

Ahlam F. Sawsaa

**Ontological Engineering  
approach of developing Ontology  
of Information Science**



**Anchor Academic Publishing**

*disseminate knowledge*

**Sawsaa, Ahlam F.: Ontological Engineering approach of developing Ontology of Information Science, Hamburg, Anchor Academic Publishing 2015**

Buch-ISBN: 978-3-95489-448-2

PDF-eBook-ISBN: 978-3-95489-948-7

Druck/Herstellung: Anchor Academic Publishing, Hamburg, 2015

**Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek:**

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

**Bibliographical Information of the German National Library:**

The German National Library lists this publication in the German National Bibliography. Detailed bibliographic data can be found at: <http://dnb.d-nb.de>

All rights reserved. This publication may not be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publishers.

---

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Dies gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Bearbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Die Wiedergabe von Gebrauchsnamen, Handelsnamen, Warenbezeichnungen usw. in diesem Werk berechtigt auch ohne besondere Kennzeichnung nicht zu der Annahme, dass solche Namen im Sinne der Warenzeichen- und Markenschutz-Gesetzgebung als frei zu betrachten wären und daher von jedermann benutzt werden dürften.

Die Informationen in diesem Werk wurden mit Sorgfalt erarbeitet. Dennoch können Fehler nicht vollständig ausgeschlossen werden und die Diplomica Verlag GmbH, die Autoren oder Übersetzer übernehmen keine juristische Verantwortung oder irgendeine Haftung für evtl. verbliebene fehlerhafte Angaben und deren Folgen.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

© Anchor Academic Publishing, Imprint der Diplomica Verlag GmbH  
Hermannstal 119k, 22119 Hamburg  
<http://www.diplomica-verlag.de>, Hamburg 2015  
Printed in Germany



In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, The Merciful

(رَبَّنَا آتِنَا فِي الدُّنْيَا حَسَنَةً وَفِي الْآخِرَةِ حَسَنَةً وَقِنَا عَذَابَ النَّارِ)

“Our Lord gives unto us in the world that which is good, and guard us from the doom of Fire.”

(The Holy Quran, 2:201)

To my family

The near and far

# Acknowledgments

First of all a special thank to my Lord Almighty Allah. We always keep the deficit in the description of words of thanks, especially to people who provide with tenderness without borders, the lines of thanks are always extremely difficult to formulate.

I would like to thank Professor Zhongyu (Joan) Lu, for her support, encouragement, and guidance from the initial to the final level, enabling me to develop an understanding of the subject, and her excellent feedback on the related paper and articles produced during the research project. Her encouragement has a big impact on my learning in finding pieces of knowledge and solving challenges.

I am heartily thankful to Julie Wilkinson and Violeta Holmes for their guidance and advice during these years.

Also, great thanks to all the staff of the Computing and Engineering School at the University of Huddersfield who inspired me to do my research. A big thank to everyone who participated in Ontocop's project.

Also, all the people were at my side; my sincere and faithful husband for his great and magnificent support, and the three essences of my life: Khalifa, Tasnim and Noor.

A great thanks also to all who gave me a helping hand to reach the end of my journey.

## Abstract

Ontology has been a subject of many studies carried out in artificial intelligence (AI) and information system communities. Ontology has become an important component of the semantic web, covering a variety of knowledge domains. Although building domain ontologies still remains a big challenge with regard to its designing and implementation, there are still many areas that need to create ontologies. Information Science (IS) is one of these areas that need a unified ontology model to facilitate information access among the heterogeneous data resources and share a common understanding of the domain knowledge. The objective of this study is to develop a generic model of ontology that serves as a foundation of knowledge modelling for applications and aggregation with other ontologies to facilitate information exchanging between different systems. This model will be a metadata for a knowledge base system to be used in different purposes of interest, such as education applications to support educational needs for teachers and students and information system developers, and enhancing the index tool in libraries to facilitate access to information collections. This thesis describes the process of modelling the domain knowledge of Information Science IS.

The building process of the ontology of Information Science (OIS) is preceded by developing taxonomies and thesauruses of IS. This research adopts the Methontology to develop ontology of Information Science OIS. This choice of method relies on the research motivations and aims, with analysis of some development ontology methodologies and IEEE 1074-2006 standards for developing software project life cycle processes as criteria. The methodology mainly consisted of; specification, conceptualization, formalization, implementation, maintenance and evaluation. The knowledge model was formalized using Protégé to generate the ontology code. During the development process the model has been designed and evaluated.

