Journal of Advances in Science and Technology

Vol. IV, No. VII, November-2012, ISSN 2230-9659

METHODOLOGIES TO COMPREHENSION LIBRARY AND INFORMATIVE CONTENT SCIENCE AS AN INTERDISCIPLINARY FIELD

www.ignited.in

Journal of Advances in Science and Technology
Vol. IV, No. VII, November-2012, ISSN 2230-9659

Methodologies to Comprehension Library and Informative Content Science as an Interdisciplinary Field

Hingmire Laxman Shivappa

Research Scholar, CMJ University, Shillong, Meghalaya, India

Abstract – The system for this meeting slates its plan: to examine library furthermore information science as an order and as a Held of exploration from recorded, observational, and speculative points of view. Yet numerous past definitions and portrayals have concentrated on the interdisciplinary nature of library science, informative content science, besides. all the more as of late, library and qualified data science. This paper utilizes interdisciplinary as a center for examining library and information science in two ways. The primary approach is to audit besides integrate the different studies that have endeavored 10 portray the interdisciplinary nature of library and qualified information science. The aforementioned studies have utilized an assortment of techniques, such as reference dissection and reasonable examination, and have differed in scope from specific regions of examination inside library and information science to the whole field. A normal discovering of the exact studies is that there is moderately bit of obtaining of thoughts, as measured by references, rather than the enumerative records distinguishing the different teaches that creators judge ought to be pertinent to library and informative content science. The second methodology is in the first place the present comprehension of the notion of interdisciplinary. helped by Julie Thompson Klein's later monograph Interdisciplinary: History, Theory and Practice, and utilize this as a foundation for investigating the issues that emerge in training, research, and hone in an interdisciplinary field for example library furthermore informative content science. Cohorted issues craft the definitions of interdisciplinary. Multi-disciplinary. What's more transdisciplinarity ; the situations and suggestions of acquiring from different teaches; situations of interdisciplinary correspondence; and the aspects of an interdisciplinary individual. The paper closes with prescriptions for further research drawn from Klein's research program for developing a more full comprehension of interdisciplinarity.

----------♦----------

INTRODUCTION

Relevance from a historical perspective has grown and expanded into a variety of interdisciplinary scholarly environments as an extension of thematic precedents evolving mainly from philosophical underpinnings. There are many variations on the concept of "relativism" as initially portrayed by the Greek philosophers, Protagorus and Gorgias, and later embedded into more modern movements espoused by William James and John Dewey. Most of these frameworks generally describe a theme that teaches us that what is known is dependent on the knowing subject (O'Neill, 1960).

The seminal work of Alfred Schutz is one of the best examples of a paradigmatic shift from philosophical discussions of relativism toward the social theory aspects of relevance. Although first printed in 1932, its value as a theoretical framework for relevance was not evident until the publication of his translated collected works in the 1960s and the eventual compilation of previously unpublished papers and lectures under the title Reflections on the Problem of Relevance (Schutz, 1970). Schutz's tripartite conceptualization of relevance into topical, interpretive and motivational relevance provided an approach for investigating the nature, manifestations and effects of this selective function of the mind.

Of course, it is reasonable to ask: What is information science? This begs another, more fundamental question: How is a subject, any subject, defined to start with? Popper (1972) suggested that: "... we are not students of some subject matter but students of problems. And problems may cut right across the border of any subject matter or discipline." In this sense information science, as any other field, is defined by the problems it has addressed and by the methods it has chosen to solve them over time. Like

any other field information science cannot be understood by lexical definitions or ontology alone.

Information science has three general characteristics that are the leit-motifs of its very evolution and existence. These are shared with many modern fields. First, information science is interdisciplinary in nature, however, the relations with various disciplines are changing. The interdisciplinary evolution is far from over.

Second, information science is inexorably connected to information technology. A technological imperative is compelling and constraining the evolution of information science, as is the evolution of information society. Third, information science is, with may other fields, an active participant in the evolution of information society. Information science has a strong social and human dimension, above and beyond the technology. These characteristics are a framework for understanding the past, present ant future of information science.

