International Journal of
Intelligent Systems and
Applications in Engineering
ISSN:2147-6799 www.atscience.org/IJISAE
Advanced Technology and Science
Original Research Paper

Fuzzy Multicriterial Methods for the Selection of IT-Professionals

Masuma Mammadova[1,*], Zarifa Jabrayilova[1], Faig Mammadzada[1]

Received 05th September 2014, Accepted 18th December 2014

Abstract: This paper presents the solution of issues related to selection based on evaluation of demand set forth to IT specialists, to develop appropriate decision support system. In this case problem is reduced to multicriterial task of decision making, functioning in a fuzzy environment. We propose criteria estimation method allowing regulation and selection of the best alternative according to the scenario appropriate to the requirements of the decision making person, at a current time. For realization of abovementioned task on the basis of fuzzy logic methods we propose methods of expert knowledge processing of the importance criteria and their characterizing factors.

Keywords: *Decision Support System, Fuzzy Environment, Personnel Selection Problem, Fuzzy Multicriterial Model, Multiscenario Approach, Importance Factor of the Criteria*.

1. Introduction

Dynamics of expansion of ICT sector, state policy and strategic documents in this area, oriented to integration of the country into global information space, Azerbaijan IT-industry growth rates have caused sharply increased demand for IT-professionals. According to the results of monitoring of a supply and demand in the labour market of the IT-professionals, carried out by Institute of information technologies, for today the ratio of demand for IT-professionals exceeds corresponding offers approximately in 3 times, i.e. IT-professionals in the market are required three times more, than train the high schools [1]. Moreover the diversification of Azerbaijan economy stipulates the further expansion and a deepening of IT applicable spheres and enables to assume, that there is no fear of the fall of demand for IT-professionals nearest years.

Penetration IT into the diversified spheres of human activity promotes diversification of the IT-segment, that, on the one hand, causes the transformation of old IT-professions, on the other hand, stimulates occurrence in the market the new ones.

Within the framework of "Monitoring of supply and demand in IT labour market of Azerbaijan", the list of IT professions and their ranking based on evaluation of demand of IT professions was determined [1], [2].

Current article reviews the solution of issues related to selection based on evaluation of demand set forth to IT specialists. Reviewed problem for this purpose was resolved within multicriteria selection problem. References [3] and [4] reviewed the personnel selection studies and found that the several main factors including change in organizations, change in work, change in personnel, change in the society, change of laws, and change in marketing have influenced personnel selection. In literature, there are a number of studies which use heuristic methods for employee selection.

A fuzzy MCDM framework based on the concepts of ideal and anti-ideal solutions for the most appropriate candidate is presented in [5]. Also, a fuzzy number ranking method by metric distance for personnel selection problem was proposed in [6] and a personnel selection system based on fuzzy AHP was developed in [7].

In addition, researchers used fuzzy technique for order preference by similarity (TOPSIS) based on the veto threshold for ranking job applicants [8]–[10].

Recently, owing to the advancements in information technology, researchers have developed decision support systems and expert systems to improve the outcomes of HRM [11], [12].

A model to design an expert system for effective selection and appointment of the job applicants developed in [13]. Although the applications of expert system or decision support systems on personnel selection and recruitment are increasing [14]–[16], however, the research taking into account requirements of the employer in the real time has not been considered in those papers.

2. Characteristic aspects and conceptual model of recruitment issues related to IT-professions

The list of criteria for recruitment as an IT professional, set forth by the employers for those wishing to be employed have been determined. Criteria are presented in 6 groups: criteria are presented as following, K_1 – age, K_2 – gender, K_3 – education, K_4 – personal qualities, K_5 – professional requirements in IT specialization, K_6 – additional capabilities. Each of these criteria is defined by multiple indicators that characterize them [17].

