

Re: Abnormal Normalization?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Access/microsoft.public.access.tablesdbdesign/2004-05/1039.html>

From: Brian Kastel (*be-ar-eye-ay-en--kay-ay-ess-tee-ee-ell_at_tampabay.rr.com*)

Date: 05/25/04

Date: Tue, 25 May 2004 05:19:15 GMT

lol... Let me set your mind at ease... It is a construction company. Some of the employees end up contracting the company itself to do remodeling or repairs, in which case their address becomes all four addresses! I had to separate jobs from clients because a client can contract for more than one job, and I had to separate contacts from clients because many clients could share one contact and many contacts could be assigned to one client. It even does labor tracking per job and payroll calculations. I thought it was a masterpiece of design when I was finished (HUGE <g>). If attaching binaries were not rude, I would show you a picture of the relationships in this puppy (all with ERI)...

I just wanted a reality check. Thanks. I'm really just an advanced dilettante. I can write VB code in my sleep (I actually have a copy of VB1 -- it's DOS-based, if you didn't know), and I love designing RDs in Access because of that. Sometimes, I even get paid to do it, though not as much as I would like (in either sense of the word). I came here the other day to ask a question, got an answer in five minutes, and stuck around to try to give back a little bit if I could.

Peace.

"tina" <nospam@address.com> wrote in message news:5Vzsc.25256\$fF3.653762@bgtnc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net... well, if a person can fill multiple roles in the data you're storing, i can see a reason to have a separate "person" table. and storing honorifics in a table as opposed to using a value list in the RowSources of combo boxes, i do that myself -- for several reasons. you could apply the same reasons to justify a separate supporting table (i hate to call them lookup tables) for the suffixes. but the first/middle and last name separations? yeah, i think you're going a little table-crazy there. <g> and the addresses bit? i'm not even going to touch that one! but i have to admit the idea of an employee also being a contact (which i've always used with the connotation of an entity *outside* my customer's organization), and the idea of an employee having the same address as a client, or a job site....all this makes me wonder what-in-the-heck kind of business this database will be used in! <big g>

Re: Abnormal Normalization?

microsoft.public.access.tablesdbdesign: Re: Abnormal Normalization?

"Brian Kastel" <be-ar-eye-ay-en--kay-ay-ess-tee-ee-ell@tampabay.rr.com>
wrote in message news:k1xsc.25753\$O13.19925@twister.tampabay.rr.com...

- > *I took people's names out of my Employees and Contacts tables, and created*
- a
- > *Names table with the PK linked to a FK in each of the two original tables.*
- > *I did this because sometimes the employee could also be the contact, or*
- > *vice-versa. But I didn't stop there. I created four tables; one for name*
- > *prefixes (Mr., Ms., etc.), one for name suffixes (Esq., Ph.D., etc.), one*
- > *for forenames (for first and middle names), and one for surnames. So now*
- I
- > *have nothing in the Names table except for its own PK and the five FKs*
- > *linking with the simple tables (First and Middle names both being linked*
- to
- > *the Forenames table). I know this is decidedly 3NF, but does anyone think*
- > *that I am overdoing it?*
- >
- > *The madness doesn't end there, either. Employees, Contacts, Job Sites,*
- and
- > *Clients can all share one address. Of course, I now have one Addresses*
- > *table linked to those four, but I found I had to assign each address a*
- > *"title" to allow for practical selection of the address from a list or*
- > *combo. Again, am I overdoing it? Laziness prompted me to create this*
- > *structure: since I would be the one doing the data entry, I simply didn't*
- > *want to enter data more than once, ever.*
- >
- >