OVERVIEW

To mark the 75th anniversary of ASIS&T this panel addresses the nature and recent history of the field of information science. It uses as a springboard The Study of Information: Interdisciplinary Messages, a collection of writings edited by economist Fritz Machlup and Una Mansfield (1983). More than a quarter of a century ago, The Study of Information (for short) presented the mandates of nine research specialties centered on information, namely: cognitive science, informatics, artificial intelligence, linguistics, library and information science, cybernetics, information theory, and systems theory. By illuminating the concerns, similarities, and differences of these related domains the book established one of the first and most lucid geographies of information as an interdisciplinary academic enterprise. In its day, reviewers described The Study of Information as “a quite remarkable overview” (Hayes, 1985), “an extraordinary volume” (Barnes, 1985), and “an historically significant book” (Harmon, 1987).

Against this backdrop our panel reflects upon the intervening years and asks: How has the "interdisciplinary" study of information changed? To begin, Jenna Hartel will introduce The Study of Information: Interdisciplinary Messages (Machlup & Mansfield, 1983) and in a succinct manner outline its structure, content, and interdisciplinary thesis. Next, as the keynote of the session, Steve Fuller, an internationally renowned public intellectual and sociologist of science, will consider the text in terms of what it means to study information today, especially given the increased centrality of information to both personal and public life and the rise of the iSchool movement. Specifically, he will examine these trends in relation to two foundational works from his field that mark their anniversary this year: Thomas Kuhn's The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (50th) and Bruno Latour's Science in Action (25th). Laurie Bonnici, lead author of a forthcoming book on the panel's topic, will report findings from a study of the disciplinary structures of library and information science and the iSchool movement utilizing Abbott's (2001) Chaos of Disciplines. Discussion will center upon the internal and external factors that contributed to the disciplinary evolution of the Schools.

Then, Rick Szostak, Professor of Economics and Interdisciplinary Studies at the University of Alberta, and the author of several articles in information science, will explore how information science can best serve the needs of interdisciplinary scholarship. Drawing on the presentations of other panelists, he will explore recent developments in both information science and the scholarship of interdisciplinarity. Each presentation will be timed to keep the agenda on schedule. Upon completion of the formal talks there will be a conversation with the audience, hosted by Steve Fuller.

ORIGIN AND SOCIAL BACKGROUND

In order to understand the interdisciplinary aspects of information science it is necessary, however briefly, to go to its origin. In a quite remarkable historical turn of events, the impetus for development of information science can be traced to an article almost half a century ago by Vannevar Bush, one of the most influential scientist of the era (Bush, 1945). In this historic article Bush did two things: (l) succinctly defined a critical problem that was on the minds of many for a long time, and (2) proposed a solution that was a “technological fix,” in tune with time and strategically attractive. The problem was (and in its basic form still is) “the massive task of making more accessible a bewildering store of knowledge.” This is the problem of “information explosion,” coupled with necessity to provide availability of and accessibility to relevant information, acute to this day. Witness the reasons for evolution of digital libraries. His solution was to use the emerging information technology to combat the problem. But he went even further: he proposed a machine named “Memex”, incorporating in his words “association of ideas”, that will duplicate “mental processes artificially. “Ideas that will govern information science and-artificial intelligence are quite evident. Memex never became a reality, but to this day R&D efforts in a number of fields have similar goals, to address the same problem of “bewildering store of knowledge.”

Information explosion is a social problem that started in science, and now has spread to every human endeavor. Justification for engaging massive efforts and resources to the problem was and still is strategic importance of information, first for work and progress in science, and now for everything else in modern human society, nationally and globally. Thus, the efforts and investments in development of modern information retrieval systems, digital libraries

and the electronic highway. Yes, they all involve massive doses of technology, but their importance relates to social and human issues and problems. Such problems require interdisciplinary approaches.

IMPORTANCE AND POTENTIAL IMPACT

We feel the nature and recent history of information science is a fundamental concern of all ASIS&T members. The topic at hand determines the constitution of faculties, design of curriculums, substance of conferences, public opinion about information science, and other matters of signal importance. We believe conversation and debate on this matter have yet to engage fully with the larger currents of recent intellectual history, the philosophy and sociology of science, or interdisciplinary scholarship, as offered in this panel.

