

**University of Groningen
Artificial Intelligence
prepublications**

author: N.A. Taatgen
title: A model of individual differences in learning air traffic control
status: revised after being accepted for ICCM-2001



April 2001
prepublication 2001-8

RUG

A Model of Individual Differences in Learning Air Traffic Control

Niels A. Taatgen (niels@ai.rug.nl)

Artificial Intelligence, University of Groningen
Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, 9712 TS Groningen, the Netherlands

Abstract

Individual differences in skill acquisition are influenced by several architectural factors. According to Ackerman's theory, general intelligence, speed of proceduralization and psychomotor speed influence different stages of skill acquisition. Ackerman tested this theory by correlating performance on an Air Traffic Controller (ATC) task with tests on specific abilities. The present study discusses an ACT-R model of the ATC task in which the relevant abilities can be manipulated directly, providing additional support for the theory.

Keywords: Skill acquisition, Air Traffic Control, Individual differences, ACT-R

Introduction

Skill acquisition is usually characterized as going through three stages: a cognitive stage, an associative stage and an autonomous stage (Fitts, 1964). The three stages can be characterized by moving from conscious, slow and error-prone to unconscious, fast and error-free. Anderson (1982) explains these three stages in terms of a transition from declarative knowledge to procedural knowledge. In the cognitive stage knowledge is declarative and needs to be interpreted. Interpreting knowledge is slow, and may lead to errors if the relevant knowledge cannot be retrieved at the right time. Procedural knowledge on the other hand is compiled and therefore fast and free of errors, and can be associated with the autonomous stage. The associate stage is an in-between stage, during which part of the knowledge is declarative and another part compiled.

A problem in the study of complex problem solving, especially in a learning context, is the vastness of individual differences. In order to study the acquisition of complex skills, it is a good research strategy to have a theory of individual differences. From the perspective of the cognitive architecture, there are two sources of individual differences: *architectural differences* and *knowledge differences* (Taatgen, 1999a). Architectural differences are differences in the cognitive architecture itself. In terms of an architecture like ACT-R, architectural differences can be tied to global parameters. For example, working-memory capacity is tied to the W -parameter in ACT-R, the parameter that controls the amount of spreading activation. Individual differences in working-memory capacity can be explained by estimating a different value of W for each individual (Lovett, Reder & Lebiere, 1997). Differences in knowledge are based on the




Figure 1: Predicted ability-performance correlations according to Ackerman. (adapted from Ackerman, 1988).

idea that people have different problem solving strategies. In terms of a cognitive model, this means individualized models have different initial contents of declarative and procedural memory.

In this paper I will focus on architectural differences. Ackerman (1988, 1990) identified three sources: general intelligence, perceptual speed, and psychomotor abilities. According to Ackerman, each of these three abilities correlates with a different stage of skill acquisition. In the cognitive stage, general intelligence is the most important aspect, as an adequate representation of the task needs to be formed. In the associative stage, the knowledge compilation process (which Ackerman associates with perceptual speed) will dominate performance, so individual differences in that aspect will become important. In the final autonomous stage, all knowledge is proceduralized, and differences in psychomotor abilities will be the most important factor. Figure 1 illustrates the general predictions of the theory.

Ackerman (1998; 1990) gathered evidence for this theory by correlating learning behavior on a complex task (the Kanfer-Ackerman Air Traffic Controller task¹, KA-ATC) with

```

FLT#      TYPE      FUEL      POS.      Score : 380
----      -
342      DC10      5        3 n      Landing Pts: 400 Penalty Pts: -20
148      727      6        3 s      Runways : DRY
-> 692    747      4        3 e      Wind : 0 - 20 knots from SOUTH
          2 n
          2 s
          2 e
          2 w
          1 n
          1 s
          1 e
          1 w
          2 e
          1 n
          1 s
          1 e
          1 w

n ===== s #1
n ===== s #2
w | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | e #3
w | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | e #4

```

Figure 2: The KA-Air Traffic Controller task

performance on simpler tasks that explicitly test the three abilities Ackerman thought to be relevant in the three stages of skill acquisition. It turned out that measures of general intelligence correlate well with the first blocks of ATC performance, measures of perceptual speed with the middle blocks, and measures of psychomotor abilities with the later blocks.

