

**A FRAMEWORK OF SUBJECTIVE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION USING
FUZZY TECHNIQUE**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Centre For Graduate Studies in Fulfillment of the
requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Universiti Malaysia Utara**

By

Mahmod Othman

© Mahmod Othman, 2005. All rights reserved.



Pusat Pengajian Siswazah

(Centre for Graduate Studies)

Jabatan Hal Ehwal Akademik
(Department of Academic Affairs)
Universiti Utara Malaysia

PERAKUAN KERJA TESIS / DISERTASI

(Certification of thesis / dissertation)

Saya, yang bertandatangan, memperakukan bahawa
(I, the undersigned, certify that)

MAHMUD OTHMAN

calon untuk Ijazah
(candidate for the degree of)

DOKTOR FALSAFAH (Ph.D.)

telah mengemukakan tesis / disertasi yang bertajuk
(has presented his/her thesis / dissertation of the following title)

**"A FRAMEWORK OF SUBJECTIVE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
USING FUZZY TECHNIQUE"**

seperti yang tercatat di muka surat tajuk dan kulit tesis / disertasi
(as it appears on the title page and front cover of thesis / dissertation)

bahawa kertas projek tersebut boleh diterima dari segi bentuk serta kandungan dan meliputi bidang ilmu dengan memuaskan, sebagaimana yang ditunjukkan oleh calon dalam ujian lisan yang diadakan pada : **18 JULAI 2005**
that the project paper acceptable in the form and content and a satisfactory knowledge of the field is covered by the thesis, was demonstrated by the candidate through an oral examination held on : 18 JULY 2005

Pengerusi Viva
(Chairman for Viva)

: **Prof. Madya Dr. Mohd. Zaini Abdul Karim**

Tandatangan
(Signature)

Penilai Luar
(External Assessor)

: **Prof. Madya Dr. Siti Mariyam Hj. Shamsuddin**

Tandatangan
(Signature)

Penilai Dalaman
(Internal Assessor)

: **Prof. Madya Dr. Norita Md Norwawi**

Tandatangan
(Signature)

Penyelia Utama
(Principal Supervisor)

: **Prof. Dr. Hajah Ku Ruhana Ku Mahamud**

Tandatangan
(Signature)

Penyelia Kedua
(Second Supervisor)

: **Dr. Azuraliza Abu Bakar**

Tandatangan
(Signature)

Tarikh:
(Date)

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of doctor of philosophy in the Centre of Graduate Studies, Universiti Utara Malaysia, I agree that the University Library may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by my supervisor(s) or, in their absence, by the Director of the Centre of Graduate Studies. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to Universiti Utara Malaysia for any scholarly use which may be made of any material from my thesis.

Requests for permission to copy or to make other use of materials in this thesis, in whole or in part, should be addressed to:

**Director
The Centre of Graduate Studies
UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA
06010 UUM Sintok
Kedah Darul Aman**

ABSTRACT

This research proposes the framework of subjective performance evaluation using fuzzy technique for ranking the attributes of different types of datasets under a multi-criteria environment. Some previous studies on fuzzy techniques have been attempted in assessment and evaluation methods. The techniques such as fuzzy similarity function, fuzzy synthetic decision and satisfaction function have been adopted in these fuzzy evaluation methods. However, research that discover a scaling measurement which can express the subjectivity element and integrate the organisation's objectives and goals into the evaluation processes by utilising the fuzzy rule in the subjective evaluation method seem limited. Hence, this framework uses the application of fuzzy sets, and approximate reasoning to determine the performance evaluation of various characteristics in decision-making. The framework based upon fuzzy sets has initiated the idea of membership set score valued evaluation of each criterion alternative enables to include requirements which are incomplete and imprecise. The approximate reasoning of the method allows decision maker to make the best choice in accordance of human thinking and reasoning processes. The method introduces an approach of normalising data using similarity function which dampens the extreme value that exists in the data. The framework is suitable for dealing with evaluations in situations that involve subjectivity, vagueness and imprecise information, such as the grading system of evaluation which involves many hedges like “*good*”, “*bad*” and “*satisfactory*”.

The framework is based on fuzzy multi-criteria decision-making that consists of fuzzy rules. The rules developed by the previous methods are unsuitable to be used in the subjective evaluation framework because of differences in certain characteristics. Moreover most methods need extensive learning process in developing the rules. The use of fuzzy rules, which were extracted directly from input data in making evaluation, contributes a better decision in selecting the best choice and less dependent to the domain of expert.

The aim of utilising the multi-criteria combination rule is to capture the main criteria that exist in the alternatives. The fuzzy rules embedded in the framework of subjective evaluation method showed advantages in generalising the evaluation of the performance achievement, where the evaluation process can be conducted consistently in producing good evaluation results with the use of the membership set score.

Ten data sets from previous studies were used to validate the subjective evaluation framework. The properties of fuzzy rules generated in terms of total number of rules, size and length for the best ranking or classification were recorded. The accuracy of the rules generated from the proposed framework was further analysed through the maximum length, minimum length and the rule definition. The rules were used in the subjective evaluation algorithm to evaluate the alternative performance. The accuracy of ranking was compared to several subjective

evaluation methods such as fuzzy performance score evaluation and fuzzy multi-criteria evaluation.

The normalisation operation process which uses the fuzzy similarity reduces the irregular data and produces highly reliable data. The reliability of the data indicates the stability and consistency with which the proposed method generates fuzzy rules and evaluating performance quality or the alternatives. Hence, the suggested framework is able to produce good and precise ranking results in fuzzy environments.

The results from the numerical examples are comparable to other fuzzy evaluation methods, even with the use of small rule size.

