IMPLIMENTATION OF NEW TRENDS OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT (KM) & LIBRARY INFORMATION SERVICES (LIS) IN MODERN AND TRADITIONAL LIBRARIES

By

Manisha V. Patil

Librarian, Shripatrao Chougule Arts & Commerce Mahavidyalaya, Malwadi-Kotoli. Tal-Panhala.Dist- Kolhapur.

Abstract

Library science program prepare people to work as a Librarian or consultant or Knowledge Management Officer. Library science often termed as library studies is the interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary field that applies the practices, perspective and tool of management, information technology education and other areas of libraries :the collection, organization, preservation, dissemination of library sources and to decrease the economy of the information. Students can learn to buy, organize, store and retrieve the information. They also learn how to help people to do research and find regarding information . Nowadays information comes in many forms. Students of library science learn how to organize these different types of information so that library users feel comfortable rather than confused. Students of library science value the past and embrace the future.

Keywords :

Implementation, Knowledge, Management.

The Roll of Library Science :-

The roll of library science is to provide a combined service of research and teaching. It contributes to the knowledge base of profession and helps in preparing them to achieve excellence. Library science is one field which has changed tremendously in the past 20 years which makes it more challenging than any other profession. The library science course will help in designing and improving libraries. In the digital age, the importance of librarian and library science is increasing. Library professionals are the one who are completely involved in providing information services to professionals and organizations. In the modern digital age the need for quality and filtered information has grown up and so librarian have a major roll to play. This has increased the scope for library science in this digital age.

1.1.Human Skills :-

Human skill's in manager's ability to work effectively as a group members and to build co-operative efforts within the team, he or she leads. Every managerial level interaction with other people, whereas the technical is primarily concerned with working with things/skills (processes or physical objects). The first level manager is involved on a regular basis with the personal problems and life events of the many non-managers. It is therefore natural that he or she must be able to work through these personal situation and effectively lead subordinates. He or she has perceive and reorganize the perception of his or her superior, equal and subordinates and his or her own behavior subsequently.

1.2.Conceptual Skills :-

Conceptual skills mean the ability to see the organization as a whole and it includes re-organizing how the various functions of organization depends on one another. It also makes the individuals aware how changes in any one part of organization affects all the others. It extends to visualizing the relationship of the individuals business to the industry, to the community and the political, economical and social forces of the nation as the whole. Thus the managers gain insight into improving the overall welfare of the total organization.

1.3.Communicational skills :-

As a manager (concerned with getting things done) your view of the words should be pragmatic rather than the philosophical. Thus the word mean not what is dictionary says they do but rather what the speaker intended. Suppose the your manager gives to you an instructions which contain an ambiguities which neither of your notice and which results in you producing entirely the wrong product. The greatest sources of difficulties is that words often have different meaning depends upon context and /or culture.

1.4.Changing Roll of future academic library professional :-

Changing Roll of future academic library professional implies the set of updated skills needed for facing the challenges created by latest web technologies in the e-learning environment. The emphasis will shifts from technical skills in the library communication, facilitation, training and management skills. Although the technology presents the librarian with ethical challenges, the librarian is to be ready for the roll of the information professionals in the connected networked world and they have to acquire skills that can be contributed to success in their new roles.

1.5.The importance of Library Science :-

Library science comes with different definitions, each one different from next and the varying forms only leads people to misunderstand its actual value in the world. To put it simply , libraries are very useful for all of us either we are kids in school, students in college learning something ace that new jobs interview or for finding that perfect books to read in our spare time.

1.6.Information ethics and policy issues for academic libraries :-

Many of the policy and ethical issues facing academic librarians are similar to, if not the same as, those across the our profession. Because of some rather unusual medical situation in my own large family over the years, I have experienced many facets of the use of medical information by patients and caregivers , and I have given a special appreciation for what medical libraries do every day. I also want to make clear that I do not pretend to be an ethics experts; my interest is in the application of ethical reflection to our field.

