

**A MULTI-ATTRIBUTE DECISION MAKING PROCEDURE USING
FUZZY NUMBERS AND HYBRID AGGREGATORS**

ANATH RAO KRISHNAN

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA
2014**

A MULTI-ATTRIBUTE DECISION MAKING PROCEDURE USING
FUZZY NUMBERS AND HYBRID AGGREGATORS

A Thesis submitted to the UUM College of Arts and Sciences in
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Universiti Utara Malaysia

by
Anath Rau Krishnan

© 2014, Anath Rau Krishnan



Awang Had Salleh
Graduate School
of Arts And Sciences

Universiti Utara Malaysia

PERAKUAN KERJA TESIS / DISERTASI
(Certification of thesis / dissertation)

Kami, yang bertandatangan, memperakukan bahawa
(We, the undersigned, certify that)

ANATH RAU A/L KRISHNAN

calon untuk ijazah
(candidate for the degree of)

PhD

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

**"A MULTI-ATTRIBUTE DECISION MAKING PROCEDURE USING FUZZY
NUMBERS AND HYBRID AGGREGATORS"**

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

Bahawa tesis/disertasi 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 : 04 Jun 2013.

That the said thesis/dissertation is acceptable in form and content and displays a satisfactory knowledge of the field of study as demonstrated by the candidate through an oral examination held on: June 04, 2013.

Pengerusi Viva:
(Chairman for Viva)

Prof. Dr. Abd Razak Yaakub

Tandatangan
(Signature)

Pemeriksa Luar:
(External Examiner)

Prof. Dr. Daud Mohamad

Tandatangan
(Signature)

Pemeriksa Dalam:
(Internal Examiner)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Md Azizul Baten

Tandatangan
(Signature)

Nama Penyelia/Penyelia-penyelia:
(Name of Supervisor/Supervisors)

Dr. Maznah Mat Kasim

Tandatangan
(Signature)

Nama Penyelia/Penyelia-penyelia:
(Name of Supervisor/Supervisors)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Engku Muhammad Nazri
Engku Abu Bakar

Tandatangan
(Signature)

Tarikh:

(Date) June 04, 2013

Permission to Use

In presenting this thesis in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree from Universiti Utara Malaysia, I agree that the Universiti Library may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for the copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purpose may be granted by my supervisor(s) or, in their absence, by the Dean of Awang Had Salleh Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. 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 :

Dean of Awang Had Salleh Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
UUM College of Arts and Sciences
Universiti Utara Malaysia
06010 UUM Sintok

Abstrak

Proses Hierarki Analitikal (PHA) klasik mempunyai dua kelemahan utama. Pertama, ia mengabaikan aspek ketidaktentuan yang lazimnya wujud dalam kebanyakan data atau maklumat yang ditafsir oleh manusia. Kedua, ia tidak mengambil kira aspek interaksi antara atribut semasa pengagregatan. Penggunaan nombor-nombor kabur dapat membantu mengatasi isu pertama, manakala penggunaan Kamiran Choquet membantu mengatasi isu kedua. Namun, penggunaan nombor-nombor kabur dalam pembuatan keputusan berbilang atribut (PKBA) memerlukan beberapa langkah dan maklumat tambahan daripada para pembuat keputusan. Sementara itu, proses pengenalpastian nilai ukuran monoton yang perlu dilaksanakan sebelum menggunakan Kamiran Choquet juga memerlukan bilangan langkah pengiraan dan jumlah maklumat yang tinggi daripada para pembuat keputusan terutamanya dengan peningkatan bilangan atribut. Justeru, kajian ini memperkenalkan satu prosedur PKBA yang mampu mengurangkan jumlah langkah pengiraan dan maklumat yang diperlukan daripada para pembuat keputusan apabila kedua-dua aspek tersebut dipertimbangkan secara serentak. Untuk mencapai objektif utama kajian ini, sebanyak lima fasa telah dilaksanakan. Pertama, konsep set kabur dan aplikasinya dalam PHA telah dikaji. Kedua, analisa berkenaan pengagregat-pengagregat yang boleh digunakan dalam masalah PKBA telah dilaksanakan. Ketiga, fokus kajian telah dijuruskan kepada Kamiran Choquet dan konsep sekutunya, ukuran monoton. Seterusnya, prosedur yang dicadangkan dibangunkan dengan kombinasi lima komponen utama iaitu Analisis Faktor, Penganggar Kabur-Linguistik, Kamiran Choquet, PHA Kabur Mikhailov, dan Purata Berwajaran Mudah. Akhirnya, satu masalah PKBA sebenar telah diselesaikan untuk menguji kebolehfungsian prosedur tersebut di mana imej tiga buah pasaraya yang terletak di Sabak Bernam, Selangor, Malaysia telah dikaji dari perspektif suri rumah. Kajian ini berpotensi untuk mendorong lebih ramai pembuat keputusan mengambil kira aspek ketidaktentuan dalam data dan interaksi antara atribut secara serentak ketika menyelesaikan sesuatu masalah PKBA.

Kata kunci: Proses Hierarki Analitikal (PHA), Kamiran Choquet, Teori set kabur, Pembuatan Keputusan Berbilang Atribut (PKBA).

Abstract

The classical Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) has two limitations. Firstly, it disregards the aspect of uncertainty that usually embedded in the data or information expressed by human. Secondly, it ignores the aspect of interdependencies among attributes during aggregation. The application of fuzzy numbers aids in confronting the former issue whereas, the usage of Choquet Integral operator helps in dealing with the later issue. However, the application of fuzzy numbers into multi-attribute decision making (MADM) demands some additional steps and inputs from decision maker(s). Similarly, identification of monotone measure weights prior to employing Choquet Integral requires huge number of computational steps and amount of inputs from decision makers, especially with the increasing number of attributes. Therefore, this research proposed a MADM procedure which able to reduce the number of computational steps and amount of information required from the decision makers when dealing with these two aspects simultaneously. To attain primary goal of this research, five phases were executed. First, the concept of fuzzy set theory and its application in AHP were investigated. Second, an analysis on the aggregation operators was conducted. Third, the investigation was narrowed on Choquet Integral and its associate monotone measure. Subsequently, the proposed procedure was developed with the convergence of five major components namely Factor Analysis, Fuzzy-Linguistic Estimator, Choquet Integral, Mikhailov's Fuzzy AHP, and Simple Weighted Average. Finally, the feasibility of the proposed procedure was verified by solving a real MADM problem where the image of three stores located in Sabak Bernam, Selangor, Malaysia was analysed from the homemakers' perspective. This research has a potential in motivating more decision makers to simultaneously include uncertainties in human's data and interdependencies among attributes when solving any MADM problems.

Keywords: Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP), Choquet Integral, Fuzzy set theory, Multi-Attribute Decision Making (MADM).

Acknowledgement

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisors, Dr. Maznah binti Mat Kasim and Associate Professor Dr. Engku Muhammad Nazri B Engku Abu Bakar for spending their precious time besides their busy schedule in sharing their expertise and knowledge, offering constructive remarks and suggestions, and for giving prompt motivating counsels. Without their constant guidance, this research would never have been accomplished.

My recognition also goes to all the lecturers and management staff of School of Quantitative Sciences, UUM who have directly or indirectly contributed to the success of this research.

Besides, I would like to extend my appreciation to the Ministry of Higher Education (MoHE) who has offered me the MyPhD scholarship which aided me in completing this research without any fiscal hurdles.

My hearty thanks to my parents, Mr. Krishnan Simanjalam and Mrs. Mariammah Seethiah and to my future wife, Miss. Phrabavathy Doraisamy who have expressed immeasurable love and endless support in assuring the success of this research.

Finally, I would like to convey my special credit to all my siblings, relatives, and friends for their invaluable moral support and prayers in making this vision come true.

