## Information Systems and Systems Theory

#### **Ovsei Gelman**

National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM), Mexico

#### **Manuel Mora**

Autonomous University of Aguascalientes (UAA), Mexico

#### **Guisseppi Forgionne**

University of Maryland Baltimore County, USA

#### **Francisco Cervantes**

National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM), Mexico

## INTRODUCTION

The information systems (IS) field has been recognized as a scientific discipline since the 80's, as indicated by: (i) the existence of an intellectual community related with doctoral programs and research centers around the world that generates scientific knowledge and solves practical problems using standard scientific procedures accepted and regulated by this community, and (ii) the diffusion of scientific knowledge related with IS through research outlets and research conferences under a rigorous peerbased review process.

Nonetheless, the discipline of information systems has been critiqued by: (i) the lack of formal theories (Farhoomand, 1987, p.55); (ii) the scarce utilization of deductive and formal (e.g., logical-mathematical) research models and methods (idem, p.55); and (iii) the lack of a formal and standard set of fundamental core well-defined concepts associated with the central object of study in this discipline (Alter, 2001, p.3; Banville & Landry, 1989, p.56; Wand & Weber; 1990, p.1282). Consequently, a common-sense language based on informal, conflicting and ambiguous concepts is used as the communicational system in this discipline (Banville & Landry, 1989), and this approach hinders the development of a cumulative research tradition and delays the maturation of the field (Farhoomand, 1987; Wand & Weber, 1990). Furthermore, a deep examination (Mora, Gelman, Cervantes, Mejia, & Weitzenfeld, 2002) of definitions of the term information system, reveals that fundamental concepts are based on few and misused core concepts from the theory of systems (Ackoff, 1960, 1971) and the few formalization proposals (Alter, 2001; Mentzas, 1994; Wand & Weber, 1990) are incomplete. Therefore, the reduction of the lack of formalization of the core concepts used in the IS discipline becomes a relevant and mandatory research purpose. This article contributes to the IS literature with the adaptation and extension of previous formal definitions reported of the terms system (Ackoff, 1971; Gelman & Garcia, 1989) and organization (Mora, Gelman, Cervantes, Mejia, & Weitzenfeld, 2002) based on the core principles from the Theory of Systems and with the proposal of a formal definition of the term information systems. The article also examines the implications for IS research and practice.

## BACKGROUND

The term *information system (IS)* has been widely defined in textbooks. Table 1 shows a sample of the main definitions posed in the literature. An examination of these definitions suggests that the IS notion: (i) lacks fundamental standardized and formal concepts (Alter, 2001); (ii) lacks competitive formal macro-structures to cumulate

Table 1. A sample of informal definitions of "what is an information system"

Definition	Reference
"An IS is a system composed of subsystems of hardware,	(Senn, 1989, p.23)
programs, files and procedures to get a shared goal."	
"An IS is a system composed of application software,	(Hoffer, George &
support software, hardware, documents and training	Valacich, 1996, p.8)
materials, controls, job roles and people that uses the	
software application".	
"An IS is a system composed of inputs, models, outputs,	(Burch & Grudnitski,
technology, data bases and controls."	1989, p.58)

Copyright © 2005, Idea Group Inc., distributing in print or electronic forms without written permission of IGI is prohibited.

There have been few, if any, efforts to formalize the discipline. Despite attempts to reduce ambiguity, the proposals (Alter, 2001; Wand & Weber, 1990) have been underpinned on partial views - e.g., syntactical and structural perspectives that hide core semantic information-of what is a system (Mora, Gelman, Cervantes, Mejia, & Weitzenfeld, 2002; Sachs, 1976). Others (Mentzas, 1994) offer a more articulated definition than exhibited on Table 1 – by the identification of five subsystems and their functional properties - still lack formalization due to they were developed using a common-sense language critiqued in the IS literature (Banville & Landry, 1989). Therefore, the concept information system has still multiple meanings. A systems-based research stream (Alter, 2001; Mora, Gelman, Cervantes, Mejia, & Weitzenfeld, 2002; Paton, 1997) combined with an ontological perspective (Wand & Weber, 1990) suggest that formal foundations from the Theory of Systems (Xu, 2000, pp.113) can reduce this ambiguity and strengthen the rigor that a scientific discipline requires to mature and simultaneously to be relevant and useful for practitioners.

## MAIN THRUST OF THE ARTICLE

Formalization reported in this article is adapted and extended from previous work by the authors on the formal concepts of *system* (Gelman & Garcia, 1989) and *organization* and *business process* (Mora, Gelman, Cervantes, Mejia, & Weitzenfeld, 2002). This conceptual development follows a ontological path to define primitive concepts and postulates to derive updated definitions of the constructs *system-I, system-II, general-system, organization, business process* and finally *information system*. A similar approach was used by Wand and Weber (1990) and Wand and Woo (1991) to define what is an *information system* and what is an *organization*.

Formal Definition of System-I. An object of study X, formalized as system-I and denoted as  $S_I(X) = \langle B(X), RB(X), E(X) \rangle$ , is a whole X that fulfills the following conditions: (I.1) it has a *conceptual structure*  $\S(X)$  that defines its set of *attributes* B(X), its set of *events* E(X) and its set of *range of attributes* RB(X); (I.2) for any subset B'(X) of *attributes* of B(X), the set of *events* E(X)associated with B(X) differs in at least one element from the set of *events* E'(X) associated with B'(X).

Therefore, to define a situation of study as a *system*-*I* implies to specify  $S_I(X) = \langle S(X) \rangle = \langle B(X), E(X), RB(X) \rangle$ and to fulfill the condition (I.2).

