

UCLA

UCLA Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Use and Nonuse of Michel Foucault's The Archaeology of Knowledge and The Order of Things in Archival, Library, and Information Science Journal Literature, 1990-2015: Reflections on How Foucault Became a Foucauldian Discursive Formation

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2jj0s1r6>

Author

Dewey, Scott Hamilton

Publication Date

2015

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Use and Nonuse of Michel Foucault's *The Archaeology of Knowledge* and *The Order of Things*

in Archival, Library, and Information Science Journal Literature, 1990-2015:

Reflections on How Foucault Became a Foucauldian Discursive Formation

A thesis submitted in partial satisfaction

of the requirements for the degree

Master of Library and Information Science

by

Scott Hamilton Dewey

2015

© Copyright by
Scott Hamilton Dewey
2015

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

Use and Nonuse of Michel Foucault's *The Archaeology of Knowledge* and *The Order of Things*
in Archival, Library, and Information Science Journal Literature, 1990-2015:
Reflections on How Foucault Became a Foucauldian Discursive Formation

by

Scott Hamilton Dewey

Master of Library and Information Science

University of California, 2015

Professor Leah A. Lievrouw, Chair

Using full-text database searches and other bibliometric techniques, this thesis tracks, both quantitatively and qualitatively, the visible use of two of Foucault's major early works related to discourse analysis from a large sample of LIS scholarly journals. This study found citations of the two works to be relatively limited and general, with LIS scholars preferring later works by Foucault and secondary sources regarding Foucault. Users of secondary discussions of the books also favored general rather than specific explorations of Foucauldian ideas. Citation of the works tended to concentrate especially in a core of academically oriented journals, yet the books also get cited and used in more standard, practical LIS journals. This study suggests possible reasons for the comparatively modest visible use of Foucault's two important early works.

The thesis of Scott Hamilton Dewey is approved.

Anne J. Gilliland

Jonathan Furner

Leah A. Lievrouw, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2015

Table of Contents

I. Introduction: Research Problem	1
II. Research Methods	6
III. Research Findings	13
A. Journal Search Results	13
B. Citation-Specific Search Results	18
C. Tertiary Use	26
D. Detailed Comparison of Use of <i>Archaeology of Knowledge</i> versus <i>Order of Things</i>	40
IV. Analysis of Findings	44
A. Limited Visible Use and Relative Marginalization of <i>The Archaeology of Knowledge</i> and <i>The Order of Things</i>	44
B. Preference for Secondary Sources	55
C. Possible Incentives for Display of Use of Foucault Rather than Use of Foucault?	59
D. Temporal Dimensions to the Disappearance of the Author	62
E. “Crowding Out” and the Principle of Least Effort	65
F. Journal Presence and Penetration	71
G. Tertiary Use	76
V. Conclusion	81
Appendices	91
Supplemental Bibliography	118

List of Appendices

Appendix 1: Unavailable, Unsearchable, and Zero-Results Journals	91
Appendix 2: Bibliography of 188 Articles Citing <i>Archaeology</i> or <i>Order</i> in This Study's Database	92
Appendix 3: Journals with Articles Citing <i>Archaeology</i> , <i>Order</i> , Both, or the Discourse on Language, with Depth of Use, Plus Citations of Other Foucault Works	106
Appendix 3a: Journals with Known Citations Only to "Other" Foucault	107
Appendix 4: Top Journals for Use of "Other" Foucault	108
Appendix 5: Top Journals for Use of <i>Archaeology</i> , <i>Order</i> , or Both	109
Appendix 6: Very Substantial Uses of <i>Archaeology</i> , <i>Order</i> , or Both	110
Appendix 7: Substantial Uses of <i>Archaeology</i> , <i>Order</i> , or Both	111
Appendix 8: Very Substantial, Substantial, and Significant Uses, by Work/Depth of Use	112
Appendix 9: Very Substantial, Substantial, and Significant Uses, by Depth of Use/Year	114
Appendix 10: Very Substantial, Substantial, and Significant Uses, by Work/Year	116

List of Supplementary Materials

[Note to readers: the three Excel spreadsheets listed below include the raw data supporting the claims made in the body of the thesis as well as the various appendices. These spreadsheets will be submitted along with this thesis for public access. The labels on the spreadsheets indicate the specific focus of each one.]

Scott_Dewey_Foucault_Citations_2015.xls

Scott_Dewey_Foucault_Journal_Searches_2015.xls

Scott_Dewey_Foucault_Relevant_Journal_Articles_2015.xls

I. Introduction: Research Problem

Postmodernism has been called “the most influential intellectual trend of the last third of the 20th century, and one of the central trends in the Western cultural-theoretical thinking since the 1960s.”¹ As such, postmodernism has significantly impacted many academic fields, including archival, library and information science/studies (hereinafter LIS).²

Of all the figures associated with postmodernism, probably the most widely known and widely cited is Michel Foucault (1926-1984),³ the French intellectual historian and theoretician who was found to be the single most cited author (not just postmodernist author) of books in the humanities during 2007 as well as the most cited postmodernist writer within LIS.⁴ Foucault has

¹ Piret Viires, “End of Irony? Estonian Literature after Postmodernism,” *Interlitteraria*, vol. 16, no. 2 (2011): 451-463, at p. 451; see also Jose Lopez and Garry Potter, eds., *After Postmodernism: An Introduction to Critical Realism* (New York: Athlone, 2001), at p. 3. For general background on postmodernism, see, e.g., Gary Aylesworth, “Postmodernism,” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy Online*, available at <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/postmodernism/> (discussing the origins and development of various different branches of postmodernism).

² Archivist and scholar Brien Brothman has listed, as examples of fields significantly impacted by postmodernist deconstruction, “architecture, management science, legal studies, literary theory, organizational theory, public administration, social theory, and even religious and theological studies.” Brothman, “Declining Derrida: Integrity, Tensegrity, and the Preservation of Archives from Deconstruction,” *Archivaria*, vol. 48 (Fall 1999): 64-88, at p. 65. Blaise Cronin and Lokman I. Meho similarly note how postmodernists have “left their mark on the American academy and their footprints all over ISI’s (now Thomson Reuters) citation indexes.” Cronin and Meho, “Receiving the French: A Bibliometric Snapshot of the Impact of ‘French Theory’ on Information Science,” *Journal of Information Science*, vol. 35 (2009): 398-413, at p. 399. John Buschman and Richard A. Brosio in 2006 found postmodernist ideas still stimulating inquiry and debate in fields such as education, anthropology, and LIS. Buschman and Brosio, “A Critical Primer on Postmodernism: Lessons from Educational Scholarship for Librarianship,” *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, vol. 32, no. 4 (2006): 408-418, at p. 408. The University of California, Los Angeles Graduate School of Education and Information Studies groups archival science together with other LIS fields or sub-fields, unlike some other programs that do not.

³ For helpful brief background regarding Foucault’s life and ideas, see, e.g., Gary Gutting, “Michel Foucault,” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy Online*, available at <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/foucault/>; Wikipedia contributors, “Michel Foucault,” *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michel_Foucault (accessed January 26, 2015). For more extensive background, see, e.g., Francois Cusset, *French Theory: How Foucault, Derrida, Deleuze & Co. Transformed the Intellectual Life of the United States* (J. Fort, translator) (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008). Like some other figures generally grouped under the category of “postmodernism,” Foucault did not necessarily perceive himself to be a “postmodernist” and sometimes had sharp differences of opinion with other postmodernist thinkers.

⁴ See “Most Cited Authors of Books in the Humanities, 2007,” *Times Higher Education* online, March 26, 2009, available at <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/405956.article> (based upon data from Thomson Reuters’ ISI Web of Science); Cronin and Meho, “Receiving the French,” *supra* note 2, at p. 401.

been called ““the central figure in the most noteworthy flowering of oppositional intellectual life in the twentieth century West.””⁵ He is especially remembered for offering radical critique of conventional assumptions, methods, or systems of knowledge and meaning. As LIS scholar Gary Radford notes, “The dissolution of taken-for-granted structures is a hallmark of Foucault’s work.”⁶ The structures Foucault challenged include not only governments, academic and professional disciplines, and other authoritative institutions, but language, knowledge, power, and authority in general.

Because much of Foucault’s critique is rooted at the essential, fundamental level of language and communication itself, the concept of discourse is especially central to Foucault’s thought, and Foucault, in turn, is particularly identified with that concept.⁷ For Foucault, discourse tends to build in assumptions and “taken-for-granted structures” that ultimately and cumulatively take on a life of their own by controlling, confining, and defining thought, understanding, knowledge, and what may be recognized or understood to be true in any particular community or context. As Radford explains, “For Foucault, objectivity and truth are sites of struggle among competing systems of discourse. What is scientific at any particular historical juncture is determined by which system is dominant and which system is true[.]”⁸

⁵ Michael Olsson, “Power/Knowledge: The Discursive Construction of an Author,” *Library Quarterly*, vol. 77, no. 2 (April 2007): 219-240, at p. 221 (quoting Gary P. Radford, “Positivism, Foucault, and the Fantasia of the Library: Conceptions of Knowledge and the Modern Library Experience,” *Library Quarterly*, vol. 62, no. 4 (October 1992): 408-424, at p. 416).

⁶ Gary P. Radford, “Flaubert, Foucault, and the Bibliotheque Fantastique: Toward a Postmodern Epistemology for Library Science,” *Library Trends*, vol. 46, no. 4 (Spring 1998): 616-634, at p. 622.

⁷ Regarding Foucault and discourse, see, e.g., Ronald E. Day, “Poststructuralism and Information Studies,” *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*, vol. 39 (2005): 575-609, at pp. 575, 589-593; Stuart Hannabuss, “Foucault’s View of Knowledge,” *Aslib Proceedings*, vol. 48(4) (April 1996): 87-102; Gary P. Radford, “Trapped in Our Own Discursive Formations: Toward an Archaeology of Library and Information Science,” *Library Quarterly*, vol. 73(1) (January 2003): 1-18; Bernd Frohmann, “Discourse Analysis as a Research Method in Library and Information Science,” *Library & Information Science Research*, vol. 16 (1994): 119-138, at p. 119.

⁸ Gary P. Radford, “Positivism, Foucault, and the Fantasia of the Library: Conceptions of Knowledge and the Modern Library Experience,” *Library Quarterly*, vol. 62, no. 4 (October 1992): 408-424, at p. 418.

Discourse analysis, whether following Foucault or influenced by his work directly or indirectly, has had and continues to have a major impact on many fields, including LIS.⁹

In order to try to recognize, uncover, and dissolve the taken-for-granted structures built into and unquestioningly assumed within established systems of discourse that Foucault labeled “discursive formations,” Foucault introduced what he termed “archaeological” and “genealogical” methods of investigation and critique. The archaeological approach tends to be more identified with and explored within Foucault’s earlier (roughly pre-1970) works; the later-developed genealogical approach mostly appears in his later (post-1970) works, although the earlier-developed archaeological approach persisted in Foucault’s later thought, inklings of the genealogical approach were already present in his earlier works, and there is substantial intellectual and conceptual overlap between the two broad periods of Foucault’s work. Nor are discourse, archaeology, and genealogy the only concepts Foucault explored by any means; they are interwoven with various other recurring themes and ideas of special interest to Foucault, such as the relationship between power and knowledge, the disappearance of the subject (sometimes referred to as the “death of the author,” in the words of Foucault’s contemporary Roland Barthes, who also famously explored that question), “governmentality,” surveillance and “Panopticism,” and, overarchingly, historicity and the inherent historical and contextual situatedness of knowledge, among others.

In light of the significant influence of Foucault and discourse analysis upon LIS among other fields, this study seeks to trace the visible impact on LIS scholarship of two of Foucault’s

⁹ As a rough measure of the level of interest in discourse analysis in LIS, a search for “discourse” or “discursive” appearing in the titles or abstracts of articles in ProQuest’s Library and Information Science Abstracts (LISA) database produces 1,651 results; a similar search of H.W. Wilson’s Library Literature and Information Science database brings up 1,090 results. For comparison, a similar search in EBSCO’s very broad, multidisciplinary Academic Search Complete database produces 93,389 results, 11,620 if the search specifies “discourse analysis.” [Searches conducted on May 26, 2015.]

most influential early works exploring the concept of discourse and his archaeological approach to studying it: *The Order of Things* (1966/1973) [hereinafter referred to as “*Order*” for brevity’s sake] and *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1969/1972) [hereinafter referred to as “*Archaeology*”].¹⁰ This study analyzes how these two works have influenced library and information science (LIS) scholars and practitioners, as evidenced by visible discussion, citation, and use of these works in LIS scholarly journal literature.

In addition to tracing the use, absorption, and understanding of these works of Foucault within the LIS arena generally, this study also seeks to trace any patterns of variation in such use and understanding between different sectors and sub-areas of the wider LIS field, to determine whether there is discernible evidence of significant differences in rates of use or citation, in depth or extent of use, or in understandings or interpretations of the works and their meaning and significance between different sectors of LIS.

To accomplish this differential analysis, rather than taking a top-down approach by first assigning or assuming preexisting distinct sectors of LIS and then investigating the results based upon those categories, the study instead adopts a fine-grained, bottom-up approach of monitoring and measuring appropriation and use of Foucault’s two works within the wider LIS field/community. It analyzes precisely which scholars have appropriated one or the other or both of Foucault’s works for use in precisely which publications, whether there are discernible patterns of variation in that appropriation, and whether any such differences tend, in practice, to also resolve into visible differences, distinctions, and/or boundaries between sectors of LIS that traditionally have been viewed as relatively distinct from each other.

¹⁰ *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Vintage, 1970 [English translation of original French edition, Paris: Gallimard, 1966]); *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972 [English translation of original French edition, Paris: Gallimard, 1969]). A.M. Sheridan Smith translated both.

This particular focus on disciplinary differentiation arose from a preliminary hypothesis predicting that in practice, the extent, nature, and quality of use and understanding of one work relative to the other might tend to serve as an indicator mechanism marking tacit self-identification with one or another sub-area of LIS by LIS scholars or practitioners, based upon the way the work is characteristically appropriated (or not) by particular clusters or communities of scholars. Had the study produced robust results revealing such apparent differential use and understanding of the two works, it was hoped that it might serve as a proof of concept experiment regarding the proposition that the bottom-up approach adopted for mapping boundaries between sub-areas of LIS might actually provide a better and more reliable approach to disciplinary mapping than one based upon pre-existing conventional, top-down assumptions regarding such divisions within LIS.