One of the complication problems during the solution of this issue, is determination of knowledge and capabilities of the job applicant in accordance with professional requirements and determination of his/her suitability level to requirements set forth to occupy this position. I.e. above listed are determined through multiple indicators with different importance levels. For instance, it is necessary to determine the level of personal qualities of the job applicant for IT position, such as performance discipline, initiative at work, capability to pass on experience, team work (communication) capability and analytical thinking, and find their importance coefficient with regard to each other; which requires attraction of experts to the process.

[1] *Institute of Information Technology of National Academy Science of Azerbaijan*
** Corresponding Author:email:depart15@iit.ab.az*
Note:This paper has been presented at the International Conference on Advanced Technology&Sciences (ICAT'14) held in Antalya (Turkey), August 12-15, 2014.

As a result of conducted researches, points reflecting the personal approach to recruitment of IT professionals emerged, which demonstrate themselves in different approaches to requirements set forth by the employer to the job applicant applying for the same position depending on the profile, activity direction, property type (government or non-government, joint etc.) of the organization.

This point emerges when a requirement indicated as obligatory by one employer for a specific position, can be evaluated as desired or even unimportant by another employer. Naturally, if a job applicant doesn't meet at least one indicator listed as obligatory for this specialty by the employer, his chances of getting accepted to the relevant position equals to zero.

Statistical results of the approach of 72 employers regarding meeting the indicators characterizing education and personal qualities for the specialty of programmer-engineer are presented in Table 1.

Accordingly, as semistructured, the problem of personnel selection is characterized by the following features:

- multifactorial and multicriteriality;
- criteria and indicators of qualitative and quantitative nature;
- the need to consider the experts views in the evaluation process;
- hierarchy rate criteria characterizing evaluated object, expressed in the fact that each top-level individual criterion is based on the aggregation of partial criteria;
- dependence on employer's requirements that define "portrait of the professional" to occupy particular position, at a real time.

Above listed characteristics of the issue defines the fuzziness of entry information, "loads" the issue to a fuzzy environment and this requires selection of an adequate formalism that considers the uncertainty of linguistic nature related to formalization of fuzziness of indicators and expert knowledge for modelling of the issue and evaluation of the alternatives. From this point of view, necessity for the use of fuzzy mathematical apparatus has emerged for solution of the recruitment issue.

Table 1. Result of employers requirements according to educational and personnel qualities criteria for proqrammer-engineer specialty

Character of employers' requirements / Indicators characterizing the employed person	obligatory (%)	desirable (%)	not required (%)
Education:			
Higher education diploma	68,11	25,02	6,87
Higher IT education diploma	30,58	51,43	17,99
Course certificates	5,64	31,97	62,39
Personal qualities			
Performance discipline	75,06	18,07	6,95
Initiative at work	23,63	55,52	20,85
Capability to pass on experience	13,9	56,91	29,19
Team work capability	34,67	29,19	36,14
Analytical thinking	17,99	50,04	31,97

3. Task Description

Current article proposes an approaching that enables to consider the individual requirements of the employers. Thus, we are proposing the approach that enables the selection of the best job applicant among all job applicants considering the individual requirement of the employer regarding meeting the general criteria indicators in order to be hired for specific IT specialties.

Thus, let's consider that $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\} = \{x_i, i = \overline{1,n}\}$ – is a set of job applicants – alternatives the best of which must be selected; $K = \{K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_m\} = \{K_j, j = \overline{1,m}\}$ – is a set of criteria inherent to alternatives and the set is defined by knowledge, capability and personal qualities of job applicants. In this case, suitability of alternatives to criteria can be shown in two-dimensional matrix, whereas element of the matrix will be defined by membership functions reflecting the suitability level of x_i alternative to K_j criteria: $\varphi_{K_j}(x_i) : X \times K \to [0,1]$.

Here, $\varphi_{K_j}(x_i)$ – reflects the suitability level of xi alternative to *Kj* criteria. But these criteria are defined based on multiple indicators of different significance.

I.e. $K_j = \{k_{j1}, k_{j2}, \ldots, k_{jT}\} = \{k_{jt}, t = \overline{1,s}\}$.

