

DOI: 10.35643/Info.30.1.5

Editorial

Knowledge Organization in multi and interdisciplinary dialogues: an editorial

**Organización del conocimiento en diálogos multi e interdisciplinarios: un
editorial**

**Organização do Conhecimento em diálogos multi e interdisciplinares: um
editorial**

José Augusto Chaves Guimarães^a ORCID: [0000-0002-0310-2331](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0310-2331)

^aSão Paulo State University, Marília, Brazil, chaves.guimaraes@unesp.br

The Knowledge Organization field - KO, especially in the context of Information Science, arises from the need to systematize and consolidate a set of knowledge, verifiable in a given society at a given historical moment, with the objective of transmission. On a more pragmatic level, it arises from the need to obtain the knowledge recorded in documents, aiming at accessing it, with the objective of retrieval.

As an area of study, KO dates back to the work of Henry Evelyn Bliss in the United States, in the late 1920s and early 1930s, and, since its inception, it has had a multidisciplinary nature, dialoguing with fields such as psychology, epistemology, communication science, linguistics, mathematics, logic and computer science and others (Dahlberg, 1993, García Marco, 1997).

Having its most important institutional and investigative framework in the International Society for Knowledge Organization – ISKO, created in Germany in 1989 by Ingetraut Dahlberg and Dagobert Soergel, KO, in our days, seeks to study and develop foundations, theories and methodologies related to processes, instruments and products that arise from the concern to systematize and make the knowledge produced and socialized by people available, guaranteeing what Smit and Barreto (2002, p.21) define as “permanence in time and its portability in space”.

In other words, it can be said that KO seeks to retrieve, preserve, represent and transmit the knowledge produced and socialized by man throughout history, in order to guarantee its conversion into information capable of generating new knowledge, in a continuous helical process. It is, therefore, a three-dimensional science, as it deals with the principles, methods and instruments put into action for the management of human knowledge from a triple perspective: its representation, its organization and its documentary communication (Barité, 2001; Guimarães, 2011).

Birger Hjørland (2016), in a seminal paper, discusses the history and the research traditions, approaches and theoretical issues of KO along the time and demonstrates the complexity and richness of such research field.

Historically, the organization and representation of knowledge (here more specifically referring to aspects linked to the intellectual content of documents, but without disregarding the importance of the processes of representing their formal aspects, as well as their ordering in storage for access purposes) has been based on a triad in which there is an epistemological dimension (conceptual, historical and methodological bases of knowledge organization as well as its interdisciplinary dialogues and scientific production), an applied dimension (models, formats, instruments, products and structures in knowledge organization), and a sociocultural dimension (professional training and performance, ethics, contexts, culture and identity in knowledge organization as well as the relationships between knowledge organization and sustainable development). These dimensions, in turn, are implemented in the processes (e.g. classification, indexing, etc.) that are developed, using instruments (e.g. classification schemes, thesauri, etc.) to generate products (notations, descriptors, indexes, etc.) (Guimarães; Dodebei, 2012).

As a dynamic field of study and permeable to phenomena that occur in society, the organization of knowledge has been faced with a diversity of investigative themes, an aspect that substantially enriches its own identity and scientific consolidation.

In a historical issue, in 2008, the journal *Knowledge Organization*, when addressing the epistemological configuration of the area (Mcilwaine; Mitchell, 2008; Hjørland, 2008; Tennis, 2008), took a look at the investigative questions that are most poignant today (López-Huertas, 2008; Gnoli, 2008), highlighting, since then, the

need for this area of studies to pay special attention to its dialogues with other disciplines and to themes that are interdisciplinary in nature.

It is important to point out that the issue of interdisciplinarity within KO was the object of the book *Interdisciplinary Knowledge Organization* (Szostak; Gnoli; López-Huertas, 2018), in which the authors start from the importance and the needs of interdisciplinary research and education in order to approach the nature of knowledge organization systems to serve interdisciplinarity (here including the phenomenon versus discipline-based classification and the feasibility of developing such knowledge organization systems), with a special mention to the domain oriented interdisciplinarity.

In view of this, the present thematic issue of the journal *Informatio*, entitled *Knowledge Organization: multi and interdisciplinary dialogues*, seeks to privilege these dialogues in order to discuss how KO has been acting in a reciprocal and collaborative way with other disciplines, which are feeding them with their theories, whether in the theoretical, methodological or applied scope.

In this sense, this *Informatio*'s special issue on the multi and interdisciplinary relations of KO accounts with the contribution of invited internationally renowned experts in the field from different parts of the world, whose articles were evaluated by a blind peer review system. It is worth noting that, in this sense, all the authors that integrate the dossier have an effective scientific insertion in the International Society for Knowledge Organization with several works published either in the *Knowledge Organization* journal or in proceedings of international and/or national/regional ISKO conferences.