In the end, the study's results mostly failed to reveal the hoped-for bottom-up disciplinary or sub-disciplinary mapping of the LIS field. This was partly due to what proved to be a substantial disparity in use of the two works overall: within the LIS arena, *The Order of Things* appears to be relatively little-used and marginalized compared to *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Yet the fine-grained, bottom-up approach used in the study proved to be fruitful in revealing other interesting and suggestive patterns regarding the particular dynamics of the dispersion and diffusion of influential ideas and concepts within a scholarly community. Notably, the study results seemingly tend to confirm some of Foucault's and his followers' own thoughts and ideas regarding the nature of discourse and discursive formations, by showing how Foucault and his important early works have, in a sense, themselves become a Foucauldian discursive formation.

II. Research Methods

As noted in the preceding section, this study's goal was to closely track LIS scholars' visible use of *The Archaeology of Knowledge* and *The Order of Things*. In order to locate as many citations and uses of the two books as possible, full-text databases of numerous LIS journals were searched digitally. The journals selected to search for evidence of LIS scholars' use of Foucault's works were drawn from three different sources that rank LIS journals by leadership and/or impact on their fields or subfields. These sources were consulted mostly without regard to their specific proposed rankings, but rather only to identify a large pool of relatively well-known, well-regarded, and widely read LIS journals.

Regarding LIS generally, this study drew upon a list of leading LIS journals prepared by Judith M. Nixon¹¹ as well as SCImago Journal and Country Rank's LIS journal rankings of the top 100 LIS journals for 2013 (the most recent year available).¹² All 100 journals on the SCImago list were searched for this study. Nixon's polling results pointed toward some 12 to 15 journals as being especially salient, basically all of which also appeared on the SCImago list—but if any did not, they were added to the list of journals to search for this study. Specifically regarding archival science journals, this study drew upon Professor Karen Anderson's 2009 "Proposed Journal Ranking List for Archives and Records Management," prepared for the Australian government's Excellence in Research in Australia research quality audit initiative and based upon consultation with all Australian academic archival programs along with a substantial number of non-Australian universities (including UCLA).¹³ This resource indicates that the

¹¹ Judith M. Nixon, "Core Journals in Library and Information Science: Developing a Methodology for Ranking LIS Journals," *College and Research Libraries*, vol. 75, no. 1 (January 2014): 66-90.

¹² Available at <http://www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php?category=3309>.

¹³ Available at aeri2009.files.wordpress.com/2009/05/archival-journal-ranking-aeri.doc or at <http://ebook-free-downloads.com/ebook-doc-free-doc-download-journal-page-5.htm>.

archival science literature in the Anglophone world tends to be heavily dominated by the single leading journal from each of the major English-speaking nations—i.e., *American Archivist* (U.S.), *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, recently renamed the *Journal of the Archives and Records Association* (U.K.), *Archivaria* (Canada), and *Archives and Manuscripts* (Australia)—along with the international journal *Archival Science*. All the journals on Anderson’s list that were rated “A+” or “A,” some of which also appear on the lists from Nixon or SCImago, were searched for this study. In certain rare cases where a journal was not included on one of the aforementioned lists but was electronically searchable and revealed significant use of Foucault—for example, *First Monday*—the journal was added to the search list.¹⁴

Wherever possible, full-text searches for “Foucault” were conducted in all journals on the search list. Many journals’ search interfaces seem not to allow root-truncation searching (e.g., “foucaul*”), and preliminary test searches for permutations such as “foucauldian,” “foucaultian,” and “foucault’s” indicated that such additional searches would change the overall search results little and would mostly only find sources including passing references to Foucault rather than actual citations, so additional searches of these permutations were not conducted.

Not all journals on the search list were searchable in full text. Some simply are not yet electronically available; others are, but are not presently available through UCLA’s library system. Among those journals that were full-text searchable, the years of coverage varied according to UCLA’s subscription agreements with the journals and publishers in question. Thus, sometimes editions from earlier years or quite recent years might not be electronically available or searchable even if most editions of a particular journal were. Of these, some journals allowed full-text searching of all the electronically available editions, then reported which results

¹⁴ Certain other, otherwise-promising journals that are not electronically searchable at UCLA, such as *Knowledge Organization*, were not added to the list.

could or could not be accessed at UCLA; others just denied electronic searching and access altogether to editions not covered by subscription agreements. In certain cases, as with the leading Australian archival journal, *Archives & Manuscripts*, although UCLA has holdings in print covering many years, its electronic access is sharply limited to very recent years. For some journals, electronic access was available back into the 1980s or earlier; for others, digital access only extended back to the early 1990s or later. With certain journals, digital searchability deteriorated noticeably for earlier editions (early 1990s or before), perhaps due to older and lower-quality scans impeding optical character recognition (OCR). Thus, occasionally an article that did in fact contain the desired search term and was electronically available would fail to appear in a list of search results. With some other journals, although the search interfaces accurately reported the presence of “Foucault” within the text, footnotes, or bibliography of an article, the article, when downloaded as a PDF, could not be searched electronically using Adobe Reader and had to be searched manually. For some journals, part of their run was available only in one database, other years in a different database. Notwithstanding these complications, however, most journals were electronically available and readily full-text searchable from the early 1990s through 2013, 2014, or 2015—a research resource that would have been unimaginable only twenty years ago.

Ultimately, 105 journals were searched according to these parameters. Of these, six were entirely unavailable at UCLA; another six were unsearchable, either actually or practically (as with the *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, which proved to have far too many article authors or cited authors named Foucault). Another six journals were searchable, but any results searches produced were unavailable at UCLA. Another 24 journals were available and searchable, but showed no results for Michel Foucault. [For a list of these various categories of

journal—unavailable, unsearchable, no relevant results, etc.—see Appendix 1.] Of the 63 remaining journals that had electronically available articles including actual citations or references to the right Foucault, some searches still produced additional stray results: a fraction of the articles on the results list remained unavailable, the references in some articles were to a different Foucault (such as 19th-century physicist Leon Foucault of “Foucault’s Pendulum” fame or present-day computer scientist Alan Foucault), or references to Foucault were only duplicative stray references appearing in a journal’s front or back matter. Leaving aside such stray results and static, the next section will address the relevant findings from these journal searches.

After legitimate citations and references to Foucault were identified and winnowed, the results were further refined by separating citations of *Archaeology* or *Order* from citations to other works of Foucault or passing references to him or his works among the relevant articles identified in the journal search results. Then all citations of *Archaeology* or *Order* (or of the “Discourse on Language,” included as an appendix to the principal English-language editions of *Archaeology* but also published separately as “The Order of Discourse”) were analyzed separately to determine the relative depth of use of Foucault’s works, what ideas or concepts from Foucault the later author drew upon, whether the author cited page numbers and which page numbers, whether the author quoted Foucault and which quotes, and various other parameters, in hopes of providing a fine-grained overall picture of the nature of LIS scholars’ use of *Archaeology* and *Order*.

The results of these various journal searches and close citation analyses were later entered into Excel spreadsheets to help with counting occurrences of particular phenomena, recognizing potential patterns, and the like. The journal search database includes columns for all journals that returned at least some relevant search results containing “Foucault,” the number of

articles in each journal showing positive results, articles found but unavailable electronically at UCLA, articles with a different Foucault or other stray or duplicative results, articles that only cite or mention works by Foucault other than *Archaeology* or *Order* (or the “Discourse on Language”), articles that cite *Archaeology* (and possibly other works by Foucault) but not *Order*, articles that cite *Order* (and possibly other works by Foucault) but not *Archaeology*, articles that cite both *Archaeology* and *Order* (and possibly other works by Foucault), articles that cite the “Discourse on Language” (usually but not always along with *Archaeology*), articles that mention *Archaeology* and/or *Order* only in the bibliography, articles that cite *Archaeology* and/or *Order* only relatively briefly and in passing in the main text or footnote text, articles that made substantial use of *Archaeology* and/or *Order*, articles that indicate at most only secondary use of Foucault (usually where Foucault’s name appears only in the title of a cited secondary source), articles where Foucault’s name appears only in passing in the text with no citation to his work, book reviews mentioning Foucault in passing, and editors’ introductory articles or letters to the editor mentioning Foucault.

The citation-specific database covers each separate citation to *Archaeology* or *Order* (or the “Discourse on Language”), with columns tracking the journals, the author(s) of the articles with the citation(s), the year of publication, how many citations per article, which of Foucault’s works was cited, the depth of use of the work indicated by the citation, the Foucauldian concept(s) used, whether the citation was only in a footnote, whether the author cited specific pages in Foucault and which ones if so, whether or not the citation to *Archaeology* or *Order* was part of a co-citation along with other works by Foucault, whether or not the citation was part of a co-citation along with other authors (such as, for example, Barthes, Derrida, Giddens, or Latour), and whether or not the citing author quoted Foucault and which quotations if so. Depth of use

was measured on a scale of five levels (or six, counting the bibliography-only category), ranging from general passing reference with a citation (very limited or almost no visible use of specifically Foucault's ideas) to passing reference with a citation (limited use) to significant use (perhaps two or three sentences specifically focused on Foucault's work(s)) to substantial use (about a short paragraph or more devoted primarily to one or the other (or both) of Foucault's works) to very substantial use (multiple paragraphs or pages devoted largely or entirely to Foucault's ideas as expressed in *Archaeology* or *Order*). This depth-of-use scale is thus a rough measure of how much attention the citing author devotes to *Archaeology* or *Order*, and how much visible "work" either book does in the citing article. Although just where to set the boundaries between neighboring levels of use on the scale admittedly might sometimes involve judgment calls in certain cases, there is a very clear difference between, for instance, "general passing reference" and "significant," or between "passing reference" and "substantial."

The methods described above were used to trace visible evidence of secondary use of Foucault's *Archaeology of Knowledge* or *Order of Things* in LIS journal literature. However, this study also sought to trace evidence of tertiary use—scholarly use of works by secondary users who had made use of the primary sources.¹⁵ Such tertiary use could not be pursued in the same manner as the secondary use, however; full-text searches for use of all the secondary users' writings in all the journals on the search list, although theoretically possible, was effectively impracticable. Instead, tertiary use was monitored by running searches in the Web of Science Citation Index database on the writings of major secondary users of *Archaeology* or *Order*. Conveniently, the Web of Science database covers many of the journals on this study's journal

¹⁵ This notion of tertiary *use* as secondary use of secondary use is, notably, different from the established concept of primary, secondary, and tertiary *sources* in traditional librarianship and archival practice, where tertiary sources include resources such as dictionaries, indices, and almanacs that summarize and distill information from secondary sources that was originally derived from primary sources.

search list, especially those that revealed the most active use and awareness of Foucault's two books, as well as other writings by significant users of Foucault in some cases. The results of these searches for secondary citations will be detailed in the following section.

The overall research process for this study also included close readings of both *Archaeology* and *Order* to gain an overall sense of the nature of Foucault's thought, and the concepts expressed in those works and the total fund of ideas potentially to be drawn from them, as well as close readings of those articles in the LIS journal literature that have made especially extensive use of one or both of Foucault's books.

III. Research Findings

A. Journal Search Results

As described in the preceding section, the research phase of this process began with extensive digital searching of full-text databases for the appearance of the search term “Foucault” in a wide array of journals related to the LIS field, broadly conceived. Out of 105 journals in which such searches were attempted, 36 journals were unavailable, unsearchable, or searchable but included no mentions of any Foucault. A further six journals, although searchable online, only produced articles that fall outside UCLA’s electronic subscription terms and are hence unavailable for purposes of this study. Another ten journals produced result lists including items that were unavailable along with others that were available, again due to variations in the terms of UCLA’s electronic subscriptions.

In the end, out of the original list of 105 LIS journals, the search process identified a total of 69 journals and 1,062 results containing any references to any Foucault. Checking of the use of “Foucault” in context revealed that 124 of these results only contained references to a different person named Foucault or duplicative or otherwise irrelevant references to Michel Foucault, such as in journal or conference advertisements, tables of contents, or journal volume indices, while a further 52 articles remained electronically unavailable. After winnowing out this chaff, there were 886 articles in 63 journals that mentioned the “right” Foucault and were available for full-text searching.

Out of the remaining 886 articles, 259 of them cited works by Foucault, but only works other than *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, *The Order of Things*, or one or another version of the *Discourse on Language*. Although it was beyond the scope of this project to keep a complete

tally of such other sources, there was a clearly visible overall pattern favoring the use of certain of Foucault's well-known later works, such as *Discipline and Punish* (published in French in 1975, translated in 1977), one or another volume of the three-volume *History of Sexuality* (which appeared in French and English from 1976 to 1986), and *Power/Knowledge*, a collection of essays written between 1972 and 1977, along with less frequent citations of other later works or of other early works such as *Madness and Civilization* (abridged and translated, 1964) or *Birth of the Clinic* (1963, translated 1973).¹⁶

In a further substantial subset of the 886 articles, no work by Foucault was cited, and Foucault was only mentioned in passing. This was true for some 238 standard journal articles, plus 99 book reviews and eleven editors' introductions to special editions of particular journals or letters to the editor. [A small handful of book reviews or intro essays that actually cited *Archaeology* or *Order* are included in the results for those books, however.] In another 88 articles, Foucault's name only appeared strictly in the context of secondary use, usually just as part of the title of a cited book or article from a secondary author, much more rarely in contexts where an author did not herself say anything directly about Foucault, but only reported what a different author said, usually in passing, usually in a quotation from the secondary article.

Leaving aside these citations exclusively of other works or uncited name-references in passing, the full-text journal searches found a total of 188 articles in which *Archaeology*, *Order*, and/or the Discourse on Language are cited. [See Appendix 2.] Out of this total, 123 articles cited *Archaeology* without *Order* (although in some cases mostly using the Discourse on

¹⁶ Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage, 1979); Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, vol. 1: An Introduction* (New York: Vintage, 1980); Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, vol. 2: The Use of Pleasure* (New York: Vintage, 1985); Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, vol. 3: The Care of the Self* (New York: Vintage, 1986); Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*, ed. Colin Gordon (Brighton, UK: Harvester Press, 1980); Foucault, *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason* (New York: Vintage, 1988); Foucault, *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception* (New York: Vintage, 1975).

Language); 37 articles cited *Order* without *Archaeology*; 25 articles cited both books in the same article; and three articles cited neither book but did cite one or another version of the Discourse on Language. Predictably, these citations varied widely in quality and depth, which will be discussed at greater length in the citation-specific analysis below. An initial evaluation of depth of usage indicated that 38 articles made quite substantial use of *Archaeology* and/or *Order*, while 144 mostly just cited them in passing, and a further six articles only listed one or the other in the articles' bibliographies. Significantly, these numbers only monitor use of *Archaeology* and/or *Order*; they only indicate that one or the other source was cited in a particular article, but not whether the author also used other of Foucault's works. Thus, in many cases, *Archaeology* or *Order* was cited along with other, usually later, works of Foucault, and in more than a few cases, such articles made significantly greater use of the later Foucault sources than of *Archaeology* or *Order*. [See Appendix 3.]