This research presents the following contributions to the present state of the art on ontology construction;

- The main achievement of the study is in constructing a new model of Information Science ontology OIS. The OIS ontology is a generic model that contains only the key objects and associated attributes with relationships. The model has defined 706 concepts which will be widely used in Information Science applications. It provides the standard definitions for domain terms used in annotation databases for the domain terms, and avoids the consistency problems caused by various ontologies which will have the potential of development by different groups and institutions in the IS domain area.

- It provides a framework for analyzing the IS knowledge to obtain a classification based on facet classification. The ontology modelling approach is based on top-down and bottom-up. The top-down begins with an abstract of the domain view. While the bottom-up method starts with description of the domain to gain a hierarchical taxonomy.
- Designing Ontocop system a novel method presented to support the developing process as specific virtual community of IS. The Ontocop consists of a number of experts in the subject area around the world. Their feedback and assessment improve the ontology development during the creating process.

The findings of the research revealed that overall feedback from the IS community has been positive and that the model met the ontology quality criteria. It was appropriate to provide consistency and clear understanding of the subject area. OIS ontology unifies information science, which is composed of library science, computer science and archival science, by creating the theoretical base useful for further practical systems. Developing ontology of information science (OIS) is not an easy task, due to the complex nature of the field. It needs to be integrated with other ontologies such as social science, cognitive science, philosophy, law management and mathematics, to provide a basic knowledge for the semantic web and also to leverage information retrieval.



## Publications

- 1 Sawsaa, A. & Lu, J (2009). A Generic Model of Knowledge Mapping Through Virtual Communities of Practice in Information Science (IS). Conference proceeding. World Congress in Computer Science, Computer Engineering, and Applied Computing, Las Vegas, Nevada.12-15 July 2009.
- 2 Sawsaa, A. & Lu, J (2010). Ontocop: A virtual community of practice to create ontology of Information science (IS). Conference proceeding. World Congress in Computer Science, Computer Engineering, and Applied Computing, Las Vegas, Nevada 12-15 July 2010.
- 3 Sawsaa, A. & Lu, J (2010). Ontology of Information Science (IS) based on OWL conference proceeding. The International Arab Conference on Information Technology (ACIT2010).
- 4 Sawsaa, A. (2010). A virtual community. The 3th Scientific Research Symposium for Libyan Students in UK Universities. Sheffield Hallam University, 12th June 2010.
- 5 Sawsaa, A. & Lu, J. (2011) 'Extracting Information Science concepts based on Jape Regular Expression'. In: WORLDCOMP'11 - The 2011 World Congress in Computer Science, Computer Engineering, and Applied Computing, 18-21 July 2011, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA
- 6 Sawsaa, A. & Lu, J. (2011) 'Virtual Community of Practice Ontocop: Towards a New Model of Information Science Ontology (OIS)' International Journal of Information Retrieval Research, 1 (2), pp. 55-78. ISSN 2155-6377
- 7 Sawsaa, A., ZHAOZONG, M. & LU, J. (2012) Using an Application of Mobile and Wireless Technology in Arabic Learning System. IN LU, Z. J. (Ed. Learning with Mobile Technologies, Handheld Devices and Smart Phones: Innovative Methods. USA, IGI Global. pp. 171-186. ISBN978-1-4666-0936-5
- 8 Sawsaa, A. & Lu, J. (2012) Developing a Domain Ontology of Information Science (OIS). IN SHONIREGUN, C. A. & AKMAYEVA, G. A. (Eds.) International Conference on Information Society (i-Society 2012) June 25-28, 2012,. London, UK, i-Society 2012 Technical Co-Sponsored by IEEE UK/RI Computer Chapter. pp 462-467.
- 9 Sawsaa, A. & Lu, J. (2012) Extracting Information Science Concepts based on JAPE Regular Expression. International Journal of advanced Computer Science (IJEC) , in press

- 10 Sawsaa, A. & Lu, J. (2012) Building an advance domain ontology model of Information Science (OIS). *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology (JASIST)*, in press
- 11 Sawsaa, A. & Lu, J. (2012) Building Information Science (OIS) Ontology with Methondology and Protégé. *Journal of Internet Technology and Secured Transactions (JITST) 2 (1/2)*, ISSN 2046-3723. In press.
- 12 Sawsaa, A. & Lu, J. (2013) Extracting Occupational Therapist concepts to develop domain ontology. *The Seventh International Conference on Digital Society (ICDS 2013) February 24 - March 1, 2013 - Nice, France.*

Posters:

- 
- 1 Sawsaa, A. and Lu, J. (2011) 'ONTOCOP: Virtual Community Of Practice to build Ontology of Information Science'. *University of Huddersfield 2009*
  - 2 Sawsaa, A. and Lu, J. (2009) A Generic Model of Knowledge Mapping Through Virtual Communities of Practice in Information Science (IS)

# Table of contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	IV
ABSTRACT.....	V
PUBLICATIONS.....	VII
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	IX
LIST OF FIGURES.....	XVII
LIST OF TABLES.....	XXI
ACRONYMS.....	XXIII
<b>PART 1: FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1 CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1. PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION.....	3
1.2. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES.....	4
1.3. METHODOLOGY AND IMPLEMENTATION.....	5
1.4. CONTRIBUTIONS.....	6
1.5. MOTIVATION OF STUDY.....	8
1.6. THESIS ORGANIZATION.....	9
<b>2 CHAPTER 2: RESEARCH BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1 ONTOLOGY OVERVIEW.....	12
2.1.1 <i>Historical and philosophical perspective of the ontology.....</i>	<i>13</i>
2.1.1.1 Definition of ontology.....	14
2.1.2 <i>Ontology Theoretic.....</i>	<i>16</i>
2.1.2.1 Category Theory.....	16
2.1.2.2 Mereotopolgy Theory.....	17
2.1.3 <i>Referencing and meaning in the ontology.....</i>	<i>19</i>
2.1.4 <i>Ontology spectrum.....</i>	<i>20</i>
2.1.4.1 Thesaurus.....	20

2.1.4.2	Taxonomy .....	21
2.1.5	<i>Approaches for modelling ontology:</i> .....	24
2.1.5.1	Top-down approach .....	24
2.1.5.2	Bottom-up approach.....	24
2.1.5.3	Middle out approach .....	25
2.1.6	<i>Structure of ontology</i> .....	26
2.1.7	<i>Ontology Categorization</i> .....	27
2.1.7.1	Informal ontology .....	29
2.1.7.2	Formal ontology.....	29
2.1.7.3	Domain ontology .....	29
2.1.8	<i>Related Research</i> .....	30
2.1.9	<i>Designing Criteria for ontology</i> .....	35
2.1.10	<i>Ontology evaluation approaches</i> .....	36
2.1.11	<i>Ontology Engineering Methodologies</i> .....	39
2.1.11.1	CYC Method .....	40
2.1.11.2	Uschold & King Method.....	40
2.1.11.3	Gruninger& Fox Method.....	41
2.1.11.4	SENSUS Methodology .....	42
2.1.11.5	Methontology.....	42
2.1.11.6	Comparison of Methodology.....	46
2.1.11.7	Evaluation of ontology methodologies.....	49
2.1.12	<i>Techniques Involved</i> .....	50
2.1.12.1	Ontology languages .....	50
2.1.12.2	Resource Description Framework RDF, and RDFs.....	51
2.1.12.3	Web Ontology Language (OWL) .....	54

2.1.12.4	Comparison of ontology languages .....	57
2.1.12.5	Ontology Tools.....	58
2.1.12.6	Ontologua server .....	59
2.1.12.7	OntoSaurus .....	59
2.1.12.8	WebOnto .....	59
2.1.12.9	OilEd: .....	59
2.1.12.10	Cmap tools.....	60
2.1.12.11	Protégé .....	60
2.1.12.12	Web Protégé.....	60
2.1.12.13	General Architecture for text engineering( GATE).....	60
2.1.12.14	Comparison of ontology tools .....	61
2.2	INFORMATION SCIENCE (IS).....	63
2.2.1	<i>Overview</i> .....	63
2.2.2	<i>Definitions</i> .....	63
2.2.3	<i>Relationship of information science with other sciences</i> .....	65
2.2.4	<i>Information Science Taxonomy</i> .....	67
2.2.4.1	Universal decimal classification (UDC).....	69
2.2.4.2	Library of Congress Classification (LCC) .....	69
2.2.4.3	Colon Classification Scheme (CCS).....	69
2.2.4.4	The advantages of Facet analysis system (FAS) .....	70
2.2.4.5	Classification Research group (CRG) .....	72
2.2.5	<i>Why Information Science Taxonomy:</i> .....	72
2.3	KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT (KM) AND VIRTUAL COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE (VCOPS).....	74
2.3.1	<i>The Main components of knowledge management</i> .....	74
2.3.1.1	Data .....	74

