

# 語意資料模型之實證研究：樣式與本體論之比較

張俊智、包冬意

E-mail: 9222553@mail.dyu.edu.tw

## 摘要

語意資料模型是開發資料庫應用系統時在需求分析階段的重要溝通工具。由於此工具並不完美，學者不斷提出新的模型，期望改善此工具在系統開發的效益。本研究以實驗設計來比較新近的兩個語意資料模型方法論：Hay (1996)的資料模型樣式及Wand et al. (1999)的本體論分析法。本研究的目的如下：(1)經由文獻探討比較樣式及本體論兩種語意資料模型的理論基礎，(2)經由實驗設計比較受試者在學習樣式及本體論兩種語意資料模型的一致性程度，(3)經由實驗後面談比較受試者在學習樣式及本體論兩種語意資料模型的理解程度，(4)綜合上述進行學術上的結論，並對業界給予建議。研究結果顯示資料模型樣式在一致性程度及理解程度上皆較本體論分析法更為優越且更受參與實驗的受測者所接受。在未來研究方向，學者可探討資料模型樣式與流程模型在企業資源規劃所扮演的角色。在資料庫設計分析上，樣式如能更具體的提出其繪製的方法或規則，相信將更被業界所接受。

關鍵詞：語意資料模型、資料模型樣式、本體論分析法。

## 目錄

第一章 緒論 第一節 研究背景與動機	1 第二節 研究目的
3 第三節 研究範圍與限制	4 第四節 研究流程
5 第二章 文獻探討 第一節 系統分析	8 第二節 資料庫模型
9 第三節 語意資料模型	11 第四節 語意資料模型之實證研究
15 第五節 資料模型樣式	18 第六節 本體論分析法
24 第七節 心得總結	28 第三章 研究方法 第一節 研究架構
30 第二節 研究假設	32 第三節 實驗流程
論及受測者	32 第四節
數據分析	34 第五節 教學實驗
44 第四節 進階探討	34 第四章 研究結果 第一節
51 第五章 結論 第一節 結論	41 第三節 理解程度分析
53 參考文獻	46 第五節 心得總結
60 附錄二 教學範例文本	52 第二節 後續研究
64 附錄四 面談題目	55 附錄一 繪圖計分原則
70 附錄六 「本體論」參考答案	61 附錄三 測驗文本
	68 附錄五 「樣式」參考答案
	73

## 參考文獻

- [1] 包冬意, (民85), 物件導向分析與設計:方法導引, 松崗.
- [2] 吳仁和、林信惠, (民89), 系統分析與設計理論與實務應用, 智勝.
- [3] 楊亨利等, (民87), 系統分析與設計, 國立空中大學.
- [4] 蔡邦仁, (民87), 系統分析與設計, 滄海書局.
- [5] Barker R., CASE\*METHODM: Entity Relationship Modeling, Oracle Corporation UK Limited, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1992.
- [6] Batra, D., Hoffer, J.A., and Bostrom, R., A comparison of user performance between the relational and the extended entity relationship models in the discovery phase of data base design, ACM Commun., (33, 2), p.126-139, Feb. 1990.
- [7] Biller H. and Neuhold E., Concepts for the conceptual schema, In Architecture and Models in Data Base Management Systems, G. Nijssen, Ed. North-Holland, Amsterdam, p.1-30, 1977.
- [8] Bunge, M. Treatise on Basic Philosophy: Vol. 3: Ontology I: The Furniture of the World. D. Reidel Publishing Co., New York, 1977.
- [9] Bunge, M. Treatise on Basic Philosophy: Vol. 4: Ontology II: A World of Systems. D. Reidel Publishing Co., New York, 1979.
- [10] Chan, H.C., Wei, K.K., and Siau, K.L., User-Database Interface: The Effect of Abstraction Levels on Query Performance, MIS Quarterly, p.441-464, Dec. 1993.

