CYBERBETICS AND SYSTEMS RESEARCH 2

Proceedings of the Seventh European Meeting on Cybernetics and Systems Research, organized by the Austrian Society for Cybernetics Studies, held at the University of Vienna, Austria, 24-27 April 1984

Edited by

Robert TRAPPL

University of Vienna Austria

Editorial Board

G. Broekstra, W. Buchstaller, C. Carlsson, A. Ghosal, F. de P. Hanika, W. Horn, H. Huebner, G. J. Klir, Y. Kodratoff, G. Majone, H. Maurer, B. Z. Nizetic, G. Pask, P. K. M'Pherson, F. Pichler, W.-D. Rauch, J. Retti, L. M. Ricciardi, W. Wahlster, A. Wierzbicki.



NORTH-HOLLAND AMSTERDAM · NEW YORK · OXFORD All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN: 0 444 86898 4

Publishers:

ELSEVIER SCIENCE PUBLISHERS B.V. P.O. Box 1991 1000 BZ Amsterdam The Netherlands

Sole distributors for the U.S.A. and Canada: ELSEVIER SCIENCE PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC. 52 Vanderbilt Avenue New York, N.Y. 10017 U.S.A.

22/0/

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

European Meeting on Cybernetics and Systems Research (7th: 1984: University of Vienna) Cybernetics and systems research 2.

1. Cybernetics--Congresses. 2. System theory--Congresses. 3. Systems engineering--Congresses. 4. Biomedical engineering--Congresses. I. Trappl, Robert. II. Österreichische Studiengesellschaft for Kybernetik. III. Title. IV. Title: Cybernetics and systems research two.

Q300.E88 1984 001.53 84-4073
ISBN 0-444-86898-4 (U.S.)

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

PREFACE

Opening Address by the Chairman of the Meeting

When I was a boy of 4 or 5 years, I used to play a strange play with my small toy figures: Delegations arrived at a castle, servants bowed, the leader, mostly a duke, bowed, and then they were led to the king in a special walking sequence. Arriving there, the aristrocrats, in a strict hierarchical order, bowed to the duke, until the king and the duke bowed to each other.

What made me perform these rituals? Sure not my upbringing in a poor family. As I see it now: While the world was in turmoil, my father serving at the frontier, my mother and I seeking shelter, often several times a day, during air-raids; in this - not only for a child - unintelligible world, I constructed my own one, with laws I created and with rituals I could understand.

The biennial European Meeting on Cybernetics and Systems Research, a ritual? Convened for the first time in 1972 in Vienna and always - with one exception - held in Vienna. Immediately after the meeting, a small group of scientists and practitioners sitting down to prepare the next meeting: Symposia titles are discussed, scientists are invited to chair symposia, the Federal Ministry of Science and Research is asked to support the meeting financially, and so on, all in all 118 items on my agenda list.

On my shelves I can see the proceedings of all meetings: 2 volumes, bound in white (now slightly yellow) card boards, published by Transcripta Books, London; 11 volumes in different, beautiful colours published by Hemisphere Publishing Company, Washington, D.C.; and 1 volume in green cloth binding, from North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam. The names in them: Some scientists died in the meantime (e.g. Professor Margaret Mead, plenary lecturer in our first meeting, Professor Boulanger, co-chairman of the first meeting), but many scientists acting as speakers or even chairmen through many or even all meetings. And the topics: Most of the symposia about the same topics as in 1972, the only major change being the introduction of an Artificial Intelligence symposium.

I wonder whether these European Meetings have become a ritual, for us, when preparing it, for you, when attending it. Do we use it to protect us from a world in turmoil? Does it reflect the changes in the world during these 12 years? And do the papers we present mirror at least partially the problems mankind is facing?

I have no answer. Please help us to decide how or if at all we shall continue. Thank you.