Table of Contents

Permission to Use	iii
Abstrak.....	iv
Abstract.....	v
Acknowledgement	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Tables	xii
List of Figures.....	xvi
List of Appendices	xvi
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Multi-attribute Decision Making.....	1
1.1.1 Multi-attribute Utility Theory	2
1.1.2 Analytic Hierarchy Process.....	5
1.1.3 Issue of Uncertainty in Human’s Data.....	9
1.1.3.1 Drawback of Applying Fuzzy Sets in MADM Environment.....	10
1.1.4 Issue of Ignoring Interaction Aspect among Attributes.....	11
1.1.4.1 Drawback of Choquet Integral	13
1.2 Problem Statement	14
1.3 Research Questions	19
1.4 Objectives.....	20
1.4.1 Main Objective.....	20
1.4.2 Specific Objectives	20
1.5 Significance of the Research.....	21
1.6 Scope of Research	22
1.6.1 Theoretical Scope.....	22
1.6.2 Geographical Scope	23
1.7 Organization of the Thesis	24
1.8 Summary of Chapter One	25
CHAPTER TWO ON THE ASPECT OF UNCERTAINTY IN HUMAN’S DATA	27
2.1 Introduction.....	27

2.2 Defining Uncertainty in MADM.....	28
2.3 Fuzzy Set Theory	29
2.3.1 Linguistic Variables	31
2.3.2 Fuzzy Numbers	32
2.3.3 Types of Fuzzy Numbers	33
2.3.4 Arithmetic Operations on Triangular Fuzzy Numbers	35
2.3.5 Fuzzification	36
2.3.6 Defuzzification.....	41
2.4 Fuzzy MADM Models	42
2.4.1 Application of Fuzzy Sets in AHP.....	43
2.4.2 Types of Fuzzy AHP Approaches.....	44
2.5 Summary of Chapter Two.....	49
CHAPTER THREE ON THE ASPECT OF INTERDEPENDENCIES AMONG ATTRIBUTES	53
3.1 Introduction	53
3.2 Properties of an Aggregation Operator	54
3.2.1 Mathematical Properties of an Aggregation Operator	54
3.2.2 Behavioral Properties of an Aggregation Operator.....	55
3.3 Types of Aggregation Operators	56
3.3.1 Additive Aggregation Operators	56
3.3.1.1 Arithmetic Mean.....	57
3.3.1.2 Quasi- arithmetic Means.....	57
3.3.1.3 Simple Weighted Average.....	57
3.3.1.4 Median	58
3.3.1.5 Minimum and Maximum.....	58
3.3.1.6 Weighted Minimum and Weighted Maximum.....	59
3.3.1.7 Ordered Weighted Average	59
3.3.2 Non-additive Aggregation Operators	60
3.4 Choquet Integral based Aggregation.....	61
3.4.1 Monotone Measure	61
3.4.1.1 Representing Interaction via Monotone Measure.....	63

3.4.2 Choquet Integral Model	64
3.4.3 Significance of Considering Interaction among Attributes	66
3.4.3.1 Television (TV) Evaluation Problem	67
3.4.3.2 Student Evaluation Problem	69
3.4.4 Attempts on Reducing the Complexity of Identifying Monotone Measure	73
3.4.5 Real Applications of Choquet integral.....	82
3.5 Summary of Chapter Three	83
CHAPTER FOUR METHODOLOGY	85
4.1 Introduction	85
4.2 Probing Fuzzy Set Theory and Its Application in AHP	85
4.3 Appraising the Aggregation Operators in MADM	86
4.4 Delving into Choquet Integral and Its Associated Monotone Measure	86
4.5 Formulating the Proposed Procedure	87
4.5.1 Defining Problem and Identifying Evaluation Attributes	89
4.5.2 Constructing Linguistic Scale for Performance Measurement	89
4.5.3 Designing Questionnaire and Reliability Test	90
4.5.4 Data Collection by Means of Questionnaire	91
4.5.5 Deriving Decision Matrix of the Problem (Alternatives vs. Attributes)....	93
4.5.6 Data Transformation for Factor Analysis	95
4.5.7 Performing Factor Analysis Data.....	96
4.5.8 Decomposing Problem into Simpler Hierarchy Structure	99
4.5.9 Estimating Monotone Measure via Revised Fuzzy-Linguistic Estimator .	99
4.5.10 Using Choquet Integral to Aggregate Interactive Scores.....	101
4.5.11 Construction of New Decision Matrix (Alternatives vs. Factors)	102
4.5.12 Estimating Weights of Independent Factors	102
4.5.13 Applying Simple Average Weighted to Compute Global Score	105
4.6 Numerical Example.....	105
4.7 Comparing Proposed Procedure, GFCEI, and Fuzzy Partitioned Hierarchy Model	116

4.7.1 Comparison based on Numbers of Monotone Measure Weights Required	117
4.7.2 Comparison based on Amount of Information Required.....	118
4.7.3 Comparison based on Other Aspects	121
4.8 Feasibility of the Proposed Procedure	123
4.9 Summary of Chapter Four.....	123
CHAPTER FIVE ASSESSING THE IMAGE OF STORES FROM	
HOMEMAKERS' PERSPECTIVE: A CASE STUDY.....	125
5.1 Introduction	125
5.2 Background of the Case Study	126
5.3 Eliciting Store Attributes.....	128
5.4 Constructing Linguistic Scale for Expressing Perception.....	129
5.5 Designing Store Image Questionnaire and Reliability Test.....	131
5.6 Data Collection: Perception on the Stores	132
5.6.1 Target Population	132
5.6.2 Sampling Procedure	132
5.6.3 Data Collection via the Questionnaire	133
5.7 Developing Decision Matrix of the Stores.....	134
5.8 Modifying the Available Raw Data Set for Factor Analysis	135
5.9 Factor Analyzing the Store Image Data	135
5.10 Decomposing Store Image Problem into Hierarchy System	139
5.11 Monotone Measure within Each Store Image Factor.....	140
5.12 Using Choquet integral to Aggregate Interactive Local Scores.....	145
5.13 Construction of New Decision Matrix (Stores vs. Factors).....	146
5.14 Estimating the Weights of Independent Store Image Factors	146
5.15 Computing Global Image Score of Each Store	149
5.16 Additional Analysis on the Proposed Procedure.....	150
5.16.1 Proposed Procedure versus Classical MAUT	150
5.16.2 Cautions on the Proposed Procedure	154
5.17 Discussion on the Result	155
5.18 Summary of Chapter Five	158

CHAPTER SIX CONCLUSION	159
6.1 Conclusion of the Research.....	159
6.2 Contributions of the Research.....	161
6.3 Limitations of the Research	165
6.4 Recommendations	166
REFERENCES.....	168

List of Tables

Table 1.1: General Form of Decision Matrix.....	3
Table 1.2: Example of Car Selection Problem based on MAUT	4
Table 1.3: Saaty’s AHP Scale	7
Table 1.4: Recent MADM Studies which Applied Additive Aggregators	11
Table 1.5: Shortcomings of GCFI, FANP, and Fuzzy Partitioned Hierarchy.....	17
Table 1.6: Research Questions.....	19
Table 2.1: Saaty’s Fuzzy AHP Conversion Scale.....	40
Table 2.2: Analysis on Fuzzy AHP Approaches.....	48
Table 3.1: Some Mathematical Properties Expected from an Aggregation Operator.....	55
Table 3.2: Decision Matrix for TV Evaluation Problem.....	67
Table 3.3: Result of TV Evaluation Problem via SWA	68
Table 3.4: Result of TV Evaluation Problem via Choquet Integral	69
Table 3.5: Decision Matrix for Student Evaluation Problem.....	70
Table 3.6: Result for Student Evaluation Problem Using SWA	70
Table 3.7: Result for Student Evaluation Problem Using Choquet Integral	72
Table 3.8: Differences between Additive and Non-additive Individual Weights	73
Table 3.9: Reducing the Complexity of Identifying General Monotone Measure.....	80
Table 3.10: Reducing the Complexity of Identifying λ -measure.....	81
Table 3.11: Real Applications of Choquet Integral	82
Table 4.1: Collected Raw Data Set by Means of Questionnaire.....	92
Table 4.2: Fuzzified Raw Data	93
Table 4.3: Fuzzy Decision Matrix.....	94
Table 4.4: Final Decision Matrix	94
Table 4.5: Transformed Data for Factor Analysis	96
Table 4.6: New Decision Matrix (Alternatives vs. Factors)	102
Table 4.7: Saaty’s fuzzy AHP scale (Cakir and Canbolat, 2008)	103
Table 4.8: Linguistic Terms and Their Corresponding TFNs (Airline Problem)	106
Table 4.9: Raw Data Set of Airline Problem	107
Table 4.10: Fuzzified Data Set of Airline Problem	108