2.2 Challenges facing librarianship in the new era: Is knowledge management the answer?

The LIS literature is characterized by speculation about the future of libraries and librarianship. Technological advances, and particularly the development of the internet and the World Wide Web, have changed the face of librarianship and have posed serious questions for libraries and LIS professionals. Among the more significant social and economic impacts of the World Wide Web is

the increasing amount of freely available information, something that has resulted in changes to information behavior. People have come to believe that they can find everything through the web. There are massive cultural, social, psychological and philosophical forces at work (Brophy 2001). For example, information services outside libraries offered by the commercial sector tend to be promoted as being more customer-oriented and responsive. Dillon accuses libraries of lagging behind commercial offerings in the most basic system features such as personalization, richness of experience, quality of content and interaction. He compared the information provided by Amazon and what library catalogues typically offer and claimed that "The information to be found at Amazon.com is often so much more useful and so much richer. And Amazon's interface is by no means state of the art" (Dillon 2002, p.334).

Although predictions of extinction might seem somewhat alarmist, it is clear that the profession cannot ignore them. Some As Ostler and Dahlin emphasize: Dewey's pragmatic approach leaves us without the theoretical tools that are necessary to deal with the problem of the information age (Ostler & Dahlin 1995, p.683; cited in Floridi 2002). While taking the point, it could be argued nonetheless, that theory has not been totally absent from the work of profession. Furthermore, it would be a mistake to view the library heritage and contribution to society solely in terms of information objects, and of storage and retrieval activities.

However, this is not the only point of view on this issue. The more optimistic view suggests that developments in information technology, globalization and the developing role of information within society have provided great opportunities for libraries and librarians, which could allow them to not only survive but also to enjoy a very exciting future. The fifth law of library science expounded by Dr Ranganathan states: "the library is a growing organism". In practical terms today this means: "honor the past and create the future" (Gorman 1997, n.p.). More than fifty years ago, Butler (1951) observed that librarians had a responsibility for the promotion of wisdom in the individual and in the community. Writing little more than a decade later, Shera (1965) defined librarianship in terms of the management of human knowledge. These classic statements not only reflect the long standing "world view" and theoretical foundation of librarians, but also lend credence to current claims for a more relevant and meaningful role for the profession in emerging knowledge-based societies.

2.2.1 The Knowledge Based Economy and the Role of Libraries and Librarians

Information and communication technologies (ICTs) as one of the main driving forces of change, have helped create a borderless world, resulting in global competition among organizations. In an increasingly knowledge-based economy, the principal asset for organizations in both the private and public sectors is knowledge. Therefore, organizations place great importance on the acquisition, creation, diffusion and use of information and knowledge. Peter Drucker, an early advocate of knowledge-based change, observed: "The basic economic resource is no longer capital, nor natural resources, nor labor. It is and will be knowledge" (Drucker 1969). Likewise, Bell, who is generally seen as the progenitor of the information society concept, argued that knowledge was the most important production factor in modern economies, the basis of the exercise of power, and of gains in productivity and business competitiveness (Bell 1973, cited in MacNaughtan 2001).

This emphasis on the treatment of knowledge as an organizational resource increased markedly in the final decade of the last century (Alavi & Leidner 2001). To survive in the face of such global competition, organizations increasingly depend on their ability to transform information into knowledge as the basis of competitiveness, decision-making and the production of new products and services. As a consequence, organizations, and large firms in particular, have invested heavily in activities designed to acquire, control, leverage and account for this intangible resource. This activity, facilitated by an increasingly sophisticated array of search, retrieval and collaborative technologies, has further contributed to the problem of information overload. Unfortunately, this virtual explosion in the supply of information has far exceeded the abilities of users and potential users to exploit it (Naismith 2006).

Rather, the sheer volume and scale of information availability has contributed to new demands for access to knowledge (Ju 2006). The satisfaction of these demands is likely to require an increased human dimension to information access, in order to ameliorate the effects of technology (Nardi & O' Day 1999). In a source quoted previously in this chapter, Brophy (2001) advocated a future for LIS professionals in helping to counter information overload by performing access and intermediary roles which embraced not just information but also knowledge management.

The rise of knowledge management has contributed to a growing recognition, at senior management level, of the crucial importance of "information" or "knowledge" to the success and well-being of all manner of organizations. This has led to a higher profile for information professionals and their skills and competencies. Such developments lend support to claims that libraries can play different roles in today's knowledge-based societies. While libraries and

information professionals are relevant in today's society, the challenge to remain as relevant as other information providers is indeed formidable, and remaining relevant demands change (Watstein & Mitchell 2006). In order to do this, librarians need to identify the parts of their core mission that will be sustainable in a changed environment (Besser 1998, cited in (Varaprasad 2006).