Perhaps unsurprisingly, journals vary in the amount of attention they have devoted both to Foucault in general and to *Archaeology* or *Order* in particular. Regarding mentions of Foucault in general, the journal searches statistically showed some tendency toward a rightward-skewed long-tail formation, with 42 of the 63 journals having ten or fewer articles with references (and 21 of those with three or less), while 12 journals had between 32 and 67 articles including references. The same trend intensifies when the focus is shifted to either articles citing *Archaeology* and/or *Order* or articles citing "Other" Foucault. Regarding "Other" Foucault, 26 of the 63 journals have zero citing articles, 49 have fewer than five, only nine have ten or more, and only four have more than twenty, ranging between 25 and 36. [See Appendix 4.] More significantly for purposes of this study, the distribution of articles including citations of *Archaeology*, *Order*, or the "Discourse on Language" is also skewed sharply rightward, with 22

of the 63 journals showing no citing articles, an additional 15 journals showing only one article, 49 showing less than five, and only six journals showing more than ten (up to sixteen). [See Appendix 5.]

Notably, the closely similar performance in the respective long tails for “Other” and *Archaeology/Order* would seem to indicate a similar overall lack of interest in Foucault generally among the majority of journals searched; while the visibly superior performance of “Other” citations relative to *Archaeology/Order* at the other end of the scale presumably reveals the higher overall level of interest in Foucault’s later works, alluded to above, among those LIS journals and authors who do take an interest in Foucault. In keeping with these hypotheses, one finds, for example, a substantial degree of overlap between the “zero” journals for both *Archaeology/Order* and “Other” Foucault (16 journals).¹⁷

Similarly, fourteen of the same journals appear in the top sixteen slots for both *Archaeology/Order* and “Other” Foucault. Yet the variations in their relative rankings on each list and their relative frequencies of use of *Archaeology/Order* or “Other” works perhaps helps somewhat to illuminate the distinctive overall “personalities” of the various journals and the scholars who contribute to them.

Thus, *Archival Science*, which places first on the *Archaeology/Order* (“A/O”) list with 16 citing articles, is only eleventh on the “Other” list with seven. *JASIST*, second on the A/O list with 14, places sixth on the “Other” list, also with 14 (again emphasizing the higher citation tallies at the top of the “Other” list, which also, of course, includes a wider range of possible

¹⁷ These are: *Archives & Museum Informatics*, *Behavioral and Social Sciences Librarian*, *Collection Building*, *Health Information and Libraries Journal*, *Information Retrieval*, *Journal of Archival Organization*, *Journal of Interlibrary Loan*, *Document Delivery & Electronic Reserve*, *Library Collections*, *Acquisition & Technical Services*, *Library Hi Tech*, *Library Hi Tech News*, *Reference Librarian*, *Reference Services Review*, *Revista Espanola de Documentacion Cientifica*, *Scientometrics*, and *Serials Librarian*.

sources). In all, fourteen of the same journals show up in the top sixteen slots on both lists.¹⁸ Some of these show relatively equal numbers of citations and comparatively close rankings on each list, such as *Archivaria*, *Library Quarterly*, *Information Research*, and *Library Trends*; other journals vary widely in their citation tallies and ranking between the two lists, usually tending to indicate a marked preference for other/later Foucault—notably including *Information & Organization*, *First Monday*, *Information Communication & Society*, and *Ethics & Information Technology*. Only a few journals skew, usually much less sharply, in favor of *Archaeology* and/or *Order*—for instance, *Journal of Documentation*, *Library & Information Science Review* (hereinafter *LISR*), and *Information Processing & Management*. [See Appendices 3 and 4 for rankings on both lists.] Even regarding journals that show a relatively high level of interest in Foucault’s earlier works in these statistics, however, it is important to remember that a fair proportion of those articles that cite *Archaeology* or *Order* also cite, often with greater interest, other, later works by Foucault.

Shifting the focus from mere numbers of citing articles to the depth of use made by citing articles, the ranking of journals changes significantly. That is, frequency of citing articles does not always correspond to really substantial use of Foucault’s works. So, for instance, *JASIST*, which ranks near the top with 14 articles citing *Archaeology* or *Order*, has twelve that cite one or

¹⁸ These 14 include *Archival Science*, *JASIST*, *Archivaria*, *Library Quarterly*, *Information & Organization*, *Information Research*, *Journal of Documentation*, *Library Trends*, *First Monday*, *Information Communication & Society*, *Organization Science*, *Ethics & Information Technology*, *Social Science Computer Review*, and *ARIST*. For comparison, the rankings of the top 20 LIS journals by total references to Foucault (including references in passing, book reviews, and such, and thus offering a somewhat different index to awareness of/traffic in Foucault) tend to roughly track both the *Archaeology/Order* and “Other” lists, the “Other” list perhaps somewhat more closely: 1. *Information Communication & Society* (67 references); 2. *Library Quarterly* (63); 3. *JASIST* (57); 4. *First Monday* (56); 5. *Information & Organization* (54); 6. *Archivaria* (51); 7. *Ethics & Information Technology* (42); 8. *Information Research* (42); 9. *Archival Science* (39); 10. *Organization Science* (32); 11. *Journal of Documentation* (32); 12. *Library Trends* (27); 13. *Social Science Computer Review* (22); 14. *College & Research Libraries* (20); 15. *Journal of Information Science* (19); 16. *ARIST* (14); 17. *Information Technology & People* (14); 18. *Reference & User Services Quarterly* (13); 19. *Library & Information Science Review* (12); 20. *Journal of Academic Librarianship* (11); *Scientometrics* (11).

the other relatively briefly in passing, and only two that delve into Foucault's works more deeply. Similarly, *Archival Science*, with 16 citing articles, shows only three substantial uses. *Information & Organization*, with a total of twelve citing articles, has 11 that cite the work(s) briefly, only one that uses the work quite substantially. Only eight journals—*Library Quarterly*, *Journal of Documentation*, *Archivaria*, *Archival Science*, *JASIST*, *Library Trends*, *ARIST*, and *Aslib Proceedings*—show at least two substantial uses, and only the first four journals on that list show more than two. An additional dozen journals included at least one substantial use of *Archaeology* or *Order*, while 43 other journals did not.¹⁹ [See Appendix 3.]

B. Citation-Specific Search Results

In addition to tracing the frequency of use of Foucault's *Archaeology of Knowledge* or *Order of Things* at the journal level, this study also traces that use within the articles identified through the journal searches down to the level of individual citations. Moreover, because citations of the sources in question sometimes may be scattered in different, discontinuous parts of a citing article, in such cases, this study traces and evaluates the use for each separate "citing event,"²⁰ where feasible.

As noted in the preceding section on Research Methods, this study uses a five-level scale to measure and categorize depth of use: General Passing Reference ("GPR"), for the most nonspecific references (above the level of mere mention in a bibliography without any citation),

¹⁹ Journals with at least one substantial use include *College & Research Libraries*, *First Monday*, *Information & Organization*, *Information Communication & Society*, *Information Research*, *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, *Journal of Information Technology*, *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, *LISR*, *Libri*, *New Library World*, and *Organization Science*.

²⁰ The concept of a "citing event" is introduced here to indicate that in some situations, either multiple citations of the same source, or citations of separate sources, may be used in very close proximity and may be harnessed to the same discussion or ideas. In such situations, rather than being (perhaps somewhat artificially) pulled apart, formally separate citations of the same or different sources are grouped together as a "citing event."

often just used for a general concept and frequently in a co-citation with other works by Foucault or with other writers besides Foucault; Passing Reference (“PR”), sharing many of the characteristics of a GPR but not quite as vague or conceptually broad or non-specific, perhaps amounting to a sentence or two that lightly but recognizably draw specifically upon Foucault’s ideas; Significant Use, still usually somewhat brief but clearly focused specifically on Foucault and making Foucault’s ideas do some actual work in the article, usually up to two or three sentences’ worth; Substantial Use, noticeably heavier and generally longer than “Significant,” with at least a short paragraph’s worth of material focused on Foucault and his ideas with a generally higher level of specificity; and finally, Very Substantial Use, involving truly extensive use that may add up to multiple long paragraphs or pages. Because Very Substantial Use cannot be neatly broken down and categorized by separate citation as the other varieties of use can be, those articles that make very substantial use of *Archaeology* or *Order* are not included in the quantitative citation-specific data. As for the others, a single, moderately extensive, in-depth use of one book or the other (or both), if located all in one place and more or less continuously there, is categorized as one “substantial” use, for example, while three separate passing references scattered throughout an article are treated as just that: three separate passing references, each considered separately.

This system is then used to offer a somewhat finer-grained evaluation of articles at the whole-article level rather than the level of separate citing events. That is, however many separate citing events an article may contain, the article as a whole is categorized according to the highest level of use that occurs within it. This particularly makes sense in situations where, for example, an article includes a significant or substantial use of *Archaeology* or *Order* somewhere in the middle, with perhaps an earlier brief citation referring ahead to it and a later passing citation

referring back to it. This study occasionally may allow one rare exception to the rule of categorization of articles by highest level of use in any one separate citation: where there are multiple separate significant and thoughtful uses of *Archaeology* or *Order* in an article, that article sometimes may be categorized as Substantial Use. Multiple substantial uses already constitute Very Substantial Use.

Also as noted in the earlier section, in addition to categorization by levels of depth of use, the citation-specific searches and analysis also tracked year of publication, number of citations per article, use of *Archaeology* or *Order* or both, use of the Discourse on Language, which Foucauldian concepts were used, which if any quotations were used, which if any page numbers were cited, and whether a citation of *Archaeology* or *Order* was a co-citation, either with other Foucault writings or with writers other than Foucault. Here are the results of the citation-specific searches.

Counting all multiple separate citations of *Archaeology* or *Order* occurring within the 188 articles identified by the journal search, and not counting those articles that make Very Substantial Use and are therefore too unwieldy to fit within the parameters of the citation database, there are 210 total citations to either or both of these works (or to the Discourse on Language). Of these, the clear majority, 147, are to *Archaeology* alone (including four that use *Archaeology* only indirectly through the work and words of secondary authors), plus five that draw exclusively upon the Discourse on Language. There are 43 citations of *Order* alone, plus 15 separate citing events that use both *Archaeology* and *Order* together. There are also 15 articles in the Very Substantial Use category that make extensive and repeated use of one or both sources and exceed the limits of the citation-specific database. [See Appendix 6.]

Reshuffling the citation-specific data to focus on it both by year and by work, 20 of the uses of *Order* occurred before 2001, 15 of them since 2005, and nine (three per year) occurred during a window of heightened activity from 2004-2006. Of the 15 uses of both works in the same citing event, seven appeared in the years up through 2002, and five during the years after 2007, with three from 2006-2007 and none in 2004 or 2005. As to citations of *Archaeology*, 31 had appeared before 2001 another 31 from 2001-2004, 29 just from 2005-2007, 30 from 2008-2010 (17 of those in 2010 alone), and 27 since 2010. In terms of the depth of these citation-specific uses, of the 43 such uses of *Order* alone, five were substantial, five were significant, and 20 were highly general passing references (GPR—the lowest level of use above Bibliography-Only, of which *Order* accounted for three of the six). Of the 152 citations of *Archaeology* and/or the Discourse on Language, 18 were substantial, 36 were significant, and 57 were GPRs. Of 15 citing events using both works, two were substantial, four significant, with six GPRs.

As discussed earlier, the citation-specific data also allows finer-grained categorization of articles according to the highest level of depth of use of any one citation appearing in them, and the Very Substantial uses can be brought back into the statistical picture. Again, there were a total of 126 uses of *Archaeology* (including the three specifically of the Discourse on Language), 37 uses of *Order* alone, and 25 uses of both works. [For a full list of all 188 of these articles, see Appendix 2.] Out of these, 15 ranked as Very Substantial, 24 as Substantial, 35 Significant, 41 Passing References, 67 GPRs, and six “Bibliography-Only.” [For a list of all articles categorized as Substantial Use, see Appendix 7.] In terms of depth of use by articles as a whole, articles citing *Order* alone showed one Very Substantial, four Substantial, and four Significant uses. Sources citing *Archaeology* alone included five Very Substantial, 15 Substantial, and 28 Significant uses. In the “Both” category, there were nine Very Substantial, four Substantial, and

three Significant uses. [See Appendix 8.] Especially considering that several of the “Both” articles making Very Substantial use relied noticeably more heavily on *Archaeology* while only one did so on *Order*, and the same overall pattern is generally true for substantial or significant uses, also, the overall balance in visible depth of use swings markedly toward *Archaeology*.

Using this system of measurement, certain journals again are prominent for the depth of use of Foucault’s two early works. For instance, the *Library Quarterly* hosted four of the fifteen Very Substantial uses, two Substantial, and four Significant uses, while the *Journal of Documentation* published two of the Very Substantial, four Substantial, and three Significant uses. *Archivaria* was notable in the archival arena for publishing three Substantial and six Significant uses—there were no actual Very Substantial uses in any archival journals, although Richard Brown’s two articles in *Archivaria* came relatively close to meeting that standard. The performance of journals in terms of depth of use also could depend significantly on which scholars were publishing in them; Gary and Marie Radford accounted for all six of the Very Substantial uses to appear in the *Library Quarterly* or the *Journal of Documentation*, for instance, while of the one Very Substantial, one Substantial, and three Significant uses to appear in *Information Research*, Elin K. Jacob accounted for the two most substantial uses as an author or coauthor.

Lumping *Archaeology* and *Order* together to focus on depth of use by year, an interesting pattern emerges: to some extent frequency of use, but especially depth of use, appear to have peaked during the period from 2005-2007. For instance, after several Substantial uses appearing from 1991 through 2001, then none from 2002-2004 and only one in 2005, 2006-2007 saw seven substantial uses. Since 2007, there have been only eight additional Substantial uses. A similar pattern emerges for Significant uses: there were twelve during 2005-2007 (four each year), while

there were only eleven Significant uses during the entire period before 2005, with only eleven Significant uses since 2007 (three of those in 2010 alone). Other measurements, whether year by year or by groups of years, tend to show the same peak in active, in-depth use around 2005-2007, with a gradual buildup before and a noticeable decline afterward. The pattern for Very Substantial uses is more uneven and may also have tended to lead Substantial and Significant uses; for instance, there were five Very Substantial uses from 2001-2004, two of them in 2001, two in 2003, and none in 2004, while there were only two Substantial uses and five Significant uses during that period, whereas the period from 2005-2007 saw only two additional Very Substantial uses but eight Substantial and 12 Significant uses. Whether or not Very Substantial uses were thus somewhat “front-loaded” and may have helped to stimulate additional in-depth use, the pattern after 2007 has been even clearer regarding Very Substantial uses: there has been only one during the past seven years (the Radfords with Lingel in 2012). [See Appendices 9-10.]