Table 4.11: Fuzzy Decision Matrix of Airline Problem	108
Table 4.12: Decision Matrix of Airline Problem	109
Table 4.13: Crisp Data Set of Airline Problem	109
Table 4.14: Data for Factor Analysis: Airline Problem	110
Table 4.15: Individual Weight of Attributes within Each Factor	112
Table 4.16: Weights of Monotone Measure for Airline Problem	113
Table 4.17: New Decision Matrix (Airlines vs. Factors)	114
Table 4.18: Pair-wise Comparison for Airline Problem	115
Table 4.19: Final Result of Airline Problem	116
Table 4.20: Comparison between Proposed Procedure, GFCI, and Fuzzy Partitioned Hierarchy Model	122
Table 5.1: Store Attributes Identified in Past Studies	128
Table 5.2: Finalized Store Attributes	129
Table 5.3: Linguistic Preferences and Corresponding TFNs for Expressing Agreement	130
Table 5.4: Decision Matrix of Store Image Problem	134
Table 5.5: Correlation between Store Attributes	136
Table 5.6: KMO and Bartlett's Test for Store Image Data	136
Table 5.7: Total Variance Explained	138
Table 5.8: Component Matrix	138
Table 5.9: Rotated Component Matrix	139
Table 5.10: Linguistic Terms and Corresponding TFNs for Expressing Individual Importance of Attributes	141
Table 5.11: Identification of Individual Weights within Each Store Image Factor	142
Table 5.12: Interaction Parameter and Monotone Measure of In-store Experience Factor .	143
Table 5.13: Interaction Parameter and Monotone Measure of First Impression Factor	144
Table 5.14: Interaction Parameter and Monotone Measure of Customer Care Factor	144
Table 5.15: In-store Experience Score of the Stores	145
Table 5.16: First Impression Score of the Stores	146
Table 5.17: Customer Care Score of the Stores	146
Table 5.18: New Decision Matrix (Stores vs. Factors)	146
Table 5.19: Linguistic Pair-wise Comparison between Store Image Factors	147
Table 5.20: Fuzzy Pair-wise Comparison between Store Image Factors	148
Table 5.21: Image Scores and Ranking of Stores	149
Table 5.22: Decision Matrix for SWA	151
Table 5.23: Final Additive Weights for SWA	152

Table 5.24: Comparing the Result from Proposed Procedure and SWA Operator.....	153
Table 5.25: Frequency of Purchasing at Each of the Store	153

List of Figures

Figure 1.1: Hierarchy of Car Selection Problem (Example).....	6
Figure 1.2: Problem Statement of the Research.....	18
Figure 1.3: Scope of the Research	23
Figure 2.1: Membership Function for Set ‘Young’ (Example).....	30
Figure 2.2: Triangular Fuzzy Number, $A_1 = (l, m_1, u)$ (Liao, 2009).....	33
Figure 2.3: Trapezoidal fuzzy number, $A_1 = (l, m_1, m_2, u)$ (Lee, 2005)	34
Figure 2.4: Fuzzy Numbers Used to Define Age.....	35
Figure 2.5: Eight Conversion Scales Proposed by Chen and Hwang (1992).....	37
Figure 2.6: 7- point Linguistic Scale based on Zhu’s Fuzzification Approach.....	39
Figure 2.7: Saaty’s Fuzzy AHP Conversion Scale.....	40
Figure 3.1: The Concept of Choquet Integral	66
Figure 4.1: Phases to Attain the Objective of the Study	85
Figure 4.2: The Proposed Procedure.....	88
Figure 4.3: 5- point Linguistic Scale for Measuring Airlines’ Performance	106
Figure 4.4: Hierarchy Structure of Airline Problem	111
Figure 4.5: Number of Monotone Measure Weights Required by Each of the Method	118
Figure 4.6: Number of Information Required From Decision Makers, ($m = 3$).....	120
Figure 4.7: Number of Information Required From Decision Makers, ($m = 4$).....	120
Figure 4.8: Number of Information Required From Decision Makers, ($m = 5$).....	121
Figure 5.1: 9-point Linguistic Scale (Expressing Agreement on Each Item)	130
Figure 5.2: Hierarchy System of Store Image Evaluation Problem.....	140
Figure 5.3: 9-point Linguistic Scale for Expressing Individual Importance of Attributes ..	141

List of Appendices

Appendix A (Questionnaire Used for the Case Study)	190
Appendix B (Letter of Permission).....	196
Appendix C (Fuzzy Decision Matrix of Stores' Image Problem).....	197

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Multi-attribute Decision Making

In today's highly competitive environment, be it in profit or non-profit based organizations, it is unfeasible to make decisions by considering a single attribute or objective. As a result, multi-criteria decision making (MCDM) emerges as one of the prominent branches of decision making (Triantaphyllou, 2000) where it offers various scientific or quantitative techniques to aid decision makers in identifying, comparing, and evaluating alternatives based on varied, usually conflicting, attributes or objectives (Choo, Schoner, and Wedley, 1999; Tavares, Tavares, and Parry-Jones, 2008). Herein, decision makers are referred as an individual or a group of individuals who has the obligation to provide some critical information on the existing evaluation problem and to carry out the quantitative decision analysis by employing the developed decision-aid tools.

In general, MCDM can be split into two domains namely multi-objective decision making (MODM) and multi-attribute decision making (MADM) (Lu, Zhang, Ruan, and Wu, 2007). Chen, Kilgour, and Hipel (2009) defined MODM as a field which applies mathematical algorithms to identify alternatives that are optimal or efficient, under certain constraints, with respect to a few objectives which are expressed mathematically using decision variables. Linear programming is an example of MODM technique. On the other hand, MADM aims to assist the decision makers in making preference assessment on finite or available set of alternatives described by a set of predefined, usually conflicting, attributes. To recapitulate, the primary divergence between the two domains is MODM deals with infinite number

The contents of
the thesis is for
internal user
only

REFERENCES

- Aiello, G., Enea, M., Galante, G., & La Scalia, G. (2009). Clean agent selection approached by fuzzy TOPSIS decision-making method. *Fire Technology*, 45(4), 405–418.
- Akinyele, S. T. (2010). Customer satisfaction and service quality: Customer's re-patronage perspectives. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 10(6).
- Alavi, S. H., Jassbi, J., Serra, P. J. A., & Ribeiro, R. A. (2009). Defining fuzzy measures: A comparative study with genetic and gradient descent algorithms. In J. A. T. Machado, B. Patkai, & I. J. Rudas (Eds.), *Intelligent Engineering Systems and Computational Cybernetics* (pp. 427-437). Springer.
- Aldian, A., & Taylor, M. A. P. (2003). Fuzzy multicriteria analysis for inter-city travel demand modelling. *Journal of the Eastern Asia Society for Transportation Studies*, 5, 1294-1307.
- Al-Yahyai, S., Charabi, Y., Gastli, A., & Al-Badi, A. (2012). Wind farm land suitability indexing using multi-criteria analysis. *Renewable Energy*, 44, 80-87.
- Andersen, A. (1997). *Small store survival: Success strategies for retailers* (Vol. 38). John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Anderson, D. R., Sweeney, D. J., Williams, T. A., Camm, J. D., & Martin, K. (2012). *An introduction to Management Science: Quantitative approaches to decision making, revised (with Microsoft Project and Printed Access Card)*. USA: South Western Cengage Learning.
- Angilella, S., Greco, S., & Matarazzo, B. (2010). Non-additive robust ordinal regression: A multiple-criteria decision model based on the Choquet integral. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 201(1), 277-288.
- Angilella, S., Greco, S., Lamantia, F., & Matarazzo, B. (2004). Assessing non-additive utility for multicriteria decision aid. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 158(3), 734-744.
- Aouam, I., Chang, S. I., & Lee, E. S. (2003). Fuzzy MADM: An outranking method. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 145(2), 317-328.