2.3.1.2	Information.....	75
2.3.1.3	Knowledge .....	75
2.3.2	<i>Knowledge Management</i> .....	76
2.3.3	<i>Knowledge Engineering (KE)</i> .....	78
2.3.4	<i>Knowledge Representation (KR)</i> .....	79
2.3.5	<i>Virtual Communities of practice (VCops)</i> .....	81
2.3.6	<i>Communities of Practice (Cops)</i> .....	81
2.3.7	<i>Virtual communities of practice (VCops)</i> .....	83
2.3.8	<i>Summary</i> .....	88
<b>PART 2: METHODOLOGY OF CREATING ONTOLOGY OF INFORMATION SCIENCE (OIS)</b> .....		<b>89</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY EMPLOYED</b> .....	<b>90</b>
3.1	THEORETICAL APPROACHES .....	90
3.1.1	<i>Taxonomy of OIS ontology approach</i> .....	91
3.2	THE METHODOLOGY TO BE ADOPTED .....	94
3.3	TECHNIQUES AND TOOLS TO BE EMPLOYED .....	94
3.4	ESTABLISHING THE ONTOLOGY MODEL .....	95
3.4.1	<i>Conceptual aspect</i> .....	95
3.4.2	<i>Computational aspect</i> .....	96
3.5	INTRODUCING OIS DESIGN METHODOLOGY.....	96
3.5.1	<i>Designing ontology model</i> .....	96
3.5.2	<i>Designing ontocop website tool</i> .....	100
3.5.3	<i>Summary</i> .....	100
<b>PART 3: IMPLEMENTATION</b> .....		<b>101</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>CHAPTER 4: MODELLING DESIGN OF OIS ONTOLOGY</b> .....	<b>102</b>
4.1	BUILDING CONCEPTUAL MODEL .....	102

4.1.1	<i>Specifications</i> .....	102
4.1.1.1	Identifying the purpose and the scope .....	102
4.1.1.2	Knowledge acquisition.....	104
4.1.2	<i>Conceptualisation of IS entities ontology</i> .....	109
-	Identification of concepts and relations .....	109
4.1.2.1	Building Glossary of terms of IS .....	110
4.1.2.2	Building Concepts taxonomy .....	110
4.1.2.3	Building ad hoc binary relation:.....	116
4.1.2.4	Build the concept dictionary.....	116
4.1.2.5	Define ad hoc binary relation .....	117
4.1.2.6	Define instance attributes .....	117
4.1.2.7	Create class attributes table .....	118
4.1.2.8	Define constants.....	118
4.1.2.9	Define formal axiom .....	119
4.1.2.10	Define instances .....	119
4.1.3	<i>Conceptual Model of OIS Ontology</i> .....	119
4.2	BUILDING COMPUTATIONAL MODEL – FORMALIZATION:.....	121
4.2.1	<i>Actors</i> .....	123
4.2.1.1	Person.....	124
4.2.1.2	Institution .....	125
4.2.2	<i>Domains</i> .....	126
4.2.3	<i>Kinds</i> .....	126
4.2.4	<i>Practice</i> .....	127
4.2.4.1	Information Service .....	128
4.2.5	<i>Studies</i> .....	129

4.2.5.1	Information economics studies .....	129
4.2.6	<i>Mediator</i> .....	130
4.2.7	<i>Methods</i> .....	131
4.2.8	<i>Resources</i> .....	132
4.2.9	<i>Tools</i> .....	133
4.2.10	<i>Philosophy and theories</i> .....	133
4.2.11	<i>Legislation</i> .....	133
4.2.12	<i>Societal</i> .....	134
4.2.13	<i>Time</i> .....	134
4.2.14	<i>Space</i> .....	134
4.2.15	<i>OIS Components</i> .....	136
4.2.15.1	Classes .....	136
4.2.15.2	Axioms .....	142
4.2.15.3	Properties .....	143
4.2.15.4	Individuals.....	148
4.2.16	<i>Usage Class Tab</i> .....	149
4.3	ONTOCOP - A SYSTEM OF VISUALISATION OF IS KNOWLEDGE .....	151
4.3.1	<i>System Requirements</i> .....	151
4.3.2	<i>System Architecture</i> .....	151
4.3.3	<i>System implementing</i> .....	152
4.3.3.1	Technical features.....	152
4.3.3.2	Aesthetic Features .....	153
4.3.4	<i>System developments</i> .....	153
4.3.5	<i>Description and potentials of Ontocop components</i> .....	157
4.3.6	<i>Summary</i> .....	160