Cognitive modeling offers a different approach to finding support for Ackerman’s theory. Instead of correlating performance on different tasks, a model can be made of the complex task, and architectural parameters can be varied that correspond to the relevant dimensions of individual differences. This the approach we will examine in this paper.

A Model of the ATC Task

The ATC Task

Although the ATC task is a simplified version of real Air Traffic Control, it is still a complicated task. Figure 2 shows the interface of the task. The goal is to score as many points as possible by landing planes and making no errors. The planes that have to be landed are represented at the top-left part of the screen, and are organized in three hold levels (indicated in the POS. column). Planes can be moved between hold levels, and can be landed from hold level 1 (the bottom four slots). There are four runways in the bottom-left of the screen on which planes can be landed. The choice of runway is constrained by a number of rules concerning runway length (long or short), plane type (prop, 727, dc10 or 747), runway direction (north-south or east-west), runway condition (dry, wet or icy), wind direction (north, south, east or west) and wind speed (0-20, 25-35 or over 40-50 knots). The main rules of interest in the context of the model are the

rules about whether a plane may land on the short runway (planes may always land on the long runway):

- 747’s may never land on the short runway
- 727’s may land on the short runway when the runway is dry or the wind speed is 0-20 knots
- DC10’s may land on the short runway when the runway is not icy and the wind is not 40-50 knots.
- Prop’s may always land on the short runway

Once a plane has successfully been assigned to a runway, it occupies the runway for some time. The runway has to be clear again before other planes may be assigned to it. Planes have a limited amount of fuel: the fuel column indicates the number of minutes the plane has left. When a plane runs out of fuel, it crashes. Except for the planes in the three hold levels, there is a queue of waiting planes. A waiting plane can be entered into an empty slot.

The interface is operated by the keyboard, mainly by using the up and down keys to move the arrow in the display up and down, and the return key to select planes and runways. Subjects receive 50 points for successfully landing a plane, 10 penalty points for violating a rule (the interface gives feedback on these violations), and 100 penalty points for each plane that crashes. Trials take 10 minutes each, after which the total amount of points is calculated.

The Model

The model presented here uses the ACT-R architecture (Anderson & Lebiere, 1998). As the ATC task is a complicated task, modeling all aspects is a major effort. As the model focuses on the learning aspects of the task, other aspects will be ignored or simplified. The model does not model the perceptual-motor parts of the task in detail, but rather uses an ad-hoc lisp-interface to do this. For example, a lisp function perceives all planes in hold level 1 and adds descriptions of them to declarative memory.

Another aspect the model simplifies are the more strategic aspects of the task. The main exploratory learning aspect is learning what planes under what conditions may land on the short runway. Other strategic aspects are not modeled. As a consequence, the model’s peak performance (around 2000 points) is not as good as human peak performance (around 3500 points).

The basis for the model is the idea that the instructions are represented in declarative memory, and need to be retrieved and interpreted (Taatgen, 1999b; Anderson, 2000). The production rules that interpret the declarative instructions are not task-specific, and can be used for other tasks as well. The declarative representation that is used is a mixture of ideas expressed by Taatgen (1999b) and by Anderson (2000).

Declarative rules are organized in lists of instructions that are usually executed in order. Each rule has an action, and at most two arguments. An argument can be a constant, a variable or a reference. A constant is used as it is. A variable is something that needs a value, for example by retrieving

1. Kanfer-Ackerman Air Traffic Controller Task[©] program is copyrighted software by Ruth Kanfer, Philip L. Ackerman, and Kim A. Pearson, University of Minnesota.

something from declarative memory or by perceiving something in the outside world. Instantiating a variable creates a chunk of type binding, that holds the relation between the variable, its value and the current context. An argument of type reference later retrieves a binding.

The following example of a declarative instruction used in the model is part of the instruction to land a plane:

<p>land1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> isa instruction action perceive-a-plane arg1 plane type1 variable arg2 plane-type type2 variable prev land 	<p>land2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> isa instruction action perceive-weather arg1 wind-speed type1 variable arg2 runway-condition type2 variable prev land1
<p>land3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> isa instruction action retrieve-experience arg1 plane-type type1 reference arg2 wind-speed type2 reference prev land2 	<p>land4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> isa instruction action decide-no arg1 take-long-runway type1 constant prev land3

The first instruction is to perceive an arbitrary plane in hold level 1, and to store it and its type in two variables (which are added to declarative memory as binding-chunks). The second step is to check the weather, and to store the wind-speed and runway-condition. The third step tries to retrieve a past experience concerning the plane-type and the wind-speed. If this past experience is unfavorable, the fourth step decides to take the long runway.