ROBERT TRAPPL

PATRONS

Dr. Heinz Fischer
Federal Minister of Science and Research

Leopold Gratz

Mayor of the City of Vienna

Magn. Professor Dr. Hans Tuppy Rektor of the University of Vienna

CHAIRMAN

Professor Dr. Robert Trappl
President, Austrian Society for Cybernetics Studies

SPONSORS

Federal Ministry of Science and Research
Municipality of Vienna
Vienna Tourist Board

PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

Professor M. Nowakowska (Poland) Professor B. Banathy (USA) Professor G. Pask (UK) Professor G. Broekstra (Netherlands) Professor M. Peschel (GDR) Professor C. Carlsson (Finland) Professor F. Pichler (Austria) Professor W.W. Gasparski (Poland) Professor Cheng Quian-sheng (China) Professor R. Glanville (UK) Professor W.-D. Rauch (FRG) Professor F. de P. Hanika (UK) Dipl.-Ing. J. Retti (Austria) Dr. W. Horn (Austria) Professor L.M. Ricciardi (Italy) Professor N. Hu (China) Dr. N. Rozsenich (Austria) Professor G.J. Klir (USA) Professor R. Trappl (Austria) Professor Y. Kodratoff (France) Dr. H. Trost (Austria) Professor A. Lee (UK) Acad. Ya. Tsypkin (USSR) Professor H. Maurer (Austria) Professor R. Vallée (France) Professor J.G. Miller (USA) Professor W. Wahlster (FRG) Professor B.K. M'Pherson (UK) Professor A. Wierzbicki (Poland) Professor B.Z. Nizetic (Denmark)

Professor G. de Zeeuw (Netherlands)

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

Professor F. Pichler I. Bodirsky E. Plechl Dipl.-Ing. E. Buchberger Professor W.-D. Rauch Dr. W. Buchstaller Professor F. de P. Hanika Dipl.-Ing. J. Retti U. Stadler Dr. W. Horn Dipl.-Ing. I. Steinacker Professor H. Huebner Professor R. Trappl G. Knittel Dr. H. Trost Dr. O. Ladanyi A. Yodzis P.E. Martin

S. Wiesbauer

LIST OF CONTENTS

| Preface | V |
|--|----|
| GENERAL SYSTEMS METHODOLOGY Chairpersons: G.J. Klir (U.S.A.) G. Broekstra (The Netherlands) | |
| Possibilistic Information Theory G.J. Klir | ,3 |
| Some Notes on Information and Interaction K. Kornwachs and W. von Lucadou | 9 |
| Correctness of the Semiotic Transformation of Information A.O. Arigoni | 5 |
| On Reducibilities Among General Problems P.A.S. Veloso and R.C.B. Martins | 21 |
| A Method to Compare Theories in the Light of General Systems Theory A. Caselles | 27 |
| A New Formalization of the General Systems by Logical and Algebraic Structures G. Resconi | 3 |
| A Hybrid Systems Method: Tests for Hierarchy & Links between Isomorphs L.R. Troncale | 9 |
| An Algebraic Approach to Some General Problems of Model Description P. Csáki | 7 |
| The Systems Approach as a Methodological Attitude. An Empirical Analysis. A. Lewicka-Strzałecka | 3 |
| Chance and the Necessity of the Third Classical Paradigm M.E. Carvallo | 1 |
| Optimization Methods in Multi-Level Systems D.M. Nachane | 9 |
| The Cybernetics of Stressed Systems E. Taschdjian | 7 |
| Emergentism and Mind C.M. Elstob | 3 |
| "Eigen-Elements" for Observing and Interacting Subjects R. Vallée | 9 |
| Valuation and Control N. Belova and K. Belov | 3 |
| Construction of an Expert Therapy Adviser as a Special Case of a General System Protection Design L.J. Kohout, W. Bandler, C. Trayner and J. Anderson | 7 |