ABSTRAK

Tesis ini memperkenalkan kerangkakerja bagi penilaian pencapaian subjektif menggunakan teknik kabur untuk menyusun ciri-ciri tertentu yang terdapat pada set data yang berbeza di bawah situasi kriteria pelbagai. Terdapat beberapa kajian lampau mengaplikasikan teknik kabur di dalam kaedah pengukuran dan penilaian. Teknik seperti fungsi kesamaan kabur, keputusan buatan kabur dan fungsi kepuasan telah digunakan di dalam keadah penilaian kabur. Namun, kajian lampau yang berjaya menghasilkan skala pengukuran yang boleh menghuraikan unsur subjektif dan mengintegrasikan matlamat dan objektif organisasi sangat terhad. Oleh yang demikian, kerangkakerja ini menggunakan teknik set kabur dan penaakulan kabur bagi menentukan susunatur penilaian pencapaian untuk sifat tertentu di dalam membuat keputusan. Kerangkakerja berdasarkan set kabur telah mencetus idea skor set keahlian untuk penilaian setiap alternatif kriteria bagi membolehkan matlumat yang tidak lengkap dan tepat diambilkira. Pendekatan penaakulan kabur di dalam kerangkakerja penilaian subjektif membantu pembuat keputusan membuat pilihan yang terbaik sama seperti penaakulan dan pemikiran manusia. Konsep pernormalan data diperkenalkan bagi menghadkan kewujudan nilai ekstrem di dalam set data. Kerangkakerja kajian adalah bersesuaian dengan penilaian yang melibatkan unsur subjektiviti, kabur dan ketidakpastian maklumat seperti penilaian sistem permarkahan yang melibatkan banyak *hedges* seperti “*good*”, “*bad*” dan “*satisfactory*”.

Kerangkakerja yang dicadangkan ini adalah berdasarkan kepada keputusan kriteria pelbagai kabur yang turut mempunyai petua kabur. Petua yang dibangunkan oleh kaedah lampau adalah tidak sesuai digunakan di dalam kerangka penilaian subjektif ini disebabkan oleh perbezaan di dalam beberapa kriteria. Tambahan pula kebanyakan kaedah itu memerlukan proses latihan yang berulang-ulang untuk membentuk petua. Penggunaan petua kabur yang dijana dari data input di dalam penilaian menyumbang kepada keputusan yang lebih baik dalam membuat pilihan dan mengurangkan kebergantungan terhadap pandangan pakar.

Tujuan petua kombinasi kriteria pelbagai adalah untuk mengenalpasti kriteria penting yang wujud di dalam alternatif. Petua kabur yang digunakan dalam kaedah penilaian subjektif telah menunjukkan keberkesanan di dalam mengitlak penilaian prestasi pencapaian iaitu proses penilaian boleh dijalankan secara konsisten dengan penggunaan darjah skor set keahlian.

Sepuluh set data daripada kajian lampau digunakan untuk mengesahkan kerangkakerja penilaian subjektif. Jumlah bilangan, saiz dan panjang petua kabur yang dijanakan untuk susunatur atau pengkelasan terbaik dicatatkan. Ketepatan petua yang dijanakan dari kaedah ini selanjutnya dianalisa melalui panjang maksima, panjang minima dan definisi petua. Petua kabur digunakan dalam kerangkakerja penilaian subjektif untuk menilai pencapaian prestasi alternatif. Ketepatan susunatur dibandingkan dengan beberapa kaedah penilaian kabur lain seperti penilaian skor pencapaian kabur dan penilaian kabur kriteria pelbagai.

Proses operasi pernormalan yang menggunakan fungsi kesamaan didapati dapat mengurangkan ketidaktentuan data dan boleh menghasilkan data yang lebih baik dengan tahap kebolehpercayaan yang tinggi. Kebolehpercayaan data menunjukkan kestabilan dan konsisten kerangkakerja dalam menjana petua dan menilai kualiti pencapaian atau alternatif. Oleh yang demikian kerangkakerja berupaya menghasilkan keputusan penilaian yang tepat, dan baik di dalam keadaan kabur.

Dapatan daripada contoh berangka menunjukkan keputusan perbandingan susunatur pencapaian yang setanding dengan kaedah penilaian kabur lain walaupun mengguna petua yang bersaiz kecil.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ

In the name of Allah, the Most Merciful and Most Compassionate. Praise to Allah s.w.t. for granted me strength, courage, patience and inspirations in completing this work.

My deepest appreciation and gratitude to my supervisors, Prof. Dr. Hajjah Ku Ruhana Ku Mahamud and Dr. Azuraliza Abu Bakar for their virtuous guidance, sharing their intellectual experiences, and giving their motivation and support that lead the way in so many aspects of the research work. Without their constant support and guidance, this thesis would never have been completed.

I am grateful to the Universiti Teknologi MARA for the scholarship, study leave and allowances that enabled me to pursue this doctoral programme.

I would like to thank En. Mohd Asri Mohd. Noor (UiTM, Arau) who patiently read this thesis.

Special appreciation to my mother, Amnah bt. Shahrudin; my wife Norlidah Mohd Yasin; my daughters Intan Filzah Mahmod, Nurul Nadiah Mahmod, Siti Azhani Mahmod; my sons Fakhrul Ariffin Mahmod and Shahrul A'izzat Mahmod for their loves and prayers in making this dream came true. I LOVE YOU...

Mahmod Othman
AUGUST 2005

TABLE OF CONTENT

	Page
PERMISSION TO USE	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ABSTRAK	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ix
TABLE OF CONTENT	x
LIST OF TABLES	xv
LIST OF FIGURE	xix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xx
CHAPTER 1	
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Problem Statement	5
1.2 Objective of the Research	8
1.3 Significance of the Research	9
1.4 Scope, Assumption and Limitation of the Research	11
1.5 Research Methodology	12
1.6 Organisation of the Thesis	13
1.7 Summary	16
CHAPTER 2	
LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Introduction	17
2.2 Subjective Evaluation	18
2.2.1 Non-Fuzzy Evaluation	19
2.2.2 Fuzzy Evaluation	24
2.2.2.1 Defense	32

2.2.2.2	Human Resource	34
2.2.2.3	Personnel Performance Evaluation	36
2.2.2.4	Others	38
2.3	Fuzzy Rule Generation	42
2.3.1	Generating Fuzzy Rules From Numerical Data	44
2.3.2	Adaptive Fuzzy Inference System	47
2.3.3	Induction of Fuzzy Rules Using Membership Functions	51
2.3.4	Other Fuzzy Rule Generation Methods	54
2.4	Summary	58