The rise of knowledge management has contributed to a growing recognition, at senior management level, of the crucial importance of "information" or "knowledge" to the success and well-being of all manner of organizations. This has led to a higher profile for information professionals and their skills and competencies. Such developments lend support to claims that libraries can play different roles in today's knowledge-based societies. While libraries and information professionals are relevant in today's society, the challenge to remain as relevant as other information providers is indeed formidable, and remaining relevant demands change (Watstein & Mitchell 2006). In order to do this, librarians need to identify the parts of their core mission that will be sustainable in a changed environment (Besser 1998, cited in (Varaprasad 2006). Arguably, its long-standing expertise in dealing with information and knowledge should enable the profession to remain in the forefront of developments in knowledge management. Indeed, the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) has called upon libraries to act as a dynamic engine for the knowledge and information society.

In a 1996 research review, the Gartner Group predicted that organizational attention to KM would bring about massive changes in the role of corporate libraries by the year 2001. They predicted that there was a 70 per cent chance that during the five years to 26. 2001 information resource centers (libraries) would be actively engaged in their organizations knowledge management or if not would face a slow and painful death (Klobas 1997). Their prediction has been accurate to some extent. Some corporate libraries have been reinvented as knowledge centers, often with bigger budgets (for example, in the "big six' – now four – consultancies) (Bishop 2001). Elsewhere, research found that for 88 per cent of libraries in legal firms, the share of internal budgets was rising owing to the introduction of knowledge management (Valera 2004). Such developments would seem to represent opportunities rather that threats to librarians, suggesting that their skills are being recognized by the wider world (Pantry & Griffiths 2003). Brophy drew attention to two major trends in library practices. From the health sector has come the demand for evidence-based practice, from the commercial sector the emphasis is on knowledge management. Both have significant implications for library services (Brophy 2001).

This "perceptions of libraries and information resources" study concluded that the library is not the first or only stop for many information seekers. Search engines are the favorite place to begin a search, and respondents indicated that Google was the search engine that most of them had recently used to begin their searches. Sixty-nine per cent of respondents believed that information from a search engine was as reliable as that from a library source; 90 per cent of college students stated that they believed information that was free was as reliable as that which had to be paid for. One-third of respondents reported that their level of library use had decreased in the previous three to five years. Most of respondents, while generally satisfied with libraries and librarians, did not plan to increase their use of libraries (OCLC 2005). Other sources meanwhile have indicated that for many, the opportunity to go to the library personally has become a treasured and distant memory (Hayes 2004).

2.2.1 The Knowledge Based Economy and the Role of Libraries and Librarians

Information and communication technologies (ICTs) as one of the main driving forces of change, have helped create a borderless world, resulting in global competition among organizations. In an increasingly knowledge-based economy, the principal asset for organizations in both the private and public sectors is knowledge. Therefore, organizations place great importance on the acquisition, creation, diffusion and use of information and knowledge. Peter Drucker, an early advocate of knowledge-based change, observed: "The basic economic resource is no longer capital, nor natural resources, nor labor. It is and will be knowledge" (Drucker 1969). Likewise, Bell, who is generally seen as the progenitor of the information society concept, argued that knowledge was the most important production factor in modern economies, the basis of the exercise of power, and of gains in productivity and business competitiveness (Bell 1973, cited in MacNaughtan 2001). This emphasis on the treatment of knowledge as an organizational resource increased markedly in the final decade of the last century (Alavi & Leidner 2001). To survive in the face of such global competition, organizations increasingly depend on their ability to transform information into knowledge as the basis of competitiveness, decision-making and the production of new products and services. As a consequence, organizations, and large firms in particular, have invested heavily in activities designed to acquire, control, leverage and account for this intangible resource. This activity, facilitated by an increasingly sophisticated array of search, retrieval and collaborative technologies, has further contributed to the problem of information overload. Unfortunately, this virtual explosion in the supply of information has far exceeded the abilities of users and potential users to exploit it (Naismith 2006).