SYSTEM AND DECISION THEORY

| Chairpersons: F. Pichler (Austria) A. Wierzbicki (Poland) |
|---|
| Parameterizations in Single Input-Output Adaptive Control Systems to Avoid Delays in the Input Generation M. de la Sen |
| A System Theory Based Simulation Language W. Delaney, F. Esposito and E. Vaccari |
| On the Reachability Problem for Some Dynamical Systems J. Stokłosa |
| Introduction to Linear p-Adic Invariant Systems C. Moraga |
| On the Theory of Bilinear Shift Registers D. Gollmann |
| The Generalized Hadamard Transforms and Linear Filters K.O. Egiazarian |
| Multi-Dimensional FFT Computation N.C. Hu |
| The Inverse Problem of Karhunen-Loeve A.K. Matevosyan |
| Distortion Measures in Image Data Compression and Transmission Systems A.V. Melkumian |
| Modularization and Abstraction; a Discussion on the Basis of Sequential Systems H. Gruber |
| General Systems Algorithms for Mathematical Systems Theory F. Pichler |
| Practical Aspects of Alternatives Evaluating and Decision Making Under Uncertainty and Multiple Objectives E.R. Viliums and L.Ya. Sukur |
| Evidence for Strategic Decisions W.L. Gage |
| The Multicriteria Decision Making with Vector Fuzzy Preference Relation V.E. Zhukovin |
| Non-Repetitive Decision Making under Risk S. Benedikt |
| An Interactive Goal Attainment Method for Multiobjective Nonconvex Problems M. Sakawa and H. Yano |
| Fuzzy Extension of Multiattribute Utility Analysis for Collective Choice F. Seo and M. Sakawa |
| Toward Alternative Methods of Systems Analysis: The Case of Qualitative Knowing M.L. Estep |
| Runoff Simulation with a Random Walk Model I.F. Kontur and S.Z. Ambrus |
| An Open System Composed of Non-Active Monotonous Parts in Passive Surroundings R. Bončina and M. Ribarič |

ix

| CYBERNETICS IN BIOLOGY AND MEDICINE Chairperson: L.M. Ricciardi (Italy) | |
|---|-----------|
| Kinetic Theory of Neural Systems: An Attempt Towards a Simulation of Cerebellar Cortex Activity F. Ventriglia | :3 |
| System-Theoretical Approach to the Neural Organization: Feed-Forward Control of the Ontogenetic Development P. Érdi | 29 |
| Periodic and Non-Periodic Motions in Different Classes of Formal Neuronal Networks and Chaotic Spike Generators E. Lábos | 37 |
| Chaotic Activity in Neural Systems A.V. Holden and M.A. Muhamad | |
| On the Representation of Control in Systems in General, and in Neural Networks in Particular G.J. Dalenoort | 51 |
| Information Transmission in Nerves A.M. Andrew | 57 |
| Short-Term Memory as a Metastable State. I. Master Equation Approach V.I. Kryukov | 51 |
| Short-Term Memory as a Metastable State. II. Simulation Model Y.I. Kovalenko, R.M. Borisyuk, G.N. Borisyuk, A.B. Kirillov and V.I. Kryukov | 57 |
| On an Algorithm of Spectral Analysis A. Arakelian and S. Agaian | 73 |
| Nonparametric Mathematical Model for Individual Human Growth Curve A.A. Georgiev | 77 |
| On a Class of Discrete Models for Regulated Growth with Intrinsic Lower Bounds A.G. Nobile, L.M. Ricciardi and L. Sacerdote | 31 |
| Identification of the Temperature Masking of the Circadian System of Euglena Gracilis R. Joerres, W. Martin ad K. Brinkmann | 93 |
| Selective Polymorphism of the Erythrocyte Acid Phosphate Locus in Humans F. Gloria-Bottini, E. Bottini, L.R. Ginzburg and R.E. Rowe | 99 |
| Simulation and Analysis of Pathological Blood Pressure Behaviour after Treadmill Test in Patients with Coarctation of the Aorta F. Breitenecker and J. Kaliman | 05 |
| A Method for Performance Assessment of Medical Radioisotope Equipment T. Kerin, A. Slavtchev, N. Nedeltchev and T. Kjurktchiev | |
| CYBERNETICS IN ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT Chairpersons: F. de P. Hanika (UK) H. Huebner (Austria) P.K. M'Pherson (UK) | |
| Algorithmic Model Systems and Innovation Strategies for Automation of Industrial Production and Information Systems HG. Lauenroth | 19 |
| Evolutionary Projects: Dynamic Optimization of Delivery Step Structure L. Krzanik | |