CHAPTER 3

FRAMEWORK OF A NEW SUBJECTIVE EVALUATION METHOD

3.1	Introduction	60
3.2	Subjective Evaluation	61
3.3	Transformation Method	69
3.4	Numerical Example	74
3.4.1	Frequency Data	74
3.4.2	Trapezoidal Fuzzy Number	77
3.4.3	Triangular Fuzzy Number	81
3.4.4	Linguistic Data	83
3.5	Rule Generation	87
3.6	Summary	93

CHAPTER 4

THE PROPOSED SUBJECTIVE EVALUATION METHOD

4.1	Introduction	94
4.2	Subjective Evaluation Algorithm	95
4.3	Numerical Example	106
4.4	Summary	122

CHAPTER 5

EXPERIMENT AND OBSERVATION

5.1	Introduction	123
5.2	Experiment Design	124
5.3	The Case Studies	128
5.3.1	Frequency Data	129
5.3.2	Trapezoidal Fuzzy Number	132
5.3.3	Triangular Fuzzy Number	135
5.3.3.1	Passenger Services of Asia-Pacific International Airports	135
5.3.3.2	Airline Safety Index	138
5.3.3.3	Weapon System	142
5.3.4	Linguistic Data	145
5.3.4.1	Privatization of Taiwan Public Bus Operation	146
5.3.4.2	Spent Fuel Storage Options	149
5.3.5	Measurement Data	152

5.3.5.1	<i>IRIS</i> Data	153
5.3.5.2	RICE Data	154
5.4	Discussion	156
5.5	Summary	159
CHAPTER 6		
CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK		
6.1	Summary of the Chapter	161
6.2	Research Contribution	162
6.3	Future Work	169
REFERENCES		171
APPENDICES		
A1	Membership Set Score for <i>UTQ</i>	184
A2	Membership Set Score for <i>RBPDA</i>	185
A3	Membership Set Score for <i>PSAPIA</i>	187
A4	Membership Set Score for <i>PTPBO</i>	189
B1	Proof Concept of Linear Programming	190
C1	Fuzzy Rule Generation	192
C2	Fuzzy Set Membership	211
C3	Similarity Value	212
D1	Taiwan Credit Rating System for Commercial Loans	213
D2	Airline Safety Index	216
D3	Evaluating Weapon System	219

D4	Spent Fuel Storage Option	224
D5	<i>IRIS</i> Data	227
D6	Rice Taste Data	231
E1	Evaluation Results for <i>FCR</i>	234
E2	Evaluation Results for <i>RBPDA</i>	238
E3	Evaluation Results for <i>PSAPIA</i>	245
E4	Evaluation Results for <i>ASI</i>	254
E5	Evaluation Results for <i>WS</i>	261
E6	Evaluation Results for <i>PTPBO</i>	264
E7	Evaluation Results for <i>SPO</i>	272
E8	Evaluation Results for <i>IRIS</i>	287
E9	Evaluation Results for <i>RT</i>	298

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
3.1	Teaching Quality Statistics	75
3.2	Factor Weightage	75
3.3	Teaching Quality	76
3.4	Membership Set Score	77
3.5a	Evaluation of Alternatives by Experts for Criteria C_1	79
3.5b	Evaluation of Alternatives by Experts for Criteria C_2	79
3.5c	Evaluation of Alternatives by Experts for Criteria C_3	79
3.5d	Evaluation of Alternatives by Experts for Criteria C_4	79
3.5e	Evaluation of Alternatives by Experts for Criteria C_5	80
3.5f	Evaluation of Alternatives by Experts for Criteria C_6	80
3.5g	Evaluation of Alternatives by Experts for Criteria C_7	80
3.5h	Evaluation of Alternatives by Experts for Criteria C_8	80
3.6	Evaluation of Criteria by Experts	81
3.7	The Fuzzy Membership Set Score of Performance Score Criteria C_1	81
3.8	Service Attributes for Passenger Service of Asia-Pacific International Airports	82

3.9	Average Fuzzy Performance Ratings of 14 Airports	
	Assessed by Travel Experts	82
3.10	The Fuzzy Membership Set Score C_1	83
3.11	Privatisation Alternative of Bus Operation	84
3.12	The Alternative and Criteria	84
3.13	Level of Service	85
3.14	Operation Performance for Public Bus	85
3.15	Operation Performance for Private Bus	86
3.16	Weightage	86
3.17	Evaluation Set	86
3.18	Membership Set Score	87
4.1	Membership Set Score	107
4.2	Grade Mid-Point and Mid-Interval	108
4.3	Fuzzy Set Membership	109
4.4	Fuzzy Set Grade	109
4.5	Similarity Value	110
4.6	Maximum Similarity Value	113
4.7	Normalised Synthetic Score Value	114
4.8	Multi-criteria Rules Combination	115
4.9	Factor Rule Value	116

4.10a	Appraisal Fuzzy Value for Decision Criteria C_1	117
4.10b	Appraisal Fuzzy Value for Decision Criteria C_2	117
4.10c	Appraisal Fuzzy Value for Decision Criteria C_3	117
4.10d	Appraisal Fuzzy Value for Decision Criteria C_4	117
4.10e	Appraisal Fuzzy Value for Decision Criteria C_5	118
4.10f	Appraisal Fuzzy Value for Decision Criteria C_6	118
4.10g	Appraisal Fuzzy Value for Decision Criteria C_7	118
4.11	Appraisal Product Value	119
4.12	Calculated range of α , $\Delta\alpha_l$, and $H_l(E_{m\alpha})$	119
4.13	Ranking The Teaching Quality	121
5.1a	Fuzzy Rules for <i>FCR</i>	130
5.1b	Results of <i>FCR</i>	131
5.2a	Fuzzy Rules for <i>RBPDA</i>	132
5.2b	Rules Description of <i>RBPDA</i>	133
5.2c	Result of <i>RBPDA</i>	134
5.3a	Fuzzy Rules for <i>PSAPIA</i>	136
5.3b	Results of <i>PSAPIA</i>	137
5.4a	Fuzzy Rules of <i>ASI</i>	139
5.4b	Comparison of Safety Index and Ranking of Four Airlines	140
5.5a	Fuzzy Rules of <i>WS</i>	144
5.5b	Results of <i>WS</i>	145
5.6a	Chang Fuzzy Rules	146
5.6b	Fuzzy Rules for <i>PTPBO</i>	147