Turning to the concepts that are addressed in these various uses of *Archaeology* or *Order*, the single most predominant category is (perhaps predictably) “Discourse,” which appeared as one of the concepts in 80 citing events (around 38 percent of the total), along with 9 appearances of the closely related concept, “Discursive formation.” Some other notable recurring conceptual categories, sometimes showing clustering around certain journals or authors, include:

Archaeology (11); Archive (19, 11 of them from *Archival Science* alone and another 5 from *Archivaria*); Classification (12, four of them associated with articles written or co-written by LIS scholar Elin K. Jacob); Death (or Disappearance) of the Author (or Subject) (11); Discipline-Academic (10, four of them in *JASIST*); History/Historicity (13, seven of them in archival journals and 5 of them from archivist-historian Brien Brothman alone); Multiple Temporalities (3, related to History/Historicity and appearing exclusively in the writings of Brien Brothman);

Power/Knowledge (24, second most popular after Discourse); and Representation (10, 6 of them appearing in *Information & Organization* and three of those in Simon Lilley's 1998 article).

Various other Foucauldian concepts appeared only once, some of them linked to recurring concepts or to each other, some perhaps not. A further nine citing events were so vague as to be unidentifiable as to concept. Any given citing event might involve more than one identifiable concept; the numbers given above and below seek to account for all of them as well as possible.²¹

Aside from the various minor examples of concept-clustering noted in passing above, perhaps only two other relatively striking points are visible in the data regarding Foucauldian concepts: although "Discourse" together with "Discursive Formations" represent the single most dominant Foucauldian concept appearing in the literature that tends to be widely scattered throughout a broad range of journals, that particular concept is largely absent from *JASIST* (two out of fourteen citations) and is also mostly absent from the archival journal literature as a whole (six out of 43 citing events, three of those from Richard Brown (1991 and 1995) alone). By contrast, "Power/Knowledge" appears to be relatively widely distributed and appears as a concept in four archival journal articles, accounting for one-sixth of the total for that concept, not far from the rate of roughly one-fifth of all articles (33 of 188) and citations (43 of 210) for which archival journals account.

²¹ Other recurring concepts include: Document (including Document/Monument) (6); Episteme (7); Epistemology (2); Genealogy (2); Postmodernism (5); Question of 'Man' (2); Statement (7); Structuralism (2); Sub-discourse (3, exclusively appearing in an article by Isto Huvila); Text (2), and Will to Knowledge (2). Identifiable concepts appearing only once include: Disordered Epistemologization, Everything Is Never Said, Evidence, Governmentality, Hegemony, Individuation, Intertextuality, Language Games, Linking of Statements, Materiality, Mode of Existence, Positivism, Posthumanism, Poststructuralism, Science, Self-Identity, Signification, Technology/Knowledge, Truth, Universal Language, Unsaid/Enunciative Field, Vicinity of Science, and Who is Speaking. Although the citation-specific database limited the concept count to three concepts per citing event because it was very rare for any scholars to go over that limit, certain scholars such as Anne Gilliland and Elin Jacob did include four or five concepts in a single substantial, complex citing event.

Regarding co-citations of *Archaeology* and/or *Order* together with other works by Foucault, 29 of the citing events were these; 28 of them included later works by Foucault (mostly *Discipline and Punish*, *History of Sexuality*, *Power/Knowledge*), while only one included an earlier work (*Birth of the Clinic*). As to co-citations with other authors, there were 51. Fellow French postmodernist philosopher Jacques Derrida appeared in 15 of these—more than any other single scholar—while other writers such as Barthes, Bourdieu, Habermas, and Rabinow (a noted scholar and interpreter of Foucault who also appears often in article bibliographies) appeared relatively frequently along with more sporadic references to figures such as Heidegger, Kuhn, Latour, Levi-Strauss, and Rorty, along with various more recent (and generally less towering) writers.

In 70 citing events, authors provided page numbers. That means that in the other 140 cases (two thirds of the total), they did not. In most cases where page numbers were used, they are relatively precise (either a single page or occasionally a range of two pages) and fairly often are linked to a particular quotation from Foucault. The single favorite page in *Archaeology* or *Order* among LIS scholars appears to be *Archaeology*, p. 49, cited eight times; another popular page was *Archaeology*, p. 129 (cited four times). In a few cases, authors cited specific pages plus *Archaeology*, Chapter 1 or 2; one author twice cited *Archaeology*'s introduction generally; another author pointed readers generally toward *Order*, Chapter 9, in connection with a discussion of the Question of 'Man' addressed at length in that chapter; and two different authors both cited generally to the relatively broad page range of "pp. 79-134 (Part III)" in *Archaeology*. Yet most authors who cited page numbers at all were fairly precise about them. Perhaps notably, out of the 70 citations that provided any sort of page numbers, 31 (over 44 percent) appeared in archival journals, specifically *Archival Science*, *Archivaria*, and the *Journal of the Society of*

Archivists (a rate roughly double the archivists' percentage either of total citations or of journal articles, in each case around 20 percent). Of the citing events providing page numbers, the overwhelming majority cited *Archaeology* alone, with only seven citing *Order* alone, another three citing both *Archaeology* and *Order*, and another three citing only the Discourse on Language. It appears that only 52 authors or pairs/sets of authors used page numbers, in 57 articles (around 30 percent of the total).

Mostly the same authors using page numbers appear among those 51 authors who quoted from Foucault. Only five authors who used quotes did not provide page numbers for those quotes, and at least one of these quotes was very generic ("grid"). Ironically, four of these five authors were using quotes from *Order*, including the relatively famous "face drawn in the sand," "vicinity of science," and classification of animals in ancient China quotations. Among the favorite and most recurring quotations are "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (describing discourses, in *Archaeology* at p. 49), "The archive is first the law of what can be said" (describing, obviously, Foucault's concept of the archive, in *Archaeology* at p. 129), and "systems of dispersion" (describing discursive formations and positivities, in *Archaeology* at p. 173), although other quotations also recur, such as "grids of specification" (*Archaeology* at p. 42), "Who is speaking?" (*Archaeology* at p. 50), and the "face in the sand" (*Order* at p. 422). Only 14 writers used more than one quote from *Archaeology* or *Order*; only 6 used more than two.

C. Tertiary Use

As discussed in the previous section, this study attempts to trace tertiary use of Foucault's works—in other words, secondary use of writings by secondary users of *Archaeology* or

Order—by searching the Web of Science Citation Index to track the use of writings regarding Foucauldian concepts by those authors who were found to have made especially substantial use of *Archaeology* or *Order* from the journal database searches.

Theoretically optimum application of this search technique would require follow-up by a careful reading, and evaluation for use of Foucauldian concepts, of each publication that appears on the citation lists of writings by substantial users of *Archaeology* or *Order*—a massive and time-consuming undertaking unfortunately beyond the scope of this project. Yet some significant and suggestive information regarding tertiary use also appears from analyzing the secondary citation lists themselves, including which authors have made tertiary use, and in which journals.

As noted, the journal full-text searches revealed fifteen articles that made Very Substantial Use of *Archaeology* or *Order*: Carol Brooke's 2002 article in the *Journal of Information Technology*, Ronald Day's 2005 article in *ARIST*, Bernd Frohmann's 2001 article in *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, Stuart Hannabuss' 1996 article in *Aslib Proceedings*, Maria Humphries' 1998 article in *Organization Science*, Elin Jacob and Hanne Albrechtsen's 1998 article in *Information Research*, Cheryl Knott Malone and Fernando Elichirigoity's 2003 article in *JASIST*, six separate articles by Gary Radford either with or without Marie Radford in *Library Quarterly* (1992, 1997, 2001, 2003) or in *Journal of Documentation* (2005, 2012), Sanna Talja's 1999 article in *Library & Information Science Review*, and Luke Tredinnick's 2007 article in *Aslib Proceedings*. For good measure, various other authors and articles that made quite if not "very" substantial use of *Archaeology* or *Order* were added to the Web of Science search list: Jack Andersen and Laura Skouvig's 2006 article in *Library Quarterly*, John Budd's 2006 article in *Library Trends*, and Jutta Haider and David Bawden's 2007 article in the *Journal of Documentation*. [Some other articles making substantial use of *Archaeology* or *Order* are too

recent to have left much if any citation trail.] Also added to the list are certain authors such as Bernd Frohmann and Michael Olsson, who have repeatedly demonstrated a substantial familiarity with various of Foucault's works, even if their published articles do not always show much evidence of specific use of *Archaeology* or *Order. Archival Science* and *Archivaria*, regrettably, appear not to be covered by the Web of Science, so citations of Richard Brown's two articles making quite substantial use of *Archaeology* or Terry Cook's 2001 article citing both works may not be identified using that tool, and both authors' names and title key words are so common as to make full-text searching impracticable. The results of the tertiary citation searches regarding these articles and authors are given below.

Ronald Day's 2005 article in *ARIST* includes what appears to be among the most extensive and intensive discussions of Foucault's ideas that has appeared in LIS journal literature to date.²² The Web of Science shows 17 articles that cite Day's article. Seven of these citing articles were authored by scholars who already are identified in this study's journal search results as users, in most cases significant or substantial users, of *Archaeology* or *Order* (Buschman (two separate citing articles),²³ Haider and Bawden, Lindh and Haider, Lund, and Tredinnick (two citing articles)). [Such identified users are sometimes referred to hereinafter as the "usual suspects"; see Appendix 2 for a full list of these identified users.] Several other citing articles on the list come from scholars who are not necessarily that interested in using Foucauldian ideas themselves, but rather are reflecting more broadly on the intellectual state, history, or evolution

²² Day's article, although it devotes extensive attention to Foucault, notably also discusses other authors and ideas related to poststructuralism and postmodernism.

²³ Buschman, notably, is not a "user" of Foucault in the same sense as many of the other authors who appear on the list of users; he tends to reject various aspects of Foucault and his ideas, but he also stays very engaged with the scholarship of his fellow LIS scholars who are users, as his repeated appearance in citation lists attests. See, e.g., John Buschman, "Transgression or Stasis? Challenging Foucault in LIS Theory," *Library Quarterly*, vol. 77, no. 1 (January 2007): 21-44; John Buschman and Richard A. Brosio, "A Critical Primer on Postmodernism: Lessons from Educational Scholarship for Librarianship," *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, vol. 32, no. 4 (2006): 408-418.

of the LIS field and are noting Day's article and related scholarship more or less as a milestone on that path (Burke, Cronin (two citing articles), Furner, McKechnie et al.).²⁴ The remaining five articles on the list may or may not show a particular interest in Foucauldian ideas, but again, it is probably impossible to tell for certain without reading the articles closely. Five of the citing articles also appeared in *ARIST* like Day's article; two others appeared in *JASIST*; two others in *Journal of Documentation*; one apiece in *Information Research*, *Library Quarterly*, and *Libri*; and five in other journals.

Gary Radford, sometimes joined by his wife Marie or other coauthors, might win the lifetime achievement award for sustained and extensive use of Foucault among LIS scholars; his various authored or co-authored publications extensively exploring Foucauldian ideas already span twenty years, from 1992 to 2012, and the Radfords account for six of the fifteen articles categorized as making Very Substantial use of *Archaeology* and/or *Order* in this study. As with Day's article discussed above, only perhaps more so, Web of Science searches regarding Radford's various contributions tend to show significant clustering in terms of both citing authors and journals.

First published and most cited among Radford's articles is "Positivism, Foucault, and the Fantasia of the Library" (1992), which has been cited 39 times in the Web of Science.²⁵ Along with three self-citations, one partial self-citation (Budd and Radford, 1997), and one citation by Marie Radford, 17 other citing articles include authors or coauthors who appear in this study's

²⁴ Colin Burke, "History of Information Science," *ARIST*, vol. 41 (2007): 3-53; Blaise Cronin, "The Sociological Turn in Information Science," *Journal of Information Science*, vol. 34, no. 4 (August 2008): 465-475; Cronin and Meho, "Receiving the French," *supra* note 2; Jonathan Furner, "Philosophy and Information Studies," *ARIST*, vol. 44 (2010): 161-200; Lynne McKechnie et al., "Dancing Around the Edges: The Use of Postmodern Approaches in Information Behaviour Research as Evident in the Published Proceedings of the Biennial ISIC Conferences, 1996-2010," *Information Research*, vol. 17, no. 4 (December 2012).

²⁵ Gary P. Radford, "Positivism, Foucault, and the Fantasia of the Library: Conceptions of Knowledge and the Modern Library Experience," *Library Quarterly*, vol. 62, no. 4 (October 1992): 408-424.

journal search results as users of *Archaeology or Order*.²⁶ Adding to this roster Blaise Cronin (two separate articles), who is neither a Foucault “user” nor particularly sympathetic to Foucauldian ideas but who has repeatedly tracked the bibliometric presence of French postmodernism,²⁷ and Archie Dick, an early and significant explorer of postmodernist ideas in LIS,²⁸ there are only fourteen authors listed on the Web of Science who are not among the “usual suspects” with a demonstrated awareness of and interest in (early) Foucault. Like the article itself, 16 of the citing articles appeared in the *Library Quarterly*; another four in the *Journal of Documentation*; two apiece in *JASIST*, *Library & Information Science Review (LISR)*, and *Library Trends*; one in *ARIST*; and twelve in various other journals.

Gary and Marie Radford’s 1997 article regarding stereotypes of female librarians has been cited 28 times.²⁹ Some of these citing articles and authors, judging by their titles, may be more interested in stereotypes of female librarians than in Foucauldian ideas in particular. Nevertheless, counting eight self-cites along with other “usual suspects” (Andersen and Skouvig, Bawden, Buschmann, McKenzie, Olsson, and Talja), half of the citing articles come from known *Archaeology or Order* users. Seven citing articles appeared in *Library Quarterly*; three apiece in *Journal of Documentation* and *Library Trends*; two in *LISR*; and thirteen in other journals.

²⁶ These are: Andersen and Skouvig, Andersen alone, Buschmann (three separate citing articles), Hjørland (two separate articles), Budd and Raber, Budd alone, Raber alone, Olsson (two separate articles), Mark (not Ronald) Day, Frohmann, Haider and Bawden, Huvila, and Weigand.

²⁷ See, e.g., Cronin, “The Sociological Turn in Information Science,” *supra* note 24; Cronin and Meho, “Receiving the French,” *supra* note 2.

²⁸ See, e.g., Archie L. Dick, “Library and Information Science as a Social Science: Neutral and Normative Conceptions,” *Library Quarterly*, vol. 65, no. 2 (April 1995): 216-235; Dick, “Epistemological Positions and Library and Information Science,” *Library Quarterly*, vol. 69, no. 3 (July 1999): 305-323.

²⁹ Marie L. Radford and Gary P. Radford, “Power, Knowledge, and Fear: Feminism, Foucault, and the Stereotype of the Female Librarian,” *Library Quarterly*, vol. 67, no. 3 (July 1997): 250-266.