The special issue starts with a group of three papers related to the cultural and ethical dimension of KO. In this sense, the first article, entitled "Intersectionality in knowledge organization revisited", authored by Daniel Martínez Ávila (University of León, Spain) and Melodie J. Fox (Milwaukee School of Engineering, United States), analyzes the importance of examining intersectional identities in knowledge representation processes and tools in order to ensure that further oppression does not occur. This ethical concern is also present in Sullen Milani's (Fluminense Federal University, Brazil) paper, entitled "Dilemmas and ethical decision-making in knowledge organization" especially because, during the

development of KO processes, the use of KO tools and the elaboration of KO products, “librarians will have to deal with ethical values as well as cultural and linguistic boundaries, and they will face dilemmas that require ethical decision-making”. In a broader cultural approach, Natália Tognoli (Fluminense Federal University, Brazil) discusses to what extent the access to information and the promotion of social justice can be considered pivotal values for a critical KO.

A second group of articles especially refers to the social interactions of KO, starting from the paper entitled “Knowledge organization and information literacy in the digital world: a needed conversation”, where Franciso Javier García Marco (University of Zaragoza, Spain) points out that “knowledge organization systems and tools are effectively used to improve the user experience in information literacy actions and products” and, as a consequence, “information literacy must incorporate knowledge organization literacy with a careful consideration of the level of knowledge and needs of users”. Another social interaction of KO is presented by Fadoua Boulakal and Widad Mustafa El Hadi (University of Lille, France) when they discuss the challenges faced by KO in order to preserve and promote access to cultural heritage in immersive museums. Another social interaction of KO is discussed by D. Grant Campbell (University of Western Ontario, Canada), specifically about the importance of the “principles of knowledge organization to explore the application of big data algorithms to the task of predicting dementia diagnoses”.

Finally, the third group refers to specific interdisciplinary spaces where KO deeply interacts: film production, discourse analyses and terminology. In this sense, Rosa Inês N. Cordeiro (Fluminense Federal University, Brazil), José Augusto C. Guimarães (São Paulo State University, Brazil), and Fernando P.O.C. Guimarães (VSI – Vox Mundi, Brazil) discuss “the sociocultural approach in KO with focus on interdisciplinary relations, within the scope of film indexing in cinema collections” by the organic KO of a film's documentation, by considering the pre-production, production and post-production processes. This interdisciplinary approach is also considered by Thiago H.B. Barros (Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil) and by Mario G. Barité (University of the Republic, Uruguay) in terms of KO interactions with discourse analysis and terminology respectively. For this, Barros analyzes “how Michel Pecheux’s and Michel

Foucault's discourse theories can contribute to knowledge organization systems and the analysis of communities", and Barité explores "the space of intersection between KO and Terminology" in order to identify mutual and reciprocal theoretical and methodological elements between them.

I deeply expect that all those discussions can contribute to broaden the research perspectives on the multi and interdisciplinary dimension of KO and I hope that you enjoy your reading.

References

- Barité, M. (2001). Organizacion del conocimiento: un nuevo marco teorico-conceptual en bibliotecologia y documentacion. In: Carrara, K. (ed.). Educação, universidade e pesquisa. Marília : Unesp, FAPESP, p. 35-60.
- Dahlberg, I. (1993). Knowledge organization: its scope and possibilities. *Knowledge Organization*, v.4, n. 20, p. 211-22.
- García Marco, F.J. (1997). Avances en organización del conocimiento en España. In: Organización del conocimiento en sistemas de información y documentación. Zaragoza: Libreria General, p. 7-12.
- Gnoli, C. (2008). Ten Long-Term Research Questions in Knowledge Organization. *Knowledge Organization.*, v.35, n.2/3, p.137-149.
- Guimarães, J. A. C. (2011). A dimensão teórica do tratamento temático da informação e suas interlocuções com o universo científico da ISKO. *Revista Ibero-Americana de Ciência da Informação*, v.1, n.1, p.77–99.
- Guimarães, J. A. C.; Dodebei, V. (2012). Desafios e perspectivas científicas para a organização e representação do conhecimento na atualidade. Marília: ISKO-Brasil : FUNDEPE. <https://isko.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/Proceedings-ISKO-Brasil-2011>.
- Hjørland, B. (2006). Knowledge organization. *Knowledge Organization*, v. 43, n. 6, p.475-84.
- Hjørland, B. (2008). What is knowledge organization. *Knowledge organization*, v.35, n.2–3, p.86-101.

- López-Huertas, M. J. (2008). Some current research questions in the field of knowledge organization. *Knowledge Organization*, v. 35, n.2/3, p. 113-136.
- Mcilwaine, I.; Mitchell, J. (2008). What is Knowledge Organization. *Knowledge Organization*, v.35, n.2/3, p. 79-81.
- Smit, J. W.; Barreto, A. A. (2002). *Ciência da Informação: base conceitual para a formação do profissional*. In: Valentim, M. L. P. (org.). *Formação do profissional da informação*. São Paulo: Polis.
- Szostak, R.; Gnoli, C.; López-Huertas, M. (2018). *Interdisciplinary knowledge organization*. New York : Springer.
- Tennis, J. T. (008). Epistemology, theory, and methodology in knowledge organization: toward a classification, metatheory, and research framework. *Knowledge Organization*, v.35, n. 2/3, p.102-112.