5.6c	Rule Description of <i>PTPBO</i>	147
5.6d	Results of <i>PTPBO</i>	148
5.7a	Fuzzy Rules of <i>SFO</i>	150
5.7b	Results of <i>SFO</i>	151
5.8a	Fuzzy Rules of IRIS	153
5.8b	The Classification of <i>IRIS</i> Data	154
5.9a	Fuzzy Rules of <i>RT</i>	155
5.9b	The Classification of <i>RT</i>	156
5.10	Summary of Experimental Results	157

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
3.1	A New Subjective Evaluation Method	62
3.2	Normalisation Method	64
3.3	The Similarity Curve	66
3.4	Positive Skew	66
3.5	Negative Skew	66
3.6	The Proposed Rule Generation Method	68
3.7	Triangle Fuzzy Number	77
3.8	Trapezoidal Fuzzy Number	78
3.9	Rule Generation	88
3.10	Clustering the Grade and Performance Score Algorithm	89
4.1	The Similarity Curve for Factor F_1	111
5.1	Classification Boundary IF-THEN Rule	127
5.2a	Safety Index by Chang & Yeh	142
5.2b	Safety Index by Subjective Evaluation	142

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>UTQ</i>	University Teaching Quality
<i>FCR</i>	Fuzzy Credit Rating
<i>RBPDA</i>	River Basin Planning Alternatives
<i>PSAPIA</i>	Passenger Services of Asia-Pacific International Airports
<i>ASI</i>	Airline Safety Index
<i>WS</i>	Weapon System
<i>PTPBO</i>	Privatisation of Taiwan Public Bus Operation
<i>SFO</i>	Spent Fuel Storage Options
<i>IRIS</i>	Iris Flower Species
<i>RT</i>	Rice Taste

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Conventional evaluation systems are representatives of structured systems that employ objective and subjective measures of evaluation. Objective measures are quantifiable measure of performance: for example, cars/hour, parts/hour, bottles/hour, etc., which are normally defined by procedures. Subjective evaluation measures are less quantifiable, for example; leadership, presentation, and problem-solving skills. In some organisations the criteria for the evaluation are less quantifiable and subjective, for example in the teaching service and research (Horowitz & Zappe, 1995).

In practice, evaluation of performance usually uses subjective criteria. In doing so, they have to depend on their wisdom, experience, professional knowledge and information, which is difficult to define and/or describe exactly. Analysing with incomplete data, a lot of uncertainties will confuse decision-makers and complicate decision-making under unknown situations.

The contents of
the thesis is for
internal user
only

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, I. (1990). Decision Support System for Modeling Bid/No-Bid Decision Problem, *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 4: 595-608.
- Ammar, S. and Wright, R. (2000). Applying Fuzzy-Set Theory to Performance Evaluation, *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 34(4): 285-302.
- Anderson, G. (1993) Fundamentals of Fuzzy Logic, *SENSORS*, 10(3): 40-49.
- Andriantiatsaholiniaina, L. A. and Phillis, Y. A. (2000). "SA.F.E": Sustainability Assessment by Fuzzy Evaluation, European Association of Environmental and Resource Economics Conference, Rethymnon Greece.
- Benson, S. J. and Asgarpoor, S. (2000). A Fuzzy Expert System for Evaluation of Demand-Side Management Alternatives, *Electric Machines and Power Systems*, 28: 749-760.
- Bellman, R.E. and Zadeh, L. A. (1970). Decision Making in a Fuzzy-Environment, *Management Science*, 17(4): 141-165.
- Biswas, R. (1995). An Application of Fuzzy Sets in Student's Evaluation, *Fuzzy Set and Systems*, 74: 187-194.
- Bojadziev, G. and Bojadziev, M. (1995). Fuzzy Sets, Fuzzy Logic, Applications, Singapore: *World Scientific*.
- Bortolan, G. and Degani, R. (1985). A Review of Some Methods for Ranking Fuzzy Subsets, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 15: 1-19.
- Cannavaciuolo, A., Capaldo, G., Ventre, A., and Zollo, G. (1994). Linking the Fuzzy Set Theory to Organizational Routines: Study in Personnel Evaluation in a Large Company. In R Marks, editor *Fuzzy Logic and Applications*, *IEEE Technical Activities Board*, pp. 515-520.
- Capaldo, G. and Zollo, G. (2001). Applying Fuzzy Logic to Personnel Assessment: A Case Study, *Omega The International Journal*, 29(6): 585-597.
- Carlsson, F. (1982). Tackling an MCDM-Problem with the Help of Some Results from Fuzzy Set Theory, *European Journal of Operational Research*, 10:270-281.
- Carlsson, C. and Fuller, R. (1996). Fuzzy Multiple Criteria Decision Making: Recent Developments. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 78: 139-153.

- Cebecl, U. and Beskesethis, A. (2002). An Approach to the Evaluation of Quality Performance, *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 17(1/2): 92-100.
- Chan, D.C.X., Yung, K.L. and Andrew, W.H. (2002). An Application of Fuzzy Sets to Process Performance Evaluation, *Integrated Manufacturing Systems*, 13(4): 237-246.
- Chan, K.C., Lin, G.C.I. and Leong, S.S. (1995). A More Accurate Adaptive Fuzzy Inference System, *Computers in Industry*, 26: 61-73.
- Chang, Y.H. and Shyu, T.H. (1995). A Fuzzy Multicriteria Model to Evaluate the Privatization of the Public Bus Operation, *Journal of Advanced Transportation*, 29(1): 63-79.
- Chang, Y.H. and Yeh, C.H. (2001). Evaluating Airline Competitiveness Using Multiattribute Decision Making, *Omega*, (29): 405-415.
- Chang, Y.H. and Yeh, C.H. (2002). A survey Analysis of Service Quality for Domestic Airlines, *European Journal of Operational Research*, 139: 166-177.
- Chang, Y.H. and Yeh, C.H. (2004). A New Airline Safety Index, *Transportation Research Part B*, 38: 369-383.
- Chao, C.T. and Chen, Y.J. and Teng, C.C. (1996). Simplification of Fuzzy Neural Systems Using Similarity Analysis, *IEEE Trans. Systems Man and Cybernet*, 26(2): 344-354.
- Charnes, A., Cooper, W.W. and Rhodes, E. (1978). Measuring the Efficiency of Decision Making Units, *European Journal of Operational Research*, 2(6): 429-444.
- Chen, L. and Chiou, T. (1999). A Fuzzy Credit-Rating Approach for Commercial Loans: a Taiwan Case. *Omega The International Journal of Management Science*, 27: 407-419.
- Chen, S.M. and Lee, C.H. (1999). New Methods for Students' Evaluation Using Fuzzy Sets, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 104: 209-218.
- Chen, M.Y. and Linkens, D.A. (2004). Rule-base Self-generation and Simplification for Data-driven Fuzzy Models, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 142: 243-265.
- Cheng, C.H. (1996). Evaluating Naval Tactical Missile System by AHP Based on the Grade of Membership Function, *European Journal of Operational Research*, 96(2): 343-350.
- Cheng, S.M. (1996). Evaluating Weapon Systems Using Fuzzy Arithmetics Operations, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 77: 265-276.

