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Abstract

The traditional vertical decomposition methods in relational database normalization fail to prevent common data anomalies. Although a database may be highly normalized, the quality of the data stored in this database may still deteriorate because of potential data anomalies. In this paper, we first discuss why practitioners need to further improve their databases after they apply the traditional normalization methods, because of the existence of functional entanglement, a phenomenon we defined. We outline two methods for identifying functional entanglements in a normalized database as the first step toward data quality improvement. We then analyze several practical methods for preventing common data anomalies by eliminating and restricting the effects of functional entanglements. The goal of this paper is to reveal shortcomings of the traditional database normalization methods with respect to the prevention of common data anomalies, and offer practitioners useful techniques for improving data quality.
Introduction

Today’s computer systems can store massive amounts of data of all types. To make searching enormous databases more efficient, programmers rely on a collection of tables, often called “relations.” A database built around such tables is called a “relational database,” and such databases are built to handle all types of data. For example, a survey system may create a searchable collection of tables that records respondent address, phone number, sex, age, survey questions, survey answers, and other information. A company database may have records representing employee name, office number, telephone number, e-mail, supervisor name, supervisor telephone number, and supervisor email, among other information. Relational databases provide a fast and efficient way to store and retrieve electronic data in modern computer systems.

Database designers create and work with relational databases on a regular basis. However, these practitioners can face numerous problems when building a database using tables. One common problem is data redundancy, which occurs when data are duplicated in a database table, or relation. These duplicated data can cause anomalies that affect data quality and provide users with incorrect information. Therefore, practitioners must follow certain rules while designing and normalizing their databases.

The traditional method of preventing data redundancy and the resulting anomalies is called “database normalization.” In the normalization process, practitioners examine functional dependency, multi-valued dependency, project-join dependency, and several other data dependencies to decompose a relation into multiple relations. The end result of normalization is a set of relations that meet the requirements of different levels of the normal form. The higher the level of the normal form we reach in a database, the lower the possibility that data anomalies can occur.

The normalization process is well defined in the literature and is commonly understood by database designers. Our experience and recent research indicate that basic data anomalies can still exist in high-level normal forms even if the database meets all traditional normalization requirements. Consequently, in addition to following the traditional normalization methods, practitioners should strive to identify functional entanglements in a database and restrict their effects. By doing so, practitioners can significantly improve data quality.

In this paper, we continue to build on these research findings. We first discuss methods of identifying functional entanglements in a normalized database. Then we analyze several practical approaches for restricting the potential effects of these functional entanglements. The discussion provides practitioners with tools they can use to improve database design and implementation, extending what is typically done during the traditional normalization process.

Through the remainder of this manuscript, we use an italic font to represent the names of relations and fields in all our discussions and examples.

Data Dependencies and Relation Decomposition

Table 1 illustrates data redundancy in the Supervisors relation. Notice that the employees in the first two rows have the same supervisor with the same telephone number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EmployeeName</th>
<th>SupervisorName</th>
<th>SupervisorPhone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>888-1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>888-1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>888-1212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>888-2222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this relation, identical information on (SupervisorName, SupervisorPhone) can appear multiple times. This is an example of data redundancy. If one of the telephone numbers in the first two rows is accidentally changed, or if a new employee with the same supervisor (Davis) but a different phone number is inserted, the relation will provide users with inconsistent information on the telephone number for this supervisor.
In the third record of this relation, the employee has the same supervisor as the first two records, but for some reason the telephone number is different. This is a typical example of a data anomaly that can occur when a record is inserted or updated. Here, data redundancy directly affects data quality for users by providing conflicting information. Removing data redundancies in a relational database is an important technique for improving data quality.

Traditionally, relational database design relies on a method called “vertical decomposition” to normalize relations and eliminate redundancies. To illustrate the basic mechanism of this method, we can decompose the Supervisors relation into two smaller relations, SupervisorsNew and SupervisorPhones, as shown in Table 2 and Table 3, respectively.

### Table 2. SupervisorsNew: result of decomposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EmployeeName</th>
<th>SupervisorName</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After this decomposition, the system can retrieve the supervisor telephone number for a particular employee by first joining the two normalized relations through the common field SupervisorName. The decomposition removes the data redundancy, does not remove information presented in the original relation, and eliminates the original potential data anomaly problem. Thus, decomposition is a useful tool in improving data quality.

The above decomposition is based on the concept of functional dependency, which states that the value of one field (X) always determines the value of another field (Y) of the same row in a relation. This is illustrated in the relationship between the fields SupervisorName and SupervisorPhone in Table 3, with a functional dependency (denoted as X → Y) existing between these two fields.

Functional dependency is the most common cause of data redundancy. Other less common data dependencies that can cause data redundancy are multi-valued dependency and project-join dependency. Researchers have also discussed other, rarer types of data dependency, such as “template dependency,” “subset dependency,” and “join dependency.” The solutions for the problems caused by these data dependencies all rely on vertical decomposition methods.

However, our main discussion focuses on the problems caused by functional entanglement, which is in direct contrast to functional dependency. The problems caused by functional entanglement discussed in this paper cannot be solved by vertical decomposition. Thus, other than functional dependency, we do not address the other types of data dependencies that are mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

Based on different types of data dependencies, vertical decomposition methods can normalize a relational model into different levels of normal form, such as Boyce-Codd normal form (BCNF), 4th normal form (4NF), and 5th normal form (5NF). These normal forms are considered high level and are the desired goals of a database normalization process. The normalization process that relies on vertical decomposition to remove data redundancies is well illustrated in the literature by Date, Kroenke, and Ullman, among many others.