Let's suppose,

1) $\{k_{jt}, t = \overline{1,s},\ j = \overline{1,m}\}$ membership function $\{\varphi_{k_{j1}}(x_i), \varphi_{k_{j2}}(x_i), \ldots, \varphi_{k_{js}}(x_i)\} = \{\varphi_{k_{jt}}(x_i), t = \overline{1,s},\ j = \overline{1,m}\}$ of $\{k_{jt}, t = \overline{1,s},\ j = \overline{1,m}\}$ alternatives to criteria indicators is known (supply base);

2) Evaluation of the decision making person (DMP) regarding obligation (O), desirability (D) and unimportance (U) of meeting $\{k_{jt}, t = \overline{1,s},\ j = \overline{1,m}\}$ criteria indicators for occupation of a specific position is known (requirement base).

Objective of the issue is to select the best alternative from the supply basis in accordance with demand basis for occupation of a specific vacancy or make a ranked list of alternatives from best to worst: $X : K^* \to X^*$. Hereby, X – is the set of primary alternatives, K^* – is the set of indicators marked with obligation (O), desirability (D) and unimportance (U), X^* – is the ranked list of selected alternatives in accordance with demand.

4. Issue solution

4.1. Modelling of the Demand Basis

Employer's criteria indicators $\{k_{jt}, t = \overline{1,T},\ j = \overline{1,m}\}$ for occupation of a specific vacancy are divided into three groups as obligatory (O), desirable (D) and unimportant (U) and form relevant sets: {O}, {D}, {U}.

Let's note that, $\{O\} \cap \{D\} \cap \{U\} = \varnothing$ and $\{O\} \cup \{D\} \cup \{U\} = \{k_{jt}, t = \overline{1,s},\ j = \overline{1,m}\}$, i.e. these sets do not have a common element, any $k_{jt} \in K_j \in K$ element can belong to only one of these sets. Following possible situations – scenarios can happen depending on distribution of $\{k_{jt}, t = \overline{1,s},\ j = \overline{1,m}\}$ criteria indicators among {O}, {D}, {U} sets.

Scenario 1. All indicators defining K_j criteria are obligatory: $k_{jt} \in \{O\}, t = \overline{1,s}$;

Scenario 2. A part of indicators defining K_j criteria are obligatory, another part is unimportant: $k_{jt} \in \{O\} \cup \{U\}, t = \overline{1,s}$;

Scenario 3. All indicators defining K_j criteria are desirable: $k_{jt} \in \{D\}, t = \overline{1,s}$;

Scenario 4. A part of indicators defining K_j criteria are desirable, another part is unimportant: $k_{jt} \in \{D\} \cup \{U\}, t = \overline{1,s}$;

Scenario 5. A part of indicators defining K_j criteria are obligatory, another part is desirable: $k_{jt} \in \{O\} \cup \{D\}, t = \overline{1,s}$;

Scenario 6. A part of indicators defining *Kj* criteria are obligatory, another part is desirable and a third part is unimportant: $k_{jt} \in \{O\} \cup \{D\} \cup \{U\}, t = \overline{1,s}$;

Scenario 7. All indicators defining *Kj* criteria are unimportant: $k_{jt} \in \{U\}, t = \overline{1,s}$.

(Let's note that, scenario 1 and 3 did not emerge during research and scenario 6 was the most common scenario).

4.2. Formation of the Supply Basis

Mathematical formalization of criteria must be carried out in order to find the membership function of

$\{k_{jt}, t=\overline{1,s},\ j=\overline{1,m}\}$

criteria indicators to alternatives.

K_1, K_2, K_3 are exact criteria and relevance of the job applicant to these criteria is determined in a formal order, based on the documentation submitted by the applicant.

An Indistinctness and quality characteristic, and support of expert knowledge during the definition of K_4, K_5, K_6 criteria, make it necessary to use fuzzy mathematical logic methods that enable to form the linguistic phrases of the natural language [18]. To that effect, it is necessary to develop mathematical formalization of criteria for realization of supply base, and the mechanism of turning the linguistic phrases regarding the level of satisfaction of criteria into a fuzzy value defined in the ─ [0,1] interval.