Regarding the Radfords' various other very substantial uses of *Archaeology* or *Order*, the Radfords' 2001 article shows 24 citing articles.³⁰ In addition to four self-cites, the usual suspects account for 12 citing articles,³¹ leaving only eight scholar/authors who do not already appear in this study's journal search results as users of *Archaeology* or *Order*. Seven citing articles appeared in *Library Quarterly*; three in *Journal of Documentation*; one in *JASIST*; and 13 in other journals. Radford's 2003 article³² has been cited by 25 articles, including one self-cite along with eleven usual suspects.³³ The Radfords' 2005 article has been cited 13 times in the Web of Science.³⁴ The usual suspects account for five of these.³⁵ Both of the latter two articles show more of the same sort of journal clustering seen with the others. The Radfords' and Lingel's 2012 article does not yet show citations.³⁶

To sum up the results for the Radfords' six articles that make very substantial use of *Archaeology* and/or *Order*: counting 18 self-cites, authors who appear in this study's journal search results as users of *Archaeology* or *Order* account for 71 out of 129 total citing articles. 41 out of the 129 citing articles appeared in the *Library Quarterly* (like four of the six Radford articles); another 18 citing articles appeared in the *Journal of Documentation* (like the other two

³⁰ Gary P. Radford and Marie L. Radford, "Libraries, Librarians, and the Discourse of Fear," *Library Quarterly*, vol. 71, no. 3 (July 2001): 299-329.

³¹ Andersen and Skouvig, Buschman (three separate citing articles, one co-authored with Brosio), Dilevko, Haider and Bawden, Huvila (two separate articles), McKenzie, Rayward, Talja et al., and Tuominen et al.

³² Gary P. Radford, "Trapped in Our Own Discursive Formations: Toward an Archaeology of Library and Information Science," *Library Quarterly*, vol. 73, no. 1 (January 2003): 1-18.

³³ Andersen and Skouvig, Budd, Buschman (three separate citing articles, one co-authored with Brosio), Haider and Bawden, Lloyd, Savolainen, Talja & McKenzie, Talja with Tuominen and Savolainen, and Wiegand.

³⁴ Gary P. Radford and Marie L. Radford, "Structuralism, Post-structuralism, and the Library: de Saussure and Foucault," *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 61, no. 1 (2005): 60-78.

³⁵ Andersen and Skouvig, Buschman, Haider and Bawden, Johannisson and Sundin, and Tredinnick.

³⁶ Gary P. Radford, Marie L. Radford, and Jessica Lingel, "Alternative Libraries as Discursive Formations: Reclaiming the Voice of the Deaccessioned Book," *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 68, no. 2 (2012): 254-267.

out of six Radford articles). Although various other journals appeared repeatedly on the lists of citing articles, no others were as salient (e.g., *Library Trends* (6), *LISR* (5)). For the record, it should be emphasized that certain citing articles actually represent more than just a single citing article in these statistics, both among the “usual suspects” and among other authors, because the same article frequently cited more than one of the Radfords’ articles.³⁷

An example of a very substantial secondary use of *Archaeology* or *Order* that displays some clustering of tertiary authors but relatively little clustering of journals is Talja (1999), which has been cited 45 times.³⁸ Along with two self-cites and two partial self-cites (with McKenzie, or with Tuominen and Savolainen), nine articles and six “usual suspects” appear in the list of citing authors in the Web of Science.³⁹ Talja’s article has been cited four times in *Information Research*, three times apiece in *Library Quarterly*, *Journal of Documentation*, and *JASIST*, as well as twice apiece in *ARIST* and *LISR*, but it is also especially remarkable for the degree to which its secondary use has moved entirely beyond the recognizable LIS literature to other fields: citing journals include, for example, *Journal of Sociology*, *Engineering Studies*, *Studies in Higher Education*, *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, *Business Economics*, *Sociology of Health and Illness*, and various other often health- or education-related journals and articles reflecting an interest in discourse analysis.

³⁷ Among the usual suspects, this is especially the case with Buschman, who cites several of the Radfords’ articles in each of three of his separate articles; the same pattern exists with, for example, Andersen and Skouvig, who cite five Radford articles, and Haider and Bawden, who cite four out of six. This pattern is also true for scholars outside the circle of “usual suspects,” however: authors such as Joseph Deodato, Mary P. Freier, Edward A. Goedeken, Deborah Hicks, Leah Shaw, and K. Tancheva all cite two or three Radford articles in the same article.

³⁸ Sanna Talja, “Analyzing Qualitative Interview Data: The Discourse Analytic Method,” *Library & Information Science Review*, vol. 21, no. 4 (November 1999): 459-477.

³⁹ Fleming-May, Haider and Bawden, McKenzie (in two other articles), Savolainen (in two other articles), and Tuominen (in three articles, two of them with co-authors). Also appearing, perhaps notably, are Deborah Hicks and Sharyn Wise, whose recent articles do not appear in the database for this study but who frequently show up as secondary users of identified significant secondary users such as Olsson or the Radfords.

In sharp contrast to the relatively frequently cited works of Talja and the Radfords, or even to the highly important but modestly cited contribution from Ronald Day, some secondary sources that rank as Very Substantial Use of *Archaeology* or *Order* in this study show few if any citations at all on the Web of Science. So, for instance, Stuart Hannabuss' 1996 article on Foucault in *Aslib Proceedings*,⁴⁰ which like Ronald Day's 2005 article is among the most significant reflections on Foucault's thought within the LIS journal literature, has been cited three times according to the Web of Science, one of these a self-cite (also in *Aslib Proceedings*) along with citations from Haider and Bawden and from Bawden alone (both in *Journal of Documentation*). Luke Tredinnick's 2007 article in *Aslib Proceedings*,⁴¹ which made very substantial use of *Archaeology* and *Order* among other works of Foucault, has been cited only once (in an article co-authored by John Willcocks, who appears in this project's database as a rare significant user of *Order* along with heavier use of other, later Foucault works.) Maria Humphries' 1998 article in *Organization Science*,⁴² which made extensive and thoughtful use of Foucault's early works applied to the context of business information, has been cited in only two articles, both of which appear to be focused directly on business and not likely to make much use of Foucauldian ideas. Malone and Elichirigoity (2001) have been cited only four times,⁴³ one of them a self-cite, one of them by Andersen & Skouvig (in *Library Quarterly*, 2006). Even allowing that the Web of Science may give an imperfect and incomplete measure of a

⁴⁰ Stuart Hannabuss, "Foucault's View of Knowledge," *Aslib Proceedings*, vol. 48, no. 4 (April 1996): 87-102.

⁴¹ Luke Tredinnick, "Post-Structuralism, Hypertext, and the World Wide Web," *Aslib Proceedings*, vol. 59, no. 2 (2007): 169-186.

⁴² Maria Humphries, "For the Common Good? New Zealanders Comply with Quality Standards," *Organization Science*, vol. 9, no. 6 (Nov.-Dec. 1998): 738-749.

⁴³ Cheryl Knott Malone and Fernando Elichirigoity, "Information as Commodity and Economic Sector: Its Emergence in the Discourse of Industrial Classification," *JASIST*, vol. 54, no. 6 (April 2003): 512-520.

publication's full impact, the results for these articles suggests that their visible wider impact may have been (undeservedly) limited.

As to articles rated as Substantial use, Haider & Bawden (2007),⁴⁴ cited 16 times, shows some journal clustering, less author clustering. Citing authors on the identified user list include only Fleming-May, Turner and Allen, and Bawden (with Robinson). Citing journals include *Journal of Documentation* (three articles), *Library Trends* (two articles), and *LISR*. Andersen & Skouvig (2006),⁴⁵ which is relatively rare in making substantial and repeated use of both *Archaeology* and *Order* along with various later works by Foucault, has been cited 8 times. Like the Haider and Bawden article, it shows some journal clustering with limited author clustering. Only Haider and Bawden, plus a self-cite by Andersen, represent the identified users of *Archaeology* or *Order*. However, the *Journal of Documentation* (three articles), *ARIST*, and *Library Quarterly* account for over half the citing articles. John Budd's 2006 article in *Library Trends* was not officially classified as constituting Very Substantial use in this study but almost could have been.⁴⁶ It has been cited nine times, including four of the "usual suspects": McKenzie, Talja and McKenzie, the Radfords, and San Segundo, one of the rare Spanish-language scholars to appear on the list of identified users in this study. Although Budd's article has not yet collected enough citations to show pronounced journal-clustering all by itself, its citing journals represent most of the most frequently occurring "journal usual suspects" on this

⁴⁴ Jutta Haider and David Bawden, "Conceptions of 'Information Poverty' in LIS: A Discourse Analysis," *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 63 no. 4 (2007): 534-557.

⁴⁵ Jack Andersen and Laura Skouvig, "Knowledge Organization: A Sociohistorical Analysis and Critique," *Library Quarterly*, vol. 76, no. 3 (July 2006): 300-322.

⁴⁶ John M. Budd, "Discourse Analysis and the Study of Communication in LIS," *Library Trends*, vol. 55, no. 1 (Summer 2006): 65-82.

study's Web of Science citation lists: *Journal of Documentation* (2 articles), *Information Research*, *JASIST*, *Library Quarterly*, *Library Trends*, and *LISR*, plus two others.

Two other articles/authors included in the list of Very Substantial users of *Archaeology* or *Order* display little, or else rather different, clustering of tertiary citing authors or journals: Brooke (2002) and Jacob & Albrechtsen (1998). Of three articles authored or co-authored by Jacob that have associations with *Archaeology* or *Order* and show citation lists in the Web of Science, the first, Jacob & Albrechtsen (1998),⁴⁷ categorized in this project as Very Substantial, has been cited in only six articles, including one self-cite, two articles by Huvila, and one by Tennis. Jacob (2001),⁴⁸ cited 17 times, includes only two self-cites, Huvila, Hjørland, and Tennis among the citing authors. The third Jacob article (2004),⁴⁹ and her most frequently cited article with 42 citing articles, which unlike the other two only cites *Order* twice rather briefly, only shows three self-cites plus Frické and Hjørland from this study's list of identified users of *Archaeology* or *Order*. Thus, out of a total of 65 citing articles, authors on this study's list of identified users of *Archaeology* or *Order* account for only 14, six of them self-cites. The journals publishing these citing articles generally showed even less of the sort of familiar clustering seen in most of the earlier examples of Very Substantial users, and journals and author names suggest a generally broader, more international tertiary use. All three of Jacob's articles together show six citing articles in *JASIST*, three apiece in *Journal of Documentation* and *Information Research*, and two in *ARIST*. By contrast, and showing a markedly different sort of clustering,

⁴⁷ Elin K. Jacob and Hanne Albrechtsen, "When Essence Becomes Function: Post- Structuralist Implications for an Ecological Theory of Organizational Classification Systems," *Information Research*, (1998): 519-534.

⁴⁸ Elin K. Jacob, "The Everyday World of Work: Two Approaches to the Investigation of Classification in Context," *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 57, no. 1 (2001): 76-99.

⁴⁹ Elin K. Jacob, "Classification and Categorization: A Difference that Makes a Difference," *Library Trends*, vol. 52, no. 3 (Winter 2004): 515-540.

Jacob's works have been cited in *Knowledge and Organization* 14 times—twice as many times as all the other Very Substantial or additional substantial users put together (7)—and in the *Journal of Information Science* five times, almost as many times as all the other writers put together (7).

Brooke (2002),⁵⁰ cited 39 times, shows only two self-cites and an article by Willcocks from this study's list of identified secondary users of *Archaeology* or *Order*. The journal list for citing articles also looks entirely different from most of the others featured in this study:

Information Systems Journal appears nine times, the *European Journal of Information Systems* four times, the *Journal of Information Technology*, *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, and *Social Science Computer Review* all twice apiece, *Ethics & Information Technology* and *Information & Organization* each only once, and the usual journal suspects for the other substantial users of *Archaeology* or *Order*—*Journal of Documentation*, *Library Quarterly*, *Information Research*, *LISR*, etc.—not once.

In addition to the various substantial or very substantial uses/users discussed above, two additional authors who demonstrate substantial background and familiarity with Foucault, even though they make little use of *Archaeology* or *Order*, also were searched in the Web of Science. One of these is Michael Olsson, whose doctoral dissertation concerned Foucault's ideas,⁵¹ but whose various articles mostly cite Foucault only in passing or rely upon secondary sources regarding Foucault. Olsson has eight articles showing citation lists in the Web of Science; these lists vary in length from one to ten citing articles and cumulatively add up to 42 citations, although with certain writers and articles citing several different Olsson articles in the same

⁵⁰ Carole Brooke, "What Does It Mean to Be 'Critical' in IS Research?," *Journal of Information Technology*, vol. 17 (2002): 49–57.

⁵¹ See Michael R. Olsson, "Re-Thinking Our Concept of Users," *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, vol. 40, no. 1 (2009): 22-35, at p. 28.

citing article. Sixteen of the citations are self-cites; other “usual suspects” account for eight citations.⁵² Olsson’s citation lists show some slight journal clustering: two articles apiece from *ARIST*, *Information Research*, and *Australian Academic and Research Libraries*, one apiece from *Journal of Documentation*, *JASIST*, *Library Quarterly*, *LISR*, and *Libri*.

Bernd Frohmann has been saved for last as a special and somewhat peculiar situation. Frohmann (2001) is categorized as an example of Very Substantial Use of *Archaeology* or *Order* in this study;⁵³ however, notwithstanding the fact that the publishing journal, the *Journal of Education for Library & Information Science*, is recognized by the Web of Science, there seems to be no record for that particular article among Frohmann’s more than thirty publications that do appear in the Web of Science.⁵⁴ In lieu of that missing information, other influential publications by Frohmann relating to Foucauldian concepts regarding discourse have been searched, even though Frohmann directly uses Foucault in them only a little, and early Foucault, including *Archaeology* and *Order*, not at all. Two of these articles appear to be among the most widely cited articles concerning discourse analysis in the entire LIS journal literature; a third, less well-known or widely used, appears likely to be an earlier, conference paper version exploring similar ideas. All three of Frohmann’s works tend to show, relatively strongly, the sort of clustering of citing authors and journals seen with authors such as the Radfords.

⁵² Heizmann (who cites three different Olsson articles in the same article), Given, Haider and Bawden, Talja and McKenzie (citing two different Olsson articles), and Talja with Hartel.

⁵³ Bernd Frohmann, “Discourse and Documentation: Some Implications for Pedagogy and Research,” *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, vol. 42, no. 1 (Winter, 2001): 12-26.

⁵⁴ Strangely, there seemingly is not even a zero placeholder as there often is for articles that have not yet been cited by articles published in journals covered by the Web of Science.