EVOLUTION OF INTERDISCIPLINARY RELATIONS

The basic problem of understanding information and communication, their manifestations, effects and human information behavior, and the applied problem of “making more accessible the bewildering store of knowledge”, particularly including the attempts at technological “fixes,” cannot be resolved within any one discipline. This was clear to Bush and Mooers and all the others who thought about the complexities involved. Interdisciplinarity in information science was introduced and is being perpetuated to the present by the very differences in backgrounds of people addressing the described problems. Differences in background were and are many, it makes for both richness of the field and difficulties in communication and education, Clearly not every discipline in the background of people working on the problem made an equally relevant contribution, but the assortment was responsible for sustaining a strong interdisciplinary characteristic of information science. It does not have to be searched for. It is there. I will concentrate on interdisciplinary relations with four fields: librarianship, computer science, cognitive science, and communication. Obviously, other fields have also interdisciplinary relations, but these are the most significant and developed ones.

INTERDISCIPLINARY CONNECTIONS OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

The literature of library and information science includes several papers that attempt to define or describe the interdisciplinary nature of library and information science. In reviewing these studies below, the terminology used by the authors is retained. Major findings of empirical studies are reported, but it is beyond the scope of this paper to do a detailed comparative analysis of the strength of disciplinary linkages identified by the various studies. The focus is the use of literature of other disciplines by library and information science, looking at imports or borrowings rather than exports or loans. Examples of studies describing exports are that by Cronin and Pearson (1990) investigating the contributions made by selected information scientists to other disciplines and those by Yerkey and Glogowski (1989, 1990) identifying the coverage of library and information science topics in databases from other disciplines.

One indicator of fields to which library and information science is linked is what Library and Information Science Abstracts terms "fringe subjects" in its classification scheme. These include: communication, computers, telecommunications, organization and administration, knowledge and learning, education, museums, authorship, reading, writing, bibliography, printing, copying, bookbinding, publishing, bookselling, public lending right, and audiovisual materials. While there are a number of empirical studies that begin to identify the disciplines contributing to library and information science, there are also several papers in the literature that provide an enumeration without further elaboration of the basis for the list. In discussing library science, Buckland (1983) suggests that links "are likely to be with the social and behavioral sciences since the use of library services is an act of conscious social behavior" (p. 18).

He also identifies education, linguistics, psychology, management, technology, and philosophy as relevant. Wilson (1980) notes the relevance of social science research content analysis and classification process used in grouping citations by subject Thus .us not clear how replicable these studies would be. But they are at least suggestive
of the range of disciplines contributing to research in library and information science as well as their relative importance.

THE CONCEPT OF INTERDISCIPLINARITY

Klein (1990) provides the first comprehensive study of the concept of interdisciplinarity, synthesizing a wide range of literature regarding interdisciplinary research, education, and practice. She notes that the majority of people engaged in interdisciplinary work lack a common identity, but in each area there are common methodological and epistemological problems created by borrowing from other disciplines. She identifies two different justifications for interdisciplinarity: a conceptually based, synoptic claim and a pragmatically based, instrumental justification. She states:

The synoptic claim is evident in several forms: historically informed arguments for unity and synthesis, modem synthetic theories and integrative

concepts, and (1991) has aptly characterized the difficulties of interdisciplinary research: People who are trained under different traditions about what constitutes an appropriate question, what kinds of issues are even researchable, what makes for acceptable data as against mere opinion, what is adequate evidence, and when a proposition is to be considered confirmed or not, are not likely to find it simple to work together on a common project. Team members tend to speak in different tongues, often with similar terms for different phenomena and different terms for the same ones.

CONCLUSION

Information science seems to be reaching a critical juncture in its evolution. A number of pressures are forcing a reexaminations of the problems addressed and ways and means of addressing them. Of course, this particularly includes reexamination of education for information science. Here are three general classes of pressures.

First, the evolution of information society is accelerating throughout the developed world, with strong effects on developing parts as well. The social and economic roles of information activities are becoming more and more pronounced; their strategic importance is increasing. This has brought many new and powerful players in the realm of information work and in competition for the stakes. To provide a description: The U.S. society is changing from an industrial to a “post-industrial” society (Bell, 1973) or “post-capitalist” society (Drucker, 1994).

So do societies of most developed countries, the changes and impacts are global. Many authors, among which Drucker is the most outspoken and popular one, argue that there are fundamental economic and social changes afoot in which knowledge and information is becoming the base, the prime valuation, for economy and even society as a whole. These ideas are challenging the traditional economic theory of value.