| Sequencing Problem with Resource Constraints J. Grabowski and A. Janiak | 29 |
|--|----|
| A Cybernetic Approach to the Application of Information Technology D.P. Best | 35 |
| Method "WHOLISTIC CREATIVITY OF MANY (WCM)" Applied to Collect and Organize Associates' Ideas about New Products and Programs M. Mulej and V. Pirc | 41 |
| Computer Integrated Manufacturing (CIM) in Irish Industry F.S. Drechsler and M.J. Zamzeer | 49 |
| Political Determinants of Information System Configuration R.G. Lucas and R.C. Hardin | 53 |
| Necessities as the Basis of the Societal Self-Organization K. Balkus | 59 |
| Systems and Management — The Political Dimension M. Blunden | 67 |
| Review and Re-Design of an Advanced Systems Analysis Course O.J. Hanson | |
| A System for Training of EDP-Specialists for the National Economy A. Athanassov and E. Bekjarov | |
| The Application of Cybernetic Principles for the Training of Operator Crews of Nuclear Power Plants L. Janssens, L. Hoebeke and H. Michiels | |
| Modelling Economic Movements Using Published International Statistics O.G. Ladanyi | |
| Si duo dicunt idem non est idem: Or on Design Methodology as Seen from neither English nor German Speaking Country W.W. Gasparski | |
| Management: The Case of the Disappearing Model J.A. Beckett | |
| MAMA: Management by Matching. A Consistency Model for Organizational Assessment and Change G. Broekstra4 | |
| ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL SYSTEMS Chairperson: G. Majone (Italy) | |
| Socio-Economic Consequences of the Volterra Approach for Nonlinear Systems M. Peschel and F. Breitenecker | 23 |
| Entropic Processes and Economic Systems A. Honkasalo | |
| An Evolutionary Analysis of World Energy Consumption and World Population U. Kriegel, W. Mende and M. Grauer | 35 |
| Systemanalytical Approaches to Long Economic Waves J. Millendorfer | |
| Control Systems and Quantitative Economic Policy M.J. Manohar Rao4 | |
| A System-Theoretic Analysis of a Simple Macroeconomic Model | 57 |

| Normative Aspects of Some Stabilizing Social Systems T. Airaksinen |
|---|
| Thoughts on a Cybernetic View of Social Organization M.S. Wenger |
| Markets as Self-Policing Quality Enforcement Systems M.J. Holler |
| Relevance of Cybernetics in the Study of Developing Countries A. Ghosal |
| Pluralistic Modelling for Development Planning G. Tonella |
| HEALTH CARE SYSTEMS Chairpersons: W. Buchstaller (Austria) B.Z. Nizetic (Denmark) |
| Some Issues in the Cybernetics of Disease Control N.T.J. Bailey |
| Linking System Research and Delivery Systems. The Example of Health Care W. Kinston |
| Constructs from General Systems Theory Related to a Health History P. Trussell |
| Patient Registers on Microcomputers P. Keréfky, I. Ratkó and M. Ruda |
| FUZZY SETS - Meeting of the EURO Working Group Chairperson: C. Carlsson (Finland) |
| Law of Large Numbers and Central Limit Theorem for Fuzzy Random Variables E.P. Klement, M.L. Puri and D.A. Ralescu |
| A Contribution to the Construction of the Gamma-Operator E. Czogala and P. Zysno |
| M-Fuzzy Numbers and Random Variables Z. Wang |
| Intuitionistic L-Fuzzy Sets K. Atanassov and S. Stoeva |
| Information Energy of a Fuzzy Event and a Partition of Fuzzy Events L. Pardo |
| Construction of Fuzzy Relational Models W. Pedrycz |
| Some Considerations on Systems Organization for Fuzzy Information Processing L.H. Sultan |
| Decomposition of Linguistic Rules in the Design of a Multi-Dimensional Fuzzy Control Algorithm Ł. Walichiewicz |
| Application of Fuzzy Decision Making and Fuzzy Linear Programming in Prediction and Planning of Animal Husbandry System in Farming Region Z. Wang and Y. Dang |
| A New Approach to the Transinformation of Random Experiments Involving Fuzzy Observations G. Jumarie |

