



KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT THROUGH GOOD SEARCHES

Sreedhara. M

Research Scholar, B.K. University , Bangalore.

Abstract:

The present paper discussed on knowledge management in digital libraries and it provides the basics of learning through online. Many of the studies are reviewed so as to follow good searching from digital libraries. It is on the part of the digital librarians to manage knowledge systematically so that all the keywords should be given, so as to provide good searches by all kinds of users.

Introduction:

Knowledge management (KM) emerged as a scientific discipline in early 1990s (Knowledge management, 2011) and its basic purpose is to enable an organization to leverage the knowledge and in turn improve productivity. The concept of CoPs has added an important dimension to organizational development, especially in the area of KM, which hails knowledge as an organization's critical and strategic asset (Retna & Ng, 2011). KM is a cross-disciplinary subject in which this concept is not limited to the business world but its development has been embedded in the processes across domains and disciplines (Wallace, 2007). Some authors call CoPs as —the killer knowledge management application (Rumizen, 2002) and as a — management tool in fostering collaboration (Awad & Gaziri, 1996).

The *Encyclopedia of Communities of Practice in Information and Knowledge Management* (Coakes & Clarke, 2006) provides varied definitions of KM and comprehensively examined all facets of CoPs in the area of information and knowledge management in societies and organizations. KM is defined as ...the processes necessary to capture, codify, and transfer knowledge across the organization to achieve competitive advantage (Archer, 2006, p. 29). KM is “...a combination of management awareness, attitudes, processes, and practices for creating, acquiring, capturing, sharing, and using knowledge to enhance learning and performance in organizations” (Bellarby & Orange, 2006, p. 306).

CoPs (Communities of Practices) lie at the core of a successful knowledge management system where informal exchanges of knowledge take place. Allee (2000) puts it this way:

Knowledge cannot be separated from the communities that create it, use it, and transform it. In all types of knowledge work, even where technology is very helpful, people require conversation, experimentation, and shared experiences with other people who do what they do. Especially as people move beyond routine processes into more complex challenges they rely heavily on their community of practice as their primary knowledge resource (p.5).

Retna and Ng (2011) in their recent work exploded the dynamics and key success factors in the development of CoPs and include a discussion on how it facilitates knowledge sharing and transfer that has positive impact on organizational knowledge management in societies and organizations. KM is defined as ...the processes necessary to capture, codify, and transfer knowledge across the organization to achieve competitive advantage (Archer, 2006, p. 29).

CoPs serve as nodes for the exchange and interpretation of information. As a consequence, a community of practice that spreads throughout an organization is an ideal channel for moving information, such as best practices, tips, or feedback, across organizational boundaries. It preserves the tacit aspects of knowledge that formal systems cannot capture. This collaborative inquiry makes membership valuable, because people invest their professional identities in being part of a dynamic, forward-looking community. They provide homes for identities and having a sense of identity is a crucial aspect of learning in organizations (pp. 5-6).

Proponents of knowledge organizations believe that CoPs as major contributors to the dissemination of information in the organization, often form the backbone of every KM program (Bergeron, 2003). In addition, Andrew, Tolson and Ferguson (2008) claimed that CoPs as tools for KM can provide a platform for collaborative workplace learning, leading to practice development and the creation, management and dissemination of new knowledge. They added — as a vehicle for the creation and management of knowledge systems, CoPs have the potential to release the creativity of practitioners and allow the sponsoring organization to harvest and disseminate the knowledge they produce (p. 251). Hence, CoPs is an important management tool through which KM takes place.

Learning Culture:

In developing a learning culture within the domain of DL entails an understanding of the concept of learning in the organization *vis-a-vis* the learning practices and tools. Also, the concept of a —learning culture or —culture of learning is defined here.

Learning Culture Defined

Learning is a social process - a by-product of man's interaction and participation in a certain social environment. Wenger (1998b) opined that learning entails both a process and a place. It entails a process of transforming knowledge as well as a context in which to define an identity of participation. As a consequence, to support learning is not only to support the process of acquiring knowledge but also to offer a place where new ways of knowing can be realized in the form of such an identity. Moreover, he defined learning as —interplay between social competence and personal experience (Wenger, 2000, p. 225). Here, he stressed that, —it is a dynamic, two-way relationship between people and the social learning systems in which they participate (p. 226). In this perspective, learning occurs not inside the mind of the individuals, but rather in the fields of social interaction between people (Hanks, 1991 cited in Coburn & Stein, 2006).