### Data Redundancy in High-Level Normal Forms

Although vertical decomposition is the most commonly accepted method, its inability to completely eliminate some very common data redundancies is often overlooked. Practitioners should consider steps beyond vertical decomposition to prevent data anomalies. To illustrate this need, we present the Employees relation described in Table 4.
Table 4. Employees: A normalized relation that contains data redundancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EmployeeID</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this relation, data redundancy exists between fields Title and Sex in the first two rows. The value set (Mr, M) in (Title, Sex) appears twice in Table 4, and it would likely occur many times in the entire relation. This kind of data redundancy can cause data anomalies when records are inserted or updated. However, because the value “Dr” in Title of rows 3 and 4 is associated with two different values in Sex, a functional dependency relationship does not exist between Title and Sex. Thus, database designers cannot use decomposition methods to normalize this relation despite the common data redundancy we have observed. Therefore, if we assume the field EmployeeID can uniquely identify a row in this relation, we can simply designate this field as the primary key for the Employees relation. This relation is in 5NF, based on the normal form definition and despite the data redundancy and potential data anomalies.

The domain/key normal form (DKNF) does not permit this kind of data redundancy. A relation is in DKNF if and only if every constraint on the relation is a logical consequence of the definition of keys and domains. A relation “key” is a field or a set of fields whose values can uniquely identify a row in the relation. Because we assume that EmployeeID can uniquely identify a row in the Employees relation, we can set this field as the relation key. The “domain” of a field is the set of all possible values that the field can take in the relation. For example, it is desirable to set the domain of Sex in the Employees relation as [M, F]. DKNF requires that all database design specifications be defined in terms of keys and domains. Because the interrelationship between Title and Sex in this example is not a constraint that can be defined by domains or keys, the Employees relation is not in DKNF. However, researchers have noted that no direct algorithms exist by which to reach DKNF, and implementing DKNF is impractical for several reasons.

To better understand the data dependency that occurs in Table 4, Chen et al. proposed a concept called “functional independency” that practitioners can apply to prevent data anomalies in database designs. Functional independency is based on the observation that two fields that are not functionally dependent on each other may sometimes still relate to each other: that is, they may not in fact be functionally independent from each other. Functional independency is defined as follows:

Given a relation R, field X of R is functionally independent on field Y of R (noted as $X \triangleright Y$) if and only if, for any instance $x_i \in \text{Domain}(X)$ and any instance $y_j \in \text{Domain}(Y)$, instance $(x_i, y_j)$ is always valid for set of fields $(X, Y)$ in R.

We noted earlier that the fields Title and Sex in the Employees relation are not functionally dependent on each other. Neither are they functionally independent, because some values in these two fields cannot appear together in a given row. For example, there should never be a record in this relation with value (Ms, M) in (Title, Sex). We define this kind of data dependency, which is between the states of functional dependency and functional independency, as “functional entanglement” throughout this paper.

Functional entanglements, like the interrelationship between Title and Sex in the Employees relation, cannot be automatically removed by the traditional vertical decomposition methods. This characteristic separates functional entanglement from all other data dependencies mentioned in this paper so far.

As we have seen from the Employees relation (Table 4), if two fields are not functionally dependent on each other but are interrelated through functional entanglement, data anomalies may occur and data quality can suffer. Database practitioners should be alert to the problems caused by functional entanglements in a normalized database so that they can identify them and restrict their effects.

In the following section, we explore the causes of common functional entanglement and analyze...
potential practical solutions to improve data quality without the need to comply with the strict and sometimes impossible DKNF criteria.

Method

Throughout this paper, we use a fictitious electronic human resources (eHR) system as an example to illustrate different data anomaly problems and examine potential solutions. In the eHR model, each employee is identified with a unique EmployeeID, as we showed in the Employees relation in Table 4.

In the following section, we examine several examples to investigate how different types of functional entanglement can exist in high-level normal forms. We follow that discussion with a section describing how practitioners can better deal with weaknesses resulting from functional entanglements.

Because fields in a database model can relate to each other in multiple ways, and because functional entanglements can appear in many different forms, trying to identify all the functional entanglements can be difficult. This is one reason that DKNF is so difficult to achieve. Our objective in this paper is not to provide an optimal or perfect database design methodology. Rather, we aim to help practitioners identify the weaknesses in real-world database models so they can take constructive and important steps to improve data quality.

Identifying Functional Entanglements

In this section, we discuss two methods for identifying some of the most common functional entanglements. The first method is based on detection of “subdomain dependencies.”

Detecting Subdomain Dependencies

The cause of the data redundancy problem in the Employees relation (Table 4) is a functional dependency relationship between a domain subset of Title (\{Mr, Ms\}) and Sex (\{M, F\}). This phenomenon is called a subdomain dependency and defined formally as follows:

Given a relation R, field Y of R is functionally dependent on field X of R in subdomain (noted as \(X \rightarrow_s Y\)) if and only if,

1. \(X \rightarrow Y\) does not hold, and
2. There exists at least one instance \(x_i \in \text{Domain}(X)\) so that \(x_i\) is associated with one and only one Y-value in R.\(^1\)

In other words, between fields X and Y, functional dependency appears in a subset of instances, but we cannot establish such a relationship for the entire two fields. Because subdomain dependencies have characteristics similar to those of functional dependencies, data redundancies caused by functional dependencies can similarly appear in subdomain dependencies. The partial dependencies and transitive dependencies that are supposedly removed by the low-level 2nd normal form (2NF) and 3rd normal form (3NF) can still appear through subdomain dependencies in high-level normal forms.