| Changes of Regional Passenger-Transport Demands by Society-Controlled Activities — A Fuzzy Simulation Approach M. Gericke and B. Straube |
|--|
| The Four Modes of Inference in Fuzzy Expert Systems W. Bandler and L.J. Kohout |
| COMMUNICATIONS AND COMPUTERS Chairpersons: H. Maurer (Austria) WD. Rauch (FRG) |
| The Austrian Approach to Videotex H. Maurer |
| Teleconferencing via Videotex W.J. Jaburek |
| Systematic Methodologies for the Design of Small Database Systems N. Revell |
| Performance Simulation of an Optical Bus Local Area Network K.H. Kellermayr |
| On Evaluating of Logical Expressions in Programming Languages I. Ratkó |
| A Systems Study of the Design of a User Interface A.M.C. Leeming |
| Naturalized System Development I.D. Cole |
| Functional versus Imperative Programming — Complement or Contradiction? H. Kerner and R. Pitrik |
| An Analysis of Computer Software and Its Importance to the Accounting Information System A. Rushinek and S.F. Rushinek |
| HUMANITY, ARCHITECTURE, AND CONCEPTUALISATION Chairperson: G. Pask (UK) |
| The Architecture of Knowledge and Knowledge of Architecture G. Pask |
| Conversation Theory and Cognitive Coherence Theories L. Johnson and R.T. Hartley |
| Design of Expert Systems from the Perspective of Conversation Theory Methodology E.T. Keravnou and L. Johnson |
| Distinguished and Exact Lies R. Glanville |
| An Ashby Hierarchy for Human Action J.L. England and W.K. Warner |
| A Cybernetic Model of Cognitive Processes S. Bogner |
| Cybernetic Aesthetics: Key Questions in the Design of Mutual Control in Education G.M. Boyd |
| Epistemological Indicators of Scientific Identity A. Cornelis |

List of Contents

| Systemic Transition from Ideological Learning to Scientific Learning R. Pla López | i |
|--|----|
| An Exploration of Shared Knowledge about Procedures Used in Fault Diagnosis Tasks | |
| P.M. Smith | 7 |
| ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE Chairpersons: W. Horn (Austria) Y. Kodratoff (France) W. Wahlster (FRG) | |
| Non-Canonical Simplification Y. Kodratoff and E. Costa | 5 |
| Program Synthesis and Constructive Proofs Obtained by Beth's Tableaux M. Franova | 5 |
| A Cybernetic Model of Scientific Research and Cognition B. Petkoff | 1 |
| A Rule-Based Approach to Natural Language Text Representation and Comprehension D. Fum, G. Guida and C. Tasso | 7 |
| From Natural Language to a Canonical Representation of the Corresponding Semantic Relationships M. Faribault, J. Léon, V. Meissonnier, D. Memmi and G.P. Zarri | 3 |
| The Role of System Modelling in Natural Language Processing E. Vaccari and W. Delaney | |
| Focussing as a Method for Disambiguation and Anaphora Resolution I. Steinacker and H. Trost | 7 |
| Representing Belief Models in Semantic Networks A. Kobsa and H. Trost | 3 |
| On Generation of Anaphora and Gapping in German H. Horacek and E. Buchberger | 9 |
| On Spotting Three-Dimensional Shape: Rigid Movement, Bending and Stretching by Eye: Implications for Robot Vision J.J. Koenderink and A.J. van Doorn | 7 |
| A Representation of Pattern Classification Teaching S. Božinovski | |
| Scenarios as a Tool for Dynamic Scene Representation J. Malec | |
| Propagation: Another Way for Matching Patterns in KBS M.O. Cordier and M.C. Rousset | 7 |
| An Interpreter of Fuzzy Production Rules L. Lesmo, L. Saitta and P. Torasso | 3 |
| A Relational Scheme for the Abstract Specification of Production System Programs Used in Expert Systems L. Bottaci | 9 |
| Explanation Facilities for Diagnosis Systems J.G. Ganascia | 15 |
| A Circuit Analysis Program that Explains its Reasoning M. Gams and I. Bratko | 1 |

List of Contents

xiv

| MOSES: A Schema-Based Knowledge Representation for Modelling and Simulation of Dynamical Systems J. Retti | 817 |
|---|-----|
| CODEX: Prototypes Driven Backward and Forward Chaining Computer-Based Diagnostic Expert System F. Gyárfas and M. Popper | 821 |
| A Frame-Based Real-Time Graphic Interaction System W. Horn, R. Trappl, D. Ulrich and G. Chroust | 825 |
| Impacts of Artificial Intelligence R. Trappl | 831 |
| Author Index | 839 |