- [11] Chen P. P., The entity-relationship model-toward a unified view of data, *ACM Trans. on Database Systems (TODS)*, (1, 1), p.9-36, March 1976.
- [12] Davis G. B. and Olson M. H., *Management Information System: Conceptual Foundations, Structure, and Development*, 2nd Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1985.
- [13] Drucker P. F., *The Discipline of Innovation*, HBR, p.95-103, August, 2002.
- [14] Gomez-Perez, A. and Corcho, O., *Ontology languages for the Semantic Web*, *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, (17, 1), p.54-60, Jan/Feb 2002.
- [15] Hammer M. and McLeod D., *Database description with SDM: a semantic database model*, *ACM Trans. on Database Systems (TODS)*, (6, 3), p.351-386, Sept. 1981.
- [16] Hay D. C., *Data Model Patterns : Conventions of Thought*, Dorset House Publishing, New York.
- [17] Hendler, J., *Agents and the Semantic Web*, *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, (16, 2) , p.30-37, Mar/Apr 2001.
- [18] Jarvenpaa S. and Machesky J., *End user learning behavior in data analysis and data modeling tools*, In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Information Systems (San Diego, Calif.)*, p.152-167, 1986.
- [19] Juhn S. and Naumann J., *The effectiveness of data representation characteristics on user validation*, In *Proceedings of the 6th Int. Conf. on Information Systems (Indianapolis Ind.)*, p.212-226, 1985.
- [20] Karp, R., Chaudhri V., and Thomere J., "XOL:An XML-Based Ontology Exchange Language(version 0.4)," Aug. 1999, [www.ai.sri.com/~pkarp/xol](http://www.ai.sri.com/~pkarp/xol) (current Jan. 2002).
- [21] Kent R., *Conceptual Knowledge Markup Language (version 0.2)*. 1998. [www.ontologos.org/CKML/CKML%200.2.html](http://www.ontologos.org/CKML/CKML%200.2.html) (current Jan. 2002).
- [22] Kim Y. G. and March S. T., *Comparing Data Modeling Formalisms*, *ACM Commun.*, (38, 6), p.103-115, June 1995.
- [23] Lassila O. and Webick R., "Resource Description Framework (RDF) Model and Syntax Specification." W3C Recommendation, Jan. 1999, [www.w3.org/TR/PR-rdf-syntax](http://www.w3.org/TR/PR-rdf-syntax) (current Jan. 2002).
- [24] Leitheiser R., *An examination of the effects of alternative schema descriptions on the understanding of database structure and the use of a query language*, Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1988.
- [25] Navathe S. B., *Evolution of Data Modeling for Database*, *ACM Commun.*, (35, 9), p.112-123, Sep. 1992.
- [26] Polanyi M., *The Logic of Tacit Inference*, *Philosophy*, (41, 155), p.1-18, 1966.
- [27] Ridjanovic D., *Comparing quality of data representation produced by nonexperts using logical data structures and relational data models*, Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1986.
- [28] Rodgers U., *Oracle: A Database Developer's Guide*, Prentice-Hall Inc., 1991.
- [29] Shoval P. and Even-Chaime M., *Database schema design: An experimental comparison between normalization and information analysis* , *Database* (18, 3), p.30-39, Spring 1987.
- [30] Shoval, P. and Shiran, S., *Entity-relationship and object-oriented data modeling---an experimental comparison of design quality*, *Data & Knowledge Engineering*, (21,3), p.297-315, Feb. 1997.
- [31] Smith J. M. and Smith D. C. P., *Database Abstractions: Aggregation and Generalization*, *ACM Trans. on Database Systems (TODS)*, (2,2), p.105-133, June 1977.
- [32] Tan C.Y. and Maciejowski J. M., *Semantic data models-an alternative to objects for simulation*, *Object-Oriented Simulation and Control*, IEE Colloquium, P.6/1-6/4, 1991.
- [33] Wand Y., Storey, V.C., and Weber, R., *An Ontological Analysis of the Relationship Construct in Conceptual Modeling*, *ACM Trans. on Database Systems (TODS)*, (24,4), p.494-528, Dec. 1999.
- [34] Wand, Y. and Weber, R. "Research Commentary: Information Systems and Conceptual Modeling-A Research Agenda," *Information Systems Research* (13,4), p.363-376. 2002.
- [35] Whitten J. L. and Bentley L. D., *Systems analysis and design methods*, McGraw-Hill, Inc. 1998.