GNITED MINDS
Journals

AN ANALYSIS ON INTERDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVE OF LEARNING MANAGEMENT'S RELEVANCE TO LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

AN INTERNATIONALLY INDEXED PEER REVIEWED & REFEREED JOURNAL

An Analysis on Interdisciplinary Perspective of Learning Management's Relevance to Library and Information Science

Balwant Singh Rajodiya*

Lecturer (Library Science), V.S.P. Govt. P.G. College, Kairana (Shamli) U.P.

Abstract – Learning management (LM) is presently broadly perceived as a key factor in hierarchical achievement and all things considered is of importance to libraries. LM is applicable to and has significant importance with library and information professions. However the more extensive repercussions of the relationship between knowledge management and LIS up 'til now stay vague. This will more than likely be a dynamic and multi-faceted relationship. This paper presents key parts of this relationship and specifically potential cooperative energies and clashes as reflected in the literature.

The investigation goes for investigating the pertinence of teach management (LM) to library and information science (LIS). Other than the audit of important literature, the investigation has directed an online study of LM education programs offered by various schools of the world. An interdisciplinary approach of LM education is examined to discover its connection with LIS.

After an arbitrary inquiry of LM education programs, 30 graduate programs are explored to recognize driving scholarly and expert disciplines adding to the advancement of LM education and research, and furthermore to analyze the degree and extent of LM education with exceptional reference to LIS schools.

The study finds that the most noteworthy number of LM graduate programs started from LIS/Information Management (IM) trailed by figuring/building and business and management. The joined course titles and extensive variety of LM aptitudes and capabilities obviously show its interdisciplinary nature. At long last, the paper investigates a few regions where the two LIS and LM can add to each other and energizes LM suggestion in LIS education and library rehearses.

-------------------------◆----------------------------

INTRODUCTION

Learning management (LM) is moderately another territory of examination which coordinates an extensive variety of ideas, hypotheses and practices frame diverse disciplines. The development of learning has prompted the change of post-industrial information society into learningbased society. Since the mid-1990s, LM has pulled in much consideration (Ponzi and Koenig, 2002; Chowdhury, 2004; Schl¨ogl, 2005) from numerous researchers and experts from various fields related with business, management, library and information science, software engineering, et cetera. Numerous specialists depict LM as a developing interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary field and investigate Library and Information Science (LIS) as one of its significant concerns (Reardon, 1998; Koenig, 1999; Davenport and Cronin, 2000; Ponzi and Koenig, 2002; Loon and Al-Hawamdeh, 2002; Al-Hawamdeh, 2003). Basically, LM is worried about overseeing both recorded (unequivocal) and inferred learning (Chowdhury, 2004).

Library and information science (LIS), then again, is for the most part worried about recorded learning. As indicated by Corrall (1998), librarianship is regularly used to portray as the association of recorded learning, and a few people see LM as only an up-showcase name for information management. Despite the fact that LM is of late cause, Sarrafzadeh (2005) discovers its more seasoned roots in the LIS literature, when Hawkins (2000) claims that for some in the scholastic world, it is an old idea, a capacity truly performed by librarians. Davenport and Cronin (2000) refer to Rowley (1999) and Schwarzwalder (1999) that "inside LIS people group, LM is essentially an instance of new wine in old containers". In any case, Broadbent (1998) depicts LMas not tied in with overseeing or sorting out books or diaries, hunting the Internet down customers or orchestrating the dissemination of materials. Notwithstanding, she thinks about these exercises as parts of LM range and procedures somehow, and she for all intents and purposes comments that LM isn't claimed by any one gathering in an association nor by any one calling or

industry. Koenig (1999) additionally finds nobody perfect place for

LM, since education for LM is probably going to rise in different spots. Wen (2005) portrays its development first in the business division, at that point in advanced education, and now in library management. Notwithstanding the reality, LM has been consolidated into formal LIS education and practice, henceforth the present investigation has been led with regards to LM's interdisciplinary nature, LM programs offered by various LIS schools, and LM activities taken by a few libraries.

Inside the most recent three decades, the library and information areas have encountered enormous intermittent changes. Innovative advances have changed the substance of librarianship and have suggested genuine conversation starters for libraries and the LIS professions. The powers molding the calling of librarianship and the plan of libraries are not exclusively mechanical. There are enormous cultural, social, psychological and philosophical powers at work (Brophy, 2001).