GENERAL SYSTEMS METHODOLOGY

Chairpersons:
G. J. Klir (U.S.A)
G. Broekstra (The Netherlands)

1330 ac

POSSIBILISTIC INFORMATION THEORY

George J. Klir

Department of Systems Science
Thomas J. Watson School of Engineering, Applied Science, and Technology
State University of New York at Binghamton
Binghamton, New York 13901 U.S.A.

It is argued that a new measure of information, defined within the framework of possibility theory, is a natural generalization of the Hartley information. In addition, this measure also possesses possibilistic counterparts of all properties of the Shannon information. It is envisioned that a theory based on the possibilistic information, when properly developed, will be an important tool in dealing with systems which involve uncertainty that is not statistical in nature.

It is well known that the amount of information obtained by observing the actual outcome of an experiment involving a finite set of alternative outcomes (events, states, etc.), say set X, can be measured by the uncertainty associated with the prospective outcome before the experiment [11,27,44]. A measure of uncertainty, when adopted as a measure of information, does not include semantic and pragmatic aspects of information. As such, it is not adequate for dealing with information in human communication [17]. However, for dealing with structural (syntactic) aspects of systems, such a measure is not only adequate but even desirable [3-8,10,31]. In fact, it can be directly used for measuring the degree of constraint among variables of interest, representing thus a powerful tool for dealing with systems problems such as systems modelling, analysis, or design [12-15,19-21,25,39].

The first measure of information was derived by Hartley in 1928 [32]. Requiring that

- (i) the amount of information be proportional to the number of possible outcomes under consideration, and
- (ii) whenever the numbers of selections from two sets of possible outcomes are such that the number of possible sequences of outcomes is the same for both of them, then the amount of information be also the same for both,

Hartley showed that the amount of information $I\left(n\right)$ necessary to characterize an outcome of a finite set with n outcomes must have the form

$$I(n) = K \log_h n, \tag{1}$$

where K>0 and b>1 are arbitrary constants, which determine the size of the unit of information. Usually, the information is measured in bits and, then,

$$I(n) = \log_2 n.$$
 (2)

The measure I(n), referred to as the <u>Hartley information</u>, was further studied by Renyi [41]. He proved that (1) is the only class of functions that satisfy the following two requirements (axioms):

(I1)
$$I(n \times m) = I(n) + I(m)$$
 for $n, m=1,2,...$;
(I2) $I(n) \le I(n+1)$.

According to requirement (II) (additivity), if a set with n×m outcomes can be partitioned into n subsets, each with m outcomes, then we should be able to proceed in two steps to characterize a particular outcome of the full set. First, we determine that subset to which the outcome in question belongs; the required amount of information is l(n). Next we characterize the outcome within the determined subset; the required amount of information is now l(m). The two amounts of information completely characterize the outcome of concern.

According to requirement (I2) ($\underline{\text{mono-tonicity}}$), the larger the set, the more information it represents.

When an appropriate <u>normalization</u> requirement

$$(13) I(2) = 1$$

is added to the requirement (II) and (I2), the unique function (2) is implied.

In 1948, an alternative measure of information based on uncertainty was formulated by Shannon in terms of probability theory [42]. The measure, usually referred to as Shannon information (or Shannon entropy), is expressed by the function

$$H(f(x)|x \in X) = -\sum_{x \in X} f(x) \log_2 f(x), \qquad (3)$$

where f(x) denotes probabilities of outcomes x in a finite set X. It is well known that (3) is the only function that satisfies the following requirements, generally accepted as

necessary for every meaningful measure of uncertainty (or information) defined within the framework of probability theory (except for the normalization requirement by which the unit of information is defined):

- (H1) symmetry--uncertainty is invariant with respect to permutations of probabilities;
- (H2) expansibility--when outcomes with zero probabilities are added to the considered set of outcomes, the uncertainty does not change;
- (H3) subadditivity--the uncertainty of a joint probability distribution is not greater than the sum of the uncertainties of the corresponding marginal probability distributions;
- (H4) additivity--for probability distributions of any two independent sets of outcomes, the uncertainty of the joint probability distribution is equal to the sum of the uncertainties of the individual probability distributions;
- (H5) continuity--uncertainty is a continuous function in all its arguments.
- (H6) normalization--H(0.5,0.5) = 1.