- Cheng, C.H. and Mon, D.L. (1994). Evaluating Weapon System by Analytic Hierarchy Process Based on Fuzzy Scales, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 63: 1–10.
- Cheng, C., Young, K. and Hwang, C. (1999). Evaluating Attack Helicopters by AHP Based on Linguistic Variable Weight, *European Journal of Operational Research*, 116: 423-435.
- Chou, T.Y. and Liang, G.S. (2001). Application of a Fuzzy Multi-criteria Decision-Making Model for Shipping Company Performance Evaluation, *Maritime Policy & Management*, 28(4): 375-392.
- Chu, F. (1990). Quantitative Evaluation of University Teaching Quality – An Application of Fuzzy Set and Approximate Reasoning, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 37: 1-11.
- Chu, F. (1995). Fuzzy Multicriteria Decision-Making in Distribution of Factories: An Application of Approximate Reasoning, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 71: 197-205.
- Deng, H. and Liu, L. (2001). An Expert System Approach for Criteria Weighting in Multicriteria Analysis. *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Neural Information Processing*, Shanghai, China, November 15-18, pp. 328-333.
- Dubois, D. and Prade, H. (1978). Operations on Fuzzy Numbers, *International Journal Systems Science*, 9: 613-626.
- Dubois, D. and Prade, H. (1994). *Fuzzy Sets – a Convenient fiction for Modelling Vagueness and Possibility*, *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, 2(1): 16-21.
- Dubois, D., Prade, H. and Yager, R.R. (1997). *Fuzzy Information Engineering: A Guided Tour of Application*, New York: Wiley.
- Durkin, J. (1994). *Expert Systems Design And Development*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Fisher, R.A. (1936). The Use of Multiple Measurements in Taxonomic Problems, *Ann. Eugen*, 7: 179-188.
- Fried, H.O., Lovell, C.A.K. and Schmidt, S.S. (1993). *The Measurement of Productivity Efficiency-Techniques and Applications*, Oxford: University Press.
- Garavelli, A.C., Gorgoglione, M. and Scozzi, B. (1999). Fuzzy Logic to Improve the Robustness of Decision Support Systems Under Uncertainty, *Computers and Industrial Engineering*, 37(1/2): 193 – 196.
- Grabisch, M., Baret, J.M. and Larnicol, M. (1997). Analysis of Interaction Between Criteria by Fuzzy Measure and Its Application to Cosmetics, *Proceeding of the International Conference on Methods and Applications of Multicriteria Decision Making* Mons, Belgium.

- Guillaume, S. (2001). Designing Fuzzy Inference Systems from Data: An Interpretability-Oriented Review, *IEEE Transactions Fuzzy Systems*, 9(3): 426-443.
- Gupta, S.M. and Chakraborty, M. (1998). Job Evaluation in Fuzzy Environment, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 100: 71-76.
- Haltori, K. and Tor, Y. (1993). Effective Algorithms for the Nearest Neighbor Method in the Clustering Problem, *Pattern Recognition*, 26: 741 – 746.
- Herrera, F. and Verdegay, J.L. (1997). Fuzzy Sets and Operation Research: Perspective. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 90: 207-218.
- Hong, T.P. and Lee, C.Y. (1996). Induction of Fuzzy Rules and Membership Functions from Training Examples, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 84: 33-47.
- Horowitz, I. and Zappe, C. (1995). The Linear Programming Alternative to Policy Capturing for Eliciting Criteria Weights in the Performance Appraisal Process, *Omega, International Journal of Management Science*, 23(6): 667-676.
- Huang, L.C., Chang, P.T. and Lin, H.J. (1997). The Fuzzy Managerial Talent Assessment Model: A Pilot Study, *Pan-Pacific Management Review*, 1: 71-83.
- Hsu, S.M., Wu, C. and Tien, T.W. (1998). A Fuzzy Mathematical Approach Measuring Multi-facet Consumer Involvement in the Product Category. *Marketing research On-line* Vol. Three.
- Ishibuchi, H., Nozaki, K. and Tanaka, H. (1992). Distributed Representation of Fuzzy Rules and Its Application to Pattern Classification, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 52: 21-32.
- Ishibuchi, H., Nozaki, K., Tanaka, H. and Matsuda, M. (1994). Empirical Study on Learning in Fuzzy System by Rice Taste Analysis, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 64: 129-144.
- Ishibuchi, H., Nozaka, K. and Tanaka, H. and Yamamoto, N. (1995). Selecting Fuzzy If-Then Rules for Classification Problems Using Genetic Algorithms, *IEEE Transactions Fuzzy Systems*, 3: 260-270.
- Ishibuchi, H. and Nakashima, T. (2001). Effect of Rule Weights in Fuzzy Rule - Based Classification Systems, *IEEE Transaction on fuzzy systems*, 9(4): 506-515.
- Ichihashi, H. and Watanabe, T. (1990). Learning Control System by a Simplified Fuzzy Reasoning Model, *Proceeding IPMU*, 417-419.