Botcheva, White and Huffman (2002) considered a learning culture as beliefs and attitudes that support the systematic and ongoing use of knowledge and information for improvement. They emphasized that a learning culture fosters risk taking, learning from mistakes, and a climate of trust and courage. Rogers (2000), however, said that a learning community is a cohesive community of which embodies a culture of learning in which everyone is involved in a collective effort of understanding. According to the Australian training.com (What is learning culture, 2011), to become a learning organization is to accept a set of attitudes,

values and practices that support the process of continuous learning within the organization... Through learning, individuals can re-interpret their world and their relationship to it. A true learning culture continuously challenges its own methods and ways of doing things. This ensures continuous improvement and the capacity to change. From the given definitions, a learning culture can be defined as an embodiment of or a set of beliefs, norms, and behaviours of individuals and groups in a community of practitioners which nurtures learning through collective discovery, sharing, and application of knowledge.

Knowledge Management based on Good Searching:

The digital libraries must have to organize the knowledge based on different keywords and should provide related links to relevant topic groups. It should enable the good searching by the patrons of the digital libraries. Further, the copy right should be taken care of while managing the knowledge management in digital libraries. The ideal searching should be based on common English or other language which should be understood by common people. The knowledge management in digital library should be achieved by following community of practices, which is based on interactive learning culture. Hence, the present day digital libraries must have to follow the same to enable good searching.

Conclusion:

It is now on the part of librarians, knowledge managers, information scientists or any individual or institution, which are dealing with knowledge to learn the user perceptions while managing the knowledge. After assessing user perceptions, the administrators of the institutions must search for the suitable tools for interactive learning. The knowledge should be stored in digital libraries so that it can be searched by ordinary and scientific languages. It enables the good searching using key words.

References:

1. Allee, V. (2000). Knowledge networks and communities of practice. *OD Practitioner*, 32 (4).
2. Andrew, N., Tolson, B., & Ferguson, D. (2008). Building on Wenger: Communities of practice in nursing. *Nurse Education Today*, 28, 246-252.
3. Archer, N. (2006). A classification of communities of practice. In E. Coakes, & S. Clarke (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of communities of practice in information and knowledge management* (p. 29). Hershey, PA: Idea Group.
4. Awad, E. M., & Ghaziri, H. M. (1996). *Knowledge management*. New Delhi. India : Dorling Kindersley.
5. Bellarby, L., & Orange, G. Knowledge sharing through communities of practice in the voluntary sector. In E. Coakes, & S. Clarke (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of communities of practice in information and knowledge management* (p. 306). Hershey, PA: Idea Group.
6. Bergeron, B. P. (2003). *Essentials of knowledge management*. New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons.
7. Botcheva, L., White, C. R., & Huffman, L. C. (2002). Learning culture and outcomes measurement practices in community agencies. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 23.
8. Coakes, E., & Clarke, S. (2006). *Encyclopedia of communities of practice in information and knowledge management*. Hershey, PA: Idea Group.

9. Hanks, W. F. (1991). Foreword. In J. Lave, & E. Wenger, *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press.
10. *Knowledge management*. (2011). Retrieved March 27, 2011, from Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia: http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Knowledge_management&oldid=431163123.
11. Retna, K. S., & Ng, P. T. (2011). Communities of practice: dynamics and success factors. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 32 (1), 41 - 59.
12. Rogers, J. (2000). Communities of practice: A framework for fostering coherence in virtual learning communities. *Educational Technology & Society*, 3 (3).
13. Rumizen, C. M. (2002). *The complete idiot's guide to knowledge management*. Madison, WI: CWL Publishing Enterprises.
14. Wenger, E. (2000). Communities of practice and social learning systems. *Organization*, 7 (2).
15. Wenger, E. (1998b). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.