The interpretation process of an instruction involves at least two steps (=production rule firings): the instruction has to be retrieved from memory, and the instruction has to be carried out. Additional steps are necessary if variables and references have to be instantiated, or if the instruction is complicated.

The current model is provided with a declarative instruction to do the ATC task. This instruction is not a literal interpretation of the instructions given to the participants, but reasonable first approximation of a strategy. Another assumption in this strategy is that the model has not memorized all the rules about when a certain plane may land on the short runway, but instead relies on trial-and-error to rediscover these rules. The instructions can be summarized as follows:

Main goal

1. If there are any planes in hold level 1, land one of them
2. Else, move an arbitrary plane from hold level 2 or 3 to hold level 2 or 1.
3. If there are no planes anymore, get between 1 and 6 new planes from the queue.

Landing a plane

1. Select an arbitrary plane in hold level one.
2. Look at the current weather conditions
3. Try to retrieve a past experience with the current plane type and the current wind-speed
4. If the past experience is unfavorable, select the long runway and move the plane there.
5. Try to retrieve a past experience with the current plane and the current runway condition
6. If the past experience is unfavorable, select the long runway and move the plane there
7. If both experiences were favorable, or not present, select the short runway and move the plane there

To move something from A to B

1. Press up or down keys until the arrow is at A
2. Press enter
3. Press up or down keys until the arrow is at B
4. Press enter

Learning in the Model

Four learning mechanisms play a role in the behavior of the model: declarative symbolic, declarative subsymbolic and procedural learning (symbolic and subsymbolic).

Declarative Symbolic Learning

ACT-R keeps past experiences in declarative memory. The current model uses these experiences to decide on whether to land a plane on the short or the long runway. The representation used for examples is restricted to two arguments, the plane type and either the runway condition and the wind speed. As a consequence, the model has no problems learning that 747's can never be landed on the short runway, and prop's always, but it has trouble with the DC10's and 727's, as these planes have complicated rules.

Declarative Subsymbolic Learning

Due to practise, the activation of the instruction chunks and the past experiences chunks steadily increases. As a consequence, retrieval times of these chunks decreases.

Procedural Learning

New productions are learned using a combination of specialization and compilation. Specialization involves substituting variables by constants, more in particular variables that occur in the retrieved chunk. As a consequence, retrieving the chunk is on longer necessary. Compilation involves making one rule out of two rules. In order to make sure the new rule has at most one retrieval, the first rule is specialized first.

This mechanism is not part of the current ACT-R 4.0, but part of the proposal for ACT-R 5.0 (Taatgen, 2000). The main function in the model that it compiles declarative instructions into production rules. Recall that interpreting

instructions takes two steps: retrieving the instruction and carrying out the instruction. Production compilation specializes the retrieval of the instruction, and concatenates the result with the rule that carries out the instruction. The following rules gives an example of pushing enter (rules have been abbreviated for clarity):

```
(p retrieve-instruction
=goal>
 isa gen-goal
 current =prev
 action nil
=>
=instr>
 isa instruction
 prev =prev
 action =action
==>
=goal>
 current =instr
 action =action)

(p press-enter
=goal>
 isa gen-goal
 action press-enter
==>
=goal>
 action nil
!eval! (press-enter))
```

These rules can interpret instructions like:

```
mvhold3 isa instruction action press-enter prev mvhold2
```

Proceduralization produces the following rule given these ingredients:

```
(p compiled-rule
=goal>
 isa gen-goal
 current mvhold2
 action nil
=>
=goal>
 current mvhold3
 action nil
!eval! (press-enter))
```

In order to promote a gradual introduction of new rules, their parameters are set to the parameter values derived from the parent rules, plus a penalty on the cost (b) parameter. So a new rule starts out at a slight disadvantage, and is slowly integrated into the system as parameters learning establishes the true values of the production parameters.

