

# Action Rules Mining

**Zbigniew W. Ras**

*University of North Carolina, Charlotte, USA*

**Elzbieta Wyrzykowska**

*University of Information Technology and Management, Warsaw, Poland*

**Li-Shiang Tsay**

*North Carolina A&T State University, USA*

## INTRODUCTION

There are two aspects of interestingness of rules that have been studied in data mining literature, objective and subjective measures (Liu et al., 1997), (Adomavicius & Tuzhilin, 1997), (Silberschatz & Tuzhilin, 1995, 1996). Objective measures are data-driven and domain-independent. Generally, they evaluate the rules based on their quality and similarity between them. Subjective measures, including unexpectedness, novelty and actionability, are user-driven and domain-dependent.

A rule is actionable if user can do an action to his/her advantage based on this rule (Liu et al., 1997). This definition, in spite of its importance, is too vague and it leaves open door to a number of different interpretations of actionability. In order to narrow it down, a new class of rules (called action rules) constructed from certain pairs of association rules, has been proposed in (Ras & Wieczorkowska, 2000). Interventions introduced in (Greco et al., 2006) and the concept of information changes proposed in (Skowron & Synak, 2006) are conceptually very similar to action rules. Action rules have been investigated further in (Wang et al., 2002), (Tsay & Ras, 2005, 2006), (Tzacheva & Ras, 2005), (He et al., 2005), (Ras & Dardzinska, 2006), (Dardzinska & Ras, 2006), (Ras & Wyrzykowska, 2007). To give an example justifying the need of action rules, let us assume that a number of customers have closed their accounts at one of the banks. We construct, possibly the simplest, description of that group of people and next search for a new description, similar to the one we have, with a goal to identify a new group of customers from which no-one left that bank. If these descriptions have a form of rules, then they can be seen as actionable rules. Now, by comparing these two descriptions,

we may find the cause why these accounts have been closed and formulate an action which if undertaken by the bank, may prevent other customers from closing their accounts. Such actions are stimulated by action rules and they are seen as precise hints for actionability of rules. For example, an action rule may say that by inviting people from a certain group of customers for a glass of wine by a bank, it is guaranteed that these customers will not close their accounts and they do not move to another bank. Sending invitations by regular mail to all these customers or inviting them personally by giving them a call are examples of an action associated with that action rule.

In (Tzacheva & Ras, 2005) the notion of a cost and feasibility of an action rule was introduced. The cost is a subjective measure and feasibility is an objective measure. Usually, a number of action rules or chains of action rules can be applied to re-classify a certain set of objects. The cost associated with changes of values within one attribute is usually different than the cost associated with changes of values within another attribute. The strategy for replacing the initially extracted action rule by a composition of new action rules, dynamically built and leading to the same reclassification goal, was proposed in (Tzacheva & Ras, 2005). This composition of rules uniquely defines a new action rule. Objects supporting the new action rule also support the initial action rule but the cost of reclassifying them is lower or even much lower for the new rule. In (Ras & Dardzinska, 2006) authors present a new algebraic-type top-down strategy for constructing action rules from single classification rules. Algorithm ARAS, proposed in (Ras & Wyrzykowska, 2007), is a bottom-up strategy generating action rules. In (He et al., 2005) authors give a strategy for discovering action rules directly from a database.

## BACKGROUND

In the paper by (Ras & Wieczorkowska, 2000), the notion of an action rule was introduced. The main idea was to generate, from a database, special type of rules which basically form a hint to users showing a way to reclassify objects with respect to some distinguished attribute (called a decision attribute). Clearly, each relational schema gives a list of attributes used to represent objects stored in a database. Values of some of these attributes, for a given object, can be changed and this change can be influenced and controlled by user. However, some of these changes (for instance “profit”) can not be done directly to a decision attribute. In such a case, definitions of this decision attribute in terms of other attributes (called classification attributes) have to be learned. These new definitions are used to construct action rules showing what changes in values of some attributes, for a given class of objects, are needed to reclassify objects the way users want. But, users may still be either unable or unwilling to proceed with actions leading to such changes. In all such cases, we may search for definitions of values of any classification attribute listed in an action rule. By replacing a value of such attribute by its definition, we construct new action rules which might be of more interest to business users than the initial rule. Action rules can be constructed from pairs of classification rules, from a single classification rule, and directly from a database.

