establishing the practical frontier in data envelopment analysis” *Omega* 2003, 261-272.