- Arsanjani, J. J. (2012). *Springer theses: Recognizing outstanding PhD research: Dynamic land use/cover change modelling: Geosimulation and multi agent-based modelling*. Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Bäckström, K., & Johansson, U. (2006). Creating and consuming experiences in retail store environments: Comparing retailer and consumer perspectives. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 13(6), 417-430.
- Baker, J., Grewal, D., & Parasuraman, A. (1994). The influence of store environment on quality inferences and store image. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22(4), 328-339.
- Bana e Costa, C., Vansnick, J.-C. (2008). A critical analysis of the eigenvalue method used to derive priorities in AHP. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 187(3), 1422–1428.
- Bartlett, M. S. (1954). A note on the multiplying factors for various chi square approximations. *Journal of Royal Statistical Society*, 16 (Series B), 296- 298.
- Beliakov, G., & James, S. (2011). Citation-based journal ranks: The use of fuzzy measures. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 167(1), 101-119.
- Bellman, R. E., & Zadeh, L. A. (1977). Local and fuzzy logics. In J. M. Dunn & G. Epstein, (Eds.), *Modern uses of multiple-valued logic*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Reidel.
- Belton, V., & Gear, T. (1985). The legitimacy of rank reversal – a comment. *Omega*, 13(3): 143-144.
- Bendjenna, H., Charre, P.-J., & Zarour, N. E. (2012). Using multi-criteria analysis to prioritize stakeholders, *Journal of Systems and Information Technology*, 14(3), 264 – 280.
- Benítez, J., Delgado-Galván, X., Gutiérrez, J.A., & Izquierdo, J. (2011). Balancing consistency and expert judgement in AHP. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, 54(7-8), 1785-1790.
- Berrah, L., Mauris, G., & Montmain, J. (2008). Monitoring the improvement of an overall industrial performance based on a Choquet integral aggregation. *Omega*, 36(3), 340-351.
- Bertolini, M., Braglia, M., & Carmignani, G. (2006). Application of the AHP methodology in making a proposal for a public work contract. *International Journal of Project Management*, 24(5), 422-430.

- Boender, C. G. E., de Graan, J. G., & Lootsma, F. A. (1989). Multi-criteria decision analysis with fuzzy pairwise comparisons. *Fuzzy sets and Systems*, 29(2), 133-143.
- Bonetti, A., Bortot, S., Fedrizzi, M., Marques Pereira, R. A., & Molinari, A. (2012). Modelling group processes and effort estimation in Project Management using the Choquet integral: an MCDM approach. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 39(18), 13366-13375.
- Bouyssou, D., Marchant, T., Pirlot, M., Perny, P., Tsoukias, A., & Vincke, P. (2000). *Evaluation and decision models: A critical perspective*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Bozbura, F. T., Beskese, A., & Kahraman, C. (2007). Prioritization of human capital measurement indicators using fuzzy AHP. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 32(4), 1100-1112.
- Buckley, J.J., 1985. Fuzzy hierarchical analysis. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 17(3), 233-247.
- Buyukozhan, G., & Ruan, D. (2010). Choquet integral based aggregation approach to software development risk assessment. *Information Sciences*, 180(3), 441-451.
- Buyukozkan, G. (2010). Applying a Choquet integral based decision making approach to evaluate Agile supply chain strategies. In D. Ruan (Ed.), *Computational Intelligence in Complex Decision Systems* (pp. 373-386). Paris: Atlantis Press.
- Buyukozkan, G., Kahraman, C., & Ruan, D. (2004). A fuzzy multi-criteria decision approach for software development strategy selection. *International Journal of General Systems*, 33(2-3), 259-280.
- Cakir, O., & Canbolat, M. S. (2008). A web-based decision support system for multi-criteria inventory classification using fuzzy AHP methodology. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 35(3), 1367-1378.
- Carpenter, J. M., & Moore, M. (2006). Consumer demographics, store attributes, and retail format choice in the US grocery market. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 34 (6), 434-447.
- Carter, B., Flores, P., Kassin, A., & Pajaro, F. (2008). Choquet integrals and multicriteria decision making. Retrieved on February 2, 2011, from <http://www.docstoc.com/docs/15464956/Choquet-Integrals-and-Multicriteria-Decision-Making>.

- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate behavioral research*, 1(2), 245-276.
- Ceberio, M., & Modave, F. (2006). Interval-based multicriteria decision making. In B. Bouchon-Meunier, G. Coletti, & R. R. Yager (Eds.), *Modern information processing: From theory to applications* (pp. 281-294). Elsevier Mathematics.
- Chan, J. K., & Chan, P. Y. (2008). Merchandise display affects store image. *European Advances in Consumer Research V*, 8, 408-414.
- Chang, D. Y. (1996). Applications of the extent analysis method on fuzzy AHP. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 95, 649-655.
- Chen, J. J. G., & He, Z. (1997). Using analytic hierarchy process and fuzzy set theory to rate and rank the disability. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 88(1), 1-22.
- Chen, M. F., & Tzeng, G. H. (2004). Combining grey relation and TOPSIS concepts for selecting an expatriate host country. *Mathematical and Computer Modeling*, 40(13), 1473-1490.
- Chen, M. F., Tzeng, G. H., & Ding, C. G. (2008). Combining fuzzy AHP with MDS in identifying the preference similarity of alternatives. *Applied Soft Computing*, 8(1), 110-117.
- Chen, M. K., & Wang, S. C. (2010). The critical factors of success for information service industry in developing international market: Using analytic hierarchy process (AHP) approach. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 37(1), 694-704.
- Chen, S. M., & Niou, S. J. (2011). Fuzzy multiple attributes group decision-making based on fuzzy preference relations. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 38(4), 3865-3872.
- Chen, S.J. and Hwang, C.L. (1992) *Fuzzy multiple attribute decision making-methods and applications: Lecture notes in economics and mathematical systems*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Chen, T. Y., & Wang, J. C. (2001). Identification of λ -fuzzy measures using sampling design and genetic algorithms. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 123(3), 321-341.
- Chen, V. Y. C., Lien, H. P., Liu, C. H., Liou, J. J. H., Tzeng, G. H., & Yang, L. S. (2011). Fuzzy MCDM approach for selecting the best environment-watershed plan *Applied Soft Computing*, 11(1), 265-275.

- Chen, Y., Kilgour, D. M., & Hipel, K. W. (2009). Using a benchmark in case-based multiple-criteria ranking. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, Part A: Systems and Humans*, 39(2), 358-368.
- Cheng, S. K. Y. (2000). *Development of a fuzzy multi criteria decision support system for municipal solid waste management*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). University of Regina, Canada.
- Chiang, Z., & Tzeng, G. H. (2009). A third party logistics provider for the best selection in fuzzy dynamic decision environments. *International Journal of Fuzzy Systems*, 11(1), 1-9.
- Choo, E. U., & Wedley, W.C. (2008). Comparing fundamentals of additive and multiplicative aggregation in ratio scale multi-criteria decision making. *The Open Operational Research Journal*, 2, 1-7.
- Choo, E. U., Schoner, B., & Wedley, W.C. (1999). Interpretation of criteria weights in multicriteria decision making. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 37(3), 527-541.
- Chou, C. C. (2007). A fuzzy MCDM method for solving marine transshipment container port selection problems. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 186(1), 435-444.
- Chou, W. C., & Cheng, Y. P. (2012). A hybrid fuzzy MCDM approach for evaluating website quality of professional accounting firms. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 39(3), 2783-2793.
- Chou, Y. C., Sun, C. C., & Yen, H. Y. (2012). Evaluating the criteria for human resource for science and technology (HRST) based on an integrated fuzzy AHP and fuzzy DEMATEL approach. *Applied Soft Computing*, 12(1), 64-71.
- Chu, M. T., Shyu, J., Tzeng, G. H., & Khosla, R. (2007). Comparison among three analytical methods for knowledge communities group-decision analysis. *Expert systems with applications*, 33(4), 1011-1024.
- Chu, T. C., & Lin, Y. C. (2009). An interval arithmetic based fuzzy TOPSIS model. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 36(8), 10870-10876.
- Chu, T. C., & Velásquez, A. (2009). Evaluating corporate loans via a fuzzy MLMCDM approach. In *18th World IMACS / MODSIM Congress* (pp. 1493-1499).

- Clavo, T., Kolesarova, A., Komornikova, M., & Mesiar, R. (2002). Aggregation operators: Properties, classes, and construction method. In T. Calvo, G. Mayor, & R. Mesiar (Eds.) *Aggregation operators: New trends and applications*. Calvo, T., Mayor, G., & Mesiar, R. (Eds.), *Aggregation operators: new trends and applications* (pp.3-106). New York: Springer.
- Cudeck, R. (2000). Exploratory factor analysis. In H. E.A Tinsley & S. D. Brown (Eds.), *Handbook of applied multivariate statistics and mathematical modeling* (pp.265-296). California/London: Academic Press.
- Dağdeviren, M., Yavuz, S., & Kılınç, N. (2009). Weapon selection using the AHP and TOPSIS methods under fuzzy environment. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 36(4), 8143-8151.
- DeCoster, J. (1998). *Overview of factor analysis*. Retrieved on May 7, 2011 from Mawww.stat-help.com/factor.pdf.
- Demiral, T., Demiral, N. C., & Kahraman, C. (2010). Multi-criteria warehouse location selection using Choquet integral. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 37(5), 3943-3952.
- Deng, Y., & Chan, F. T. S. (2011). A new fuzzy dempster MCDM method and its application in supplier selection. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 38(8), 9854-9861.
- Detyniecki, M. (2000). *Mathematical aggregation operators and their application to video querying*. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). University of Paris VI, Paris, France.
- Domingo-Ferrer, J., & Torra, V. (2003). Median-based aggregation operators for prototype construction in ordinal scales. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 18(6), 633-655.
- Dongxiao, N., Jie, T., & Ling, J. (2011). Research on Chinese cities comprehensive competitiveness based on principal component analysis and factor analysis in SPSS. In *2nd International Conference on Software Engineering and Service Science* (pp. 868-871). IEEE.
- Dornyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2010). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing*. USA/UK: Taylor & Francis.
- Dubois, D., & Prade, H. (1980). *Fuzzy sets and systems: Theory and applications*. New York: Academic Press.