Modeling Individual Differences

The three abilities identified by Ackerman are modeled by varying three parameters. General ability is modeled by varying the *W*-parameter. The *W*-parameter controls the amount of spreading activation, and is associated with working-memory capacity (Lovett, Reder & Lebiere, 1997). Working-memory capacity itself is strongly correlated with general ability (Kyllonen & Christal, 1990). The simulation uses values 0.8, 1.0 and 1.4 as *W*-values. Speed of knowledge compilation, measured by Ackerman through perceptual speed, is modeled by varying a parameter that controls proceduralization speed. The parameter determines the probability that, given an opportunity to learn a new rule, the rule




Figure 3: Points scored by the model and subjects in Ackerman (1990).

is actually learned. Values used are: 0.1%, 0.2%, 0.5%, 5%

Psychomotor speed is modeled by varying the time needed for a key-press. Values used for this parameter are: 150 ms, 200 ms and 250 ms

Results of the Model

In order to assess results of the model, I will compare the model outcomes to the data from Ackerman (1990).

A single run of the model consists of going through 24 trials of 10 minutes each. For each combination of individual difference parameters the model was run twice, producing $4 \times 3 \times 3 \times 2 = 72$ runs.

The model's performance in terms of the number of points scored is shown in Figure 3. As the model is only outfitted with a very basic strategy, and no means to improve it, it is no surprise the subjects outperform the model. The shapes of the curves are however similar.


Figure 4 shows correlations between abilities and performance on the ATC-task found by Ackerman, and the correlations between parameter settings and performance of the model. According to Ackerman's theory, these outcomes should resemble the graphs in Figure 1.

Figure 4a and d show the impact of general intelligence. Ackerman measured intelligence by administering a battery of tests for general intelligence (Letter sets, Raven progressive matrices, figure classification and analogies). The model simulates this ability by varying *W*. A higher value of *W* facilitates the retrieval process by increasing spreading activation. Initially this factor is very important, as both instructions and task information are represented declaratively. As more and more instructions are proceduralized, the stress on declarative memory lessens, so the impact of *W* on performance decreases.


Figure 4b and e show the impact of speed of proceduralization. Ackerman assessed this ability and psychomotor speed by administering a set of choice-reaction tests (9CRT, 4CRT, 2CRT and a simple reaction test) in 12 blocks. These tests span the range of perceptual speed ability (more choices and less practice) to psychomotor speed (less choices and

Data


Model




(a)




(d)




(b)



(e)



(c)



(f)

Figure 4: Correlations between Ability scores and performance on the ATC task. (a)-(c) Data from Ackerman (1990) (d)-(f) Outcomes of the model. Solid lines indicate the regression of the ability on practice (cubic polynomial). Each session in the data (a)-(c) consists of three trials.

more practice). Figure 4b uses the results of the first block of the 9CRT, the test at the perceptual-speed extreme of the range, while Figure 4c uses simple-reaction time results in block 12 at psychomotor-speed extreme of the spectrum.

In the model the speed of proceduralization has its main effect in the middle blocks of trials. As proceduralization

prerequisites some experience with the knowledge it uses to construct new rules, it plays only a small role in the first few trials. Although proceduralization remains an important factor until the end of the experience, its impact trails off slightly, as productions that have the largest impact on performance are learned relatively early.

Figure 4c and f depict the impact of psychomotor speed. In the model this factor becomes more important as experience grows. Although the influence of the effort parameter that models psychomotor speed remains the same, the variance due to other factors decreases, increasing the impact of this psychomotor speed.

Note that for all three abilities, the correlations for the model are larger than the correlations for the data. This should be no surprise, as the parameter manipulations in the model have a direct impact on performance, while assessing these abilities through tests, as is done in the data, is only indirect. Another reason why the correlations in the model are higher is that the model ignores knowledge differences, thereby amplifying the architectural differences.

Discussion

Despite the limitations of the model, it succeeds in going through the three stages of skill acquisition, as demonstrated by the correlations with abilities that characterize these stages. As such it supports the ideas about skill acquisition put forth here and in earlier models based on the same principles (e.g., Taatgen 1999b).

The model also exhibits an example of an ACT-R model where all learning mechanisms are used, instead of a subset of mechanisms for a small task. As such it supports the notion of ACT-R as an architecture of cognition.