Frohmann (1992),⁵⁵ seemingly his first major foray into discourse analysis, had been cited 76 times as of early 2015, when the various Web of Science search lists used in this study were compiled.⁵⁶ Citing authors who appear in this study's list of identified users account for 36 of the 76 citing events;⁵⁷ adding Archie Dick as an honorary member of the list would raise the total to 38 (50%). Thirteen of these citing articles appeared in *Journal of Documentation*, eleven in *Library Quarterly*, nine in *ARIST*, eight in *JASIST*, and five apiece in *Information Research* and *LISR*, along with 16 in other journals and nine books or book chapters. The overall picture is mostly similar with Frohmann (1994),⁵⁸ cited 61 times. Citing authors who are identified users/"usual suspects" include 35 out of the 61 citing authors.⁵⁹ *LISR* accounted for nine of the citing articles, *ARIST* and *Library Quarterly* for eight apiece, *Journal of Documentation* for six, *JASIST* for five, and *Information Research* for four, along with other journals and books or book chapters. What appears to have been a conference-paper version of Frohmann's 1992 article or an otherwise parallel study has been cited eleven times.⁶⁰ Counting two self-cites, eight of these

⁵⁵ Bernd Frohmann, "The Power of Images: A Discourse Analysis of the Cognitive Viewpoint," *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 48, no. 4 (1992): 365-386.

⁵⁶ By early May, that number had risen to 78 citing articles.

⁵⁷ Budd (two articles); Budd and Raber; Raber and Budd; Buschman (three articles); Day (three articles); Fleming-May (two articles); Haider and Bawden; Jacob; Lund; McKenzie (two articles); Olsson (nine articles); Pawley; Radford; Rayward; Talja and McKenzie; Tuominen; Tuominen with Talja and Savolainen; and Wiegand, plus three self-cites.

⁵⁸ Bernd Frohmann, "Discourse Analysis as a Research Method in Library and Information Science," *Library & Information Science Research*, vol. 16 (1994): 119-138.

⁵⁹ Budd and Raber; Buschman (two articles); Chelton; Day (two articles); Ellis; Fleming-May (two articles); Given and Olson; Haider and Bawden; Hjørland (three articles, one with Capurro); Jacob and Shaw; Jacobs; Joyce; Lloyd; Lund; Malone and Elichirigoity; McKenzie; Olson (two articles); Olsson (three articles); Radford and Radford; San Segundo; Talja (two articles); Talja and McKenzie; Talja with Tuominen and Savolainen; Tuominen; and Turner and Allen, plus one self-cite.

⁶⁰ Bernd Frohmann, "Knowledge and Power in Library and Information Science—Toward a Discourse Analysis of the Cognitive Viewpoint," in Vakkari & Cronin, eds., *Proceedings of the International Conference on Conceptions of Library and Information Science: Historical, Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives*, Tampere, Finland, August 16, 28, 1991 (Tampere, 1992), at pp. 135-148.

come from “usual suspects”: Buschman; Ellis; Haider and Bawden; Jacob and Shaw; Talja alone; and Talja with Tuominen and Savolainen. Citing articles include three apiece in *ARIST* and *Journal of Documentation*, and one apiece in *Information Research*, *Library Quarterly*, and *LISR*.

Viewing the results on tertiary use cumulatively, counting all the Very Substantial users of *Archaeology* or *Order* together, without Olsson or Frohmann and without the additional substantial users such as Andersen and Skouvig, Budd, and Haider and Bawden but including Jacob and Brooke, scholars on this study’s list of identified secondary users of *Archaeology* or *Order* accounted for 111 (with 32 self-cites) out of a total of 302 citing articles listed in the Web of Science (many of them double-counted because they cite more than one Very Substantial Use in the same article) (36.75%). Excluding the somewhat anomalous results for Jacob and Brooke, the ratio changes to 94 (with 24 self-cites) out of 198 (47.47%). Further excluding the also somewhat anomalous 1999 Talja article with its broad appeal beyond the LIS field, the ratio changes to 81 (with 20 self-cites) out of 153 (52.94%). Adding in the substantial users, the ratio changes to 91 (with 22 self-cites) out of 186 (48.92%); adding in Olsson’s and Frohmann’s works produces a ratio of 193 (with 42 self-cites) out of 376 total listed citing articles (51.33%). Including everybody all together (i.e., Jacob, Brooke, and Talja with the others) gives a ratio of 223 (with 54 self-cites) out of 525 (42.48%).

In terms of cumulative results for journal clustering, *Library Quarterly* accounted for 69 of the citations, *Journal of Documentation* for 59, *ARIST* for 34, *JASIST* for 27, *LISR* for 25, *Information Research* for 22, and *Library Trends* for 10—in other words, 246 out of 525 total citations, or 46.86%, with *Library Quarterly* and *Journal of Documentation* together representing 24.38 %. Excluding Brooke, Jacob, and Talja, these tallies become 66, 53, 33, 18,

23, 18, and 9, respectively—220 out of 376, or 58.51%, with *Library Quarterly* and *Journal of Documentation* together representing 31.65%.

D. Detailed Comparison of Use of *Archaeology of Knowledge* versus *Order of Things*

As noted in an earlier section, one original goal of this study was to trace whether differential use of *Archaeology* versus *Order* corresponded to differential self-identification and self-location of scholars within the LIS field. As also noted, such differential analysis proved mostly impossible due to the very wide disparity between use of one book and the other; basically, in practice, compared to other works of Foucault including *Archaeology*, *Order* appears to be relatively invisible and ignored by LIS scholars. However, notwithstanding the wide disparity, a comparison in scholars' visible usage of the two books may reveal some other interesting patterns.

As discussed earlier, out of a total of 188 articles in which *Archaeology*, *Order*, and/or the Discourse on Language are cited, 126 articles cited *Archaeology* without *Order*, 37 articles cited *Order* without *Archaeology*, and 25 articles cited both books in the same article. In each of these categories, the clear majority of the uses are only passing references or quotations with little additional discussion. Out of the list of uses of *Order* alone, there are seven relatively substantial uses.⁶¹ On the list of uses of *Archaeology* alone, there are 24 relatively substantial uses.⁶² On the list of articles using both books, there are twelve that make relatively substantial

⁶¹ Clark 1998, Introna 2007, Jacob & Albrechtsen 1998, Jacob 2001, Lilley 1998, Sotto 1997, and Zhang & Jacob 2013.

⁶² Andersen and Skouvig 2006, Brooke 2002, Brothman 2010, Brown 1991, Brown 1995, Budd 1997, Budd & Raber 1998, Carter 2006, Day 2005, Frohmann 2008, Haider & Bawden 2007, Haider & Bawden 2006, Haikola & Jonsson 2007, Herb 2010, Hubbard 1995, Huvila 2015, Lund 2009, Malone & Elichirigoity 2003, Maynard 2009, Radford & Radford 2005, Radford & Radford 1997, Stoler 2002, Talja et al. 2005, Talja 1999.

use of one or the other.⁶³ In seven of these cases, the use of *Archaeology* (or the Discourse on Language) heavily predominates over the use of *Order*;⁶⁴ in four cases the use of each book could be called roughly equal;⁶⁵ and in only one case did the use of *Order* clearly outweigh that of *Archaeology* (Jacob 2001). [See Appendix 8.]

One somewhat surprising pattern that did pop out from this comparative use data is that *Order* generally seems to be relatively more invisible in North America, and perhaps less so in the rest of the world, including other Anglophone nations such as Australia and the United Kingdom. To test this, the educational and professional backgrounds of all users of *Order* were searched.⁶⁶ Out of the 37 articles and corresponding authors who used *Order* only, 22 of them showed either strong professional or strong educational associations outside North America, usually both.⁶⁷ Six other articles involved geographically mixed authorship including scholars from North America along with others not from North America (two of these involving Elin K.

⁶³ Budd 2006, Frohmann 2001, Gilliland 2011, Girdwood 2009, Hannabuss 1996, Humphries 1998, Jacob 2001, Radford et al. 2012, Radford 2003, Radford & Radford 2001, Radford 1992, Tredinnick 2007.

⁶⁴ Budd 2006, Frohmann 2001, Gilliland 2011, Humphries 1998, Radford et al. 2012, Radford 2003, Radford & Radford 2001.

⁶⁵ Girdwood 2009, Hannabuss 1996, Radford 1992, Tredinnick 2007. In light of the discussion that follows in the next paragraph, note that in three out of four cases of relatively equal use of the two books, the authors are strongly associated with the United Kingdom educationally and professionally (Girdwood, Hannabuss, and Tredinnick).

⁶⁶ Uses/users of *Order* alone include: Andersen (1999), Berg et al. (2005), Bowker (1996), Clark (1998), Day (2004), Day (2000a), Day (2000b), Denegri-Knott & Taylor (2005), Dennis & Al-Obaidi (2010), Dervin et al. (2006), Douglas (1993), Eastman and Bailey (1998), Ferraioli (2005), Frické (2013), Golden-Biddle and Locke (1993), Gomez and Jones (2000), Hanson (2009), Horner (1992), Introna (2007), Jacob (2004), Jacob & Albrechtsen (1998), Jashapara (2007), Kallinikos (1999), Lilley (1998), Lin & Chen (2012), McSweeney (1995), Milojevic et al. (2011), Refinetti (1989), Rymarczuk & Derksen (2014), Scholz (2008), Seadle (2000), Sotto (1997), Truex et al. (2000), Wersig (1993), Willcocks (2006), Zeggio Martinez (2013), and Zhang & Jacob (2013). Uses/users of both *Archaeology* and *Order* include: Andersen and Skouvig (2006), Cook (2001), Dalbello & Spoerri (2006), Frohmann (2001), Gilliland (2011), Girdwood (2009), Hannabuss (1996), Hardiman (2009), Hatch (1997), Hjørland (2002), Humphries (1998), Jacob (2001), Johannisson and Sundin (2007), Munro (1993), Nakata (2002), Olsson (2007), Qayyum (2012), Radford (1992, 2001, 2003), Radford et al. (2012), Tennis and Sutton (2008), Tredinnick (2007), and Wake (2008).

⁶⁷ This (relatively non-invasive) search mostly just involved checking for online resumes or similar sources of information indicating whether the scholars in question had received undergraduate or graduate degrees from universities outside of North America, have been employed long-term outside North America, or show other major national affiliations outside of North America, usually a combination of more than one.

Jacob as a co-author).⁶⁸ There were only nine situations where all authors appeared to have entirely North American professional and educational associations; three of these involved articles by Ronald Day, one was by Jacob, while F. Allan Hanson is an anthropologist, not an LIS scholar. Out of 24 articles and their authors who used both *Archaeology* and *Order*, 16 of them showed substantial educational or professional background outside of North America, while only eight of them showed purely North American associations; of the latter, four articles were from the Radfords, one from Elin Jacob.⁶⁹

Regarding both users only of *Order* and users of both works, as well as geographically mixed coauthor situations along with authors or coauthors all with substantial non-North American associations, however, it should be noted that in several of these cases, the authors in question are now associated with Indiana University or with Rutgers and thus have as colleagues either Elin Jacob (and Ronald Day) or Gary Radford, both active users of *Order*. Thus, in such cases (or perhaps even in all cases), the selection of *Order* for use might depend more on recent professional associations than on earlier educational exposure. Nevertheless, the strong association of *Order* with non-North American educational and/or professional background is intriguing.

One other pattern of note: notwithstanding well-known and well-respected senior Canadian archivist Terry Cook's admonition that *Order*, along with *Archaeology*, should be

⁶⁸ Non-North American nations represented on the list included the United Kingdom (10), Australia (2), Sweden (2), Brazil (2), China, Denmark, the Netherlands, France, Germany, Greece, New Zealand, Singapore, and Taiwan. In an e-mail message, Professor Jacob identified herself as all-American.

⁶⁹ Non-North American nations represented on the list included the United Kingdom (7), Australia (3), Sweden (2), Denmark, Ireland, and New Zealand.

required reading for archivists,⁷⁰ *Order* is almost entirely absent from the archival literature. Out of 101 articles in archival journals that mention Foucault in any way; out of 55 such articles that cite any work by Foucault; out of 33 such articles that cite *Archaeology*, *Order*, or both; and out of 43 actual citations of *Archaeology* or *Order* in these archival journal articles, there are five articles that use *Order* and five citing events, four of them citing *Archaeology* together with or in close proximity to *Order*, two of them as brief passing references. Also perhaps notably, of the handful of exceptions to that rule of overall non-use of *Order* by archivists (Cook 2001, Gilliland 2011, Girdwood 2009, Hardiman 2009, and Wake 2008), all authors save possibly Cook have substantial educational or professional associations with one or the other of the British Isles, and all articles appeared in journals of international reach and focus (*Archival Science*) or at least non-North American focus (the UK-based *Journal of the Society of Archivists*).

⁷⁰ See, e.g., Terry Cook, "Archival Science and Postmodernism: New Formulations for Old Concepts," *Archival Science*, vol. 1 (2001): 3-24, at p. 8, fn. 8; Cook, "Fashionable Nonsense or Professional Rebirth: Postmodernism and the Practice of Archives," *Archivaria*, vol. 51 (2001): 14-35, at p. 24, fn. 21.

IV. Analysis of Findings

A. Limited Visible Use and Relative Marginalization of *The Archaeology of Knowledge* and *The Order of Things*

This study began with a tacit foundational assumption: that both *The Archaeology of Knowledge* and *The Order of Things* are especially central and crucial to the understanding and use of Foucault and his work in general. Thus, the study anticipated finding relatively extensive as well as intensive use of the two works, and it was hoped that close comparison of the varying ways the books had been put to use might resolve into an interesting and illuminating way to help map the boundaries of LIS and its subfields from the bottom up.

To the extent that the data produced by this study regarding visible use of *Archaeology* or *Order* in LIS journal literature accurately reflects actual appropriation of either or both works by LIS scholars, however, the results would seem to indicate that rather than being especially central and crucial for those who would incorporate Foucauldian ideas in their work, both works have instead been treated as relatively marginal and peripheral in the LIS field. This conclusion is reinforced not only by the fact that a clear and substantial majority of the articles in this study's database that cite Foucault at all only cite works other than *Archaeology* or *Order* (259 versus 188), but also that of those articles that do cite *Archaeology* or *Order*, a substantial fraction, probably a majority, also cite other works by Foucault and make heavier use of them than of *Archaeology* or *Order*.