- Dubois, D., & Prade, H. (1985). A review of fuzzy set aggregation connectives. *Information sciences*, 36(1), 85-121.
- Duran, O., & Aguilo, J. (2008). Computer-aided machine-tool selection based on a Fuzzy-AHP approach. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 34(3), 1787-1794.
- Emin Ocal, M., Oral, E. L., Erdis, E., & Vural, G. (2007). Industry financial ratios-application of factor analysis in Turkish construction industry. *Building and Environment*, 42(1), 385-392.
- Ertugrul, I., & Karakasoglu, N. (2007). Fuzzy TOPSIS method for academic member selection in engineering faculty. In M. Iskander (Ed.), *Innovations in E-learning, instruction technology, assessment, and engineering education* (pp 151-156). Netherlands: Springer.
- Ertugrul, I., & Karakasoglu, N. (2008). Comparison of fuzzy AHP and fuzzy TOPSIS methods for facility location selection. *International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 39, 783-795.
- Ertugrul, I., & Tuş, A. (2007). Interactive fuzzy linear programming and an application sample at a textile firm. *Fuzzy Optimization and Decision Making*, 6(1), 29-49.
- Feng, C. M., Wu, P. J., & Chia, K. C. (2010). A hybrid fuzzy integral decision-making model for locating manufacturing centers in China: A case study. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 200(1), 63-73.
- Fodor, J. C., & Roubens, M. (1995). Characterization of weighted maximum and some related operations. *Information sciences*, 84(3), 173-180.
- Fulop, J. (2005). *Introduction to decision making methods*. (Working Paper 05-6). Computer and Automation Institute, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest: Laboratory of Operations Research and Decision Systems. Retrieved on November 10, 2012, from <http://academic.evergreen.edu/projects/bdei/documents/decisionmakingmethods.pdf>.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update (4 th ed.)*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Goshal, D. S. K., Naskar, S. K., & Bose, D. D. (2012). AHP in assessing performance of diploma institutes—A case study. *Journal of Technical Education and Training*, 3(2).

- Grabisch, M. (1996a). The representation of importance and interaction of features by fuzzy measures. *Pattern Recognition Letters*, 17(6), 567-575.
- Grabisch, M. (1996b). Fuzzy integral in multicriteria decision making. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 69(3), 279-298.
- Grabisch, M. (1998). Fuzzy integral as a flexible and interpretable tool of aggregation. In B. Bouchon-Meunier (Ed.), *Aggregation and fusion of imperfect information* (pp. 51-72). Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag.
- Grabisch, M. (2011). OWA operators and non-additive integrals. In R. R. Yager, J. Kacprzyk, & G. Beliakov (Eds.), *Recent developments in the ordered weighted averaging operators: Theory and practice* (pp. 3-15). Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Grabisch, M., & Roubens, M. (2000). Application of the Choquet integral in multicriteria decision making. In M. Grabisch, T. Murofushi, & M. Sugeno (Eds.), *Fuzzy measures and integrals: Theory and applications*, (pp. 415-434). Wurzburg: Physica-Verlag.
- Grabisch, M., Kojadinovic, I., & Meyer, P. (2008). A review of methods for capacity identification in Choquet integral based multi-attribute utility theory: Applications of the Kappalab R package. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 186(2), 766-785.
- Grabisch, M., Marichal, J. L., Mesiar, R., & Pap, E. (2011). Aggregation functions: means. *Information Sciences*, 181(1), 1-22.
- Grewal, D., & Baker, J. (1994). Do retail store environmental factors affect consumers' price acceptability? An empirical examination. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 11(2), 107-115.
- Grewal, D., Krishnan, R., Baker, J., & Borin, N. (1998). The effect of store name, brand name and price discounts on consumers' evaluations and purchase intentions. *Journal of retailing*, 74(3), 331-352.
- Hadi-Vencheh, A., & Mokhtarian, M. N. (2011). A new fuzzy MCDM approach based on centroid of fuzzy numbers. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 38(5), 5226-5230.
- Hansen, T., & Solgaard, H. S. (2004). *New perspectives on retailing and store patronage behavior: a study of the interface between retailers and consumers* (Vol. 4). Springer.

- Hanss, M. (2005). *Applied fuzzy arithmetic: An introduction with engineering applications*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Harris, J. (2006). *Fuzzy logic applications in engineering Science*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Hazura, Z., Abdul Azim, A. G., Mohd Hasan, S. & Ramlan, M. (2007). Using Fuzzy Integral to Evaluate the Web-based Applications. In *Proc of the Fifth International Conference on Information Technology in Asia* (pp. 23-27).
- Hsieh, T. Y., Lu, S. T., & Tzeng, G. H. (2004). Fuzzy MCDM approach for planning and design tenders selection in public office buildings. *International Journal of Project Management*, 22(7), 573-584.
- Hsu, C. C. (2012). Evaluation criteria for blog design and analysis of causal relationships using factor analysis and DEMATEL. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 39(1), 187-193.
- Hsu, T. H., Hung, L. C., & Tang, J. W. (2012). The multiple criteria and sub-criteria for electronic service quality evaluation: An interdependence perspective. *Online Information Review*, 36(2), 241-260.
- Hu, Y. C., & Chen, H. C. (2010). Choquet integral-based hierarchical networks for evaluating customer service perceptions on fast food stores. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 37(12), 7880-7887.
- Huang, D., & Wang, Y. (2011). Research on the comprehensive evaluation for competition ability of private hospital. In *4th International Conference on Biomedical Engineering and Informatics*, (Vol. 4, pp. 1785-1788). IEEE.
- Huang, K. K., Shieh, J. I., Lee, K. J., & Wu, S. N. (2010). Applying a generalized Choquet integral with signed fuzzy measure based on the complexity to evaluate the overall satisfaction of the patients. *International Conference on Machine Learning and Cybernetics* (Vol. 5, pp. 2377- 2382). IEEE.
- Hung, C. Y., Li, Y., & Chiang, Y. H. (2007). A Study of A/R Collection for IC Design Industry in Taiwan Using Fuzzy MCDM Methodology. In *Portland International Center for Management of Engineering and Technology* (pp. 1248-1255). IEEE.
- Hwang, C. L., & Yoon, K. (1981). *Multiple attribute decision making: Methods and applications : A state-of-the-art survey*. Berlin & New York: Springer-Verlag.

- Ourinski, D., & Modave, F. (2003). Qualitative multicriteria decision making based on the Sugeno integral. In *22nd International Conference of the North American Fuzzy Information Processing Society* (pp. 444-449). IEEE.
- Ishii, K., & Sugeno, M. (1985). A model of human evaluation process using fuzzy measure. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, 22(1), 19-38.
- James, C. (2012). Feminine role and family purchasing decisions. *International Journal of Management and Social Sciences Research (IJMSSR)*, 1(3), 76-85.
- Jaskowski, P., Biruk, S., & Bucon, R. (2010). Assessing contractor selection criteria weights with fuzzy AHP method application in group decision environment. *Automation in Construction*, 19(2), 120-126.
- Jeng, D. J. F. (2012). Selection of an improvement strategy in internal service operations: the MCDM approach with fuzzy AHP and non-additive fuzzy integral. *International Journal of Innovative Computing, Information and Control*, 8(8), 5917-5933.
- Jiang, C. Y., Zhang, X., Hu, L., Wang, Q., & Zhang, W. J. (2012). Application of AHP method in evaluation of atmospheric environment comprehensive Quality in Xi'an. *Advanced Materials Research*, 347, 2054-2057.
- Jiang, Z., Feng, X., & Shi, X. (2009). An extended fuzzy AHP based partner selection and evaluation for aeronautical subcontract production. In *Ninth International Conference on Hybrid Intelligent Systems*, (Vol. 1, pp. 367-372).IEEE.
- Jiang, Z., Feng, X., Feng, X., & Shi, J. (2010, September). An AHP-TFN model based approach to evaluating the partner selection for aviation subcontract production. In *2nd IEEE International Conference on Information and Financial Engineering* (pp. 311-315). IEEE.
- Joyce, M. L., & Lambert, D. R. (1996). Memories of the way stores were and retail store image. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 24(1), 24-33.
- Kabak, M., & Burmaoğlu, S. (2013). A holistic evaluation of the e-procurement website by using a hybrid MCDM methodology. *Electronic Government, an International Journal*, 10(2), 125-150.
- Kahraman, C. (2008). MCDM methods and fuzzy sets. In C. Kahraman (Ed.), *Fuzzy multi-criteria decision-making: Theory and applications with recent developments* (pp. 1-18). New York: Springer.