4.3. Mathematical formalization of Criteria

A criteria indicators scale is selected in order to determine the membership function – fuzzy value of the alternative criteria indicators, i.e. each criteria indicator is divided into rating levels in accordance with quality levels (excellent, good, acceptable, poor etc) of the relevant linguistic phrases of the natural language.

After performing of each criteria factor, appropriation of a fuzzy value from the fuzzy set to a linguistic rating level selected for it must be performed (Table 2).

Table 2. Mathematical formalization of "work experience in specialty"

Quality rating of "Work experience in specialty" indicator	Linguistic rating	fuzzy subset, set in [0, 1] interval
1) Has three or more years work experience in specialty	excellent	[0,98-1]
2) Has 1 to 3 years work experience in specialty	good	[0,8-0,97]
3) Has 6 months to 1 year work experience in specialty	acceptable	[0,5-0,79]
4) Has less than half a year work experience in specialty	poor	[0,1-0,49]

Final – collective fuzzy value determined by the experts based on individual fuzzy values can be defined in following ways:

1) by intersection of fuzzy sets;
2) by connection of fuzzy sets;
3) by making an agreed selection on fuzzy sets.

Based on the last approach, individual evaluation of the "superior" expert with special creativity is considered as the collective value. Such expert must choose such a membership value out of all individual membership values defined by experts as a collective membership value at each point of the possible alternatives space, that in general situation, it must differ from remote values in collective and hold a determined "middle" position.

Thus, a "supply basis" is formed by finding a

$$\{\varphi_{k_{j1}}(x_i), \varphi_{k_{j2}}(x_i), \dots, \varphi_{k_{jT}}(x_i)\} = \{\varphi_{k_{jt}}(x_i), t=\overline{1,s},\ j=\overline{1,m}\}$$

membership function based on how alternatives meet $\{k_{jt}, t=\overline{1,s},\ j=\overline{1,m}\}$ criteria indicators of alternatives.

5. Evaluation of alternatives

Evaluation of alternatives based on proposed indicators is carried out in three stages.

In the first stage, suitability of the job applicant to relevant requirements of the employer on indicators of K_1, K_2, K_3 criteria determined based on documents submitted by the job applicant. In the second stage, evaluation of alternative based on K_4, K_5, K_6 criteria is carried out. Definition of membership function of the alternative to these criteria is realized through a scenario relevant to evaluation of these criteria in the supply basis.

Claim 1. If a part of indicators defining $K_j = \{k_{jt}, t=\overline{1,s}\}$ (here $j=\overline{4,6}$) criteria (scenario 1, 2, 5, 6) is obligatory and the value of membership function of alternative to at least one of these indicators equals to 0, then the membership function of the alternative to the relevant criteria will also equal to 0.

Claim 2. $K_j = \{k_{jt}, t=\overline{1,s}\}$ (here $j=\overline{4,6}$) is only defined by desirable (or partly unimportant – scenario) indicators and the value of membership function of alternative to at least one of desirable indicators differs from 0, then the membership function of the alternative to the relevant criteria will also be different from 0.

Thus, membership function K_j, $j=\overline{4,6}$ of the alternative, depends on distribution of indicators characterizing it among {O}, {D}, {U} sets, scenarios.

Calculation of membership function of the alternative $K_j = \{k_{jt}, t=\overline{1,s}\}$ to the criteria, is based on membership function of the indicators characterizing the criteria and its "curve" i.e. their aggregation based on principal of their importance factor depicted in thus [19], following are proposed for calculation of membership function of the alternative to $K_j = \{k_{jt}, t=\overline{1,s}\}$ criteria:

1. Based on Scenario 1: Membership function of the alternative to criteria *Kj* is calculated using following equation.

$$\varphi_{K_j}(x_i) = \prod_{t=1}^{s} \left[\varphi_{k_{jt}}(x_i)\right]^{w_{jt}} \quad (1)$$

Here $\varphi_{k_{jt}}(x_i)$ – is the membership function of the job application to k_{jt} indicator, w_{jt} – is the importance factor of k_{jt} indicator. Let's note that,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{s} w_{jt} = 1, \quad t=\overline{1,s}$$

condition must be met for criteria indicators.