Formal Definition of System-II. An object of study X, formalized as system-II and denoted as  $S_{II}(X) = \langle C_{X} \rangle$ ,  $\Re_{s}(C_{x}') > is a whole X that fulfills the following conditions:$  $(II.1) the whole X is a set <math>C_{x}$  of elements  $X_{1}, X_{2}, ..., X_{k}$ , called *subsystems*, where each  $X_{i}$  for i=1,2,...,k can be formalized as  $S_{I}(X_{i})$  or  $S_{II}(X_{i})$ ; (II.2) there is a collection finite  $\Re_{s}(C_{x}')$  of *set-relations* where  $\Re_{s}(C_{x}') = \{\Re_{1}(C_{x}'), \Re_{2}(C_{x}'), ...\}$  on the set  $C_{x}'=\{C, S_{I}(X)\}$  and where each *set-relation*  $\Re_{p}(C_{x}')=\{\Re_{1}, \Re_{2}, ..., \Re_{p}, S_{1}, X_{j} > \text{or } \Re_{n} = <X_{i}, ia_{x}, S_{I}(X) > \text{or } \Re_{n} = <S_{I}(X), xa_{j}, S_{j} > and ia_{j}$  stands by the output-input parameters or acts between the two elements}; and (II.3) exists at least a *non-directed-path* among two any items  $X_{i}$  and  $X_{i}$  in the *set-relation*  $\Re_{s}(C_{x}')$ .

It must be noted that: (i) condition II.3 assures that for any two elements  $X_i$  and  $X_j$  in the multi-digraph X,  $X_i$  is reachable from  $X_j$  and vice versa; (ii) it is a recursive definition to let a *subsystem* has *subsystems*; and (iii) this definition updates previously reported by authors to consider the output/input relationships between any *subsystem* and the whole *system*. Therefore, to define a situation of study as a *system-II* implies to specify:  $S_{II}(X) = \langle C_X, \\ \Re_s(C_X') \rangle$  where  $C_X = \{S_I(X_i) \text{ or } S_{II}(X_i)\}$  for i = 1, 2, ..., k; $\Re_s(C_X') = \{\Re_1(C_X'), \Re_2(C_X'), ...\}$  and the fulfillment of the condition II.3.

Formal Definition of System as General-System. An object of study X, formalized as *general-system* and denoted as  $S_{G}(X)$ , is a whole X that can be defined simultaneously as a *system-I*  $S_{I}(X)$  and as a *system-II*  $S_{I}(X)$ .

**Postulate 1.** Any general-system  $\mathbf{S}_{G}(\mathbf{X})$  defined as system- $I\mathbf{S}_{I}(\mathbf{X})$  can be mapped to a system- $II\mathbf{S}_{II}(\mathbf{X})$  and vice versa.

Auxiliary Definition 1. Suprasystem. A whole SX is called the *suprasystem of a system X* and it is denoted as SS(X) if (IV.1) the whole X is a *subsystem* of SX; and (IV.2) SX can be formalized as  $S_{I}(SX)$  or  $S_{II}(SX)$ .

Auxiliary Definition 2. Envelope. A whole EX is called the *envelope of a system X* and it is denoted as EE(X), if (V.1) the whole EX is the *suprasystem* of the *suprasystem* of X; and (V.2) EX can be formalized as  $S_1(SX)$  or  $S_{II}(SX)$ .

Auxiliary Definition 3. Environment. A whole WX is called the *environment of a system X* and it is denoted as W(X), if (VI.1) WX can be formalized as  $S_I(WX)$  or  $S_{II}(WX)$  and (VI.2)  $W(X) = \{SS(X), EE(X)\}$ .

**Postulate 2.** Any general-system  $S_G(X)$  has a suprasystem SS(X) and an envelope EE(X).

The first formal definition of the concept system – for example, system-I – accounts for the conception of an external view that sees the system as a single-unit with special characteristics – called, attributes – and potential acts to execute – called, events. In turn, the second formal definition – for example, system-II – represents the more usual view – for example, the internal view – that sees the system as a digraph. Furthermore, the definitions of the set-relations  $\Re_1(C_x'), \Re_2(C_x'), ..., \Re_m(C_x')$  consider the system as a multi-digraph instead of digraph and therefore 4 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/information-systems-systems-theory/14461

## **Related Content**

## Live Interactive Virtual Explorations at a Southern California Native American Learning Center: Case Studies and Lessons Learned

Kimberly Mann Bruch, Hans-Werner Braunand Susan Teel (2010). *Journal of Cases on Information Technology (pp. 62-74).* 

www.irma-international.org/article/live-interactive-virtual-explorations-southern/46039

## Legal Issues of Virtual Organizations

Claudia Cevenini (2009). Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, Second Edition (pp. 2411-2413).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/legal-issues-virtual-organizations/13921

# Capturing Tacit Knowledge from Transient Workers: Improving the Organizational Competitiveness

Salah Eldin Adam Hamza (2010). Information Resources Management: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools and Applications (pp. 1535-1551).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/capturing-tacit-knowledge-transient-workers/54557

#### The Diffusion of Ignorance in On-Line Communities

Selene Arfini, Tommaso Bertolottiand Lorenzo Magnani (2020). *Information Diffusion Management and Knowledge Sharing: Breakthroughs in Research and Practice (pp. 843-857).* www.irma-international.org/chapter/the-diffusion-of-ignorance-in-on-line-communities/242167

## Identification of Co-Changed Classes in Software Applications Using Software Quality Attributes

Anushree Agrawaland R. K. Singh (2020). *Journal of Information Technology Research (pp. 110-128).* www.irma-international.org/article/identification-of-co-changed-classes-in-software-applications-using-software-qualityattributes/249220