<b>PART 4: RESULTS &amp; DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>161</b>
<b>5      CHAPTER 5: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>162</b>
5.1    RESULTS .....	162
5.1.1 <i>Evaluation OIS ontology</i> .....	162
5.1.1.1    Ontology validation .....	162
5.1.1.2    Ontology verification .....	166
5.1.1.3    Use case scenario of evaluation .....	166
5.1.1.4    Results of Evaluation .....	169
5.1.2 <i>Results of Ontocop System</i> .....	175
5.2    DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS .....	177
5.3    REVISED OIS MODEL .....	184
<b>PART 4: CONCLUSION &amp; FUTURE WORK .....</b>	<b>187</b>
<b>6      CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION &amp; FUTURE WORK .....</b>	<b>188</b>
6.1    CONTRIBUTIONS .....	188
6.2    ACHIEVEMENTS .....	190
6.3    FUTURE WORK .....	191
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>194</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>205</b>
A.    EVALUATION REPORT .....	205
B.    TAXONOMY OF IS .....	205
C.    GLOSSARY .....	205
D.    INVITATION LETTER ONTOCOP .....	205
E.    INFORMATION ABOUT PARTICIPENTS PROCESS .....	205
F.    LIST OF ONTOCOP’S PARTICIPENTS .....	205
G.    GETTING INITIATION OF PARTICIPENTS PROCESS .....	205

H.	EXAMPLES OF A COLLECTED DATA .....	205
I.	LETTER SENT TO PARTICIPANTS .....	205
J.	RESPONSE EMAILS FROM PARTICIPENTS.....	205
K.	EVALUATION TAXONOMY .....	205
L.	PART OF OIS ONTOLOGY IN OWL FORMAT.....	205
M.	LESSONS LEARNED .....	205

# List of Figures

FIGURE 1-1 THESIS ORGANIZATION .....	11
FIGURE 2-1 THE MEANING TRIANGLE .....	19
FIGURE 2-2 RELATIONS BETWEEN TERMS IN THESAURUS .....	21
FIGURE 2-3 SIMPLE TAXONOMY .....	22
FIGURE 2-4 SPECTRUM OF ONTOLOGY. ....	23
FIGURE 2-5 ILLUSTRATION OF MIDDLE-OUT APPROACH .....	25
FIGURE 2-6 GUARINO'S PROPOSAL FOR ONTOLOGY MODULARIZATION .....	28
FIGURE 2-7 AN EXAMPLE OF ONTOLOGY ROLE .....	34
FIGURE 2-8 CONCEPTUAL MODELLING .....	44
FIGURE 2-9 SEMANTIC WEB LANGUAGES.....	51
FIGURE 2-10 SEMANTIC NET IN RDF, RDFs.....	53
FIGURE 2-11 INFORMATION SCIENCE RELATIONS WITH OTHER SCIENCES .....	66
FIGURE 2-12 KNOWLEDGE MAP OF INFORMATION SCIENCE .....	67
FIGURE 2-13DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DEWEY & RANGANATHAN CLASSIFICATION .....	70
FIGURE 2-14 CLASSIFICATION OF KNOWLEDGE IN ONTOLOGICAL DIAGRAM.....	77
FIGURE 3-1 THE MAIN COMPONENTS OF OIS ONTOLOGY.....	91
FIGURE 3-2 TAXONOMY OF LIBRARY SCIENCE MODULE .....	93
FIGURE 3-3 DOMAIN ONTOLOGY OF OIS DEVELOPING PROCESS.....	99
FIGURE 4-1 THE MAIN COMPONENT OF IS DOMAIN .....	103
FIGURE 4-2 SCREENSHOT OF IS GAZETTEER .....	105
FIGURE 4-3 ANNOTATIONS OF IS TERMS .....	107