Perhaps related to this seeming relative marginality, use of *Archaeology* or *Order* also has tended to be characterized by a relatively high overall level of vagueness and non-specificity. Measured either by specific citations or by articles as a whole, almost two thirds of all uses

constituted only brief, passing references, while those uses categorized as “Significant,” although more than mere passing references, also remain relatively brief and generally indicate relatively little reliance upon Foucault’s works.⁷¹ This overall sense of generality in the use of *Archaeology* or *Order* is heightened by the conceptual lumping-together indicated by the 29 co-citations together with other (later) works of Foucault and the 51 co-citations with other scholars; notably, such co-citations cumulatively accounted for almost 40 percent of all citing events involving *Archaeology* or *Order*. Yet perhaps most of all, the overall dearth of page numbers may be most emblematic of the generality in usage of *Archaeology* or *Order*, with perhaps the most typical example being a relatively passing reference to the concept of discourse or discourse analysis, perhaps with a mention of Foucault’s name, followed by a general citation of *Archaeology*. Ironically, in more than a few cases where *Archaeology* or *Order* were cited without page numbers, in neighboring sentences and paragraphs in the same article, the author was visibly more fastidious about using page numbers in citing other sources, sometimes including other works by Foucault.⁷²

As discussed in an earlier section, in addition to the seeming comparative marginalization of both *Archaeology* and *Order* relative to Foucault’s later works, there is a clear hierarchy of marginalization between the two books: if *Archaeology* is less salient in the literature than this study originally anticipated, *Order* is almost invisible. This might seem somewhat ironic, given that Foucault himself emphasized the close relationship between the two works both explicitly,

⁷¹ The same likely would also apply to many of the citations of Foucault’s later works, of course.

⁷² Admittedly, part of the cause of the comparative lack of page numbers in citations of *Archaeology* or *Order* could arise from the longstanding convention in some of the sciences and social sciences of non-specifically citing entire sources that are usually relatively concise and compact journal articles in which the particular point cited may be relative easy to find even without page numbers. Yet even in such disciplines, authors often appear to adjust that convention by including page numbers, especially with citations of books, presumably recognizing that a non-specific citation of an entire book is usually not that helpful for those who wish to use and follow the citing author’s research.

by identifying *Archaeology* as a more complete theorization of ideas he started exploring in *Order* and other earlier works,⁷³ and implicitly, by repeatedly and extensively referring back to those works, especially *Order*, throughout *Archaeology*. Thus, Foucault in a sense invited his readers to think of *Archaeology* and *Order* together, rather like two parts of a larger whole; but the visible evidence from this study suggests that relatively few LIS scholars have accepted or noticed that invitation.

Yet the relatively limited visible evidence of extensive use of *Archaeology* or *Order* perhaps necessarily begs the question of whether the works might nonetheless have had, and be having, significant but invisible impact on LIS scholars? And on that point, this study produced some interesting and perhaps surprising or counterintuitive results: namely, several of the scholars who profess to have been strongly influenced by Foucault, or otherwise have demonstrated substantial familiarity with Foucault, in practice visibly use and cite Foucault fairly little.

This pattern may be particularly pronounced in archival scholarship. One dramatic example is Terry Cook, who in footnotes in several articles repeatedly emphasizes the influence Foucault had on his thinking⁷⁴ and also specifically points out both *Archaeology* and *Order* as key works for archivists,⁷⁵ but who also only rarely cites or quotes Foucault in his numerous

⁷³ Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge*, at pp. 14-15.

⁷⁴ “There seems no point to citing here a shelf-full of postmodernist books. However, in addition to Foucault’s own analysis and historical methodology, and Derrida’s seminal volume, my understanding of postmodernism owes much to an early exposure to the work of [various later secondary scholars].” Terry Cook, “Archival Science and Postmodernism: New Formulations for Old Concepts,” *Archival Science*, vol. 1 (2001): 3-24, at p. 8, fn. 8. Basically the same footnote also appears in Cook, “Electronic Records, Paper Minds: The Revolution in Information Management and Archives in the Post-Custodial and Post-Modernist Era,” *Archives & Manuscripts*, vol. 22, no. 2 (November 1994): 300-328, at p. 326, fn. 27; and Cook, “Fashionable Nonsense or Professional Rebirth: Postmodernism and the Practice of Archives,” *Archivaria*, vol. 51 (2001): 14-35, at p. 24, fn. 21. Some of the publications from Cook’s long and distinguished career predate the present window of electronic availability and thus had to be pursued by other means.

⁷⁵ “For Foucault, his key works for archivists are *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*

articles. Indeed, aside from a substantial and fairly lengthy paragraph devoted entirely to Foucault in his 2001 article in *Archival Science* and a mostly identical paragraph in his earlier 1994 article in *Archives and Manuscripts* (each with a footnote non-specifically citing both *Archaeology* and *Order*), plus a brief biographical description of how Foucault influenced his thought in a 2005 article in *Archival Science* that cited only a secondary source regarding Foucault,⁷⁶ Foucault seems to have rarely made it into the main text of Cook's articles as more than a passing reference if that, notwithstanding the great importance Cook clearly saw in Foucault both for himself personally and for the archival profession generally.⁷⁷ Again, as noted in the preceding section, for all Cook's emphatic recommendation of *Order* along with *Archaeology*, *Order* appears to have remained almost entirely unused among archivists, especially Cook's fellow North Americans.

Another, rather similar and striking example from the archival arena of demonstrated awareness together with limited visible use of Foucault is South African archivist Verne Harris. Harris has long been a particularly devoted and steadfast disciple of Foucault's contemporary, French postmodernist philosopher Jacques Derrida, and frequently cites, quotes, and uses Derrida at length in his articles.⁷⁸ Foucault appears less frequently and more furtively, yet enough to indicate Harris' familiarity with his ideas, also. For instance, in a memorable and

(New York, 1970, originally in French in 1966) and especially *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (New York, 1972, originally in French in 1969). A good introduction to his thought is Gary Gutting, *Michel Foucault's Archaeology of Scientific Reason . . .*" Cook, "Archival Science and Postmodernism," p. 16, fn. 22. Basically the same footnote also appears in Cook, "Electronic Records, Paper Minds," p. 327, fn. 33. Notably, Cook here is accepting Foucault's implicit invitation to group and consider the two works together.

⁷⁶ Cook, "Macroappraisal in Theory and Practice: Origins, Characteristics, and Implementation in Canada, 1950–2000," *Archival Science*, vol. 5 (2005): 101-161, at p. 122 and fn. 33.

⁷⁷ The statement regarding infrequency of citation of Foucault is based upon electronic searches of nine electronically available articles written or co-written by Cook, including two co-authored with Joan Schwartz, along with more the more general database searches that form the basis of this study.

⁷⁸ See, e.g., Verne Harris, "Against the Grain: Psychologies and Politics of Secrecy," *Archival Science*, vol. 9 (2009): 133-142; Harris, "Antonyms of Our Remembering," *Archival Science*, vol. 14 (2014): 215-229.

partly biographical article regarding the South African government's archival policies toward the end of the apartheid regime, Harris observes in a footnote:

My disclosure of the major shaping pre-impressions carried in my head as I started writing this article reflects a recognition that no observer, no writer, is exterior to the object of his or her observation. In my case the complicity verges on the obscene. I was, and am, an active participant in virtually every process which I critique in the article. So I am irrevocably caught in the tensions between the archival record conventionally defined, Foucault's assemblage of society's discourses, and the psychic archive explored by Freud, Jung, Derrida, Hillman, and others.⁷⁹

Elsewhere, Harris' publications also reveal traces of substantial familiarity with Foucault, yet Foucault is mentioned only sporadically and rarely cited. There are two notable examples of this overall rule. In a 2002 article in *Archival Science* co-written with Wendy Duff, Foucault is co-cited along with several other authors;⁸⁰ and in a 2009 article in the same journal, Harris gently mocks archivists of the early 1980s for their resistance to the writings of figures such as Foucault, H el ene Cixous, or various other scholars who might have challenged their insular understandings, and he chides Heather MacNeill slightly for using Foucault's ideas only narrowly regarding surveillance, "but nothing else from his vast oeuvre."⁸¹ Otherwise, though, Foucault only appears to haunt Harris' many publications like a ghost in occasional passing name references.⁸²

⁷⁹ Verne Harris, "The Archival Sliver: Power, Memory, and Archives in South Africa," *Archival Science*, vol. 2 (2002): 63-86, at p. 64, fn. 1. Harris, something of a superstar in the relatively quiet archival profession, heroically risked his life and career to blow the whistle on the apartheid regime's plans to destroy massive amounts of documents regarding the policies and practices of apartheid over many decades during the years immediately before the national elections that would ultimately transfer power to the Mandela government.

⁸⁰ Wendy M. Duff & Verne Harris, "Stories and Names: Archival Description as Narrating Records and Constructing Meanings," *Archival Science*, vol. 2 (2002): 263-285, at pp. 276, 277, and 277, fn. 49.

⁸¹ Harris, "Against the Grain," *supra* note 78, at pp. 135-36, 137, and 140. Characteristically, Harris cites several works by Derrida, but none by Foucault.

⁸² This statement is based upon an electronic search of ten of Harris' electronically available articles as well as a few additional book reviews written by Harris or written about Harris' books, in addition to wider database searches.

Yet another noteworthy example from the archival world of a scholar who almost certainly is very well steeped in Foucault but uses him visibly only sporadically is Brien Brothman. Brothman's oeuvre probably represents the most intensive and sophisticated exploration of postmodernist ideas that the archival arena has yet seen or is ever likely to, including the ideas of writers such as Lyotard, Deleuze, and Guattari along with figures better known in the LIS and archival world such as Foucault and Derrida. Like Harris, Brothman has spent most of his time and energy devoted to postmodernism on Derrida; also like Harris, Brothman reveals a deep familiarity with Foucault's works, but cites or uses them only relatively rarely.⁸³

Other archival scholars who have evinced a significant and persistent interest in postmodernist ideas, such as Joan Schwartz and Tom Nesmith, at most usually only mention Foucault sporadically in passing in their publications, mostly do not cite specific works of Foucault, and do not cite *Archaeology* or *Order*.⁸⁴

Although the archival arena may be particularly striking in its roster of scholars who demonstrate an awareness of Foucault but do not visibly cite or use him much in their work,

⁸³ Brothman, unlike Harris, is an identified user of *Archaeology* (not *Order*) in this study's database. Brothman specifically cites *Archaeology* in Brothman, "Archives, Life Cycles, and Death Wishes: A Helical Model of Record Formation," *Archivaria*, vol. 61 (Spring 2006): 235-269, at p. 260, fn. 48; Brothman, "The Limits of Limits: Derridean Deconstruction and the Archival Institution," *Archivaria*, vol. 36 (Autumn 1993): 205-220, at pp. 212, fn. 28 and 215, fn. 52; Brothman, "Perfect Present, Perfect Gift: Finding a Place for Archival Consciousness in Social Theory," *Archival Science*, vol. 10 (2010):141-189, at pp. 142 and 143, fn. 4; and Brothman, "The Past that Archives Keep: Memory, History, and the Preservation of Archival Records," *Archivaria*, vol. 51 (Spring 2001): 48-80, at pp. 62, fn. 20 and 63, fn. 24. Brothman further displays his familiarity with Foucault in, e.g., Brothman, "The Society of American Archivists at Seventy-Five: Contexts of Continuity and Crisis, A Personal Reflection," *American Archivist*, vol. 74 (Fall/Winter 2011): 387-427. The statements in this paragraph are based upon electronic searches of eleven of Brothman's electronically available articles.

⁸⁴ This conclusion is based upon electronic searches of six electronically available articles apiece from Schwartz and Nesmith (and not including articles co-authored by Schwartz with Cook, already considered earlier). Canadian archivists notably appear to have shown a stronger overall interest in postmodernist ideas than those in any other Anglophone nation, but this mostly has not translated into heavy use or citation of early Foucault. See, e.g., the various articles listed in Joan M. Schwartz and Terry Cook, "Archives, Records, and Power: The Making of Modern Memory," *Archival Science*, vol. 2 (2002):1-19, at pp. 10-11, fn. 17.

archivists are certainly not alone in this. Notable scholars closer to the heart of traditional LIS show some of the same tendency.

One striking example is Michael Olsson, an Australian LIS scholar who used Foucauldian ideas prominently in his doctoral dissertation, which analyzed the “social/discursive construction” of LIS scholar Brenda Dervin.⁸⁵ In his 2007 article in *Library Quarterly* that includes the fullest discussion of Foucault out of all his electronically available articles, Olsson notes, “A crucial conceptual starting point for the study was Michel Foucault’s work on the discursive construction of power/knowledge.”⁸⁶ Yet of the five works by Foucault that Olsson co-cites near the beginning of his article, which include *Order, Archaeology, Discipline and Punish*, and the first volume of *The History of Sexuality* along with an essay from Foucault’s later period, two of these sources (*Order* and the essay) never reappear in the citations, while each of the other three makes only one brief reappearance. Instead, Olsson makes heavy and thoughtful use of various secondary sources that discuss Foucault and Foucauldian discourse, including Paul Rabinow’s *Foucault Reader* (published in 1984)⁸⁷ along with a book and article by Radford, Frohmann’s influential 1992 and 1994 articles, a book by Talja, and others. Several of Olsson’s other articles that do not focus as closely on Foucault each contain three closely parallel passages in which Olsson notes the importance of Foucault’s influence upon his work with a co-citation to *Archaeology, Discipline and Punish*, and *Power/Knowledge* usually plus Rabinow or Derrida, notes Foucault together with Barthes in the context of the postmodernist concept of the “death of the author,” briefly explains Foucault’s belief in the fundamental

⁸⁵ Michael Olsson, “Power/Knowledge: The Discursive Construction of an Author,” *Library Quarterly*, Vol. 77, No. 2 (April 2007): 219-240, at p. 219.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Paul Rabinow, ed., *The Foucault Reader* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984).

subjectivity of knowledge, and includes a quote from Rabinow on that point: “‘For Foucault, there is no external position of certainty, no universal understanding that is beyond history and society’ (Rabinow 1984, 4).”⁸⁸ Later in each article, there is also a reference to Foucault’s notion of the “Battle for Truth.”⁸⁹ Yet beyond these limited appearances, Foucault is mostly absent from the main text and citations of the articles, and Olsson instead relies more on secondary sources, including Talja and Frohmann, especially Frohmann’s 1992 article, as well as his own earlier publications.⁹⁰

The reliance of Olsson, along with many other authors, on Frohmann’s 1992 or 1994 articles as sources regarding Foucauldian concepts relating to discourse is perhaps somewhat ironic, given that, as noted in an earlier section, Foucault, directly, is mostly absent from both these articles, and *Archaeology* and *Order*, usually considered among Foucault’s most key works exploring the concept of discourse, are entirely absent.⁹¹ Instead, in those articles, aside from some relatively minor visible use of *Power/Knowledge*, a collection of essays from Foucault’s later career, Frohmann relies on secondary sources, such as Mark Poster (1984) or Dreyfus and Rabinow (1983).⁹² Indeed, other postmodernist thinkers such as Lyotard and Baudrillard appear

⁸⁸ Michael R. Olsson, “Re-Thinking Our Concept of Users,” *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, vol. 40, no.1 (2009): 22-35, at pp. 22, 23; Olsson, “The Play’s the Thing: Theater Professionals Make Sense of Shakespeare,” *Library & Information Science Research*, vol. 32 (2010): 272–280, at pp. 273-74; Olsson, “All the World’s a Stage – the Information Practices and Sense-Making of Theatre Professionals,” *Libri*, Vol. 60 (September 2010): 241–252, at pp. 241, 244-45.