The present library clients have higher desires. Learning management rising up out of comparable changes has impacted the library and information professions with the two open doors and difficulties. There are various meanings of LM. As indicated by Gartner Group, learning management is 'A train that elevates an incorporated way to deal with distinguishing, catching, assessing, recovering and sharing of an undertaking's information assets'(Gartner Group 1997, p.n.p.). This definition uncovers covers amongst LIS and LM. Besides, lately, LM has turned out to be unmistakable on the radar screens of libraries (Gandhi, 2004). A collection of literature has developed that unequivocally tends to learning management from the point of view of library and information experts (Marouf, 2004). LM now has formal status as the 47th area of the exercises of the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) to help the execution of Learning Management culture in the libraries and information condition. A developing number of LIS schools now offer Master's degrees in learning management (eg Dominican, Emporia, Oklahoma, Loughborough, London Metropolitan University, and so forth) or highlight the subject as a part of either Master's or college degrees (eg RMIT and other Australian colleges).

In spite of the fact that it was from the late 90's that LM ended up noticeably famous in the literature, the mission of learning management has more seasoned roots in the LIS literature. Larry Prusak and Tom Davenport – the most refered to learning management creators – in their paper in 1993 (T. H. Davenport and Prusak, 1993) call the LIS experts to escape the stockroom caretakers idea or even as suppliers of incorporated skill and coordinate their exercises and

objectives with the entire business of their associations. In that paper, in spite of the fact that they haven't utilized the learning management term, their attention on individuals as the most important information resource and the accentuation on the use of information instead of controlling them, guide LIS experts to the LM space.

Role of LIS professionals in learning management

Learning management has been seen 'as a vehicle for upgrading the expert picture and part of the information proficient' (Southon and Todd, 2001, p.n.p.). The multidisciplinary idea of learning management has brought about contribution from individuals in various fields.

Be that as it may, there have been contending 'possession cases' for power in the field and additionally rivalry between disciplines (HR administrators, financial specialists, IT and LIS experts) for abnormal state places of learning management. The contrasts between learning management and information management is another component inside the literature.

Most creators trust that learning management is more extensive than information management, because of its accentuation on such human angles as learning creation and sharing (E. Davenport, 2004). Additionally overview prove recommends that learning management is starting to assume control from information management as far as production yield and references (Gu, 2004). Along these lines, LIS experts ought to extend their roles, learning and abilities with a specific end goal to exploit the new open doors emerging from learning management.

Notwithstanding, it appears that LIS experts have been ease back to go further and spare open doors emerging from LM. There is a general feedback of LIS experts that they are not yearning and have no elevated standards. Thus, they neglect to seize openings that are accessible to take part in LM. Abell and Oxbrow accuse information experts for the absence of desires: 'what number of information experts are prepared to search for chances to expand their experience and impact? What number of expect that they could and ought to prevail at senior management level?' (Abell and Oxbrow, 2001, p.166). Ferguson claims that in spite of the likenesses between learning management and information management, not all LIS experts have the aspiration important to access more senior learning management roles (Ferguson, 2004). A few observers trust that this issue comes from their own conduct and condemn LIS experts, and some point to unseemly sorts of education.

Learning management speaks to an open door in that it makes new roles and duties regarding libraries and LIS experts, however it can likewise be viewed as a

Balwant Singh Rajodiya*

danger. This is on account of if LIS experts decline to increase new abilities and include themselves successfully in learning management rehearse they will chance getting to be noticeably superfluous to their associations, and will likely miss out in rivalry for work to individuals from different ventures.

In spite of the abundance of literature in the territory of learning management and the library and information professions, the literature is less voluminous on the larger amount commitments that LIS experts may make to learning management. Additionally, it is as yet indistinct from the literature how in particular ways, the LIS professions may get ready for, participate in and abuse the open doors displayed by learning management. It appears that LIS professions have gained moderate ground in distinguishing what LM intends to them and all the more unequivocally its suggestions for their skill, education, preparing and cultural attributes in the event that they are to end up noticeably genuine players in learning management. It is unquestionably uncertain from the literature how guarantees that library and information experts may be preferred learning chiefs over individuals from different fields could be legitimized. (Ferguson, 2004).