FIGURE 4-4 ANNOTATION OF IS CONCEPTS .....	108
FIGURE 4-5 RESULT ACCURACY .....	109
FIGURE 4-6 CONCEPTUALISATION ACTIVITIES .....	109
FIGURE 4-7 SHOWS TOP-DOWN METHOD .....	111
FIGURE 4-8 CONCEPT TAXONOMY OF OIS ONTOLOGY .....	112
FIGURE 4-9 BOTTOM-UP METHODS .....	113
FIGURE 4-10 FRAGMENT OF OIS TAXONOMY .....	115
FIGURE 4-11 AD HOC BINARY RELATIONS.....	116
FIGURE 4-12 PART OF CONCEPTUAL MODEL OF OIS ONTOLOGY.....	120
FIGURE 4-13 UPPER-LEVEL OF OIS ONTOLOGY .....	122
FIGURE 4-14 MAIN ACTORS CLASS .....	124
FIGURE 4-15 PERSON CLASS.....	124
FIGURE 4-16 INSTITUTION CLASS .....	125
FIGURE 4-17 DOMAINS CLASS .....	126
FIGURE 4-18 KINDS CLASS.....	127
FIGURE 4-19 PRACTICE CONCEPTS .....	128
FIGURE 4-20 INFORMATION SERVICE CLASS .....	129
FIGURE 4-21 INFORMATION ECONOMICS STUDIES CLASS.....	130
FIGURE 4-22 MEDIATOR CLASS .....	131
FIGURE 4-23 METHODS CLASS.....	132
FIGURE 4-24 RESOURCES CLASS .....	132
FIGURE 4-25 PHILOSOPHY AND THEORIES CLASS.....	133

FIGURE 4-26 VISUALIZING OIS BY OWLVIZ.....	135
FIGURE 4-27 METHODS OF DEFINING CLASS IN OWL.....	137
FIGURE 4-28 DEFINED CLASS IN OWL.....	141
FIGURE 4-29 AN EXAMPLE OF DISJOINT CLASS.....	142
FIGURE 4-30 OBJECT PROPERTIES.....	143
FIGURE 4-31 INVERSO F RELATION.....	145
FIGURE 4-32 INDIVIDUALS OF OIS ONTOLOGY.....	148
FIGURE 4-33 PROPERTIES ASSERTIONS OF OIS ONTOLOGY.....	149
FIGURE 4-34 USAGE CLASS TAP IN PROTÉGÉ.....	150
FIGURE 4-35 WEBSITE LAYOUT.....	152
FIGURE 4-36 ONTOCOP FORUM.....	154
FIGURE 4-37 ONTOCOP CHATTING PAGE.....	154
FIGURE 4-38 : ONTOCOP CHATTING PAGE.....	155
FIGURE 4-39 ONTOCOP MEMBERS LIST.....	155
FIGURE 4-40 ONTOLOGY PAGE.....	156
FIGURE 4-41 FEEDBACK PAGE.....	156
FIGURE 4-42 FQA PAGE.....	157
FIGURE 4-43 CONTACT PAGE.....	157
FIGURE 5-1 CIRCULAR CLASSES.....	164
FIGURE 5-2 INFERRED CLASS HIERARCHY.....	165
FIGURE 5-3 PART OF OIS ONTOLOGY VERIFICATION RESULTS.....	166
FIGURE 5-4 EVALUATION OF IS TAXONOMY.....	167

FIGURE 5-5 SNAPSHOT OF OIS ONTOLOGY ON WEBPROTÉGÉ .....	168
FIGURE 5-6 OIS DOCUMENTATION .....	168
FIGURE 5-7 ONTOLOGY CONSISTENCY .....	170
FIGURE 5-8 CONSISTENCY OF IS-A AND PART-OF –RELATIONSHIPS.....	171
FIGURE 5-9 COMPLETENESS OF ONTOLOGY .....	171
FIGURE 5-10 CLARITY OF OIS ONTOLOGY .....	172
FIGURE 5-11 ONTOLOGY GENERALITY .....	172
FIGURE 5-12 SEMANTIC DATA RICHNESS OF THE ONTOLOGY.....	173
FIGURE 5-13 THE GENERAL ASSESSMENT ON OIS ONTOLOGY .....	175
FIGURE 5-14 PARTICIPANTS OF ONTOCOP .....	175
FIGURE 5-15 VISITORS OF ONTOCOP .....	176
FIGURE 5-16 SATISFACTION LEVELS WITH THE OIS ONTOLOGY.....	181
FIGURE 5-17 EVALUATION CRITERIA AT LEVEL 3 .....	182
FIGURE 5-18 SEARCHING ON WEBPROTÉGÉ .....	184
FIGURE 5-19 ONTOLOGY MATRICES.....	185
FIGURE 6-1 ARCHITECTURE OF SYSTEM DESIGN APPROACH.....	189
FIGURE 6-2 INTERFACE OF OIS ONTOLOGY SEARCHING .....	192
FIGURE 6-3 RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ONTOLOGIES.....	193