Using a decomposition method is feasible only when we can establish functional dependency between two entire fields. Owing to the nature of subdomain dependency, in which functional dependency occurs only between domain subsets of the fields but not in their entire domains, database designers cannot use decomposition methods to remove data redundancies caused by this kind of dependency.

Subdomain dependency is a specific type of functional entanglement. Detecting subdomain dependencies is the first extra step a practitioner should consider after having applied the traditional normalization methods. This process is similar to that of identifying functional dependencies. The clues that allow us to detect subdomain dependencies usually reside in the data modeling specifications.

The eHR model we are using as example needs to capture the employment status of each employee. An employee is hired on either a full-time (denoted as FT) or hourly (denoted as PT) basis. The model also needs to keep the ratio of hours to full-time employment for every employee, so that administrators can calculate payment scales and benefits. For a full-time employee, the ratio is always 1. For an hourly employee, this ratio is
between 0 and 1. We designed the Employment relation shown in Table 5 to capture this information.

Table 5. Employment: a normalized relation with subdomain dependency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EmployeeID</th>
<th>EmploymentStatus</th>
<th>EmploymentRatio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, we cannot establish functional dependency between fields EmploymentStatus and EmploymentRatio because value “PT” in EmploymentStatus is associated with multiple values in EmploymentRatio. But we can identify the following subdomain dependency:

EmploymentStatus → EmploymentRatio

This dependency exists because if EmploymentStatus is “FT,” then EmploymentRatio must be 1. With this subdomain dependency, data anomalies, such as the record with EmployeeID 105 in Table 5, may occur after record insertion or update, despite the fact that we can designate EmployeeID as the primary key and this relation is in 5NF. The clue to help identify this subdomain dependency is within the statement in the requirement specifications: “For a full-time employee, the ratio is always 1.”

Subdomain dependencies are a common problem in relational databases. If a practitioner does not make an extra effort to identify and restrict their effects, data redundancies can cause significant data quality problems.

As another example of the complexities of these potential dependencies, the eHR model needs to store address information for the employees. Each address record contains street number, street name, city, state, and zip code. Some zip codes are uniquely associated with certain cities and states. Some cities have multiple zip codes, and a zip code can sometimes be used for multiple cities in the same state. One zip code can also potentially cross state lines in special areas such as military bases. Finally, the same city name can appear in different states. We designed the EmployeeAddresses relation shown in Table 6 to store the address information.

Because of the specified requirements of city, state, and zip code, we cannot establish functional dependencies among these three fields because some zip codes are used for more than one city or state. Although this relation is in 5NF with EmployeeID as the primary key, the following subdomain dependencies exist.

Zip Code → State, and
Zip Code → City.

This situation arises because of the requirement “some zip codes are uniquely associated with certain cities and states,” while some zip codes can be used for multiple cities or even states. From this example we can again observe: one can spot subdomain dependency information from the design requirements that describe the characteristics of the data.

Because of these subdomain dependencies, data redundancies are widespread in the EmployeeAddresses relation. The same value in (City, State, Zip Code) appears multiple times, as in rows 1 and 2, and redundancy on (State, Zip Code) is visible in rows 4 and 5. These data redundancies are the prime sources

Table 6. EmployeeAddresses: another example of subdomain dependency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EmployeeID</th>
<th>Street Number</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1st Ave.</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>35049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>2nd Ave.</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>35049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>A Drive</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>35215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>B Drive</td>
<td>Hoover</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>35216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>C Drive</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>35216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>White Rd.</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>35049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for data anomalies. The record with EmployeeID 106 is an example of data anomaly among city, state, and zip code. In reality, zip code 35049 is not valid for Birmingham, AL, but the current design cannot prevent this record from being introduced into the relation by record insertion or update.

Subdomain dependencies are a common phenomenon in a relational database. Practitioners should attempt to detect subdomain dependencies after applying the traditional database normalization methods.

**Identifying Restricted Domains**

Functional entanglements can appear in forms other than subdomain dependency. To illustrate these functional entanglements, we first introduce two terms related to field domain—“unrestricted domain” and “restricted domain.” Specifically, for any given field, if all possible values in its domain can be assigned to any record in this field, we call the domain of this field an unrestricted domain; otherwise, we call it a restricted domain.

The value in a field of a given row can be restricted in one of two ways: (1) by other values in the same field of other records, or (2) by the values in another field of the same record. We can observe these two types of restriction in the example that follows.

The eHR system needs to keep track of the total number of advanced degrees each employee has obtained; it also needs to record, among those degrees, how many are related to information technology (IT). We can design a 5NF relation denoted Degrees (EmployeeID, Total_Degree, IT_Degree), with EmployeeID as the primary key. The domains of all three fields are nonnegative integers. Total_Degree and IT_Degree give the total number of advanced degrees and IT-related advanced degrees, respectively, per employee. Table 7 shows a few rows of this relation.

In this relation, the EmployeeID field has a restricted domain because of the uniqueness requirement of its values. If we need to insert a new row in Table 7, the EmployeeID of the new record must not duplicate any of the values that have already been assigned to other records in this field. Therefore, the domain of this field is restricted by other existing values in the same field.