Nardi and O'Day (1999) describe the problem of information overload as like swimming in the ocean and yet being unable to drink from the surrounding water, because information integrity, quality and security are critical considerations that are not easily achieved. People using this information are information-rich but knowledge-poor (Naismith 2006). In Naisbitt's words: "We are drowning in information but starved for knowledge" (Naisbitt 1982, cited in Materska 2004). In this environment, access to information is no longer a major challenge for libraries. Rather, the sheer volume and scale of information availability has contributed to new demands for access to knowledge (Ju 2006). The satisfaction of these demands is likely to require an increased human dimension to information access, in order to ameliorate the effects of technology (Nardi & O' Day 1999). In a source quoted previously in this chapter, Brophy (2001) advocated a future for LIS professionals in helping to counter information overload by performing access and intermediary roles which embraced not just information but also knowledge management. The rise of knowledge management has contributed to a growing recognition, at senior management level, of the crucial importance of "information" or "knowledge" to the success and well-being of all manner of organizations. This has led to a higher profile for information professionals and their skills and competencies. Such developments lend support to claims that libraries can play different roles in today's knowledge-based societies. While libraries and information professionals are relevant in today's society, the challenge to remain as relevant as other information providers is indeed formidable, and remaining relevant demands change (Watstein & Mitchell 2006).

In order to do this, librarians need to identify the parts of their core mission that will be sustainable in a changed environment (Besser 1998, cited in (Varaprasad 2006). Arguably, its long-standing expertise in dealing with information and knowledge should enable the profession to remain in the forefront of developments in knowledge management. Indeed, the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) has called upon libraries to act as a dynamic engine for the knowledge and information society.

In a 1996 research review, the Gartner Group predicted that organizational attention to KM would bring about massive changes in the role of corporate libraries by the year 2001. They predicted that there was a 70 per cent chance that during the five years.

2001 information resource centers (libraries) would be actively engaged in their organization's knowledge management or if not would face a slow and painful death (Klobas 1997). Their prediction has been accurate to some extent. Some corporate libraries have been reinvented as knowledge centers, often with bigger budgets (for example, in the "big six" – now four –

consultancies) (Bishop 2001). Elsewhere, research found that for 88 per cent of libraries in legal firms, the share of internal budgets was rising owing to the introduction of knowledge management (Valera 2004).

2.2.2 From Librarianship to Knowledge Management: Changing Labels or New Frontiers?

Along with developments in information technology and the increasing role of information within society have been shifts within LIS from traditional librarianship to information management and now to knowledge management. This evolution involves much more than the simple renaming of the profession. In fact, potentially it could represent a huge advancement. Although in one sense the library mission remains the same, these differences in nomenclature extend to a range of developments which are not adequately provided for in the traditional terminology. For example, the phenomenon of "information everywhere", almost by definition questions the status of the library as the only provider of information. Information in electronic formats can be everywhere. Therefore, the term "librarianship", used in the sense that it refers to the library as a place where people actually go to find information, has its limitations in describing the activities of the profession in a world where time and space are no longer the dominant factors they once were. Similar reservations apply to the transition in nomenclature from librarianship to information management, and perhaps even more to information science. Recognition of such transitions has come from people such as Cronin, who was an early advocate for the status of information management as a new interdisciplinary field (Cronin 1985, p.viii).

When it comes to distinguishing information management from knowledge management, the results of an Australian survey of the perceptions of knowledge management among LIS professionals revealed a lack of understanding of the concept (including wide variations in the terminology employed), and no general consensus as to the relationship between knowledge management and information management (Southon & Todd 2001; Todd & Southon 2001).

2.2.3 KM and LIS: are they Related?

To some it comprises a completely new discipline, while to others it involves simply a rebranding of librarianship or information management. However, there appears to be widespread recognition within the LIS literature that KM is relevant to, and has considerable overlap with, the interests of the library and information professions. Accordingly, it follows that significant contributions to KM can be made by these professions. But where, it might be asked, do libraries and information centers fit into this highly business-intensive, not to say commercial phenomenon that is

knowledge management? A look at some of the standard definitions would not at first glance provide much in the way of an answer. Knowledge management has been defined as:

A capability to create, enhance and share intellectual capital across the organization … a shorthand term covering all of the things that must be put in place, for example, processes, systems, culture and roles to build and enhance this capability (Lank 1997). And again: The creation and subsequent management of an environment which encourages knowledge to be created, shared, learnt, enhanced, organized and utilized for the benefit of the organization and its customers (Abell & Oxbrow 2001, p.267). Neither of these definitions would appear to hold much promise for involvement by the LIS professions, notwithstanding that the second of them emerged from a leading library-related consultancy in the United Kingdom. However, not only are library and information professionals expert in content management, something that is often central to successful knowledge management, but also individual professionals have demonstrated their management potential by transferring to careers in consultancy and other forms of business. On the whole, however, the LIS professions may still labor under a dual, self-imposed handicap in seeking to exploit opportunities in knowledge management. The first is a traditional reluctance to move beyond the information container towards analysis and interpretation of its contents, and the second, is that information professionals continue to promote themselves as service-oriented, rather than value-oriented (Corrall 1998). The perpetuation of such attitudes may well help to explain the general absence of a LIS component within the mainstream knowledge management literature.

