

KNOWLEDGE ORGANIZATION

KO

Official Quarterly Journal of the International Society for Knowledge Organization ISSN 0943 – 7444

International Journal devoted to Concept Theory, Classification, Indexing and Knowledge Representation

Contents

Eighth International ISKO Conference: Knowledge Organization and the Global Information Society63

Articles

Beghtol, Clare. Classification for Information Retrieval and Classification for Knowledge Discovery: Relationships between “Professional” and “Naïve” Classifications.....64

The Importance of ISKO Conferences: An Editor’s Note74

McIlwaine, I.C. Trends in Knowledge Organization Research75

Hjørland, Birger. Fundamentals of Knowledge Organization87

Book Reviews

KAGEURA, Kyo. The Dynamics of Terminology: A Descriptive Theory Of Term Formation And Terminological Growth. Amsterdam/Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2002. 322 p. ISBN 90-272-2328-9 (Eur) / 1-58811 314-0 (US). 112

SAUPERL, Alenka. Subject Determination During The Cataloging Process. Lanham, MD : Scarecrow, 2002. 173 p. ISBN 0-8108-4289-0. 114

SCHROEDER, Sandi, ed. Software for Indexing. Medford, NJ : Information Today, in association with the American Society of Indexers, 2003. 275 p. ISBN 1-57387-166-4. 115

Knowledge Organization Literature

30(2003)No.2..... 117

Personal Author Index

30(2003) 124

Contents page

Beghtol, Clare. (2003). **Classification for Information Retrieval and Classification for Knowledge Discovery: Relationships between “Professional” and “Naïve” Classifications.** *Knowledge Organization*, 30(2). 64-73. 33 refs.

ABSTRACT: Classification is a transdisciplinary activity that occurs during all human pursuits. Classificatory activity, however, serves different purposes in different situations. In information retrieval, the primary purpose of classification is to find knowledge that already exists, but one of the purposes of classification in other fields is to discover new knowledge. In this paper, classifications for information retrieval are called “professional” classifications because they are devised by people who have a professional interest in classification, and classifications for knowledge discovery are called “naïve” classifications because they are devised by people who have no particular interest in studying classification as an end in itself. This paper compares the overall purposes and methods of these two kinds of classifications and provides a general model of the relationships between the two kinds of classificatory activity in the context of information studies. This model addresses issues of the influence of scholarly activity and communication on the creation and revision of classifications for the purposes of information retrieval and for the purposes of knowledge discovery. Further comparisons elucidate the relationships between the universality of classificatory methods and the specific purposes served by naïve and professional classification systems.

McIlwaine, I. C. (2003). **Trends in Knowledge Organization Research.** *Knowledge Organization*, 30(2). 75-86. 86 refs.

ABSTRACT: This paper looks at current trends in knowledge organization research, concentrating on universal systems, mapping vocabularies and interoperability concerns, problems of bias, the Internet and search engines, resource discovery, thesauri and visual presentation. Some problems facing researchers at the present time are discussed. It is accompanied by a bibliography of recent work in the field.

Hjørland, Birger. (2003). **Fundamentals of Knowledge Organization.** *Knowledge Organization*, 30(2). 87-111. 74 refs.

ABSTRACT: This article is organized in 10 sections: (1) Knowledge Organization (KO) is a wide interdisciplinary

field, much broader than Library and Information Science (LIS). (2) Inside LIS there have been many different approaches and traditions of KO with little mutual influence. These traditions have to a large extent been defined by new technology, for which reason the theoretical integration and underpinning has not been well considered. The most important technology-driven traditions are: a) Manual indexing and classification in libraries and reference works, b) Documentation and scientific communication, c) Information storage and retrieval by computers, d) Citation based KO and e) Full text, hypertext and Internet based approaches. These traditions taken together define very much the special LIS focus on KO. For KO as a field of research it is important to establish a fruitful theoretical frame of reference for this overall field. This paper provides some suggestions. (3) One important theoretical distinction to consider is the one between social and intellectual forms of KO. Social forms of KO are related to professional training, disciplines and social groups while intellectual organization is related to concepts and theories in the fields to be organized. (4) The social perspective includes in addition the systems of genres and documents as well as the social system of knowledge producers, knowledge intermediaries and knowledge users. (5) This social system of documents, genres and agents makes available a very complicated structure of potential subject access points (SAPs), which may be used in information retrieval (IR). The basic aim of research in KO is to develop knowledge on how to optimise this system of SAPs and its utilization in IR. (6) SAPs may be seen as signs, and their production and use may be understood from a social semiotic point of view. (7) The concept of paradigms is also helpful because different groups and interests tend to be organized according to a paradigm and to develop different criteria of relevance, and thus different criteria of likeliness in KO. (8) The basic unit in KO is the semantic relation between two concepts, and such relations are embedded in theories. (9) In classification like things are grouped together, but what is considered similar is not a trivial question. (10) The paper concludes with the considering of methods for KO. Basically the methods of any field are connected with epistemological theories. This is also the case with KO. The existing methods as described in the literature of KO fit into a classification of basic epistemological views. The debate about the methods of KO at the deepest level therefore implies an epistemological discussion.

This contents page may be reproduced without charge.