- Kahraman, C., & Cebi, S. (2009). A new multi-attribute decision making method: hierarchical fuzzy axiomatic design. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 36(3–1), 4848–4861.
- Kahraman, C., Cebeci, U., & Ruan, D. (2004). Multi-attribute comparison of catering service companies using fuzzy AHP: The case of Turkey. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 87(2), 171-184.
- Kahraman, C., Cebeci, U., & Ulukan, Z. (2003). Multi-criteria supplier selection using fuzzy AHP. *Logistics Information Management*, 16(6), 382 – 394.
- Kahraman, C., Gulbay, M., & Kabak, O. (2006). Fuzzy applications in industrial engineering studies in fuzziness and soft computing. In C. Kahraman (Ed.), *Applications of fuzzy sets in industrial engineering* (pp. 1-55). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39(1), 31-36.
- Kandampully, J., & Suhartanto, D. (2000). Customer loyalty in the hotel industry: the role of customer satisfaction and image. *International journal of contemporary hospitality management*, 12(6), 346-351.
- Kandoje, A. A. (2009). *Women's influence on family purchase decision in Tanzania*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Open University of Tanzania.
- Kangas, A., Kangas, J., & Kurttila, M. (2008). Uncertainty in multi-criteria decision making. In A. Kangas, J. Kangas, & M. Kurttila (Eds.), *Decision support for forest management* (pp. 55-99). Netherlands: Springer.
- Kaufmann, A., & Gupta, M. M. (1991). *Introduction to fuzzy arithmetic: Theory and applications*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Klir, G. J., Wang, Z., & Harmanec, D. (1997). Constructing fuzzy measures in expert systems. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 92(2), 251-264.
- Kojadinovic, I. (2004). Estimation of the weights of interacting criteria from the set of profiles by means of information-theoretic functionals. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 155(3), 741-751.
- Kojadinovic, I. (2008). Unsupervised aggregation of commensurate correlated attributes by means of the Choquet integral and entropy functionals. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 23(2), 128-154.

- Kwong, C. K., & Bai, H. (2002). A fuzzy AHP approach to the determination of importance weights of customer requirements in quality function deployment. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, 13(5), 367-377.
- Kwong, C. K., & Bai, H. (2003). Determining the importance weights for the customer requirements in QFD using a fuzzy AHP with an extent analysis approach. *IIE Transactions*, 35, 619- 626.
- Lai, W. H., Chang, P. L., & Chou, Y. C. (2008). Fuzzy MCDM approach to R&D project evaluation in Taiwan's public sectors. In *Portland International Conference on Management of Engineering & Technology* (pp. 1523-1532). IEEE.
- Larbani, M., Huang, C. Y., & Tzeng, G. H. (2011). A novel method for fuzzy measure identification. *International Journal of Fuzzy Systems*, 13(1), 24-34.
- Lee, C. C. (1990). Fuzzy logic in control systems: fuzzy logic controller. I. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics*, 20(2), 404-418.
- Lee, K. H. (2005). *First course on fuzzy theory and applications*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Lee, K. M., & Leekwang, H. (1995). Identification of λ -fuzzy measure by genetic algorithms. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 75(3), 301-309.
- Lee, S. K., Mogi, G., & Kim, J. W. (2008). The competitiveness of Korea as a developer of hydrogen energy technology: The AHP approach. *Energy Policy*, 36(4), 1284-1291.
- Lee, S. K., Mogi, G., & Kim, J. W. (2009). Decision support for prioritizing energy technologies against high oil prices: A fuzzy analytic hierarchy process approach. *Journal of Loss Prevention in the Process Industries*, 22(6), 915-920.
- Lee, S. K., Mogi, G., Kim, J. W., & Gim, B. J. (2008). A fuzzy analytic hierarchy process approach for assessing national competitiveness in the hydrogen technology sector. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 33(23), 6840-6848.
- Leszczyński, K., Penczek, P., & Grochulski, W. (1985). Sugeno's fuzzy measure and fuzzy clustering. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 15(2), 147-158.

- Li, H., Ren, L., & Zheng, H. (2013). Applications of relative risk evaluations in the spacecraft development. In *2013 Proceedings-Annual Reliability and Maintainability Symposium (RAMS)* (pp. 1-7). IEEE.
- Liao, Y. (2009). A novel method for decision making based on triangular fuzzy number. In *Chinese Control and Decision Conference* (pp. 4312-4315). IEEE.
- Lin, J., & Jiang, Y. (in press). Some hybrid weighted averaging operators and their application to decision making. *Information Fusion*.
- Lin, W. L., Shiu, J. Y., & Tzeng, G. H. (2011). Combined fuzzy factor analysis and fuzzy integral to evaluate strategies of hybrid electric vehicle trial. *International Journal of Operational Research*, 8(4), 59-71.
- Lindquist, J. D. (1974). Meaning of image: A survey of empirical hypothetical evidence. *Journal of Retailing*, 50(4), 29-38.
- Liou, J. J. H., Yen, L., & Tzeng, G. H. (2007). Building an effective safety management system for airlines. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 14(1), 20-26.
- Liu, H. C., Jheng, Y. D., Lin, W. C., & Chen, G. S. (2007). A novel fuzzy measure and its Choquet Integral Regression Model. In *International Conference on Machine Learning and Cybernetics* (Vol. 3, pp. 1394-1398). IEEE.
- Liu, X. (2006). An orness measure for quasi-arithmetic means. *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, 14(6), 837-848.
- Liu, X. (2011). A review of the OWA determination methods: Classification and some extensions. In R. R. Yager, J. Kacprzyk, & G. Beliakov (Eds.), *Recent developments in the ordered weighted averaging operators: Theory and practice* (pp. 49-90). Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Liu'an, K., Xiaomei, W., & Lin, Y. (2012). The research of teaching quality appraisal model based on AHP. *International Journal of Education and Management Engineering (IJEME)*, 2(9), 29.
- Lopez Orriols, J. M., & de la Rosa, J. L. (2004). Definition and study of a consensus method with dynamic weight assignment. In J. Vitria, P. Radeva, & I. Aguilo (Eds.), *Recent advances in artificial intelligence research and development* (pp. 137-144). Amsterdam, Netherlands: IOS Press.

- Lu, J., Zhang, G., Ruan, D., & Wu., F. (2007). *Multi-objective group decision making: Methods, software and applications with fuzzy set techniques*. London: Imperial College Press.
- Lu, Y., & Zhang, X. (2008). A method for the problems of fuzzy grey multi-attribute decision-making based on the triangular fuzzy number. In *International Conference on Computer Science and Software Engineering* (Vol. 1, pp. 590-593). IEEE.
- Luukka, P. (2010). A classification method based on similarity measures of generalized fuzzy numbers in building expert system for postoperative patients. In H. R. Arabnia (Ed.), *Advances in computational Biology* (pp. 3-10). New York: Springer.
- Mansur, Y. M. (1995). *Fuzzy sets and economics: Applications of fuzzy mathematics to non-cooperative oligopoly*. England: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Marichal, J. L., & Roubens, M. (2000). Determination of weights of interacting criteria from a reference set. *European journal of operational Research*, 124(3), 641-650.
- Marichal, J.-L. (2000). An axiomatic approach of the discrete Choquet integral as a tool to aggregate interacting criteria. *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, 8(6), 800-807.
- Marichal, J.-L. (1999). *Aggregation Operator for Multicriteria Decision Aid*. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). University of Liege, Belgium.
- Marichal, J.-L., & Roubens, M. (2000). Determination of weights of interacting criteria from a reference set. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 124(3), 641-650.
- Marques Pereira, R. A., Ribeiro, R. A., & Serra, P. (2008). Rule correlation and Choquet integration in fuzzy inference systems. *International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems*, 16(05), 601-626.
- Matue, A.V. (2002). *ClusDM: A multiple criteria decision making method for heterogeneous data sets*. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Univesitat Politecnica De Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain.
- Mau-Crimmins, T., de Steiguer, J.E., Dennis, D. (2005). AHP as a means for improving public participation: A pre-post experiment with university students. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 7(4), 501-514.