## MAIN THRUST OF THE CHAPTER

The technology dimension will be explored to clarify the meaning of actionable rules including action rules and action rules schema.

### Action Rules Discovery in Information Systems

An information system is used for representing knowledge. Its definition, given here, is due to (Pawlak, 1991).

By an information system we mean a pair  $S = (U, A)$ , where:

1.  $U$  is a nonempty, finite set of objects (object identifiers),

2.  $A$  is a nonempty, finite set of attributes i.e.  $a:U \rightarrow V_a$  for  $a \in A$ , where  $V_a$  is called the domain of  $a$ .

Information systems can be seen as decision tables. In any decision table together with the set of attributes a partition of that set into conditions and decisions is given. Additionally, we assume that the set of conditions is partitioned into stable and flexible conditions (Ras & Wieczorkowska, 2000).

Attribute  $a \in A$  is called stable for the set  $U$  if its values assigned to objects from  $U$  can not be changed in time. Otherwise, it is called flexible. “Date of Birth” is an example of a stable attribute. “Interest rate” on any customer account is an example of a flexible attribute. For simplicity reason, we will consider decision tables with only one decision. We adopt the following definition of a decision table:

By a decision table we mean an information system  $S = (U, A_{St} \cup A_{Fl} \cup \{d\})$ , where  $d \notin A_{St} \cup A_{Fl}$  is a distinguished attribute called decision. The elements of  $A_{St}$  are called stable conditions, whereas the elements of  $A_{Fl} \cup \{d\}$  are called flexible conditions. Our goal is to change values of attributes in  $A_{Fl}$  for some objects from  $U$  so values of the attribute  $d$  for these objects may change as well. A formal expression describing such a property is called an action rule (Ras & Wieczorkowska, 2000), (Tsay & Ras, 2005).

To construct an action rule (Tsay & Ras, 2005), let us assume that two classification rules, each one referring to a different decision class, are considered. We assume here that these two rules have to be equal on their stable attributes, if they are both defined on them. We use Table 1 to clarify the process of action rule construction. Here, “St” means stable attribute and “Fl” means flexible one.

In a standard representation, these two classification rules have a form:

$$r1 = [ a1 \wedge b1 \wedge c1 \wedge e1 \rightarrow d1 ], \quad r2 = [ a1 \wedge b2 \wedge g2 \wedge h2 \rightarrow d2 ].$$

Assume now that object  $x$  supports rule  $r1$  which means that  $x$  is classified as  $d1$ . In order to reclassify  $x$  to class  $d2$ , we need to change its value  $b$  from  $b1$  to  $b2$  but also we have to require that  $g(x)=g2$  and that the value  $h$  for object  $x$  has to be changed to  $h2$ . This is the meaning of the  $(r1,r2)$ -action rule  $r$  defined by the expression below:

3 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: [www.igi-global.com/chapter/action-rules-mining/10789](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/action-rules-mining/10789)

## Related Content

---

### Cost-Sensitive Learning

Victor S. Sheng and Charles X. Ling (2009). *Encyclopedia of Data Warehousing and Mining, Second Edition* (pp. 339-345).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/cost-sensitive-learning/10842](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/cost-sensitive-learning/10842)

### Web Design Based on User Browsing Patterns

Yinghui Yang (2009). *Encyclopedia of Data Warehousing and Mining, Second Edition* (pp. 2074-2079).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/web-design-based-user-browsing/11105](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/web-design-based-user-browsing/11105)

### A Data Distribution View of Clustering Algorithms

Junjie Wu, Jian Chen and Hui Xiong (2009). *Encyclopedia of Data Warehousing and Mining, Second Edition* (pp. 374-381).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/data-distribution-view-clustering-algorithms/10847](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/data-distribution-view-clustering-algorithms/10847)

### Positive Unlabelled Learning for Document Classification

Xiao-Li Li (2009). *Encyclopedia of Data Warehousing and Mining, Second Edition* (pp. 1552-1557).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/positive-unlabelled-learning-document-classification/11026](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/positive-unlabelled-learning-document-classification/11026)

### Inexact Field Learning Approach for Data Mining

Honghua Dai (2009). *Encyclopedia of Data Warehousing and Mining, Second Edition* (pp. 1019-1022).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/inexact-field-learning-approach-data/10946](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/inexact-field-learning-approach-data/10946)