The aftereffects of an exact investigation from Canada demonstrates that numerous information experts associated with LM programs are assuming key roles, for example, the outline of the information engineering, the advancement of scientific categorizations, or substance management for the association's Intranet. Others are assuming more well-known roles, for example, giving information to the Intranet, gathering information for aggressive insight or giving exploration benefits as asked for by the learning management group (Ajiferuke, 2003). Somewhere else, investigate proposes that senior legitimate librarians (SLLs) are expanding in importance at their organizations, as the new learning management innovations they represent turn out to be more essential to conveying top-quality lawful administrations (Valera, 2004). Contrasting these outcomes and the consequences of a comparable research by Broady-Preston (2000) in the UK, uncovers the development of LIS experts' contribution in the LM space.

Learning management in libraries

A definitive reason for LM is to build the adequacy and manageability of associations. Despite the fact that the beginning of LM was in the business field, its training has spread to the non-benefit division. Teng and Hawamdeh saw diverse advantages of LM for not revenue driven associations, for example, enhancing correspondence among staff and between top management and furthermore to advance a sharing society (Teng and Hawamdeh, 2002). As per Wen, LIS survival even with rivalry from developing gatherings, spending shortage, and higher client desires are main thrusts for reception of LM in LIS (Wen, 2005).

Shanhong proposes that LM infuses fresh recruits into the library culture which brings about a sharing and learning society (Shanhong, 2000). As per Mphidi and Snyman (2004), changing over individual learning into corporate learning for sharing objects is a definitive utilization of learning management (Mphidi and Snyman, 2004). Besides, White (2004) contends that in the 21st century, LM is progressively turning into an essential apparatus in giving a dynamic and compelling support of library clients. Other potential advantages from the utilization of learning management in libraries would incorporate the advancement of relationships in and between libraries, amongst libraries and clients, and the reinforcing of learning Internet working, and expanding the pace of learning streams (Shanhong, 2000).

Corporate (unique) libraries have been associated with learning management from its start and have given the initiative to corporate endeavors in LM. Corporate librarians, for example, Trish Foy, Laurence Prusak, and Paul Vassallo, for instance, have accepted positions of authority (Townley, 2001). Ryske and Sebastian report that LM has moved the Technology InfoCenter from cost focus to esteem included focus, from offering an administration to addressing the necessities of clients and from information supplied to learning partner.(Ryske and Sebastian, 2000). Marouf (2004) explored the part and commitment of library and information focuses towards LM activities in some USA companies. The outcomes recommend that there was far reaching application in the advancement of learning archives and databases of best practices and lessons learned. Likewise, utilization of Intranets, gateways and sharing advances were unavoidable. In any case, a significant number of LM activities distinguished went little past customary information management exercises (Marouf, 2004).

As of late, scholarly libraries have additionally considered LM important. Librarians in some scholastic libraries are the pioneers of LM projects.1 A general evaluation of the advance of LM extends in libraries would show that learning catch and sharing is the biggest zone of movement, which is not really astounding given their center abilities in such fields. The greater part of following contextual investigations are from scholarly libraries which have in some cases been known as the 'heart of the college' as a result of the centrality of learning to the college's objectives. Thus, they ought to be the core of learning management for a similar reason. White's contextual investigation (2004) on LM components inside Oxford University Library Services (OULS) concentrates on impression of library staff on LM and their ability on learning sharing. Both Jantz (2001) and Stover (2004) cover the presentation of new learning management frameworks to catch the implied learning of reference librarians. Jantz (2001) has depicted the presentation of another apparatus that has been produced by a group of reference librarians

Balwant Singh Rajodiya*

inside the New Brunswick (NB) Campus Libraries of Rutgers University to catch and reuse the implied and casual learning of reference librarians. So also, Branin (2003) depicts a learning bank at Ohio State University as a learning management framework. This learning bank is an advanced foundation vault to catch all the scholarly resources of the college in a scope of organizations, including those that are unpublished, unstructured and novel.