- Mesiar, R., & Komornikova, M. (1997). Aggregation operators. In *Proc. Prim. 96, XI Conference on Applied Mathematics* (pp 173-211).
- Mesiar, R., & Mesiarová, A. (2008). Fuzzy integrals and linearity. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 47(3), 352-358.
- Meyer, P., & Roubens, M. (2006). On the use of the Choquet integral with fuzzy numbers in multiple criteria decision support. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 157(7), 927-938.
- Mikenina, L., & Zimmermann, H. J. (1999). Improved feature selection and classification by the 2-additive fuzzy measure. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 107(2), 197-218.
- Mikhailov, L. (2003). Deriving priorities from fuzzy pairwise comparison judgments. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 134(3), 365-385.
- Modave, F., & Eklund, P. (2001). A measurement theory perspective for MCDM. In *The 10th IEEE International Conference on Fuzzy Systems* (Vol. 3, pp. 1068-1071). IEEE.
- Moon, J. H., & Kang, C. S. (2001). Application of fuzzy decision making method to the evaluation of spent fuel storage. *Progress in Nuclear Energy*, 39(3-4), 345-351.
- Mussi, S. (1999). Facilitating the use of multi-attribute utility theory in expert systems: An aid for identifying the right relative importance weights of attributes. *Expert Systems*, 16(2), 87-1102.
- Narukawa, Y., & Torra, V. (2007). Fuzzy measures and integrals in evaluation of strategies. *Information Sciences*, 177(21), 4686-4695.
- Nijkamp, P., Rietveld, D.P. & Voogd, H. (1990). *Multi-criteria evaluation in physical planning*. USA: Elsevier science publishers B.V.
- Normann, R. (1991). *Service Management Strategy and Leadership in Service Businesses*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Nurchahyo, G. W., Shamsuddin, S. M., Alias, R. A., & Sap, M. N. M. (2003). Selection of defuzzification method to obtain crisp value for representing uncertain data in a modified sweep algorithm. *Journal of Computer Science & Technology*, 3.

- Onut, S., Kara, S. S., & Isik, E. (2009). Long term supplier selection using a combined fuzzy MCDM approach: A case study for a telecommunication company. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 36(2), 3887-3895.
- Opricovic, S., & Tzeng, G. H. (2008). Defuzzification within a multicriteria decision model. *International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness, and Knowledge-Based Systems*, 11(5), 635-652.
- Pallant, J. (2011). *Multivariate analysis of variance: SPSS survival manual*. (4th ed.). Crows Nest, NSW, Australia.: Allen & Unwin.
- Peters, J. F., & Ramanna, S. (1996, September). Application of the Choquet integral in software cost estimation. In *Proceedings of the Fifth IEEE International Conference on Fuzzy Systems*, (Vol. 2, pp. 862-866). IEEE.
- Promentilla, M. A. B., Furuichi, T., Ishii, K., & Tanikawa, N. (2008). A fuzzy analytic network process for multi-criteria evaluation of contaminated site remedial countermeasures. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 88(3), 479-495.
- Ramanathan, R., & Ganesh, L. S. (1995). Using AHP for resource allocation problems. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 80(2), 410-417.
- Ramík, J. (2009). Consistency of pair wise comparison matrix with fuzzy elements. In *Proceedings of the IFSA/EUSFLAT 2009 Congress* (pp. 98-103).
- Rao, R. V. (2007). *Decision making in manufacturing environment: Using graph theory and fuzzy multiple attribute decision making*. London: Springer-Verlag.
- Reche, F., & Salmeron, A. (1999). Towards an operational interpretation of fuzzy measures. In *First International Symposium on Imprecise Probabilities and their Applications*. Retrieved on July 7, 2012 from <ftp://decsai.ugr.es/pub/utai/other/smc/isipta99/061.pdf>
- Ribeiro, R. A. (1996). Fuzzy multiple attribute decision making: A review and new preference elicitation techniques. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 78(2), 155-181.
- Royes, G. F., & Bastos, I. I. (2001). Fuzzy MCDM in election prediction. *IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, 5, 3258-3263.
- Saad, I., Hammadi, S., Benrejeb, M., & Borne, P. (2008). Choquet integral for criteria aggregation in the flexible job-shop scheduling problems. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, 76(5), 447-462.

- Saaty, T. L. (1980). *The analytic hierarchy process: planning, priority setting, resource allocation*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Saminger-Platz, S., Mesiar, R., & Dubois, D. (2007). Aggregation operators and commuting. *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, 15(6), 1032-1045.
- Sekita, Y., & Tabata, Y. (1977). A consideration on identifying fuzzy measures. In *XXIX International Meeting of the Institute of Management Sciences Athens*.
- Senel, B., & Senel, M. (2011). An analysis of technology acceptance in Turkey using fuzzy logic and structural equation modelling. In *Isletme Arastirmalari Dergisi 3/4* (pp 34-48).
- Shi, Y., Kou, G., Li, Y., Wang, G., Peng, Y., & Shi, Y. (2010). FMCDM: A fuzzy multi-criteria decision-making hybrid approach to evaluate the damage level of typhoon: Integration of fuzzy AHP and fuzzy TOPSIS. *3rd International Conference on Information Sciences and Interaction Sciences (ICIS)*, 666-671.
- Shieh, J. I., Wu, H. H., & Liu, H. C. (2009). Applying a complexity-based Choquet integral to evaluate students' performance. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 36(3), 5100-5106.
- Smolikova, R., & Wachowiak, M. P. (2002). Aggregation operators for selection problems. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 131(1), 23-34.
- Sousa, J. M., & Kaymak, U. (2002). *Fuzzy decision making in modeling and control: Vol. 27. World scientific series in robotics and intelligent systems*. Singapore: World Scientific Publishing Company Incorporated.
- Sugeno, M. (1974). *Theory of fuzzy integrals and its applications*. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Tokyo Institute of Technology, Japan.
- Surhone, L. M., Timpledon, M. T., & Marseken, S. F. (2010). *Test-retest*. Kniga po Trebovaniyu.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). New York: Allyn and Bacon.
- Tahani, H., & Keller, J. M. (1990). Information fusion in computer vision using the fuzzy integral. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics*, 20(3), 733-741.