- Iwamura, K. and Lin, B. (1998). Chance Constrained Integer Programming Models for Capital Budgeting Environments, *Journal of Operational Research Society*, 49: 854-860.
- Jang, J.S.R. (1993). ANFIS: Adaptive Network-Based Fuzzy Inference System, *IEEE Trans. Systems Man and Cybernet*, 23: 665-685.
- Jin, Y. (2000). Fuzzy Modelling of High-dimensional Systems Complexity Reduction and Interpretability Improvement, *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Systems*, 8(2): 212-221.
- Jessen, H. and Slawinski, T. (1998). *Test and Rating Strategies for Data Based Rule Generation*, Collaborative Research Center 'Computational Intelligence' (531). University of Dortmund.
- Kacprzyk, I. and Yager, R.R. (1985). *Management Decision Support systems Fuzzy Sets and Possibility Theory*, Verlag.
- Karacapilidis, N. (2000). Computer-Supported Collaborative and Fuzzy Similarity Measures in Multiple Criteria Decision Making, *Computer & Operation Researchs*, (27): 653-671.
- Karwowski, W. and Mital, A. (1986). Application of Fuzzy Set Theory in Human Factor, *Advances in Human Factors/Ergonomics*, 6, Elsevier, Tokyo.
- Karr, C.L. and Gentry, E.J. (1993). Fuzzy Control of pH using Genetic Algorithm, *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Systems*, 1: 46-53.
- Kaufmann, A. and Gupta, M.M. (1991). *Fuzzy Mathematical Models in Engineering and Management Science*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Kesimal, A. and Bascetin, A. (2002). Application of Fuzzy Multiple Attribute Decision Making in Mining Operation, *Mineral Resources Engineering*, 11(1): 59-72.
- Kim, B. and Bishu, R.R. (1998). Evaluation of Fuzzy Linear Regression Models by Comparing Membership Functions, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 100: 343-352.
- Klir, G. J. and Folger, T. A. (1988). *Fuzzy Sets, Uncertainty, and Information*, New York: Prentice-Hall International Inc.
- Kosko, B. (1992). *Neural Networks and Fuzzy Systems*, Prentice-Hall. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs.
- Kosko, B. (1993). *Fuzzy Thinking: The New Science of Fuzzy Logic*, Hyperion.
- Kuo, Y.P. and Chen, L.S. (1999). Fuzzy Customer Satisfaction Measurement: A Study of Fast Food Restaurant, *International Journal of Management*, 16(3): 396-404.

- Kuo, Y.P. and Chen, L.S. (2002). Using the Fuzzy Synthetic Decision Approach to Assess the Performance of University Teachers in Taiwan, *International Journal of Management*, 19(4): 593-603.
- Kwang, H.L. and Lee, J.H. (1999). A Method for Ranking Fuzzy Numbers and Its Application to Decision-Making, *IEEE Transactions On Fuzzy Systems*, 7(6): 677-685.
- Laarhoven and Pedrycz (1983). A Fuzzy Extension of Saaty's Priority Theory, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 11: 229-241.
- Labib, A.W., Williams, G.B. and O'Connor, R.F. (1998). An Intelligent Maintenance Model (System): An Application of the Analytic Hierarchy Process and a Fuzzy Rule-Based Controller, *Journal of Operational Research Society*, 49: 745-757.
- Lai, T.Y. and Hwang, C.L. (1994). *Fuzzy Multiple Objective Decision Making - Methods and Applications*, Cologne: Springer-Verlag Heilderberger.
- Lai, Y.J. (1996). Hierarchical Optimization: A Satisfactory Solution, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 77: 321-335.
- Law, C.K. (1996). Using Fuzzy Numbers in Educational Grading System, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 83: 311-323.
- Lee, C.C. (1990). Fuzzy Logic in Control System: Fuzzy Logic Controller, Part 1 and Part 11, *IEEE Trans. Systems Man and Cybernet*, 20: 404-435.
- Lee, K.M., Cho, C.H., and Kwang, H.L. (1994). Ranking Fuzzy Values with Satisfaction Function, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 64: 295-309.
- Lee, C., Liu, L.C. and Tzeng, G.H. (2001). Hierarchical Fuzzy Integral Evaluation Approach for Vocational Education Performance: Case of Junior Colleges in Taiwan, *International Journal of Fuzzy Systems*, 3(3): 476-485.
- Lee, E.S. and Zhu, Q. (1995). *Fuzzy and Evidence Reasoning*, Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag.
- Levrat, E., Voisin, A., Bombardier, S. and Brémont, J. (1997). Subjective Evaluation of Car Seat Comfort with fuzzy Set Techniques, *Intelligent Systems*, 12(12):
- Liang, G. and Wang, A. (1992). Personnel Placement in a Fuzzy Environment, *Computers Operations Research*, 19(2): 107-121.
- Li, H.C. and Ilacqua, J.A. (1994). Job Search and Employment, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 68: 335-342.

- Lilien, G. (1987). *MS/OR: A Mid-Life Crises*, Interfaces, 17: 53-59.
- Liao, S.H, Cheng, C.H. and Chang, C.T. (2000). Selecting Weapon Systems Use Extensible and Identification Method, *Panpacific Management Review*, 4(1): 101-110.
- Lipovetsky, S. (1996). The Synthetic Hierarchy Method: An Optimizing Approach to Obtaining Priorities in the AHP, *European journal of operational research*, 93: 550-564.
- Lootsma, F.A. (1978). Saaty's Priority Theory and the Nomination a Senior Professor in Operational Research, *European Journal of Operational Research*, 4: 380-388.
- Lopes, A. L.M., Lanzer, E. A. and Barcia R. M. (1997). *Fuzzy Cross-Evaluation of the Performance of Academic Departments within a University*. Toronto Proceeding.
- Lunci, Y. (2001). Fuzzy Multicriteria Decision-Making in Traditional Chinese Medical Diagnosis and Treatment for the Unnormal Rhythm of Heart-Beats: An Application of Approximate Reasoning, *World Multiconference on systematics Cybernetics and Informatics*, 17.
- Mamdani, E.H. (1977). Application of fuzzy logic to approximate reasoning using linguistic systems, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 26: 1182-1191.
- Miceli, D. (1998). Measuring Poverty Using Fuzzy Sets, Discussion Paper no. 38, University of Canberra.
- Mon, D.L., Cheng, C.H. and Lin, J.C. (1994). Evaluation Weapon System Using Fuzzy Analytical Hierarchy Process Based on Entropy Weight, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 62: 27-134.
- Moon, J.H. and Kang, C.S. (1999). Use of Fuzzy Set Theory in the Aggregation of Expert Judgments, *Annals of Nuclear Energy*, 26, 461-476.
- Negnevitsky, M. (2002). *Artificial Intelligence, A Guide to Intelligent Systems*, England: Addison – Wesley.
- Nomura, H., Hayashi, I. And Wakami, N. (1992). A learning Method of Fuzzy Inference Rules by Descent Method. *IEEE International Conference on Fuzzy Systems*, San Diego, 203-210.
- Novak, V. (1989). *Fuzzy Sets and Their Applications*, Adam Hilger
- Nozaki, K., Ishibachu, H. and Tanaka, H. (1997). A Simple but Powerful Heuristic Method for Generating Fuzzy Rules from Numerical Data, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 86: 251-270.