Shannon measure of information was considered for many years as the only feasible base for developing information theory. Although it was originally introduced for the purpose of analyzing and designing telecommunication systems, it became later obvious that its significance and applicability reaches far byyond this original purpose. Its important role in measurement, prediction, retrodiction, deduction, induction, pattern recognition, and other scientific procedures was recognized by Brillouin [11], Watanabe [45], Jaynes [36,37], and others [9,18,30,36,40]; its role as a fundamental and general tool for investigating and designing systems of a universal nature was first demonstrated by Ashby [3-7] and later by Conant [19-23] as well as others [12-15,25,39].

Notwithstanding the significance and success of the current information theory based on the Shannon entropy, it is becoming increasingly clear that the probabilistic framework within which the theory is developed is ill-suited for many applications that have come to fore in recent years. In particular, it is ill-suited for dealing with problems that were characterized by Warren Weaver as problems of organized complexity [46]. As relationships in society become more complex, due to advances in modern technology, the significance of this range of problems increases. At the same time, technology provides us with a new tool--the computer--by which we can meaningfully enter into this neglected area. The reason why

traditional methods are inadequate to handle this level of complexity in systems is that these systems are rich in factors that cannot easily be justified as negligible, but, on the other hand, they are not sufficiently complex and random to yield meaningful statistical averages. Thus, they are not susceptible to either of the two simplification strategies, exemplified by Newtonian Mechanics and Statistical Mechanics, invented by science.

When the complexity of an organized system increases, the ability to make precise and yet relevant statements about its behavior diminishes. One way of dealing with complex systems that possess the characteristics of organized complexity, perhaps the most significant one, is to allow imprecision in describing properly aggregated data. Here, the imprecision is not of a statistical nature, but rather of a more general modality, even though it may include imprecise statistical descriptions as well. The mathematical apparatus for this new modality, which is recognized under the name "theory of fuzzy sets," has been under development since the mid-1960's [24,27]. For reasons mentioned previously in the context of probability theory, it is desirable to develop an adequate information theory within this new framework. Although the amount of information should still be measured by the amount of uncertainty associated with a given situation, the uncertainty is now of a different nature within the new framework of fuzzy set theory.

One significant area of fuzzy set theory is a theory of possibility. Its functions were formulated by Zadeh in 1978 [48]. He introduced the concept of a possibility distribution and possibility measure, the latter being a special case of the concept of fuzzy measure proposed by Sugeno [43].

A possibility measure defined on a finite set X is a function

 $\pi: P(X) \rightarrow [0,1]$

that is uniquely determined by a possibility distribution function

f: X+[0,1]

via the formula

 $\pi(A) = \max_{x \in A} f(x),$

where $A \subseteq X$. A possibility distribution

 $f = (f(x) | x \in X)$

is called a normalized possibility distribution if and only $\overline{\mathbf{if}}$

 $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = 1.$

To develop an alternative information theory, based on possibility theory rather than probability theory, a new conception of information must be used; it may conveniently be referred to as possibilistic information. In analogy with its probabilistic counterpart, possibilistic information should be defined in terms of the underlying notion of possibilistic uncertainty.

A measure of uncertainty for possibility theory was discovered jointly by Higashi and Klir in 1982; its derivation and basic properties are described in a recent paper [33]. In order to define this measure, the following two concepts for possibility distributions must be first introduced:

1. For each possibility distribution

$$f = (f(x) | x \in X)$$

defined on a finite set X and for each $\ell \in [0,1]$, let

c:
$$F_x \times [0,1] \rightarrow P(X)$$
,

where $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}}$ denotes the set of all possibility distributions on X and let \mathbf{c} be a function such that

$$c(f,\ell) = \{x \in X \mid f(x) \geq \ell\}.$$

This function is called an $\underline{\ell}$ -cut function and the set is called an $\underline{\ell}$ -cut of \underline{f} .