Librarianship is the management of human knowledge, the most interdisciplinary of all the disciplines – and because it is concerned with the philosophy of knowledge it is potentially the most deeply philosophical of all the professions (Shera 1965, p.176) As reflected in the above definitions, the concept of coding, storing and transmitting knowledge is nothing new for the library profession. However, it could be argued that some definitions appear to limit library science to the domain of recorded knowledge.

For example, the American Library Association (ALA) Glossary defines Library Science as "the professional knowledge and skill by which recorded information is selected, acquired, and utilized in meeting the information demands and needs of a community of users" (Young 1983). This definition has been criticized for overlooking the "humanistic side" of librarianship. Floridi states that: "it would be very misleading to conclude that LIS's object is therefore only the domain of organized knowledge …" (Floridi 2002, p.41).

Although it was in the 1990s that KM became popular, the mission of knowledge management has older roots in the LIS literature. Larry Prusak and Tom Davenport – the most-cited knowledge management authors – in their paper in 1993, called on LIS professionals to get out of the warehouse custodians concept, or even that of the providers of centralized expertise and integrate their activities and goals with the whole business of their organizations. Although not actually using the term knowledge management, their focus on people as the most valuable information asset, and an emphasis on the usage of information rather than its control, could be interpreted as directing LIS professionals towards the KM domain (Davenport, 2004).

2.2.4 Perceptions of KM Among LIS Professionals

Therefore, some commentators maintain that KM is a new name for what librarians have been doing for years (Gorman 2004). For some in the LIS community, KM is simply a case of "new wine in old bottles" or as "librarianship in new clothes" (Koenig 1997; Rowley 2003; Schwarzwalder 1999); and, more controversially, as "nothing more than information management" (Wilson 2002). Koenig is a prominent supporter of the view that knowledge management is little more than information management (Koenig 1997; Koenig 1999; Koenig et al. 2000; Koenig 2001; Koenig & Srikantaiah 2002; Wilson 2002; Koenig 2005). We would of course recognize "KM" as librarianship, or at least as an extension of "librarianship" – but unfortunately the business community does not recognize that essential identity (Koenig 1996, p.299). Koenig argues that much of the terminology and techniques used in knowledge management, for example, knowledge mapping, seem to have been borrowed from both information management and librarianship (Koenig 1997). Some of us in the library community will be having a slight feeling of deja-vu – Yes, this is precisely the concept of "information mapping" that Horton and others in the library community have been promoting for years … we may feel, with some justification, that KM is just a new name for librarianship … (Koenig 1996, p.299). Despite all the buzz and hype surrounding knowledge management, in the real world it doesn't seem to have moved much beyond Library 101 ... (Liberman 1999, p.850, cited in Davenport & Cronin 2000 n.p.). Debate continues as to whether knowledge management is librarianship or information management under another name (Koenig 1997, Wilson 2002).

A dominant view sees IM as a subsystem of KM processes (Choo 1998; Owen 1999; Butler 2000; Abell & Oxbrow 2001; Al-Hawamdeh 2002; Bouthillier & Shearer 2002). In this context, Middleton (1999) described knowledge management as a combination of information management

(IM) for managing the documentary form, and human resource management (HRM) for managing the expression of knowledge. However, some critics of KM have dismissed it as being nothing more than an alternative term for IM. Although one would regard this description as an oversimplification. The most noteworthy critique has been conducted by Wilson, who in his research-based paper entitled: "The nonsense of KM" argues that if knowledge occurs only in people's heads, it cannot be codified, captured, retained, searched or accessed, and therefore it cannot really be managed. He claims that KM is simply another management fad and in fact, a repackaged form of IM (Wilson 2002). Jashapara (2005) questions the methodology used by Wilson. He claims that the research time scale, the biased sample and the keywords used are problematic areas and thus the validity of Wilson's research results is under question. Wilson, however, is not alone in his view. Stoker (1999) claims that the KM is and always has been one aspect of the discipline of "information management" and, in fact, KM is a new term to repackage and market existing techniques.