# List of Tables

TABLE 2-1 SIMILARITY BETWEEN ONTOLOGY AND CATEGORY THEORY .....	17
TABLE 2-2 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TAXONOMY AND ONTOLOGY .....	23
TABLE 2-3 ONTOLOGY CATEGORIES .....	30
TABLE 2-4 DOMAIN ONTOLOGIES .....	33
TABLE 2-5 APPROACHES OF ONTOLOGY EVALUATION.....	36
TABLE 2-6 AN OVERVIEW OF LEVELS OF ONTOLOGY EVALUATION.....	39
TABLE 2-7 IMPLEMENTATION OF METHONTOLOGY .....	45
TABLE 2-8 COMPARISON BETWEEN METHODOLOGIES .....	48
TABLE 2-9 METHODOLOGY STANDARDS .....	49
TABLE 2-10 COMPARISON BETWEEN SEMANTIC LANGUAGES.....	54
TABLE 2-11 OWL CONSTRUCTORS .....	56
TABLE 2-12 OWL AXIOMS INTERPRETATION AND FACT.....	57
TABLE 2-13 COMPARISON BETWEEN ONTOLOGY LANGUAGES.....	58
TABLE 2-14 GROUPS OF ONTOLOGIES TOOLS .....	58
TABLE 2-15 COMPARISON BETWEEN ONTOLOGY TOOLS .....	62
TABLE 2-16 COMPARISON BETWEEN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE.....	87
TABLE 4-1 THE SCOPE OF IS DOMAIN.....	103
TABLE 4-2 PART OF THE GLOSSARY OF TERMS OF OIS ONTOLOGY .....	110
TABLE 4-3 CONCEPTS CLUSTERING .....	114
TABLE 4-4 CONCEPTS DICTIONARY .....	117
TABLE 4-5 PART OF THE AD HOC BINARY RELATION OF OIS ONTOLOGY .....	117

TABLE 4-6 SHOWS PART OF INSTANCE ATTRIBUTES OF OIS ONTOLOGY .....	118
TABLE 4-7 A SECTION OF THE INSTANCE ATTRIBUTES TABLE OF OIS ONTOLOGY.....	118
TABLE 4-8 A SECTION OF CONSTANTS TABLE OF OIS ONTOLOGY.....	118
TABLE 4-9 THE INSTANCE TABLE OF THE OIS ONTOLOGY.....	119
TABLE 4-10 TYPES OF RELATIONS BETWEEN TERMS .....	144
TABLE 5-1 INCONSISTENCE CLASSES.....	163
TABLE 5-2 THE QUESTIONS IN OIS ONTOLOGY SURVEY.....	169
TABLE 5-3 LEVEL 3 OF SATISFACTION ON ONTOLOGY BASED ON SPECIFIC CRITERIA.....	182



## Acronyms

AI	.....Artificial Intelligence
ANNE	.....A Nearly New Information extraction System
CLIPS	.....C Language Integrated Production System
COC	.....Community of Commitment
CoI	.....Community of Interest
Cops	.....Communities of practice
DARPA	.....Defence Advanced Research Projects Agency
GATE	.....General Architecture for Text Engineering
IE	.....Information Extracting
IS	.....Information Science
JAPE	.....Java Annotation Patterns Engine
KE	.....Knowledge Engineering
KR	.....Knowledge Representation
LOOM	.....Language for Object Oriented Methods
Nop	.....Network of practice
OCML	.....Operation Conceptual modelling Language
OIS	.....Ontology of Information Science
Ontocop	.....Community of Information Science website
OWL	.....Web Ontology Language
RDF	.....Resource Description Framework
SGML	.....Standard Generalized Mark-up Language
VCops	.....Virtual Community of practice

VCS	.....	Virtual community
W3C	.....	World Wide Web Consortium
XML	.....	Extensible Mark-up Language

---

# **Part 1: Fundamental Issues**

# 1 Chapter 1: Introduction

---

Recently, the development of domain ontologies has become increasingly important for knowledge level interoperation and information integration. They provide functional features for AI and knowledge representation. Domain Ontology is a central foundation of growth for the semantic web that provides a general knowledge for correspondence and communication among heterogeneous systems. Particularly with a rise of ontology in the artificial intelligence (AI) domain, it can be seen as an almost inevitable development in computer science and AI in general.

Ontologies are useful for different applications to be able to share information between heterogeneous data resources. They are also essential for enabling knowledge-level interoperation of agents, when these agents are interacting to share a common interpretation of the vocabulary. Moreover, it is useful for human understanding and interaction to reach a consensus amongst a professional community.