2. Let $\underline{f} = (f(x)|x \in X)$ be a possibility distribution on X. Then,

$$L_{\underline{f}} = \{\ell \mid (gx \in X) (f(x) = \ell \text{ or } \ell = 0)\}$$

is called a <u>level set</u> of f. Let

$$L_{\underline{f}} = \{\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_r\}$$

denote the level of \underline{f} , $\ell_1 = 0$, $r = \{\ell_{\underline{f}}\}$, and is implies $\ell_i < \ell_i$. For convenience, $\overline{1}$ et

$$\frac{\ell_{\underline{f}} = \max_{x \in X} f(x)}{x \in X}.$$

Clearly,
$$\ell_{\underline{f}} = \ell_{\underline{r}} \epsilon L_{\underline{f}}$$
.

The measure of possibilistic uncertainty (and information), referred to as the <u>U-un-certainty</u>, is a function

$$U: F \rightarrow [0, \infty],$$

where F is the set of all possibility distributions defined on finite sets except the distributions $(0,0,\ldots,0)$, such that

$$U(\underline{\mathbf{f}}) = \frac{1}{\ell_{\underline{\mathbf{f}}}} \sum_{k=1}^{r-1} (\ell_{k+1} - \ell_k) \log_2 |c(\mathbf{f}, \ell_{k+1})|, (1)$$

or, using a different notation,

$$U(\underline{\mathbf{f}}) = \frac{1}{\ell_{\mathbf{f}}} \int_{0}^{\ell_{\mathbf{f}}} \log_{2} |c(\underline{\mathbf{f}}, \ell)| d\ell.$$
 (2)

The distribution (0,0,...,0) is excluded since it is not meaningful to consider a set of alternatives none of which is possible.

The U-uncertainty, in agreement with the Shannon entropy, possesses the possibilistic counterparts of all the properties required for a measure of uncertainty: symmetry, expansibility, subadditivity, additivity, continuity, and normalization. The proof for this can be found in the mentioned paper [33]. In addition, U-uncertainty has an important property of monotonicity: if two possibility distributions $\underline{f_1}$ and $\underline{f_2}$ defined on the same set X are such that $\underline{f_1} \leq \underline{f_2}$ (i.e., $\underline{f_1}(x) \leq \underline{f_2}(x)$ for all $x \in X$) and

$$\max_{x \in X} f_1(x) = \max_{x \in X} f_2(x),$$

then $U(\underline{\mathbf{f}}_1) \leq U(\underline{\mathbf{f}}_2)$.

It is significant that the possibilistic information based on the U-uncertainty is a natural generalization of the Hartley information. This is not true for the Shannon information, which does not satisfy the monotonicity of the Hartley information.

The U-uncertainty can be viewed as the mean of uncertainties for all L-cuts associated with the respective level set (each expressed by the Hartley measure), weighted by differences in the levels. It is obvious that formula (1) can be rewritten as

$$\mathfrak{V}(\mathbf{f}) = \frac{1}{k_{\mathbf{r}}} [\ell_{\mathbf{r}} \log_2 | c(\mathbf{f}, \ell_{\mathbf{r}}) |
+ \sum_{k=1}^{\mathbf{r}-1} \ell_{\mathbf{r}-k} \log_2 \frac{|c(\mathbf{f}, \ell_{\mathbf{r}-k})|}{|c(\mathbf{f}, \ell_{\mathbf{r}-k+1})|}$$
(3)

The first term in (3) represents the Hartley information associated with the set of outcomes that have the highest possibility degree $\ell_r = \ell_f (\ell_r = 1)$ if the possibility distribution involved is normalized); each of the remaining terms represents the Hartley information associated with the set of outcomes whose possibility degree is $\ell_{r-k}(k=1,2,\ldots,r-1)$, weighted by the ratio of ℓ_{r-k} to ℓ_r (or by the value ℓ_{r-k} in the normalized case).

To reconcile the Hartley information (which is not continuous) with the Shannon information (which is not monotonic), the former has frequently been given one of two probabilistic interpretations. In one, it is viewed as a special case of the Shannon