2. Based on Scenario 2: Suppose, g quantity of indicators defining *Kj* criteria have been evaluated as unimportant and naturally g<s. Then, the membership function formula of the alternative to *Kj* criteria (1) is defined based on s-g quantity of obligatory indicators.

3. Based on Scenario 3: Membership function of ith alternative to Kj criteria is calculated using

$$\varphi_{K_j}(x_i) = \sum_{t=1}^{s} w_{jt}\ \varphi_{k_{jt}}(x_i) \quad (2)$$

equation.

4. Based on Scenario 4, membership function of i^{th} alternative to *Kj* criteria is found only based on formula for indicators included in {D} set (2).

5. Based on Scenario 5, in order to find the , membership function of i^{th} alternative to *Kj* criteria, firstly the difference of membership function of its obligatory indicators from 0 is checked and if one of them equals to zero, then $\varphi_{K_j}(x_i)$ =0 is accepted, otherwise in accordance with formula (2), the value of membership function to *Kj* criteria is calculated. i.e.:

$$\varphi_{k_j}(x_i) = \begin{cases} 0, & if \quad \prod_{d=1}^{g} \varphi_{k_{js}}(x_i) = 0 \\ \sum_{t=1}^{s} w_{jt}\, \varphi_{k_{jt}}(x_i) & if \quad \prod_{d=1}^{g} \varphi_{k_j}(x_i) \neq 0. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Here, $k_{jd} \in \{M\}, d=\overline{1,g}$ ─ K_j is the obligatory indicators characterizing *Kj* criteria and naturally in this case g<s.

6. Based on Scenario 6, if S quantity of indicators of *Kj* is evaluated as unimportant, then it is possible to find the membership function of the alternative to this criterion by carrying out the

operational sequence relevant with formula (3) in accordance with *s-g* quantity of indicators.

7. Based on Scenario 7, during the definition of membership function of the alternative to *K*, (i.e. the value of the job applicant's chance to get the job), its membership function to *Kj* is not taken into consideration.

In the Third stage, the value of the job applicant's chance to get the job, i.e. $\varphi_K(x_i),\ i=\overline{1,n}$ must be defined. The value of membership function of alternative to K, is based on aggregation of its $\{\varphi_{K_j}(x_i),\ j=\overline{4,6}\}$ membership function to $K_j,\ j=\overline{4,6}$ criteria, i.e. the evaluation of the alternative's chance to get the job is defined based on $\varphi_K(x_i)=\sum_{j=4}^{6} w_j\ \varphi_{K_j}(x_i)$ formula [19], [20].

6. Use of information about importance of the criteria

This point is one of the problems emerging in the solution of personnel management problems and obtaining of such information gives opportunity to eliminate multicriterionness and to bring this problem to one-criterion problem. In this case global criterion is defined as

$$K_Q=\sum_{j=1}^{m} w_j K_j$$

And here K_j ─ is criterion characterizing estimated object (j=1, 2,…, m), w_j ─ is called weight of criterion K_j or importance factor [21]. For importance factor of the criterion the following condition is foreseen:

$$0\le w_j\le 1;\quad \sum_{j=1}^{m} w_j=1 \qquad (4)$$

The idea of unification is based on the expressions of the person who expresses the opinion about importance of criteria (expert, person who makes a decision) or on determination of appropriate evaluation grade determined to reflect value of considered criterion(in other case refer to 1-100 point scale) and further normalization within condition (1) of this value. On the basis of the obtained information for today preparation of methods for determining of criteria importance factors is one of the points the attention is attracted to in the sphere of multicriterion problems solution [21], [22].