- Takahagi, E. (2007). A fuzzy measure identification method by diamond pairwise comparisons: AHP scales and Grabish's graphical interpretation. In B. Apolloni, R. J. Howlett., & L. Jain (Eds.), *Knowledge-Based Intelligent Information and Engineering Systems* (pp. 316-324). Springer Berlin Heidelberg: Springer.
- Tam, M. C. Y., & Tummala, V. M. R. (2001). An application of the AHP in vendor selection of a telecommunications system. *Omega*, 29(2), 171-182.
- Tanton, J. S. (2005). *Encyclopedia of mathematics*. Infobase Publishing.
- Tavares, R. M., Tavares, J. M. L., & Parry-Jones, S. L. (2008). The use of a mathematical multicriteria decision-making model for selecting the fire origin room. *Building and Environment*, 43(12), 2090-2100.
- Thammano, A. (1999). A new forecasting approach with neuro-fuzzy architecture. In *IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics* (Vol. 1, pp. 386-389). IEEE.
- Theodoridis, P. K., & Chatzipanagiotou, K. C. (2009). Store image attributes and customer satisfaction across different customer profiles within the supermarket sector in Greece. *European Journal of Marketing*, 43(5/6), 708-734.
- Thompson, K. E., & Chen, Y. L. (1998). Retail store image: a means-end approach. *Journal of Marketing Practice: Applied Marketing Science*, 4(6), 161-173.
- Tiryaki, F., & Ahlatcioglu, B. (2009). Fuzzy portfolio selection using fuzzy analytic hierarchy process. *Information Sciences*, 179(1), 53-69.
- Torfi, F., Farahani, R. Z., & Rezapour, S. (2010). Fuzzy AHP to determine the relative weights of evaluation criteria and Fuzzy TOPSIS to rank the alternatives. *Applied Soft Computing*, 10(2), 520-528.
- Torra, V., & Narukawa, Y. (2007). *Modeling decisions: information fusion and aggregation operators*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Treiblmaier, H., & Filzmoser, P. (2010). Exploratory factor analysis revisited: How robust methods support the detection of hidden multivariate data structures in IS research. *Information & Management*, 47(4), 197-207.
- Triantaphyllou, E. (2000). *Multi-criteria decision making methodologies: A comparative study*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Tsai, H. H., & Lu, I. Y. (2006). The evaluation of service quality using generalized Choquet integral. *Information Sciences*, 176(6), 640-663.
- Tsaur, S. H., Chang, T. Y., & Yen, C. H. (2002). The evaluation of airline service quality by fuzzy MCDM. *Tourism management*, 23(2), 107-115.
- Tseng, M. L. (2011). Using a hybrid MCDM model to evaluate firm environmental knowledge management in uncertainty. *Applied Soft Computing*, 11(1), 1340-1352.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1990). Judgement under uncertainty: heuristics and biases. In G. Shafer & J. Pearl (Eds.), *Readings in uncertain reasoning* (pp. 32-39). San Francisco: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
- Tzeng, G. H., & Huang, J. J. (2011). *Multiple attribute decision making: Methods and applications*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- Tzeng, G. H., Ou Yang, Y. P., Lin, C. T., & Chen, C. B. (2005). Hierarchical MADM with fuzzy integral for evaluating enterprise intranet web sites. *Information Sciences*, 169(3-4), 409-426.
- Van Laarhoven, P. J. M., & Pedrycz, W. (1983). A fuzzy extension of Saaty's priority theory. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 11(1), 229-241.
- Verma, D. P. S., & Gupta, S. S. (2005). Influence of store image on buyers' product evaluation. *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, 2(1), 47-60.
- Vinodh, S., Ramiya, R. A., & Gautham, S. G. (2011). Application of fuzzy analytic network process for supplier selection in a manufacturing organisation. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 38(1), 272-280.
- Waghlikar, A., & Deer, P. (2007). Fuzzy measures acquisition methods. *Engineering Letters*, 14(2), 56-60.
- Wang, C. H., Lu, I. Y., & Chen, C. B. (2010). Integrating hierarchical balanced scorecard with non-additive fuzzy integral for evaluating high technology firm performance. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 128(1), 413-426.
- Wang, J., & Wang, Z. (1997). Using neural networks to determine Sugeno measures by statistics. *Neural Networks*, 10(1), 183-195.

- Wang, Y. M., Elhag T. M. S., & Hua Z.S. (2006). A modified fuzzy logarithmic least squares method for fuzzy analytic hierarchy process. *Fuzzy sets and systems*, 157(23), 3055-3071.
- Wang, Y.M., Luo Y., & Hua Z.S. (2008). On the extent analysis method for fuzzy AHP and its applications. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 186(2), 735–747.
- Wang, Z., Yang, R., & Leung, K. S. (2010). *Nonlinear integrals and their applications in data mining* (Vol. 24). Singapore: World Scientific Publishing Company Incorporated.
- Warren, L. (2004). *Uncertainties in the analytic hierarchy process*. Australia: DSTO Information Sciences Laboratory.
- Wibowo, S. (2011). *Fuzzy multicriteria analysis and its applications for decision making under uncertainty*. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). RMIT Univeristy, Melbourne, Australia.
- Wierzchon, S. T. (1983). An algorithm for identification of fuzzy measure. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 9(1), 69-78.
- Wong, Y. T., Osman, S., Jamaluddin, A., & Yin-Fah, B. C. (2012). Shopping motives, store attributes and shopping enjoyment among Malaysian youth. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 19(2), 240-248.
- Wu, H. Y., Tzeng, G. H., & Chen, Y. H. (2009). A fuzzy MCDM approach for evaluating banking performance based on Balanced Scorecard. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 36(6), 10135–10147.
- Yager, R. R. (1988). On ordered weighted averaging aggregation operators in multicriteria decisionmaking. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics*, 18(1), 183-190.
- Yager, R. R. (2000). On the entropy of fuzzy measures. *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, 8(4), 453-461.
- Yang, J. L., Chiu, H. N., Tzeng, G. H., & Yeh, R. H. (2008). Vendor selection by integrated fuzzy MCDM techniques with independent and interdependent relationships. *Information Sciences*, 178(21), 4166-4183.
- Yang, R. (2005). *The fuzzification of Choquet integral and its applications*. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.

- Yoo, B. S., Cho, S. H., & Kim, J. H. (2011). Fuzzy integral-based composite facial expression generation for a robotic head. In *IEEE International Conference on Fuzzy Systems* (pp. 917-923). IEEE.
- Yoo, S., & Chang, Y. (2005). An exploratory research on the store image attributes affecting its store loyalty. *Seoul Journal of Business*, 11(1), 19-41.
- Young, J. G. (2008). *Program analysis and transformation in mathematical programming*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- Yu, V. F., & Hu, K. J. (2010). An integrated fuzzy multi-criteria approach for the performance evaluation of multiple manufacturing plants. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 58(2), 269–277.
- Yue, S., Li, P., & Yin, Z. (2005). Parameter estimation for Choquet fuzzy integral based on Takagi–Sugeno fuzzy model. *Information Fusion*, 6(2), 175-182.
- Yurdakul, M. (2003). Measuring long-term performance of a manufacturing firm using the analytical network process (ANP) approach. *International Journal of Production Research*, 41, 2501-2529.
- Zadeh, L. A. (1965). Fuzzy sets. *Information and Control*, 8, 338–353.
- Zadeh, L. A. (1975). The concept of a linguistic variable and its application to approximate reasoning—I. *Information Sciences*, 8(3), 199-249.
- Zayed, T., Mohamad Amer, Pan, J. (2008). Assessing risk and uncertainty inherent in Chinese highway projects using AHP. *International Journal of Project Management*, 26(4), 408-419.
- Zeleny, M. (1982). *Multiple criteria decision making*. McGraw-Hill: New York.
- Zhang, C., Ma, C., & Xu, J. (2005). A new fuzzy MCDM method based on trapezoidal fuzzy AHP and hierarchical fuzzy integral. In L. Wang & Y. Jin, *Fuzzy systems and knowledge discovery: Lecture notes in computer science*, (pp. 466-474). Berlin Heidelberg: Springer.
- Zhang, L., Zhou, D., Zhu, P., & Li, H. (2006). Comparison analysis of MAUT expressed in terms of Choquet integral and utility axioms. In *1st International Symposium on Systems and Control in Aerospace and Astronautics* (pp. 85-89). IEEE.

- Zhang, X., Shin, M. Y., & Pham, H. (2001). Exploratory analysis of environmental factors for enhancing the software reliability assessment. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 57(1), 73-78.
- Zhang, W. (2004). Handover decision using fuzzy MADM in heterogeneous networks. In *Wireless Communications and Networking Conference* (Vol. 2, pp. 653-658). IEEE.
- Zhu, C., Chen, Y., Lu, X., & Zhang, C. (2009). Identification of λ -fuzzy measure by modified genetic algorithms. In *Sixth International Conference on Fuzzy Systems and Knowledge Discovery* (Vol. 6, pp. 296-300). IEEE.
- Zhu, K. (2012). The Invalidity of Triangular Fuzzy AHP: A Mathematical Justification. (Working paper). Available at SSRN 2011922.
- Zhu, K., Shang, J., & Yang, S. (2012). The triangular fuzzy AHP: Fallacy of the popular extent analysis method. (Working paper). Available at SSRN 2078576.
- Zhu, L. (2010). A fuzzy MCDM model for knowledge service vendor evaluation and selection. In *3rd International Symposium on Knowledge Acquisition and Modeling* (pp. 289-292). IEEE.
- Zimmermann, H. -J. (2001). *Fuzzy set theory and its applications* (4th ed.). Boston/ Dordrecht/ London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Zimmermann, H.-J. (2000). An application-oriented view of modeling uncertainty. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 122(2), 190-198.
- Zopounidis C., & Doumpos M. (2002). Multi-criteria decision aid in financial decision making: methodologies and literature review. *Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis*, 11, 167-186.