Total_Degree and IT_Degree also have restricted domains. This is because in any given row, the value of IT_Degree must be no greater than the value of Total_Degree. Once we assign a value to Total_Degree, we cannot assign a greater value to IT_Degree in the same row. Similarly, if we have assigned a value to IT_Degree in a given record, we cannot assign a smaller value to Total_Degree of the same record. Said another way, the value (1, 2), shown for EmployeeID 103 in Table 7, is invalid for (Total_Degree, IT_Degree); the person could not have more advanced IT degrees than total professional degrees. In short, not all possible values in the two domains are free to be assigned to all rows of these two fields in this relation. The values in these two fields are causing domain restrictions for each other. Because our goal is to identify functional entanglements among fields, we are interested only in the restricted domains that are caused by values in other fields of the same row.

The subdomain dependency discussed in the Employment relation (Table 5) and the EmployeeAddress relation (Table 6) is a specific appearance of restricted domain. In the Employment relation, the fields EmploymentStatus and EmploymentRatio are restricting each other's domain. However, the interrelationship between Total_Degree and IT_Degree is not one of subdomain dependency. In subdomain dependency, some values in a field can uniquely determine the values in another field. However, the value of Total_Degree or IT_Degree in a given row can determine only the range of values in the same row of the other field, not the specific value. Any time that a field's domain is restricted by the values of another field in a relation, functional entanglements and potential data anomalies exist. In the Degrees relation of Table 7, the value (1, 2) is a data anomaly for (Total_Degree, IT_Degree). No mechanisms in the current design can prevent this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EmployeeID</th>
<th>Total_Degree</th>
<th>IT_Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Degrees: a relation with restricted domains

In this relation, the EmployeeID field has a restricted domain because of the uniqueness requirement of its values. If we need to insert a new row in Table 7, the EmployeeID of the new record must not duplicate any of the values that have already been assigned to other records in this field. Therefore, the domain of this field is restricted by other existing values in the same field.

Total_Degree and IT_Degree also have restricted domains. This is because in any given row, the value of IT_Degree must be no greater than the value of Total_Degree. Once we assign a value to Total_Degree, we cannot assign a greater value to IT_Degree in the same row. Similarly, if we have assigned a value to IT_Degree in a given record, we cannot assign a smaller value to Total_Degree of the same record. Said another way, the value (1, 2), shown for EmployeeID 103 in Table 7, is invalid for (Total_Degree, IT_Degree); the person could not have more advanced IT degrees than total professional degrees. In short, not all possible values in the two domains are free to be assigned to all rows of these two fields in this relation. The values in these two fields are causing domain restrictions for each other. Because our goal is to identify functional entanglements among fields, we are interested only in the restricted domains that are caused by values in other fields of the same row.

The subdomain dependency discussed in the Employment relation (Table 5) and the EmployeeAddress relation (Table 6) is a specific appearance of restricted domain. In the Employment relation, the fields EmploymentStatus and EmploymentRatio are restricting each other's domain. However, the interrelationship between Total_Degree and IT_Degree is not one of subdomain dependency. In subdomain dependency, some values in a field can uniquely determine the values in another field. However, the value of Total_Degree or IT_Degree in a given row can determine only the range of values in the same row of the other field, not the specific value. Any time that a field's domain is restricted by the values of another field in a relation, functional entanglements and potential data anomalies exist. In the Degrees relation of Table 7, the value (1, 2) is a data anomaly for (Total_Degree, IT_Degree). No mechanisms in the current design can prevent this.
value from being inserted or updated into the *Degrees* relation, which is in 5NF.

Analyzing the domain of each field in a relation can help root out functional entanglements. If database designers detect any fields with restricted domains caused by the values of another field, then they need to provide an extra mechanism to prevent data anomalies. We can look at another example to illustrate how analyzing the domains of fields can help identify functional entanglements in a relation. So far, in all our examples, functional entanglements among fields appear within the same relations. Sometimes, however, similar functional entanglements can come from different relations, as illustrated by considering salary information as yet another part of the hypothetical eHR system.

The eHR system keeps salary information for all employees. Each employee belongs to a salary grade that is identified with an alpha character, and each employee has a current (annual) salary (denoted here in US$, rounded to the nearest $1,000). In addition, each salary grade is associated with a minimum salary value. The annual salary of an employee must be greater than or equal to the minimum salary of the grade that he or she is in.

We can achieve 5NF by designing two relations: *EmployeeSalary*(EmployeeID, SalaryGrade, Salary) as shown in Table 8, and *Grade*(SalaryGrade, MinimumSalary), as shown in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EmployeeID</th>
<th>SalaryGrade</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>63,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. *EmployeeSalary*: functional entanglement caused by restricted domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SalaryGrade</th>
<th>MinimumSalary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. *Grade*: functional entanglement caused by restricted domain

The functional dependencies in this model are as follows:

- EmployeeID → SalaryGrade
- EmployeeID → Salary
- SalaryGrade → MinimumSalary

The domains of each field are as follows:

- **EmployeeID**: any nonnegative integers
- **SalaryGrade**: any single alpha characters
- **MinimumSalary**: any positive decimal numbers
- **Salary**: any positive decimal numbers

If we further examine the domain of each field in these two relations, we find two additional requirements:

1. For any row in *EmployeeSalary*, the value of SalaryGrade must be one of the values in the field that bears the same name in the *Grade* relation.
2. For any row in *EmployeeSalary*, the value of Salary must be greater than or equal to the value in MinimumSalary in the row with a matching SalaryGrade in the *Grade* relation.

