KO   KNOWLEDGE ORGANIZATION

Contents

KNOWLEDGE ORGANIZATION

KO

Contents pages

Shiri, Ali. **Making Sense of Big Data: A Facet Analysis Approach.** *Knowledge Organization. 41(5)*, 357-368. 29 references.

Abstract: Understanding, exploring and investigating big data to inform the development of policies and best practices requires a solid analysis, identification and mapping of the key facets and aspects of big data. The objective of this paper is two-fold: a) to provide a facet analysis of big data key topics and issues; and, b) to present a select number of information science research methodologies and study frameworks that may have the potential to be applied to research on big data. Six facets, namely data type, environment, people, operations and activities, analytics, and metadata are introduced to capture the key aspects of big data. Furthermore, sub-facets are created for each facet to demonstrate specific aspects that constitute the key topics. This type of conceptualization of big data will contribute to our learning and understanding of big data and its key components and characteristics. A number of suitable methodological frameworks from information science are introduced along with their potential applications for big data.

Hjørland, Birger. **Is Facet Analysis Based on Rationalism? A Discussion of Satija (1992), Tennis (2008), Herre (2013), Mazzocchi (2013b), and Dousa & Ibekwe-SanJuan (2014).** *Knowledge Organization. 41(5)*, 369-376. 35 references.

Abstract: In several writings I have claimed that the basis of knowledge organisation (KO) must be found in subject knowledge, and that researchers and practitioners in KO must achieve knowledge about the domains that they are organising. Domain knowledge is not neutral, but rather is based on competing epistemologies and worldviews, and the classifier is therefore participating in struggles related to worldviews. Different traditions, approaches and paradigms in knowledge organisation research (and practice) can best be understood as more or less associated with one of four epistemologies: empiricism, rationalism, historicism/hermeneutics, or pragmatism/critical theory (of which only the last position fully acknowledges the non-neutrality of knowledge organisation). Ranganathan—and the whole facet-analytic school—has formerly been exemplified as a rather clear example of rationalism. Some have objected to this claim, and Satija (1992), Tennis (2003), Mazzocchi (2013b), Herre (2013), and Dousa and Ibekwe-SanJuan (2014) have each provided important arguments that need to be considered. This paper therefore takes these authors' studies as the point of departure and examines the arguments that have been raised in relation to my position.

Martínez-Ávila, Daniel and Kipp, Margaret E.I. **Implications of the Adoption of BISAC for Classifying Library Collections.** *Knowledge Organization. 41(5)*, 377-392. 90 references.

Abstract: We analysed the written statements of libraries that have adopted the bookstore model for coherence or lack of coherence with common public library guidelines. We used a text-based Foucauldian genealogical discourse analysis to investigate the written statements used by libraries that have adopted BISAC and other aspects of the bookstore model. Libraries adopting bookstore models such as BISAC should consider the potential consequences of adopting a commercial model for a public entity. This paper has practical implications for libraries considering adopting any aspect of the bookstore model, but especially the BISAC system, as it examines the potential benefits and drawbacks of the bookstore model popular in some libraries with respect to the purposes and goals of public libraries. BISAC application in libraries seems to be part of a trend of applying commercial practices, values and terminology in libraries, perhaps not with the purpose of replacing libraries with bookstores, but with the aim for both systems to converge into a new kind of commercial entity and context. The influence of one kind of system over the other does not seem to be totally reciprocal, since the application of library practices, values and standards in bookstores has not had the same effects and resonance as has occurred in the opposite direction.

García Gutiérrez, Antonio. **Declassifying Knowledge Organization.** *Knowledge Organization. 41(5)*, 393-409. 51 references.

Abstract: Classification, as is common knowledge, is simultaneously an operation (classer) and an instrument of knowledge organization (classifier), regardless of more technical or specific designations used in that area of research, although an operation that 'naturally' transcends the very realm of knowledge organization (KO) to which it descended from the logos. In this text, a summary of more than 35 years of work, the author presents a series of hypothesis and itineraries of declassified thought, a way of thinking based on strategies of reflexivity and pluralism that buttress the automatic, hierarchical and essentialist tendencies enhanced by totalitarian mind, whether this be harsh or subtle, which are imposed by all levels of power in order to re-orientate them towards civic commitment, repoliticization of KO practices that were never depoliticized. Declassification is a hermeneutics of KO that recuperates criticism, rhetoric, reflection, emotions, affection and even contradiction as the cornerstones of systematic knowledge production processes. The world is not only full of heterogeneous knowl-

KO   KNOWLEDGE ORGANIZATION

edge but also heterogeneous forms of knowing that must be restored and deliberated upon on an equal basis. That is the aim of declassification on putting forward an open and alternative interpretation of rethinking and practising identity, culture, memory or social sciences and KO, particularly in the new digital space of unlimited interaction.

Šolc, Roman. **Brief Communication: The Czech System of Evaluation of Science Research Handicaps Interdisciplinary Science** *Knowledge Organization.* *41(5)*, 410-413. 2 references.

Abstract: The system of evaluation of scientific outputs in the Czech Republic has been established by viewing all outputs which are registered in the database called Information Register of R&D results. Every output gets some points which are allocated to individual authors and institutions. The procedure is established in the material called Methodology of Evaluation of Research Organizations and Evaluation of Finished Programmes (valid for an actual year or years). This article shows how one changeover in that algorithm which was carried out between the years 2009 and 2010 handicaps interdisciplinary science. As an example, the data about publications from Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Science are used. The data from more or less interdisciplinary disciplines are compared using the algorithm from different versions of methodology. The results show that the changeover handicaps interdisciplinarity and mainly publications in prestigious journals.