- Oliveira, V.D. (1999). Semantic Constraints for Membership Function Optimization, *IEEE Transaction Systems Man and Cybernet*, 29(1): 128-138.
- Pal, K. (1999). An Approach to Legal Reasoning Base on a Hybrid Decision-Support System, *Expert Systems with Application*, 7: 1-12.
- Parthiban J., (1996). The Revolutionary Computer Technology That is Changing Our World, *Fuzzy Logic and Its Uses Articles 1*, http://www.doc.ic.uk/~nd/surprise_96/journal/vol111/jp6/article1.html
- Pedrycz, W. (1996). *Fuzzy Modeling: Paradigms and Practices*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publisher.
- Pedrycz, W. and Gomide F. (1998). *An Introduction to Fuzzy Sets Analysis and Design*, England: The MIT Press.
- Prascevic, Z. and Petrovic-Lazarevic S. (1997). Fuzzy Multiple Objective a Decision Making in the Construction Industry, *paper accepted for presentation at ISOR*, Melbourne.
- Radojevic, D. and Petrovic, S. (1997). A Fuzzy Approach to Preference Structure in Multicriteria Ranking, *International Transactions in Operational Research*, 4(5/6): 419- 430.
- Raj, P.A. and Kumar, D.N. (1998). Ranking Multi-criterion River Basin Planning Alternatives using Fuzzy Numbers, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 100: 89-991.
- Render, B. and Stair, R.M. (2000). *Quantitative Analysis for Management*, U.S.A: Prentice Hall International, Inc.
- Ross, T.J. (1997). *Fuzzy Logic with Engineering Applications*, New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Ryoke, M. (1996). Fuzzy Rule Generation from the EMEP Ozone Model to Examine Source-Receptor Relation, *Working paper WP-96-130, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis A2361*, Laxenburg Austria.
- Saaty, T.L. and Bennett, J.P. (1977). A Theory of Analytic Hierarchy Applied to Political Candidacy, *Behavioral, Science*, 22: 237 – 235.
- Saaty, T.L. (1980). *The Analytic Hierarchy Process*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Saaty, T.L. (1994). How to make Decision: The Analytic Hierarchy Process, *Interfaces*, 24: 19-43.
- Saaty, T.L. (1995). *The Analytic Hierarchy Process*, Pittsburgh: RWS Publications.

- Sage, A. P. (1977). *Methodology for Large-Scale Systems*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sakawa, M., Nishizaki, L. and Hitaka, M. (1999). Interactive Fuzzy Programming for Multi-Level 0-1 Programming Problems Through Genetic Algorithms, *European Journal of Operational Research*, 114: 580-588.
- Schauten, D. (2001). An Evolutionary Concept for Selecting Relevant Sets of Input Variables for Data-based Fuzzy Modeling, *Proceeding Eunate*, Tenerife, Spain.
- Selhausen, M. Z. (1989). Repositioning OR's Products in the Market, *Interfaces*, 19: 79-87.
- Setnes, M. (2000). Supervised Fuzzy Clustering for Rule Extraction, *IEEE Transaction on Fuzzy System*, 8(4): 416-424.
- Setries, M., Babuska, R., Kaymak, U. and Lemke, H.R.N. (1998). Similarity Measure in Fuzzy Rule Based Simplification, *IEEE Transaction Systems Man and Cybernet*, 28(3): 376-386.
- Shaout, A. and Shammari, M.A. (1998). Fuzzy Logic Modeling for Performance Appraisal Systems a Framework for Empirical Evaluation, *Expert Systems With Application*, 14: 323-328.
- Shin and Chuan, K. (1993). *Gray and Fuzzy System*, Ta-Tung Institute of Technology, Taipei, Taiwan, R.O.C.
- Smithson, M. (1987). *Fuzzy Set Analysis for Behavioral and Social Sciences*, New York: Springer.
- Sonja P. L. (2001). Personnel Selection Fuzzy Model, *International Transactions in Operational Research*, 8(1): 89-105.
- Sugeno, M. and Kang, G.T, (1988). Structure Identification of Fuzzy Model, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 28: 15-33.
- Sugeno, M. and Yasukawa, T. (1993). A Fuzzy-Logic-Based Approach to Qualitative Modeling, *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Systems*, 1: 7-31.
- Takagi, H. and Hayashi, I. (1991). NN-driven Fuzzy Reasoning, *Approximate Reasoning*, 5, 191-212.
- Takagi and Sugeno, M. (1985). Fuzzy Identification of Systems and Its Applications to Modeling and Control, *IEEE Trans. On Systems, Man and Cybernetics*, 15(1): 116-132.