We can address the first requirement by simply using the well-known and commonly used technique of enforcing a foreign key constraint on the field SalaryGrade from the *Grade* relation to *EmployeeSalary*. The second requirement indicates that the domains of SalaryGrade and Salary in the *EmployeeSalary* relation are restricted. The domain of Salary in the *EmployeeSalary* relation is restricted by the values in MinimumSalary in the *Grade* relation through the common field SalaryGrade. Because of these restricted domains, functional entanglements exist in this relation design.

As we can see in Table 8, the third record (namely, EmployeeID 103) contains a data anomaly because the salary is lower than the minimum value of the corresponding grade. Unfortunately, we cannot prevent this record from being inserted or updated into this 5NF relation based on the current design. In short, the correlation between restricted domains and data anomalies is clear.

In conclusion, by detecting subdomain dependencies and identifying restricted domains, we can determine
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whether a database design contains functional entanglements. In the next section, we analyze practical approaches to eliminate or prevent data anomalies caused by functional entanglements.

Practical Approaches for Preventing Data Anomalies

Chen et al. proposed three practical methods for preventing data anomalies caused by functional entanglements. We summarize them briefly below, explore their applicability, and discuss their strengths and shortcomings in dealing with different types of functional entanglement. Following that discussion, we introduce and analyze another practical method that can be applied to prevent data anomalies.

Practitioner Approaches for Preventing Data Anomalies

Chen et al. proposed three practical methods for preventing data anomalies caused by functional entanglements. We summarize them briefly below, explore their applicability, and discuss their strengths and shortcomings in dealing with different types of functional entanglement. Following that discussion, we introduce and analyze another practical method that can be applied to prevent data anomalies.

Practitioner Approaches for Preventing Data Anomalies

Chen et al. proposed three practical methods for preventing data anomalies caused by functional entanglements. We summarize them briefly below, explore their applicability, and discuss their strengths and shortcomings in dealing with different types of functional entanglement. Following that discussion, we introduce and analyze another practical method that can be applied to prevent data anomalies.

Field-Level Disentanglement

The first option, which we call “field-level disentanglement,” seeks to untangle data interrelationships at the field level. We can demonstrate this approach by further analyzing the relation Degrees(EmployeeID, Total_Degree, IT_Degree) shown in Table 7, in which both Total_Degree and IT_Degree have restricted domains because they do not represent two disjoint subsets in terms of categorical classification of degrees. In essence, IT_Degree is a part of Total_Degree. Hence, there is a constraint, Total_Degree ≥ IT_Degree, for all rows. This constraint can lead to data anomalies, although the relation is already in 5NF and cannot be further decomposed.

To remove the restricted domains in this relation, we can change the relation design by using disjoint subsets. In this particular example, we can replace the field Total_Degree with Non_IT_Degree; this field would then reflect the number of professional degrees that are not IT-related for each employee. The new relation, EmployeeDegrees, is as follows:

EmployeeDegrees(EmployeeID, Non_IT_Degree, IT_Degree), where Total_Degree = Non_IT_Degree + IT_Degree.

After the redesign, the fields Non_IT_Degree and IT_Degree represent two disjoint and mutually complementary subsets. Because no restrictions exist on how the values of these two fields can be assigned in any rows, these two fields both have unrestricted domains. This new design eliminates the potential of data anomalies. In addition, because the value of the original Total_Degree can be derived from the sum of Non_IT_Degree and IT_Degree, no information is lost from the original relation model. This example demonstrates that both relations Degrees and EmployeeDegrees are in 5NF, but EmployeeDegrees is better than Degrees at preventing data anomalies. One important point about this improvement is that EmployeeDegrees is a product of relation redesign rather than decomposition.

This example also highlights the importance of further actions after database designers have applied the traditional decomposition methods when designing a database. Practitioners should analyze functional entanglements and continue to refine the design of relations as an integral part of normalizing a database. When a field exists that is a subset of another field in terms of categorical classification, like Total_Degree and IT_Degree in Degrees, or when mathematical or logical interrelationships exist among fields, this relation will usually have insertion and update anomalies that vertical decomposition methods cannot remove. If we identify restricted domains in a relation, we can first consider using the field-level disentanglement method, which redesigns the relation model to improve data quality.

The main advantage of the field-level disentanglement method is that changes are made at the design level: database designers should thus encounter little or no additional cost at the programming or production levels. Once practitioners apply this method successfully, functional entanglements and the resulting insertion and update anomalies no longer exist, even before the database is implemented. This
process is efficient and straightforward; it does not require any other database system tools to enhance data quality.

Although the field-level disentanglement method is very effective in disentangling data dependencies caused by categorical classification and logical or mathematical interrelationships, this method does have a disadvantage: its usefulness in other situations is limited. Usually, this method works only when functional entanglements occur at the field level for all rows. For example, it cannot be used to solve the data anomaly problems for the relation EmployeeAddresses (Table 6), because the subdomain dependencies only affect a subset of rows.

**Horizontal Decomposition**

Our second option to eliminate restricted domains at the design level is to use horizontal decomposition. Database designers can apply this method to normalize some relations into DKNF in certain situations. As the name suggests, this method decomposes a relation horizontally by splitting a relation into multiple relations with the same table structure. It targets mainly relations with restricted domains that are caused by a limited number of domain subsets. Practitioners use decomposition along the line of these domain subsets to remove the restrictions on domains.

