

Occidental region), the Indian subcontinent (Hindu) and Eastern Asia. She identifies ways in which cultural context affects terminology, concept identification and naming, categorization, focus of themes and citation order.

Comparative approach is a means to discover sameness and differences which explain what design decisions were based on cultural warrant. This comparative approach is even more needed in the context of cross-cultural use of KOSs. Clarifying distinct design decisions on the adaptation can provide demonstration of the implementation of cultural warrant.

Intercultural use of classification

I reviewed scholarly works with emphasis on sociocultural contexts in KOSs: more specifically, recognition of multiplicity in epistemologies, a call for the needs of studies on those matters and efforts to address diversity. Some problematic issues, however, are raised during the construction and utilization of various KOSs because each reflects a different sociocultural perspective. On the one hand, for such systems to reflect a certain domain or cultural view, it is possible that the systems will have limited accessibility—fewer users will be able to use a particular culturally targeted system. On the other hand, any systems aiming to accommodate diverse cultures and different perspectives are likely to satisfy no one due to the difficulties of managing myriad and often incompatible differences. Therefore, one challenge in developing a KOS is to make it accessible to as many users as possible while satisfying the needs of intended users. As global use of library classification systems increases, more than one cultural perspective may exist in a system. In cross-cultural environments, the knowledge structures of classification systems should reflect multiple sociocultural viewpoints, because the classification is intended to meet the needs of multiple cultures. The multiplicity or plurality in classification systems is worth scholarly attentions in a pursuit of ethical approach to KOS.

Cultural hegemony in KOSs refers to the global dominating over the local, but the global is more likely the leading countries—either the USA or Europe. For example, the adoption of Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) in other parts of the world form US intellectual-cultural hegemony and circumscribes local perspectives (McKennon, 2006). Applying the concept of cultural warrant, this issue of cultural hegemony can be evident in that one dominating cultural warrant prevails throughout the use of globalized information system across cultures. The, so called, universal system needs a particular attention when it is used or adopted to other countries. Thus, it is necessary to explore the case of international or cross-cultural use of classification systems with emphasis on pluralistic cultural warrant. This paper suggests that we examine cultural warrant in the adoption of the universal classification system to different cultures.

Warrant is basically the source of design and vocabulary for classification. Simply put, cultural warrant is to take time and space as source. However, it becomes more difficult to have a consensual base of cultural warrant for a certain classification system given the increasing needs for international and culturally diverse classification. So, in reality, consensual cultural warrant is likely to privilege the viewpoint of one set of users at the expense of another. Here the concept of ethical warrant is engaged and played—ethical warrant is to be mindful of the oppressed or minorities, so tends to be more evaluative. To evaluate, there should be sets of criteria. The case of cross-cultural uses of classifications, especially, requires consideration of how to respect plural cultural warrant not to suppress one another. It requires understanding of the plural cultural warrant interplayed in the system, which would potentially result in pursuing of ethical warrant. Therefore, the present study is conducted to fulfill its goal—understanding of the plural cultural warrant interplayed—in comparing classifications. Comparative approaches bring about discovery of insights in the problems caused by sociocultural differences in classification systems and