Although there are a range of domain ontologies on the semantic web such as Gene Ontology (GeneOntology, 2009), Biological science ontology (Sabou 2005), CIDOC-CRM ontology of culture heritage documentation, FRBR in Bibliographic and NCI cancer ontology (Golbeck et al., 2008), there still exists a lack of domain ontologies, which has led to the loss of knowledge in specific domains. This is a significant problem for scholars and researchers who need to be able to access information within their interest area.

Ontology provides a vocabulary for metadata description with machine understandable terminology. Ontology provides a format for explaining and understanding terminology and the knowledge contained in a software system. By using shared concepts and terms in accordance with a specific approach, a lot of information remains in people's heads. It is discussed in 2.3.

However, information science (IS) is a fast paced discipline and communication technology is rapidly increasing, so it is imperative to take advantage of this development. IS is a multidisciplinary field and it has gained the fundamental root of its theory from different related fields. The analysis includes the three branches of the field, which are; Library Science, Archival Science and Computer Science. Meanwhile it overlaps with other sciences, as stated in Section 2.2, e.g., communication, cognitive science, philosophical science, management, social science and marketing. More precisely, the relationships between information and marketing can be subdivided into marketing information, marketing information services, marketing of library services.

These kinds of relationships need logical ontology to clarify their relations and the science boundaries, amongst others. Therefore, Information Science still needs identity.

However, there is a lack of IS ontology representing the unified model that combines all concepts and their relationships. Moreover, IS as any domains which use the natural language. It contains a lot of jargon which needs to be in a formal language for programming or logic. Alternatively, integration of the computer with the internet has led to the emergence of new concepts in the field of IS such as , Electronic Library, Virtual Library, Library Without Walls, Digital Library and Information Management, as well as Nerve Centres. Even the information concept itself has strong and complex relations with other concepts, for example some people have defined it as fact, energy, data, and symbols. Also, it can be composed with other words such as; information age, information revaluation, information crisis, information explosion. However, there are 400 definitions for information in the literature (Yuexiao, 1988). It is hard to differentiate between these concepts. Even within the same field, there is still confusion over defining information - everyone defines it based on his background, for example librarians know it in term of facts, and data can be in containers such as journals, books and documents. The computer scientists conceive it as small units such as bits and bytes.

Consequently, modelling the IS domain necessarily assumes the need to represent the correct picture of the whole domain, and any changes in the domain will have to be added to keep the model up to date (Mommers, 2010, Yuexiao, 1988).

Our consideration is that in developing an ontology of Information science OIS to define its boundaries, and avoid ambiguous concepts.

Therefore, there is a lack of unified model of domain knowledge, because of the inconsistency in structure of domain which led to difficulty of using and sharing data in syntax and semantic level.

## **1.1. Problem Identification**

Information Science is seeking its identity and it is one of the many domains which use natural language including much jargon. Also, integration of the computer with the internet has led to emerging concepts in the field of IS such as , Electronic Library, Virtual Library, Library without walls , digital Library It is hard to differentiate between them.

Furthermore, its structure led to lack of a unified model of domain knowledge. This led to lack of a unified model of domain knowledge, and difficulty of using and sharing data at

syntax and semantic levels. The OIS ontology provides a standard terminology and shared representation of domain concepts.

Therefore, the ontology of information science is missing in ontological engineering area. Our consideration is that developing ontology of Information science to define its boundaries, and to avoid the concepts ambiguous.

The research problem of the study was defined as the following:

**Q. How an ontology of Information Science (OIS) model can be developed to visualise the IS domain, and how the model could capture and represent this knowledge?**

To achieve the primary objective, the researcher asks questions to be answered through this study such as:

- What domain knowledge does the ontology represent?
- What is the level of knowledge that the ontology will represent?
- Which knowledge representation techniques and languages should be used?
- What are the relations that will be used to structure the knowledge, and which structure for the ontology will it have e.g. tree, graph, and its main components of ontology (e.g., classes, instances, relations, rules)?
- What is the value of tools such virtual community of practice ontocop? Could they be valuable in supporting the developing process?
- Does the developing process of the ontology follow designing criteria?
- Is the ontology evaluated based on specific criteria?

## **1.2. Aims and Objectives**

The aim of this research is to develop a generic model of ontology that visualize domain knowledge of IS that serves as a foundation of knowledge modelling for applications and aggregation with other ontologies.

The visualisation stage provides an extensible and commonly understood semantic framework by describing the terminology of the domain. Achieving this aim in the current study will fulfil the following Objectives:

- Building a conceptual model for establishing a better analysis framework to understand, classify and compare various classes of Information Science.