The relation Employment(EmployeeID, EmploymentStatus, EmploymentRatio) of Table 5 illustrates this approach. According to the horizontal decomposition method, we can split Employment into two smaller relations with identical structure:

- Employment WholeRatio(EmployeeID, EmploymentStatus, EmploymentRatio), which holds only full-time employees with EmploymentStatus = “FT” and EmploymentRatio = 1, and
- Employment PartialRatio(EmployeeID, EmploymentStatus, EmploymentRatio), which holds only hourly employees with EmploymentStatus = “PT” and 0 ≤ EmploymentRatio ≤ 1.

After the decomposition, the domains of fields EmploymentStatus and EmploymentRatio in the new relations are no longer restricted, and the new model eliminates potential data anomalies. As a result, subdomain dependency EmploymentStatus → EmploymentRatio no longer exists in either relation.

Although the horizontal decomposition method is simple and straightforward, its drawbacks may outweigh its benefits. The method has not been commonly adopted since its debut. First, this method increases the complexity of a system and the cost of maintenance. When introducing a new record, the programmer must know in which relation to insert this record. Merely updating the value of a row may also require the row to be moved to another relation. Second, this method may cause the information in the database to be widely scattered. Using this method to decompose the EmployeeSalary relation (Table 8), for instance, may produce quite a few decomposed relations, one for each possible salary grade, which makes queries for information extremely difficult. Finally, although the horizontal decompositions appear to have normalized some relations into DKNF, they can also inadvertently introduce a new constraint that requires the decomposed relations to maintain the same or similar structure. If database designers need to change the design of one relation, they must also make the same change to multiple relations. This kind of redundancy adds costs to maintaining the database. Furthermore, this new constraint in itself violates the definition of DKNF.

We demonstrated above that by changing relation design, practitioners can prevent data anomalies in certain situations. We also noted that these methods have limitations. When changing the design is not feasible, we can consider employing some existing relational database management system (RDBMS) tools in the implementation stage.

Next, we demonstrate how to use these standard RDBMS tools to restrict or reduce the effects of functional entanglement to prevent data anomalies. These tools are not new techniques per se, and our intention is not to explain what they are and how they work. Rather, we explain how to use those tools and techniques to handle functional entanglements.
Implementing Lookup Relations

One approach based on using RDBMS tools involves enforcing referential integrity and using lookup relations. As the name suggests, lookup is a referencing mechanism that allows the values of certain fields of a relation to be verified by the values of the same fields in another relation.

To establish a lookup relationship, practitioners can first build a lookup relation with all possible values in certain fields. They can then enforce referential integrity on the referencing relation to the lookup relation by using a foreign key constraint. This mechanism ensures that the values of the underlying fields in the referencing relation are validated whenever a row is inserted or updated.

Referential integrity is a well-known and widely used technique in database implementation. It ensures that different relations are properly related in a database. To illustrate how this method can reduce data anomalies, we return to the EmployeeAddresses relation (Table 6). In this relation, data anomalies arise because of subdomain dependencies among zip code, city, and state. The first step of improvement is to build an additional relation that holds all possible valid values of zip code, city and, state. Table 10 shows a few records of the relation Zipcodes (Zip Code, City, State). This relation serves a lookup purpose for the matched fields in the referencing EmployeeAddresses relation. In this lookup relation, because no functional dependencies arise among Zip Code, City, and State, all three fields are part of the primary key.

Table 10. Zipcodes: lookup relation with all possible underlining values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35049</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35215</td>
<td>Center Point</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35215</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35216</td>
<td>Hoover</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35216</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35220</td>
<td>Center Point</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After we build a lookup relation of this sort, we can set up a foreign key constraint so that fields Zip Code, City, and State in EmployeeAddresses are linked to the corresponding fields in Zipcodes. A generic structured query language (SQL) statement for defining referential integrity for this model is shown below:

```
ALTER TABLE [dbo].[EmployeeAddresses] WITH CHECK ADD CONSTRAINT [FK_EmployeeAddresses_Zipcodes] FOREIGN KEY ([Zip Code],
[City],
[State]) REFERENCES [dbo].[Zipcodes]
([Zip Code],
[City],
[State])
```

Once we enforce referential integrity in this way, every time a row in EmployeeAddresses is inserted or updated, the City, State, and Zip Code values are validated through the Zipcodes relation. The insert or update operation will succeed only when a row with matching values in all three fields in Zipcodes exists. By keeping clean records in Zipcodes, we can largely prevent invalid entries in the EmployeeAddresses relation.

The main advantages of defining referential integrity in a database are improved data quality and consistency. Because referential integrity is declared at the design level, custom programming is not needed. This advantage in turn eliminates unintended programming errors. The data are kept valid and intact by the database itself.

The lookup relation method has some disadvantages. First, subdomain dependencies still exist in Zipcodes, and data anomalies may still occur in this lookup relation. If the content in a lookup relation is not valid, then the data quality of the main relation can erode. This erosion can in turn affect the maintenance costs of keeping the correct content in the lookup relation. Second, this method requires an increased level of processing to validate data, and it increases the complexity of the data model by introducing more relations. Third, using cascading deletes and updates, which database servers offer as a built-in option to maintain data integrity, may cause
inadvertent loss of data without the user’s knowledge. Finally, if the lookup values require constant updates or user manipulations, this method will increase the processing burden and possibly cause potential data errors in the main relation.