There is of course, room for a middle ground in which there is more to the matter than simply the relabeling of LIS (Broadbent 1997; Broadbent 1998; Corrall 1998; Davenport & Cronin 2000). For Broadbent, who attempts to clarify the position of LIS professionals in the emerging KM field, KM is not about managing or circulating printed materials or internet searching on behalf of clients (although these activities may form 32 part of the KM process) (Broadbent 1998, p.26).

In other words, routine work to support information access is not what KM is about, and coding and process representation are only parts of what it is about. A frequently-cited survey conducted by TFPL company, observed that: Though it is apparent that information management is very much part of the KM environment, it is only one part and only truly effective when applied with an understanding of the full KM picture (TFPL 1999). In a similar view, KM is seen as distinct from both librarianship and IM, as it includes knowledge creation and knowledge sharing, and the interplay of tacit and explicit, individual and collective knowledge (Davenport 2004).

The key issue that separates KM from IM is the fundamental belief that people, as opposed to electronic or print materials are the most important asset of an organization. They have a vital and central role in the success or failure of KM (Blair 2002; Sinotte 2004). While KM includes information management, the knowledge component requires the "care, feeding and training of experts" (Blair 2002).

2.3 Roles of LIS Professionals in KM

As the focus of KM moved from IT towards human expertise, including the importance of tacit knowledge, other disciplines and departments became increasingly involved. Koenig notes that attendance at KM conferences shifted from being almost entirely comprised of IT people, to including a significant contingent of human resources people in the late 1990s (Koenig 2002). Today, KM tends to be viewed increasingly as a series of organizational initiatives that are built and implemented by multidisciplinary teams. This includes: the installation of software such as intranets to facilitate information management, including the capture of explicit knowledge through such facilities as Yellow Pages, and of tacit knowledge through chat rooms. It also includes the widespread availability of learning opportunities for employees and the development of formal or informal "communities of practice" (groups that develop or are constructed to allow the sharing of expertise) to facilitate knowledge sharing and innovation (Sinotte 2004). Gradually, the various disciplines involved, information technology, human resources and LIS, have begun to acknowledge that this very critical, but complex, organizational asset will not be effectively managed without the use of integrated 35.

This view has been supported by Davenport and Cronin: „KM is a form of distributed cognition, a multifaceted domain where professionals of different provenance must recognize each other's "roles" (Davenport & Cronin 2000). Also, Owen observed that KM had quite different meanings to people depending on their place in the organization (e.g., HRM, the Library, the IT Department) and that fully integrated KM should combine these different approaches (Owen 1999). Similarly, Broadbent (1998) argues that: KM requires a holistic and multidisciplinary approach to management processes and an understanding of the dimensions of knowledge work … KM is not owned by any one group in an organization, nor by any one profession or industry. But if you want to be a player in the emerging KM phenomenon, you need to understand the multiple perspectives of the other players (Broadbent, 1998). It is clear that: "This very critical but complex organizational asset [knowledge] will not be effectively managed without integrated teams and approaches" (Sinotte 2004, p.194).

Given this breadth of provenance, choosing where different professional competences should be invested is a challenge. Middleton describes knowledge management as "A combination of information management (IM) for managing the documentary form, and HRM for managing the expression of knowledge" (Middleton 1999, p.2). So far as LIS is concerned, the information management component has been most prominent, which is scarcely surprising. A body of literature has emerged that explicitly addresses the opportunities for librarians within the context of

KM (van Rooi & Snyman 2006). There is a general acknowledgement within this literature that, since information management lies at the heart of knowledge management programs, LIS professionals with the relevant information management skills have the potential to be significant players in knowledge management. Henczel points out that information audit, which she describes as the first step of a KM strategy, have been undertaken by information professionals for many years (Henczel 2004a, p.301).

Davenport and Prusak (1998) observed that the awareness and application of knowledge have always been at the centre of librarians work and, therefore, it is important that companies pursuing KM exploit the skills of people within librarianship. However, as will be discussed later, there are different views as to the nature of this involvement, with some claiming for instance that it has been confined to the management of explicit knowledge. Especially worth noting in the literature is the 2004 collection published by IFLA with the provocative title, Knowledge Management.