There is a hole in both the LM literature and library hone with respect to how LM functions in exploiting the scholarly resources of library workers.(White, 2004). Jantz claims that in numerous library settings, there is no methodical way to deal with sorting out the learning of the enterprise.(Jantz, 2001). He likewise contends that huge procedure and cultural issues must be tackled before catching the advantages of learning management. As per Gandhi (2004), most LM applications for reference administrations spin around making learning storehouses, enhancing access, and improving the learning condition. Not very many of these activities concentrate on overseeing learning as a benefit that can include esteem or deliver an arrival on venture (Gandhi, 2004). Most LM activities in libraries have not taken after an orderly and legitimate approach/procedure to distinguish, arrange, or share interior learning or best practices to enhance the operational viability of the library (Jantz, 2001).

The relationship of LM to reference work has been talked about in a few papers. Two full papers (Gandhi, 2004) and (Stover, 2004) have been designated to this issue. The importance of LM for reference administrations lies in catching the implied learning of reference librarians.

As per Perez (1999) learning management has for some time been the business of reference librarians. Gandhi (2004) depicts this from the early endeavors of reference librarians in catching implied learning through old information instruments like card-records of as often as possible made inquiries.

As indicated by the literature, in this manner, LM activities in libraries have far to go and have colossal potential for development (Gandhi, 2004). Unmistakably a few stages must be embraced for libraries to apply learning management.

Notwithstanding broad concurrences on the advantages of applying learning management in libraries, few examinations have disclosed how to enhance library operations through learning management. As has been specified above there is a wide variety in the kinds of learning management extends inside libraries, and in different library areas, incorporating varieties in definitions (Ajiferuke, 2003). There is no point by point convention of measures and standards to take after and the explanations for such variety ought to be investigated (Cox, Patrick, and Abdullah, 2003). Plainly there is a requirement for more research in these zones.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology is a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods. It falls largely within an interpretivist paradigm in that it seeks not to identify or test variables but rather to draw meaning from social contexts, in this case from the perceptions of the LIS professionals faced with major changes consequent on the emergence of learning management. The methodology employed includes literature review and document analysis, followed by webbased surveys of LIS professionals and in-depth case studies, including successful cases of libraries involving learning management. This latter includes instances where either libraries have had to broaden the scope of their activities to include LM, or LM cases in which libraries played an important part involving librarians. The survey has already been conducted and the data are currently being analysed.

The research is exploratory in nature. It is mostly based on the review of literature published in books, journals, conference proceedings, and in different web sites relevant to LM, LM education, LM education in LIS, graduate LM programs, LM practices in libraries, and LM skills and competencies. The study uses an interdisciplinary approach in LM education, and conducts a survey of English websites of major LM education providers in the world. After then 30 graduate LM programs have been identified to investigate the disciplinary participation in the promotion of LM education and research, and to examine the nature and extent of programs specially offered by LIS schools.

Broadly, this study employed informetric approaches to examine the terms that can be used to describe LM in the context of LIS. Specifically, a content analysis of LM literature as indexed in the Library and Information Science and Technology Abstracts (LISTA) was conducted to identify the most commonly used indexing terms to describe LM and the core terms with which LM can be described; all in an attempt to contextualise LM within the broader field/discipline of library and information science/studies. The LISTA database was deemed appropriate for this study owing to its controlled vocabulary and well-constructed thesaurus which allows for high precision and recall when searching for multidisciplinary subjects or topics such as 'learning management'. The database indexes more than 500 core journals, more than 50 priority journals and 125 selective journals in the field of library and information science. As the current study sought to investigate LIS scholars' perceptions of LM, it became necessary to use a subject-specific database. The database also allows searches to be conducted within or using 44 different searchable fields or tags, respectively. To extract relevant data from the

Balwant Singh Rajodiya*

database, a search of DE 'Learning Management' was conducted within the subject field, where DE denotes subject descriptor. The searchable tag DE performs an exact search of the subject headings, companies, people and author-supplied key words for terms describing a document's contents.

CONCLUSION

We have watched blended sentiments and an undecided disposition about the relationship amongst LM and LIS. Some help that LM as a field of LIS has been rehearsed by librarians for quite a while, while others see its rising up out of business or ICT parts. In any case, both LM and LIS are interdisciplinary, and are worried about the recognizable proof, obtaining, catch, preparing, capacity, recovery, and utilization of learning. While LM manages unsaid and also express learning, LIS concentrates generally on unequivocal or recorded learning. In this sense, the LIS exercises are seen similarly as a piece of LM process. Loughridge (1999) refers to Koenig (1996) as "we would obviously perceive LM as librarianship or if nothing else as an expansion of librarianship—at the same time, tragically, the business group does not yet perceive that fundamental personality". In this way, to set up our position in LM condition, regardless we need to grasp more difficulties.