Information about mutual importance, significance of the criteria can be referred by the experts can be:

─ expressed by the linguistic expressions representing mutual relative advantage (or weak points) and their pair comparison;

─ referred to the establishing of appropriate grade to reflect assessment value of the considered criterion against the background of criteria defining any global factor.

In first case to display mutual relative advantage of the criteria the linguistic expressions of the type given below are used:

- criterion K_1 has a weak advantage over criterion K_2
- criterion K_2 has rather more advantage over criterion K_1 and etc.

Such linguistic expressions for degree of mutual relative advantage of compared criteria are estimated by 9-point Saati's table (Table 3) [23].

If number of criteria equals to *n* then by defining of n-1 ratio of pair criteria comparison it is possible to make a matrix of mutual relative relations [23], [24].

Table 3. Defining of relative importance factors of pair comparison on the basis of quality estimations

Importance intensity	Qualitative (linguistic) estimation
1	Criterion K_1 has no advantage over K_2
3	Criterion K_1 has weak advantage over K_2
5	Criterion K_1 has essential advantage over K_2
7	Criterion K_1 has evident advantage over K_2
9	Criterion K_1 has absolute advantage over K_2
2,4,6,8	Intermediate estimations between neighboring estimation

After all matrix elements are defined private vector (w_i^*) is to be found. For this purpose radical of *n*-power of matrix line edge (n is measure of comparison matrix) should be defined and after they are normalized importance factor w_i of appropriate elements is calculated.

$$w_i^*=\sqrt[m]{K_{i1}\times K_{i2}\times\ldots\times K_{im}}$$

$$w_i=\frac{w_i^*}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} w_i^*} \qquad (5)$$

It must be noted that importance factors identified by means of formula (5) condition (4) is being checked up.

In the second case information about the importance, significance against the background of common criteria reflects value of any criterion.

In such case it is more advantageous to use method of importance factor on the basis of 10-point system of expert estimation of the criteria [24].

7. Detection of contradictions in the expressions of pair comparison about criteria importance

It must be noted that usually in multicriteria tasks multiple number of criteria and criteria indicted lead to the contradictions of expert expressions reflecting their pair comparison made by expert group members.

Thus before the application of criteria importance factor found by formula (5) in appropriate way one of the primary task is to identify if contradictory information (expert knowledge) used for their pair comparison is available. For this purpose maximal private value $\lambda_{\max}$, consent index and consent relation must be calculated.

Calculation of maximal private value $\lambda_{\max}$ is implemented by the pair comparison matrix as follows: each column of expressions is summarized, then sum of the first one is multiplied to the quantity of the first component of normalized priority vector, and sum of the second column is multiplied with second one and etc., then all obtained numbers are added. I.e.,

$$\lambda_{\max}=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} k_{ij}\times w_i\right)$$

The closer $\lambda_{\max}$ is to *n* (*n* – is a number of compared matrix elements), the more consent the result is.

Decline from consent may be expressed by the value $(\lambda_{\max}-n)/(n-1)$, that will be called consent index (consent index – *CI*).

CI is calculated by the following formula:

$$CI=(\lambda_{\max}-n)/(n-1).$$

If *CI* is divided into the number appropriate to the chance consent – *CC*, we obtain consent relation – *CR*.

According to [23] for matrix of the *n=3* size chance consent *CC=0,58;* for matrix of the *n=4* size *CC=0,90*; for *n=5* size *CC=1,12;* for *n=6 size CC=1,24* and etc.

Consent relation if identified by the following formula:

$$CR=CI/CR.$$

Consent rate is considered acceptable at $CR\le 0{,}1$. If consent rate if higher than 0,1, then expressions should be re-considered.

8. Defining of importance factor by pair comparison

In the Institute of Information Technologies of ANAS general criteria system of nominees employment problem on the IT-specialties has been created in the framework of building of personnel management intelligent system [3].