One might ask what the added value of a cognitive model is to Ackerman's theory. It can be observed that the outcomes of the model are much closer to the data than Ackerman's more qualitative predictions in Figure 1. The model allows the study of what the exact impact of an individual difference related parameter is, and may also help understand other experiments where Ackerman's theory does not seem to hold. Some issues need further exploration: for example, it is not clear what the exact relationship between perceptual speed and speed of proceduralization is. Ackerman doesn't have a clear explanation for this. A model of the 9CRT using proceduralization might clarify this issue.

The strategy of the model is still its main limitation: it cannot improve the simple initial strategy very much. The retrieval of examples to guide behavior is something that can be extended, and general strategies to improve on plans can be added. The declarative representation is very flexible, so allows easy modification (as opposed to productions). Work by Lee, Anderson and Matessa (1995) and John and Lallement (1997) may be useful for this purpose.


Finally, the perceptual-motor aspects of the model can be extended to improve its credibility and scope of modeling learning, possibly based on Lee and Anderson (in press).

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Frank Lee and John Anderson for their help, and providing me with a Lisp implementation of the ATC task.

References

- Ackerman, P. L. (1988). Determinants of individual differences during skill acquisition: Cognitive abilities and information processing. *Journal of experimental psychology: General*, 117(3), 288-318.
- Ackerman, P. L. (1990). A correlational analysis of skill specificity: learning, abilities, and individual differences. *Journal of experimental psychology: learning, memory, and cognition*, 16(5), 883-901.
- Anderson, J. R. (1982). Acquisition of cognitive skill. *Psychological Review*, 89, 369-406.
- Anderson, J. R. (2000). Learning from instructions. Proceedings of the seventh annual ACT-R workshop.
- Anderson, J. R. & Lebiere, C. (1998). The atomic components of thought. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fitts, P. M. (1964). Perceptual-motor skill learning. In A. W. Melton (Eds.), *Categories of human learning*. New York: Academic Press.
- John, B. E. & Lallement, Y. (1997). Strategy use while learning to perform the Kanfer-Ackerman air traffic controller task. In M. G. Shafto & P. Langley (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society* (pp. 337-342). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kyllonen, P. C. & Christal, R. E. (1990). Reasoning ability is (little more than) working-memory capacity. *Intelligence*, 14(4), 389-433.
- Lee, F. J., Anderson, J. R., & Matessa, M. P. (1995). Components of dynamic skill acquisition. In *Proceedings of the 17th annual conference of the cognitive science society* (pp. 506-511). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Lee, F.J. & Anderson J.R. (in press). Does learning a complex task have to be complex? A study in learning decomposition. *Cognitive Psychology*.
- Lovett, M. C., Reder, L. M., & Lebiere, C. (1997). Modeling individual differences in a digit working memory task. In M. G. Shafto & P. Langley (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society* (pp. 460-465). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Taatgen, N. A. (1999a). Cognitief Modelleren: Een nieuwe kijk op individuele verschillen. *Nederlands tijdschrift voor de psychologie*, 54(4), 167-176.
- Taatgen, N. A. (1999b). A model of learning task-specific knowledge for a new task. In M. Hahn & S. C. Stoness (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 21th annual conference of the cognitive science society* (pp. 730-735). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Taatgen, N. A. (2000). Learning new production rules in ACT-R. Online document: <http://www.ai.rug.nl/~niels/proceduralization.html>. University of Groningen, Netherlands.