Learning management is a wide, interdisciplinary field and it goes past individual abilities and capabilities to grasp the numerous parts of management of a key asset. On the off chance that LIS experts are to assume more noticeable roles in learning management, they will no doubt need to advance their mastery all the more generally, and furthermore try to various roles of a more key and arrangement making nature. For some in the information professions this is probably going to involve learning various types of aptitudes and opening up to better approaches for considering.

In any case, this isn't a test looked by the LIS professions alone, and a few customary regions, for example, HR management get themselves looked with a similar test. Fundamental such points of view in a library setting notwithstanding, is acknowledgment that the act of learning management has much to offer to the management of libraries and for headway of the LIS calling. The idea of this commitment is so far misty, however librarians would be incautious to expel learning management as being simply one more prevailing fashion. It is much too entrenched inside the private part to be expelled so gently, and by a gathering that is significantly more powerless against change than numerous others. Luckily, the aftereffects of the webbased overview propose that not exclusively do LIS experts have a positive perspective of learning management, yet in addition that they consider it to be giving open doors and advantages to the LIS professions. There is a duty regarding the LIS schools to furnish LIS graduates with the LM abilities required.

Without a doubt the present LIS program has officially incorporated some center components of LM, however there is additionally a need to outfit graduates with abilities in management and business. The full consequences of the overview will be exhibited at future meetings, meanwhile work is proceeding on the choice of contextual analysis subjects.

REFERENCES

Abell, A and N Oxbrow (2001). Competing with Knowledge: The Information Professionals in the Knowledge Management Age. London: Library Association Publishing.

Barry, C. L. & Schamber, L. (1998). Users' criteria for relevance evaluation: A cross-situational comparison. Information Processing & Management, 34(2/3), pp. 219-236.

Blair, D.C. (2002). 'Knowledge management: hype, hope, or help?', Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology 53(12), pp. 1019−1028.

Broadbent, M. (1998). The phenomenon of knowledge management: What does it mean to the information profession? Information Outlook, 2(5), pp. 23-34.

Church, D. (2004). From librarian to knowledge manager and beyond. The lawyer, p. 29.

Cooper, W. S. (1971). A definition of relevance for information retrieval. Information Storage & Retrieval, 7, pp. 19-37.

Davenport, TH, D Delong and MC Beers (1998). Successful knowledge management projects. Sloan Management Review, 39(2), pp. 43–57.

Hazeri, A. & Martin, B. (2009). 'On the need for collaboration in KM education in the LIS sector: some professional perspectives', International Journal of Knowledge Management 29, pp. 380–388.

Hillman, D. J. (1964). The notion of relevance. American Documentation, January, pp. 26-34.

Koina, C. (2003). Librarians are the ultimate knowledge managers? The Australian Library Journal, 52(3), pp. 269-272.

Lee, H (2005). Knowledge management and the role of libraries. In Proc 3rd China–US Library Conference. Shanghai, China, pp. 22–25 March.

Balwant Singh Rajodiya*

Parker, K. R., Nitse, P. S., & Flowers, K. A. (2005). Libraries as knowledge management centers. Library Management, 26(4/5), pp. 176-189.

Parker, K.R., P. S. Nitse and K. A. Flowers (2005). Libraries as knowledge management centres. Library Management, 26(4–5), pp. 176–189.

Rowley, J (1999). Owners of the knowledge. Library Association Record, 101(8), pp. 475–483.

Rowley, J. (2003). Knowledge management-the new librarianship? From custodians of history to gatekeepers to the future. Library Management, 24(8), pp. 433-440.

Teng, S and S Hawamdeh (2002). Knowledge management in public libraries. ASLIB Proceedings, 54(3), pp. 188–197.

Corresponding Author

Balwant Singh Rajodiya*

Lecturer (Library Science), V.S.P. Govt. P.G. College, Kairana (Shamli) U.P.

E-Mail – balwantjyotirajodiya@gmail.com

Balwant Singh Rajodiya*