The list of criteria for recruitment as an IT professional, set forth by the employers for those wishing to be employed have been determined. Criteria are presented in 6 groups: criteria are presented as following, K_1 – age, K_2 – gender, K_3 – education, K_4 – personal qualities, K_5 – professional requirements in IT specialization, K_6 – additional capabilities. Each of these criteria is defined by multiple indicators that characterize them for instance K_4 – personal quality criteria is determined based on below indicators: k_{41} – performance discipline; k_{42} – initiative at work; k_{43} – capability to pass on experience; k_{44} – team work (communication) capability; k_{45}– analytical thinking. On the basis of the expressions said by the expert about theoretical importance of these shown criteria indices the given below (Table 4) relation matrix is created by using relational importance scale displayed in Table 3. While matrix is being compiled it is referred to the its diagonal, symmetric and transitive features. For instance because of evident superiority of criteria index k_{44} over criterion index k_{42} 5 is written in appropriate cell of the matrix, while in diagonally symmetric place cell 1/5 is noted.

Table 4. Comparison matrix personal quality criteria indicators

	k_{41}	k_{42}	k_{43}	k_{44}	k_{45}	Private vector (w_i^*)	Importance factor (w_i)
k_{41}	1	4	4	0,33	1	1,39	0,22
k_{42}	0,25	1	1	0,2	2	0,63	0,1
k_{43}	0,25	1	1	0,25	0,5	0,57	0,09
k_{44}	3	5	4	1	4	2,99	0,47
k_{45}	1	0,5	2	0,25	1	0,76	0,12
$\sum_{J=1}^{5} k_{4j}$	5,5	11,5	12	2,03	8,5		

After matrix has been compiled importance factors of the criteria are found by means of formula (5). In next step the availability of contracting features of used expert expressions is checked. For this purpose first of all $\lambda_{\max}$ is found.

$$\lambda_{\max} = \sum_{i=1}^{5}(\sum_{j=1}^{5} k_{ij} \times w_i) = 5{,}41.$$

consent index (CI) of the used expert expressions is defined.

$$CI = (\lambda_{\max} - n)/(n-1) = 0{,}102 .$$

If we consider chance consent to be CC= 1,12 for the 5-sized matrix then we can calculate consent relation – CR.

$$CR = CI / CR = 0{,}09 .$$

Consent relation was defined to be lower than 0,1 and it means there is no contradiction in the expressions used by the experts about criteria pair comparison and determined importance factor can be used in the realization of the task.

9. Conclusion

A system supporting the decision making system is used in ANAS Institute of Information Technology during the recruitment of IT specialized staff. The results of the survey with 101 specialist-experts specialized in IT field are used for the formation of the information base of the system. It is considered to use the results obtained from the realization of the system for decision making during regulation and administration of supply and demand in IT labour market.

Proposed solution method of the issue of recruitment of IT specialized staff is realized in Delphi 2010 programming system. The proposed methodology and decision support system is successfully used in various companies to support management decision making for the recruitment of IT professionals. The application of the system required to improve methodology towards the preferences and interests of IT professionals. Currently, the work is underway to develop a method for making trade-off decisions to deal with the preferences of employers, as well as IT professionals.

References

[1] M. H. Mammadova, Z. G. Jabrayılova, M. I. Manaflı, Monitoring of demands for Information Technology specialists, Baku, 2009. p. 199.

[2] M. Mamedova, F. Mamedzade, "Fuzzy multicriterion estimation of demand for IT-specialities", in Proc. International Conference "Problems of Cybernetics and Informatics (PCI─2010), Baku, Azerbajan 6─9 September ,2010, vol. 1, pp. 94–97.

[3] W. C. Borman, M. A. Hanson, J. W. Hedge, "Personnel selection", Annual review of psychology, 1997, pp. 299–337.

[4] T. Robertson, M. Smith, "Personnel selection", Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 2001, vol.74, Issue 4, pp.441–472.