- Taylor III, F.A., Ketcham, A.F. and Hoffman, D. (1998). Personnel Evaluation with AHP, *Management Decision*, 36(10): 679-685.
- Tingley, G. A. (1987). *Can MS/OR Sel Itself Well Enough?*, *Interfaces*, 17: 41-52.
- Trajkovski, G. (2001). A Fuzzy Framework for Expert System Evaluation, *Proceedings Joint Meeting of the 5th World Multiconference on Systematics, Cybernetics and Informatics*, Orlando, Florida.
- Tseng, H.C. and Yeh, H. (2000). A Linguistic Approach to Constructing Fuzzy Numerical Scales, *PanPacific Management Review*, 3(3): 419-428.
- Turban, E., Zhou, D. and Ma, J. (2000), A Methodology for Grades of Journals: A Fuzzy Set-Based Group Decision Support System, *Proceedings of the 33rd Hawaii International Conference on System Science*.
- Turksen, I.B. (1992). Fuzzy Expert Systems for IE/OR/MS, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 51:1-27.
- Turksen, I.B. and Wilson, I.A. (1994). A Fuzzy Sets Preference Model for Consumer Choice, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 68: 253-266.
- Vandewalle, B. (2000). Constructing Fuzzy Models with Linguistic Integrity from Numerical Data-AFRELI algorithm, *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Systems*, 8(5): 591-600.
- Wang, J. and Allada, V. (2000). Hierarchical Fuzzy Neural Network-Based Serviceability Evaluation, *International Journal of Agile Management Systems*, 2(2): 130-141.
- Wang, J. and Malakooti, B. (1992). A Feedforward Neural Networking for Multiple Criteria Decision Making, *Computers and Operations Research*, 19(2): 151-167.
- Wang, L.X. and Mendel, J.M. (1991). Generating Fuzzy Rules by Learning from Examples, *Proceeding IEEE International Symposium on Intelligent Control, Arlington, VA*, 263-268.
- Wang, L.X. and Mendel, J.M. (1992). Generating Fuzzy Rules by Learning from Examples, *IEEE Transaction on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, 22(6): 1414-1427.
- Wang, W.J. (1997). New Similarity Measures on Fuzzy Sets and on Elements, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 85: 305-309.
- Wang, J. (2000). A Subjective Modelling To applied to Formal Ship Safety Assessment, *Ocean Engineering*, 27: 1019-105.
- Weon, S. and Kim, J. (2001). Learning Achievement Evaluation Strategy Using Fuzzy Membership Function, *ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference*, pp. 19-24.

- Wen, U.P. and Bialas, W.F. (1986). The Hybrid Algorithm for Solving the Three-Level Linear Programming Problem. *Computers and Operations Research*, 13: 367-377.
- WINROSA, (1997). Manual, MIT Gmbh, Aachen.
- Wong, C.C. and Lin, N.S. (1997). Rule Extraction for Fuzzy Modelling, *Fuzzy sets and Systems*, 88: 23-30.
- Yaakob, S.B. and Kawata, S. (1999). Workers' Placement in An Industrial Environment, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 106: 289-297.
- Yager, R.R. (1982). Multicriteria Decisions with Soft Information: An Application of Fuzzy Set and Possibility Theory (II), *Fuzzy Mathematics*, 2(3): 7-16.
- Yager, R.R. (1991). On Linguistic Summaries of Data, Knowledge discovery in Databases, *AAAI/The MIT Press*, England: 347-363.
- Yager, R.R. (1993). Families of OWA Operators, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 59(2): 125-148.
- Yamasita, T. (1997). On a Support System for Human Decision Making By the Combination of Fuzzy Reasoning and Fuzzy Structural Modeling, *Fuzzy sets and Systems*, 87: 257-263.
- Yeh, C.H., Willis, R.J., Deng, H. and Pan, H. (1999). Task Oriented Weighting in Multi-criteria Analysis, *European Journal of Operational Research*, 119(1): 130-146.
- Yeh, C.H. and Willis, R.J. (2001). A Validation Procedure for Multicriteria Analysis: Application to the Selection of Scholarship Students, *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 6(1): 39-52.
- Yeh, C.H. and Kuo, Y.L. (2003). Evaluating Passenger Service of Asia-Pacific International Airports, *Transportation Research Part E*, 39: 35-48.
- Yen, J. and Wang, L. (1999). Simplifying Fuzzy Rule-base Models Using Orthogonal Transformation Methods, *IEEE Transaction on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, 29(1): 13-24.
- Yuan, Y. and Zhuan, H. (1996). A Genetic Algorithm for Generating Fuzzy Classification Rules, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 84: 1-19.
- Zadeh, L.A. (1965). Fuzzy Sets, *Information Control*, 8: 338 – 353.
- Zimmermann, H.J. (1980). Mathematical Modeling, 1: 123-139.

Zimmermann, H.J. and Zysno, P. (1983). Decisions and Evaluations by Hierarchical Aggregation of Information, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 10: 243-260.

Zimmerman, H. J. (1992). *Fuzzy Set Theory and Its Application*, Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Zimmerman, H.J. (1996). *Fuzzy Set Theory and Its Application*, Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers

Reviewed Papers

- K.R. Ku-Mahamud, M. Othman and A.A. Bakar (2004). Fuzzy Linguistic Multicriteria Decision on Privatization Evaluation of Bus Operation, *Proceeding CD The 6th International Multi-Objective Programming and Goal Programming Conference*, April 14-16 2004, Hammamel Tunisia.
- Othman, M., Ku-Mahamud, K.R. and Bakar, A.A. (2003). Quality Evaluation Using Two Phase Fuzzy Approach, *Proceeding DSI 7TH International Conference*, Shanghai, China.
- Othman, M., Ku-Mahamud, K.R. and Bakar, A.A. (2004). Fuzzy Rule Generation Using Membership Function, *Proceeding The 4th Information and Computer Engineering Postgraduate Workshop, Phuket Thailand*, p. 115 – 120.
- Othman, M., Ku-Mahamud, K.R. and Bakar, A.A. (2004). Fuzzy Similarity Function For Ranking River Basin Planning Alternatives, *Preprints Fifth International Workshop on Artificial Intelligence in Agricultural*, Cairo, Egypt, p. 95 – 100.
- Othman, M., Ku-Mahamud, K.R. and Bakar, A.A. (2004). Ranking The River Basin Planning Alternatives Using Fuzzy Approximate Reasoning, *Chiang Mai Journal of Science*.
- Othman, M., Ku-Mahamud, K.R. and Bakar, A.A. (2004). Subjective Evaluation Using Fuzzy Rule Approach, *Journal of Institute of Mathematics & Computer Sciences (Comp. Sc. Series)*, 15(1).