If we accept Bell’s and Drucker’s premise that knowledge (and by extension information) is becoming central to the emerging social and economic order, then this has enormous implication for information science, for information retrieval and, of course, for library and information services. However, this does not mean that they are suddenly, and in present configursation, being thrusted into a central social role, not at all. It means that they are facing many challenges, as are other fields and institutions in transition. So does information science.

Second, the technological imperative is providing for or even forcing development and application of an ever increasing variety of information services, products, systems and networks. These are coming within, but mostly outside of information science, with competition increasing. Development of the national and global information infrastructures is bringing not only technological issues to the fore, but many commercial, social, legal and political issues to a head clash. Whatever the resolution(s), there are great changes ahead in the quantity and quality of information being available and accessible.

Third, the interdisciplinary relations for all fields engaged in whatever way with information problems are changing. There is more interdisciplinarity in all efforts from R&D to professional practice to business. As a result of the ‘communication explosion,’ exemplified with the huge spread of the Internet and the concepts of the Global Information Infrastructure, number of fields and new players are moving into dealing with information. The competition for information services is increasing. All this brings both tensions, and opportunities for alliances.

For information science these pressures are bringing about, among others, more interdisciplinary cooperations. The relations with computer science and weak Al are becoming more pronounced in both applications and in information retrieval and digital libraries research. With cognitive science and communication, the relations are more pronounced in development and/or utilization of theories and in experimentation. With librarianship, the relations has become more pronounced and successful in experimentation and development of Online Public Access Catalogs (OPACs), which a now becoming more and more information retrieval systems. Both fields share concern and uneasiness with the emergit electronic highway exemplified with the discussion of National Information Infrastructure in the U.S. and Global Information Infrastructure worldwide. Both feel being somewhat left out and overwhelmed; great many similar issues a: being raised in both fields.

Information problems worldwide are in no way diminishing, but they are changing. Some of them are posing many challenges and issues for information science, for its research, professional practice and education. The two approaches to interdisciplinarity explored in this paper- the review of studies that have attempted to characterize the interdisciplinary nature of library and information science and the discussion of Kleins synthesis of the current understanding.

REFERENCES

- Fuller, S. (2007). The Knowledge book: Key concepts in philosophy, science and culture. Durham UK and Montreal CA: Acumen and McGill-Queens University press.
- Harmon, G. E. (1987). The Interdisciplinary study of information: A review essay. The Journal of Library History, 22(2), 206-227.

- Machlup, F. & Mansfield, U. (Eds.). (1983). The Study of information: Interdisciplinary messages. New York, NY: Wiley.

- Szostak, R. (2004). Classifying science: Phenomena, data, theory, method, practice. Dordrecht: Springer.

- Abbott, A. (2001). The Chaos of disciplines. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

- Barnes, R. F. (1985). [Review of the book The Study of information: Interdisciplinary messages by F. Machlup & U. Mansfield]. Information Processing & Management, 21(5), 467-468.

- BUSH, V. (1945). As we may think. Atlantic Monthly, 176,(1),101-108.

- DENNING, P.J. et al (1989). Computing as a discipline. Communication of rhe ACM, 32, (1), 9-23.

- WALDROP, N.M. (1987). Man-made minds: The promise of artificial intelligence. New York: Walker.

- RUBEN, B.D. (1984). Communication and human behavior. New York: MacMillan.

- FOX. E.A, Akscyn, R.M., Furuta, R.K., & Leggett, J.J. Guest editors (1995). Digital Libraries. Communications of the ACM, 38, 4, 23-96.

- HARMAN, D. Guest Editor (1995). Special issue: The second Text Retrieval Conference (TREC-2). Information Processing & Management, 31, 3,269-448.

- SARACEVIC, T. (1992). Information science: origin, evolution and relations. In Vakkari, P. & Cronin, B. Conceptions of library and information science: Historical, empirical and theoretical perspectives. Los Angeles, CA: Taylor Graham.

- JOHNSON-LAIRD, P.N. (1988). The computer and the mind: An introduction to cognitive science. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- MOOERS, C.N. (1951). Zatocoding applied to mechanical organization of knowledge. American Documentatfon, 2, 2 32.

- POPPER, K.R (1972). Conjectures and refutations: The growth of scientific knowledge. 4th rev ed. New York: Basic Books.

- TURING, A.M. (1950). Computing machinery and intelligence. Mind, 59,433-460.