Libraries and Librarians Taking up the Challenge. The aim of the collection was to persuade LIS professionals to take up the challenge of KM, claiming that librarians were the most likely candidates for KM roles, since KM had deep roots in the LIS profession (Hobohm 2004). Professional interest in KM is also reflected in two monograph publications edited by Koenig and Srikantaiah (2000) and Abell and Oxbrow (2001), which map out the KM domain for information professionals (Koenig et al. 2000; Abell & Oxbrow 2001). KM has been perceived as a vehicle to extend the role of LIS professionals in their organizations, and in the process enhancing their position, image and salary (Southon & Todd 2001).

Valera, writing in a legal context, reports that: "Knowledge management is now at the very core of many firms, and, because of this, law librarians are increasingly important. The old perception of legal librarians working away in small, dusty libraries, searching through volumes of legal texts is completely divorced from reality" (Valera 2004). As will be reported later in this thesis, the law area seems to be one where librarians have done well as knowledge managers. So far as specific contributions are concerned, the literature review contains ample references to the role of LIS professionals in facilitating access to information (explicit knowledge).

The KM movement has gone through a number of stages, and it is now moving into a stage of recognizing the importance of and incorporating information and knowledge external to the parent organization (Koenig 2005, p.2). Stage one and stage two concerned, respectively, the application of technology and knowledge sharing. In stage three, the role of LIS professionals is their traditional one of facilitating access to information although with potential for a wider role;

because, as Koenig observed: "it's not good if they can't find it (Koenig 2005). Davenport (2004) believes that library activities with respect to KM are located within the externalization and combination quadrants of the SECI model of knowledge conversion proposed by Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995).

Socialization Individual tacit knowledge is conveyed to others by showing and doing	**Externalization** The resulting "social" knowledge is captured and codified and made explicit
Internalization New codified knowledge is digested by the individual whose tacit knowledge is transformed	**Combination** Codified explicit knowledge is synthesized to create new combinations

Figure 1. *The simplified version of a cyclical "knowledge creation" model of Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) by Davenport (2004, p.82).*

Essentially, the Externalization (tacit to explicit) and Combination (explicit to explicit) quadrants focus on explicit knowledge. Hence, it is not surprising that Davenport would recommend them for this role as "LIS professionals have the core information management skills required to manage knowledge once it becomes explicit, that is, to identify, catalogue and maximize the visibility and availability of the products in which knowledge is stored" (Webster 2007). Creating new knowledge by adding value to information through services such as filtering, summarizing and packaging information can be examples of the activities of LIS professionals in the Combination mode. Also, librarians add value to existing knowledge through portal development, which can include recommending and listing useful, reliable websites with annotations and grouping these in appropriate categories. It seems clear that librarians do play a role in KM through involvement in externalization and combination activities. In a search for evidence of the involvement of LIS professionals in KM, Ajiferuke (2003) conducted an empirical study in Canadian organizations.

The results revealed that information professionals involved in KM programs were playing key roles, such as the design of the information architecture, the development of taxonomies, or content management for the organization's intranet. Others were playing more familiar roles, such as providing information for the intranet, gathering information for competitive intelligence or providing research services as requested by the knowledge management team.(Ajiferuke 2003). Van Rooi and Snyman (2006) conducted a content analysis of 28 English journal articles1 which discussed knowledge management opportunities for librarians. The following opportunities were identified:

➢ Facilitating an environment conducive to knowledge sharing

➢ Managing the corporate memory

➢ Transfer of information management and related skills to a new context linked to business processes and core operations

➢ Management of information in a digital/electronic environment

➢ Development of corporate information literacy (van Rooi & Snyman 2006).

The research sample for this project was not ideal, and the researcher admits that the findings may have limitations as regards generalizability. Furthermore, while the above-mentioned opportunities are general enough to be plausible, there is neither much evidence for them, nor clarification of any consequent implications for practice. Although the last two opportunities identified are familiar roles for LIS professionals, the first two opportunities would require LIS professionals to move well out of familiar territory. In fact, the first one sounds more like a job for cultural change experts. Information literacy, as a potential field of opportunity for LIS in the KM context, has featured elsewhere in the literature. Knowledge workers need to be able to make effective use of information and systems. Blair (2002) states that successful KM requires both the ability to access stored information and knowledge among workers to "evaluate the validity and reliability of information obtained from unfamiliar sources". The importance of these abilities and knowledge has also been identified by Abell (1999). Hence, all staff in an organization need to be able to

➢ Define a problem and the information required to solve it,

➢ Find the information and navigate the systems that hold it,

➢ Evaluate and interpret the information they find,

➢ Use the information and assess the outcome, and

➢ Record and disseminate the results (Abell 1999).