[5] M. Dursun, E. Karsak, "A fuzzy MCDM approach for personnel selection", Expert Systems with Applications, 2010, v.37, pp.4324–4330.

[6] L. S. Chen, C. H. Cheng, "Selecting IS personnel use fuzzy GDSS based on metric distance method", European journal of operational research, 2005, vol.160, no 3, pp. 803–820.

[7] Z. Gungor, G. Serhadlıoglu, S. E. Kesen, "A fuzzy AHP approach to personnel selection problem". Applied Soft Computing, 9 (2009), pp. 641–649.

[8] Y. J. Wang, H. S. Lee, 'Generalizing TOPSIS for fuzzy multiple-criteria group decision-making", Computers and Mathematics with Applications, 2007, v.53, no.11, pp.1762–1772.

[9] A. Kelemenis, D. Askounis, "A new TOPSIS-based multi-criteria approach to personnel selections", Expert systems with applications, vol 37, pp. 4999–5008, 2010.

[10] M. H. Mammadova, Z. G. Jabrailova, S. M. Nobari, "Application of TOPSIS method in support of decisions made in staff management issues", in Proc. IV International Conference "Problems of Cybernetics and Informatics" (PCI-2012), Sept.12-14, 2012, Baku, vol. IV, pp.195-198.

[11] C. F. Chien, L. F. Chen, "Data mining to improve personnel selection and enhance human capital: A case study in high-technology industry", Expert system with applications, 2008, vol 34(2), pp 280–290.

[12] P. C. Chen, "A Fuzzy Multiple criteria decision making model in employee recruitment", IJCSNS International Journal of Computer Science and Network Security, 2009, vol. 9, no.7, 113-117.

[13] M. S. Mehrabad, M. F. Brojeny, "The development of on expert system for effective selection and appointment of the jobs applicants in human resource management", Computer and Industrial engineering, 2007, vol 53, pp.306-312.

[14] M. Nussbaum, M. Singer, R. Rosas, M. Castillo, E. Flies, R. Lara and R. Sommers, "Decision support system for conflict

diagnosis in personnel selection," Information & Management, Vol. 36, Issue 1, pp. 55-62, 1999.
[15] O. I. Larichev, M. Sternin, "Decision support system of multi-objective problem of assignment", Information systems and processes, 1998, Vol. 3, pp.10-16.
[16] R. S. Hooper, T. P. Galvin, R. A. Kolmer, J. Liebowitz, "Use of an expert system in a personnel selection process", Expert systems with Applications, 1998, vol 14(4), pp.425-437.
[17] M. H. Mamedova, Z. G. Jabrayilova, S. M. Nobari, "Methodology for solution of personnel employment task for multi-scenario analyze", Problems of information technology, Baku, no. 2, pp. 24–35, 2010.
[18] L.A.Zadeh, "The Concept of a Linguistic variable and its Application to Approximate Reasoning-I", Information Sciences, no. 8, pp. 199–249, 1975.
[19] J. V. Neumann, O. Morgenstern, Theory of games and economic behavior, One of Princeton University press's Notable Centenary Titles, 2007, 776 pp.
[20] P. V. Sevestyanov, L. G. Dimova, M. Kaptur, A. V. Zenkova, "Methodology of multi-criterion hierarchic estimation of quality in uncertainty conditions", Information technologies, Moskau, no.9, pp. 10–13, 2001.
[21] O. I. Larichev, Theory and Methods of Decision Making, Logos, Moscow, 2000, p. 296 (in Russian).
[22] V. D. Nogin, Decision making at muptiple criteria, St. Petersburg, p.103, 2007. (in Russian).
[23] T. L. Saaty, The Analytic Hierarchy Process, Mc. Graw-Hill, 1980, 267p.
[24] Z. G. Jabrayilova, S. N. Nobari, "Processing methods of information about the importance of the criteria in the solution of personnel management problems and contradiction detection", Problems of information technology, Baku, 2011, no 1, pp. 57–66.