University of Groningen

Artificial Intelligence

prepublications

AI-2001-8	N.A. Taatgen A model for individual differences in learning air traffic control
AI-2001-7	J. Misker Validating a tool for simulating user interaction
AI-2001-6	N.A. Taatgen Extending the past-tense debate: a model of the German plural
AI-2001-5	G.R. Renadel de Lavalette & H.P. van Ditmarsch Exact models for knowledge games
AI-2001-4	H.P. van Ditmarsch The semantics of concurrent knowledge actions (extended abstract)
AI-2001-3	B.P. Kooi & H.P. van Ditmarsch Speltheorie en logica
AI-2001-2	B. Dunin-Keplicz & L.C. Verbrugge Collective Intentions
AI-2001-1	W. van der Hoek & L.C. Verbrugge Epistemic logic: problems and puzzles
TCW-2000-13	H.P. van Ditmarsch Knowledge games (article)
TCW-2000-12	N.A. Taatgen & D. Wallach Whether Skill Acquisition is Rule or Instance based is determined by the Structure of the Task
TCW-2000-11	H.P. van Ditmarsch Knowledge games (thesis)
TCW-2000-10	N.A. Taatgen Dispelling the magic: towards memory without capacity
TCW-2000-9	N.A. Taatgen & J.R. Anderson Why do children learn to say "Broke"?
TCW-2000-8	H.P. van Ditmarsch Axioms for cardgames
TCW-2000-7	F. Dignum, B. Dunin-Keplicz & L.C. Verbrugge Agent architecture and theory for team formation by dialogue
TCW-2000-6	H.P. van Ditmarsch Dynamic knowledge logic
TCW-2000-5	F. Stulp & L.C. Verbrugge A knowledge-based algorithm for the internet protocol TCP
TCW-2000-4	P. Hendriks Het taalorgaan en andere linguïstische curiositeiten: de taalkunde in het nieuwe millennium
TCW-2000-3	W. Teepe "Wij kiezen voor u" Online Voting Advice
TCW-2000-2	N.A. Taatgen samenvatting van "Learning without limits"
TCW-2000-1	N.A. Taatgen Expertsysteem strandt op leergedrag expert

- TCW-1999-15 P.S. Hasper & L.C. Verbrugge
Filosofie in tweeduizend en vierenvijftig lemmata
- TCW-1999-14 B. Dunin-Keplicz & L.C. Verbrugge
Collective motivational attitudes in cooperative problem solving
- TCW-1999-13 H.P. van Ditmarsch
The semantics of actions in knowledge games
- TCW-1999-12 H. Prakken & G.A.W. Vreeswijk
Logics for Defeasible Argumentation
- TCW-1999-11 G.A.W. Vreeswijk
Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for a Version Space Representation Theorem
- TCW-1999-10 H.P. van Ditmarsch
The logic of knowledge games: showing a card
- TCW-1999-9 L.C. Verbrugge
Review of Epistemic Logic for AI and Computer Science
- TCW-1999-8 P. Hendriks
The problem with logic in the logical problem of language acquisition
- TCW-1999-7 P. Hendriks
Review of Projecting the Adjective
- TCW-1999-6 B. Dunin-Keplicz, F. Dignum & L.C. Verbrugge
Dialogue in team formation: a formal approach
- TCW-1999-5 B. Dunin-Keplicz & L.C. Verbrugge
The role of dialogue in collective problem solving: Part I
- TCW-1999-4 N.A. Taatgen
A model of learning task-specific knowledge for a new task
- TCW-1999-3 L. Jongman & N.A. Taatgen
An ACT-R model of individual differences in changes in adaptivity due to mental fatigue
- TCW-1999-2 N.A. Taatgen
Implicit versus explicit: an ACT-R learning perspective Commentary on Dienes & Perner
- TCW-1999-1 N.A. Taatgen
Cognitief Modelleren: Een nieuwe kijk op individuele verschillen

- TCW-1998-5 P. Hendriks
Waarom Plato s probleem niet van toepassing is op de verwerving van taal
- TCW-1998-4 N.A. Taatgen
Review of The Atomic Components of Thought
- TCW-1998-3 P. Hendriks & H. de Hoop
Optimality Theoretic Semantics
- TCW-1998-2 H.P. van Ditmarsch
User interfaces in natural deduction programs
- TCW-1998-1 C. Lebiere, D. Wallach & N.A. Taatgen
Implicit and explicit learning in ACT-R
- TCW-1997-2 N.A. Taatgen
Explicit learning in ACT-R
- TCW-1997-1 L.C. Verbrugge & B. Dunin-Keplicz
A reconfiguration algorithm for the maintenance of collective commitment

University of Groningen
Artificial Intelligence / Cognitive Science and Engineering (AI/TCW)
Grote Kruisstraat 2/1
9712 TS Groningen
The Netherlands
tel.: +31 50 363 77
fax. +31 50 363 84
<http://www.ai.rug.nl/prepublications>