By understanding the drawbacks of the lookup relation method, we can determine when to apply it. This method works best in situations that have finite, predefined, stable, and standard lookup values, such as zip code data (which can be purchased and do not require constant user manipulations). This method is also helpful for alleviating the problem explained in the Employees relation shown in Table 4 by predefining a set of finite values for (Title, Sex) in a lookup relation. If building such a lookup relation is impossible or not appropriate, such as in the Employment relation of Table 5 and the EmployeeSalary relation of Table 8, using this method is not suitable.

**Utilizing Check Constraints**

In the examples of the Employment and EmployeeSalary relations above, we demonstrated how to detect functional entanglements by identifying subdomain dependencies and restricted domains. In these two examples, creating lookup relations to prevent data anomalies was impossible because of the infinite number of possible lookup values. However, in similar situations, the “check constraints” method is effective in preventing data anomaly problems.

Check constraints are fast, row-level integrity checks offered by most database servers as a standard, built-in RDBMS tool. Traditionally, RDBMS check constraints are designed to limit the domain scope of a field. Using check constraints can improve domain integrity by limiting a field to a set of allowable values. For example, when implementing the Employees relation in Table 4, the data type of field Sex can be defined only as a one-character string in the database. Without a check constraint, we can assign any character to this field, which could obviously introduce a considerable number of data problems. If database designers want this field to take only a value of {F, M} and nothing else, a check constraint can be defined as follows:

```sql
ALTER TABLE [dbo].[Employees] WITH CHECK
ADD CONSTRAINT [CK_Employees_Sex]
CHECK ([Sex] = 'F' or [Sex] = 'M')
```

This same technique can help prevent data anomalies caused by functional entanglements. For example, we can build a check constraint as follows for the Employment relation (Table 5):

```sql
ALTER TABLE [dbo].[Employment] WITH CHECK
ADD CONSTRAINT [CK_StatusRatio]
```

Once the check constraint is implemented, any attempts to insert or update a row in the Employment relation with an invalid combination in (EmploymentStatus, EmploymentRatio) will fail. Similarly, a check constraint can be devised to prevent data anomalies in the EmployeeSalary relation (Table 8) as follows:

```sql
ALTER TABLE [dbo].[EmployeeSalary] WITH CHECK
ADD CONSTRAINT [CK_SalaryGrade]
CHECK (([SalaryGrade] = 'A' and [Salary] >= 50000) or ([SalaryGrade] = 'B' and [Salary] >= 60000) or ([SalaryGrade] = 'C' and [Salary] >= 70000))
```

When this check constraint is implemented, any attempts to insert or update a row in EmployeeSalary with an invalid salary grade, or with an out-of-range salary value, will cause the RDBMS to generate an error and the operation will fail.

The main advantages of the check constraint method are its simplicity and its ability to handle situations that the other methods discussed cannot. This method is considerably faster than using lookup relations and other RDBMS tools. In some instances, the check constraint method can also simplify the relation model. In the example involving the EmployeeSalary relation, the Grade relation may no longer be needed if the business model does not use it for purposes other than limiting the salary values in the EmployeeSalary relation.

The main disadvantage of the check constraint method is that it is difficult to maintain. If frequent changes are needed to the information related to
the minimum value of each salary grade in the EmployeeSalary relation, or adding or deleting salary grade has to be done on a regular basis, then database administrators will constantly need to change the SQL code in the check constraint definition. The additional custom programming required to implement and maintain check constraints can itself be a source of errors. In addition, with the check constraint method, some useful information is hidden in SQL code, and the information is not available through database queries.

Also, in most database servers, a check constraint is limited to checking information within one relation. Querying information in another relation in a check constraint is impossible. For example, with respect to the salary and grade example, if the check constraint could query into the Grade relation to retrieve the value of MinimumSalary for a given SalaryGrade. This would mean keeping both relations (EmployeeSalary and Grade) while making the constraint simpler and easier to implement and maintain. It would also mean making the minimum salary information available via database queries. Because this querying mechanism is not possible via a check constraint method, the usefulness of this method is limited.

The check constraint method is effective for enforcing general data validation rules or simple business rules. The checks are usually very easy to implement if the functional entanglement is based on simple logic, such as in the Employment relation of Table 5. However, when no clear logic for the rules among fields exists in a relation, such as the EmployeeAddresses relation (Table 6), this method cannot apply.

When all the above methods fail to eliminate data anomalies, we recommend that practitioners consider database triggers, as we describe next.

**Implementing Database Triggers**

A database trigger can be defined as a special type of stored procedure that is executed automatically based on the occurrence of a database event. A trigger ensures that specific events of data insertion, update, or deletion cause the database to automatically execute the programming code written in the corresponding trigger. The stored procedure in a database trigger can perform virtually any operation in a database. Therefore, using database triggers can be a powerful tool in preventing data anomalies. Unlike other RDBMS tools mentioned earlier, the functionality of a database trigger goes beyond enforcing data rules. Therefore, practitioners should exercise caution when designing and implementing them.