Based on the results of a study by KPMG, Koenig (2001) claims that more than half of the failures of KM systems can be attributed to inadequate user training and education. He calls for librarians to take a role by engaging in teaching database searching, teaching the use of groupware, teaching database mining, and training users in the use of current awareness services. In fact, for a number of years, librarians have been developing a role in preparing and delivering information literacy training to users both formally and informally (Blair 2002, p.63; Abell, 1999, p.296; Henczel 2004a, p.61; Koenig 2001, p.52, Sinotte 2004, p.17; Webster 2007, p.294).

CONCLUSIONS:

The changing role of the librarians, an facilitated by the use of the internet, should be of the profession. There are three major areas which should be addressed by the information profession to meet the challenges of these changes.

1.Beacuse the internet provides library users with a vast array if seemingly accurate information will need to increasingly adopt the roll of the teacher or guide. Users will not need to learn how to best access information, they will also need to be taught to critically evaluate Internet resources to determine their validity. Librarians will need to provide guidance.

2.Library professionals will need to address the issue of information organization and retrieval via the Internet. Librarian should remain proactive in dealing with policy and procedural issues concerning organization and access. In this way the Internet of the information retrieved by library users can be ensured.

References:-

1. Alavi, M. (1997). *KPMG Peat Marwick U.S.: One giant brain*. Harvard Business School Case, 108-115.

2. Alavi, M. (2000). *Managing organizational knowledge: framing the domains of IT management*. Cincinatti: Pinnaflex. Alavi, M. & D. E. Leidner (2001). Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: conceptual foundations and research issues [1,2]. (Review). *MIS Quarterly* 25(1): 107-137.

3. Bell, Daniel. (1973). *The Coming of Post-industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*. New York: Basic Books. p.175.

4. Bair, Jim. (1999). "Knowledge Management is About Cooperation and Context," Gartner Advisory Services Research Note (May 14).

5. Bishop, K. (2002). *New roles, skills and capabilities for the knowledge-focused organisation*. Sydney: Standards Australia.

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

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

8. Broadbent, M. (1997). The emerging phenomenon of knowledge management. *The Australian Library Journal* 46(1): 6-23. B

9. rogan, M., Hingston, P. et al. (2001). *A bounded or unbounded universe?: knowledge management in postgraduate LIS education*. 67th IFLA Council and General Conference,

10. Choo, C. (1996). *An integrated information model of the organization: The knowing organization*. Retrieved February 10, 2006, from http://www.fis.utoronto.ca/people/faculty/choo/FIS/KO/KO.html.

11. Cronin, B. (1985). *Information management: from strategies to action*. NJ: Information Today Inc.

12. Choo, C.W. (2000). Working with knowledge: how information professionals help organizations manage what they know. *Library Management* 21(8). C

13. Choo, C.W. (1998). *Information management for the intelligent organization: the art of scaning the environment*. Medford: Information Today Inc.

14. Church, D. (2004). From librarian to knowledge manager and beyond. *The Lawyer* 2004: 29. Corcoran, M. & R. Jones (1997). Chief knowledge officers? perceptions, pitfalls & potential. *Information Outlook*: 30-36.

15. Dakers, H. (1998). Intellectual capital: auditing the people assets. *INSPEL* 32(4): 234-242.

16. Davenport, E. (2004). Organizations, knowledge management and libraries: issues, opportunities and challenges. *Knowledge management: libraries and librarians taking up the challenge*. Ed. H.C.Hobohm. Munchen: Saur.

17. Koenig, M.E.D. (2005). *KM moves beyond the organization: the opportunity for librarians*. World Library and Information Congress: 71th IFLA General Conference and Council Libraries – A voyage of discovery, Oslo, Norway, IFLA.

18. Koenig, M.E.D. (2001). *Knowledge management, user education, and librarianship*. 67th IFLA council and general conference, Boston. 228

19. Shera, J. (1965). *Libraries and the organization of knowledge*. London: Lockwood

20.   Chandraiah, I. 2001. Marketing of information services in the digital environment , in

21.   library practices for effective management (ILA seminar paper of the 47 th . All India Library Conference, Warangal,20-23 Dec.,2001, Edited by Kalpana das Gupta, Indian Library Association,368-378

22.   Prytherch, Ray. 1997.'Problems of research' Information management report (Sept.)

23.   Basant, L and D, Sharp.2001Upsize this Down! Libraries need relationship marketing information outlook.