A database trigger can perform all data validations that are enforceable with check constraints. An example of how to implement a trigger for the Employment relation of Table 5 is as follows:

```
ALTER TRIGGER [dbo].[EmployeeID] ON [dbo].[Employment] AFTER INSERT AS
BEGIN
SET NOCOUNT ON;
DECLARE @EmploymentCount int
SELECT @EmploymentCount = count(*)
FROM [dbo].Inserted
WHERE (([EmploymentStatus] = 'FT' and
[EmploymentRatio] = 1) or
([EmploymentStatus] = 'PT' and
[EmploymentRatio] >= 0 and
[EmploymentRatio] <= 1))
IF @EmploymentCount <= 0
BEGIN
ROLLBACK TRANSACTION
RAISERROR ('Invalid Employment Status or out of range Employment Ratio', 10, 1)
END
END
```

This is a typical insert trigger. The database server executes the above SQL code every time a row is inserted into the Employment relation. The content of the inserted row is temporarily stored in a one-row relation named "Inserted" that is available for data validation by the trigger. When this trigger is implemented, any attempts to insert a row in the Employment relation with invalid combinations in (EmploymentStatus, EmploymentRatio) will fail. A similar mechanism can be implemented separately for other data events such as row update or deletion.

One advantage of database triggers over check constraints is their ability to perform relation queries. With respect to the EmployeeSalary relation, for instance, we noted that the ideal approach would be to keep both relations EmployeeSalary and Grade and build a relationship between them to validate data.
This kind of relationship is not possible with check constraints, but it is with a database trigger, which can be done as follows:

```
ALTER TRIGGER [dbo].[SalaryRequirement] ON [dbo].[EmployeeSalary] AFTER INSERT AS
BEGIN
    SET NOCOUNT ON;
    DECLARE @SalaryCount int
    SELECT @SalaryCount = count(*)
    FROM [dbo].Grade G, Inserted I
    WHERE (I.SalaryGrade = G.SalaryGrade) and
          (I.Salary >= G.MinimumSalary)
    IF @SalaryCount <= 0
        BEGIN
            ROLLBACK TRANSACTION
            RAISERROR ('Invalid Salary Grade or out of range Salary value', 10, 1)
        END
END
```

When this trigger is implemented, any attempt to insert a row into `EmployeeSalary` will cause the RDBMS to query and compare the salary information with the `MinimumSalary` value in the `Grade` relation based on the value of `SalaryGrade`. If the row that is supposed to be inserted has an invalid salary grade, or has an out-of-range salary value, the RDBMS will generate an error and the insertion will fail. This type of data validation can be a useful tool for maintaining data quality.

The main benefits of using database triggers are flexibility and power. The stored procedure triggered by a data operation of a relation can provoke any SQL code. This allows practitioners to build numerous features, such as a relation query, as discussed earlier, into their databases. Moreover, a trigger can enforce data validation rules at the row level as well as the field level. For example, if a condition is imposed on the `Grade` relation (Table 9) such that the total number of different grades should be 20 or fewer, then this condition would require data validation that this relation can contain only up to 20 rows. No other RDBMS tools, other than an insert trigger, can enforce this requirement. Compared with other RDBMS tools in general, and check constraints in particular, a database trigger offers superior functionality in many aspects. Using triggers correctly often leads to improved data quality.

Nevertheless, implementing database triggers has potential drawbacks. First, comparing the solutions offered by check constraints and database triggers on the `Employment` relation above, we can see that programming a trigger is more complicated than programming a check constraint. Moreover, a check constraint performs data validation on both record insertion and update. Practitioners need to implement triggers for relation insertion and update separately, with very similar code. Consequently, when we need to change data validation rules, we have to alter the program in multiple places.

A second potential drawback is that, because a database trigger is so powerful, it can easily cause unintended consequences. For example, a trigger in a relation can cause a data operation in another relation with a trigger that provokes a data operation in the first relation. This can cause a recursive execution of triggers that may damage or destroy the database. Third, though powerful, database triggers have their own limitations. For example, we have not found an effective solution using a database trigger to address the data anomaly issue in the `EmployeeAddresses` relation (Table 6) without first building a lookup relation, as stated above. The business rules that dictate the relationship among city, state, and zip code are too complicated to be captured in a database trigger without some kind of lookup function.

**Conclusion**

In creating and maintaining relational databases, merely meeting the traditional normalization requirements is not enough to eliminate some basic data anomalies. Common data anomalies can exist in high-level normal forms because of the existence of functional entanglements. By identifying functional entanglements in a database and restricting their effects, practitioners can greatly improve data quality.

We introduced two different methods to identify functional entanglements by detecting subdomain dependencies and restricted domains. We also examined two methods of eliminating functional entanglements at the design level in a normalized database: field-level disentanglement and horizontal
decomposition. Finally, we analyzed three other practical approaches for restricting the effects of functional entanglements with RDBMS tools: building lookup relations, utilizing check constraints, and implementing database triggers.

Each solution presented in this paper has its strengths and shortcomings when handling different types of problems. Based on these strengths and shortcomings, practitioners should carefully evaluate the requirements at hand and apply the most appropriate methods to deal with potential data anomalies.

This paper provides practitioners with some important principles that promote improved database design and implementation by going above and beyond the traditional normalization techniques.

References


Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Craig R. Hollingsworth of RTI’s Research Computing Division for making substantial editorial contributions to this paper. We also owe a debt of gratitude to an RTI Press senior editor, Kathleen N. Lohr, for her invaluable suggestions on the style and substance of this paper.
RTI International is an independent, nonprofit research organization dedicated to improving the human condition by turning knowledge into practice. RTI offers innovative research and technical solutions to governments and businesses worldwide in the areas of health and pharmaceuticals, education and training, surveys and statistics, advanced technology, international development, economic and social policy, energy and the environment, and laboratory and chemistry services.

The RTI Press complements traditional publication outlets by providing another way for RTI researchers to disseminate the knowledge they generate. This PDF document is offered as a public service of RTI International.