⁸⁹ Olsson, “Re-Thinking Our Concept of Users,” p. 28; Olsson, “The play's the thing,” p. 278; Olsson, “All the World’s a Stage,” p. 245.

⁹⁰ See the various articles by Olsson listed in the preceding two footnotes, *supra*.

⁹¹ Bernd Frohmann, “The Power of Images: A Discourse Analysis of the Cognitive Viewpoint,” *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 48, no. 4 (1992): 365-386; Frohmann, Discourse Analysis as a Research Method in Library and Information Science,” *Library & Information Science Research*, vol. 16, no. 2 (Spring 1994): 119-138.

⁹² Mark Poster, *Foucault, Marxism, and History: Mode of Production Versus Mode of Information* (Cambridge and New York: Polity Press, 1984); Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).

in the 1992 article almost as prominently as Foucault.⁹³

This relative absence of Foucault from some of Frohmann's most influential works regarding the quintessentially Foucauldian concept of discourse might seem ironic and counterintuitive, particularly given that Frohmann, with an academic background in philosophy⁹⁴ and a long record of demonstrating a strong interest in philosophy and critical theory in his many publications over the past 25 years, is almost certainly better versed in Foucault than all but a scant handful of LIS scholars in the Anglophone world. Certain later publications showcase Frohmann's fluency and familiarity with Foucault much more than the earlier articles, though except for Frohmann's 2001 article, they, too, usually make relatively little if any use of *Archaeology or Order*.⁹⁵ Also, although the articles from the early 1990s of course got a long head start in the race to accumulate citations, few of Frohmann's other articles yet come anywhere close to showing the extent of impact on other LIS scholars seen with the oft-cited 1992 and 1994 articles.⁹⁶

For another striking example of relatively limited use of Foucault by an LIS scholar who is eminently well-equipped to use him, and who has a substantial and demonstrated interest in the sorts of issues and concepts traditionally associated with Foucault, there is Ronald Day, one of the few LIS scholars who might rival Bernd Frohmann in his level of sophistication,

⁹³ Frohmann, "The Power of Images," *supra* note 91.

⁹⁴ See Frohmann's curriculum vitae, available at his faculty web page: <http://www.fims.uwo.ca/people/faculty/frohmann/>.

⁹⁵ See, e.g., Frohmann, "Discourse and Documentation: Some Implications for Pedagogy and Research," *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, vol. 42, no. 1 (Winter, 2001): 12-26; Frohmann, "Documentary ethics, ontology, and politics," *Archival Science*, vol. 8 (2008): 165-180 (uses two works of later Foucault, none of early Foucault); Frohmann, "Subjectivity and Information Ethics," *JASIST*, vol. 59, no. 2 (2008): 267-277 (an example of an article that makes some use of *Archaeology*, but much more of later Foucault).

⁹⁶ As another seeming example of the same phenomenon, Jacob's 2004 article, which addresses Foucauldian ideas but barely mentions Foucault, has been cited 42 times, while her earlier articles that delve into Foucault and *Order* more deeply have been cited markedly less (23 times cumulatively).

familiarity, and fluency regarding a wide range of abstruse postmodernist authors and writings, together with other critical theory and philosophy. As noted in an earlier section, Day's 2005 article in *ARIST* on poststructuralism is one of the most important, in-depth explorations of postmodernism yet to appear in the LIS literature, and it digs deeply into Foucault's work along with that of other postmodernist figures.⁹⁷ Yet aside from that one striking foray, Foucault seems to be generally more notable for his absence from most of the rest of Day's oeuvre, with usually only cameo appearances in other articles.⁹⁸ Perhaps tellingly, even in Day's excellent, thought-provoking book regarding the history of discourse in the LIS field, Foucault appears only once in a footnote.⁹⁹

Although six authors, three from the archival arena and three not, do not make a very large sample, it nevertheless seems curious and suggestive that several notable LIS scholars, probably representing a substantial core of those LIS scholars most familiar with and able to visibly use and cite Foucault, *Archaeology*, and *Order*, mostly refrain from doing so even while recognizing Foucault's importance either explicitly or implicitly. Although each of the authors in this small and relatively special set of scholars might have had his own personal and particular reasons for not making greater visible use of *Archaeology* or *Order*, their seeming pattern of relative hesitance, disinterest, or other disinclination toward making greater use of Foucault's early works appears to parallel the wider pattern found in this study of relatively limited, mostly generalized use of these works by other LIS scholars who are likely to be far less conversant

⁹⁷ Day, "Poststructuralism and Information Studies," *supra* note 7.

⁹⁸ See, e.g., Ronald E. Day, "The 'Conduit Metaphor' and The Nature and Politics of Information Studies," *JASIST*, vol. 51, no. 9 (2000):805–811, at p. 809, fn. 10; Day, "Tropes, History, and Ethics in Professional Discourse and Information Science," *JASIST*, vol. 51, no. 5 (2000): 469-475, at p. 472, fn. 9; Day, "Community as Event." *Library Trends*, vol. 52, no. 3 (2004): 408-426, at p. 414.

⁹⁹ Ronald E. Day, *The Modern Invention of Information: Discourse, History, and Power* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2001), p. 123, fn. 2.

with Foucault or postmodernism. That is, both scholars near the top of the LIS field in terms of theoretical sophistication regarding postmodernism, and scholars with other, more usual preoccupations, perhaps seem to overlook *Archaeology* and *Order* more than might be expected. If so, that may raise the question whether the theoretical leaders and the rest of the field are all responding in the same way spontaneously, or whether the rest of the field might be following the cues they are receiving from the theoretical leaders?

In certain fundamental ways, of course, theoretically sophisticated scholars are, by definition, differently situated from those of us who are less so. Scholars who are already conversant with a broad range of theory and theoretical works are better able to pick and choose among those works for the right works to serve their specific needs, just as a skilled artisan knows which is the best tool for a particular task. Thus, scholars such as Brothman, Day, and Frohmann don't have to reach for Foucault for their theoretical needs (as some of the rest of us might); they can (and do) equally well draw on other authors such as Baudrillard, Deleuze, or Lyotard (or Habermas, or Heidegger), most of whom remain relatively unknown in the LIS field.¹⁰⁰ Thus they can be more selective about how and when to pull out Foucault. Notably, for example, in the three cases identified in this study (outside of his 2005 *ARIST* article) where Day cites early Foucault, he selects *Order* rather than the more usual *Archaeology*, and he uses *Order* for specific concepts that are particularly present there and not as much in other of Foucault's works, such as classification or the eighteenth-century "question of man."¹⁰¹ The same applies when Brothman uses *Archaeology* regarding the specific issue of multiple temporalities. Thus, theoretical leaders, with a wider range of more precise theoretical tools at their disposal, can

¹⁰⁰ See, e.g., Cronin and Meho, "Receiving the French," *supra* note 2, at p. 401.

¹⁰¹ See, e.g., the sources cited in note 98, *supra*.

more easily choose when to use Foucault and when not to. Yet it remains intriguing how often they choose not to.

B. Preference for Secondary Sources

Yet another advantage theoretically sophisticated and knowledgeable LIS scholars have over the rest of us is that in addition to having greater awareness and familiarity with original sources such as Foucault, they also have greater familiarity with the various secondary sources that help to explicate such original sources. As such, even if they wish to use ideas that appear in or are especially associated with Foucault's works, they do not have to use those works directly, and can turn to other sources that may explain those ideas in ways that may be easier for readers to follow and understand. Although at first glance an author's deliberate use of secondary sources to say what Foucault says might appear only to be a form of intellectual laziness, it might instead be calculated to maximize clarity and impact for readers, as well as to avoid getting on the potentially slippery slope of trying to neatly and accurately summarize exactly what Foucault said, and meant, on a particular topic. Thus, where an author is familiar with both Foucault's original works and a secondary author's explanation of parts of them, and where the citing author finds that the secondary author did an unusually good job of clarifying Foucault's meaning, the citing author may be well justified in using the secondary work, and pointing readers toward it, instead of to the original—especially with works as complex and non-self-explanatory as Foucault's.¹⁰²

¹⁰² See, e.g., Patrick Wilson, "Bibliographic Instruction and Cognitive Authority," *Library Trends*, vol. 39, no. 3 (1991): 259-270, at p. 264 (noting "Michel Foucault's *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1972), a famous but abstract and difficult work that is hard to imagine serving as a textbook in an advanced [bibliographic instruction] course"); Rachel Hardiman, "En mal d'archive: Postmodernist Theory and Recordkeeping," *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, vol. 30, no. 1 (April 2009): 27-44, at p. 36 (noting "the criticism of Michel de Certeau that in Foucault's writing, both the sources themselves and the links between them and his conclusions remain opaque").

In keeping with this, it is interesting to note how Terry Cook, who mostly does not cite Foucault at more than a general level yet who emphasizes the crucial importance of both *Archaeology* and *Order* for archival scholars, immediately also offers some recommended secondary sources as a helpful introduction to Foucault's works—clearly and explicitly recognizing that most uninitiated scholars will need some secondary source as a guide. Although most other scholars in the group discussed above are not so overt, nevertheless, for a scholar who is versed in Foucault to discuss Foucault's ideas using secondary sources is fairly clearly signaling to readers, first, that it is acceptable to draw on good secondary sources for help in understanding Foucault, and, second, that at least in some contexts, these secondary sources may be preferable to the original, certainly at least for gaining a working familiarity and a practical ability to use Foucault's ideas. Such scholars are, in effect, tacitly encouraging the use of secondary sources at the very least in conjunction with exploration of Foucault's original works; in actual practice, given human nature, the message received might be that it is all right to use the secondary sources instead of the originals. The latter message might come across particularly strongly especially where scholars give relatively little indication of having used Foucault themselves in more than a relatively general way.

Another factor that could be at work regarding theoretically sophisticated scholars, and another way they differ from most of the rest of us, is that they are likely to be more aware of the actual complexity of Foucault's work and the difficulty and danger of trying to neatly and concisely summarize writing that frankly often resists such neat repackaging. As such, for example, it is likely much easier for those of us who are relatively uninitiated to go to a particular page of Foucault, see an enticing quote regarding some Foucauldian concept such as "the archive" or "discursive formations," and take it out of context, assuming we understand

sufficiently what it means, and that Foucault's meaning is reasonably straightforward and self-explanatory as in most authors' books. More theoretically sophisticated scholars who are better versed in Foucault, however, might be aware that any one concept in Foucault usually is linked closely and conditionally to an almost endless array of other, often complex concepts, few of them self-explanatory and perhaps dangerous to take out of context. At any rate, this is another possible reason why some scholars who are quite familiar with Foucault and emphasize his importance and influence nevertheless make limited visible, specific use of his works or rely more on secondary sources.

Whether theoretically sophisticated scholars are indeed signaling to the rest of us how to use or not use Foucault and the rest of us mostly are following those cues, or whether the rest of us are coming to the same general conclusions on our own, the fact remains that, as noted above, the scholarly use of *Archaeology* and *Order* in the LIS field remains comparatively limited as well as often vague and generalized. This is especially striking given the overall popularity of discourse analysis in the field, and the fact that *Archaeology* is the single work by Foucault most closely associated with discourse, plus the additional fact that Foucauldian discourse analysis is by now one of the most dominant varieties of discourse analysis (though certainly not the only one, as various theoretically sophisticated LIS scholars are quick to point out).

Along with the comparatively limited use and vagueness of use, it appears likely that many LIS scholars may be following the example of the scholars discussed above by getting most of their Foucauldian discourse analysis from secondary sources rather than delving directly into Foucault's works. That is perhaps especially obvious with the 88 articles (ten percent of the original total of 886 articles) in which Foucault's name only appears in the article as part of the title of a cited secondary source (sometimes an article by the Radfords, who usually include

Foucault's name in their article titles). The same sort of primary reliance on secondary sources is likely at work in many of the 238 journal articles that mentioned Foucault's name but did not cite any of his works. Moreover, it likely is still at work with a substantial percentage of those articles that do cite *Archaeology* or *Order*, particularly if the citation was highly general or in passing (or only in the bibliography). For instance, a relatively typical mention of the general concept of discourse, together with a non-specific citation of *Archaeology* (the entire book), could mean one of a few different things: the author might be indicating that she had indeed read all of *Archaeology* and knows what is in there, including the extended discussion of discourse; she could be indicating that she had at least read through some or all of the passages specifically concerning discourse; she could be trying to make it look as though she is familiar with the book when she really isn't (as we scholars do from time to time); she could be making no claim to familiarity with the contents of the book, but merely be using the book as a general placeholder for the concept of discourse with which it is so closely associated while giving a respectful nod toward Foucault; or she could be making no claim to familiarity but be helpfully pointing readers toward an additional source of information that she knows is respected regarding the topic of discourse. With some of these possibilities, there may be little difference in practice between a passing reference with a citation and a passing reference without a citation. With all of these possibilities, even where the author is truthfully flaunting the fact that she has read the entire book, in terms of the actual writing of her article, she is still likely to be relying more on secondary sources that speak directly to her particular issues of concern and help to focus thinking about them. The same, ironically, often will tend to be true even in cases where an author includes page numbers or a quotation, because a helpful secondary source often may have been the actual original source of the idea or quotation used, even if the author then went and

found the same quote in the original. For that reason, Olsson’s practice of explicitly quoting Foucault through Rabinow rather than directly, for example, might provide fuller disclosure regarding the actual process by which the ideas in a particular publication were assembled.

C. Possible Incentives for Display of Use of Foucault Rather than Use of Foucault?

Along with Cook’s explicit but generalized urging of scholars to consider Foucault’s early works, and the more tacit similar message from other scholars described above, and the overall generality of citations and uses, the dearth of page numbers, and so on—another related example of use/nonuse of Foucault and his early works is perhaps further illuminating of the wider overall phenomenon that this study seems to be finding at work.

In his 2002 article, “The Myth of the Computer Hacker,” Reid Skibell observes,

This explanation of how the myth was formed will rely on the work of Michel Foucault, and specifically his understanding of discursive formation. Rather than digressing into a full discussion of Foucault’s thought, which is available in great detail in other places, it will be assumed that the reader has some familiarity with his work. In *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault reconsiders his earlier project of *Madness and Civilization* and argues that the emergence of a discipline is not isolated to changes in one field of knowledge, but rather that its claim to legitimacy, and thus its authority, cut across many fields (Foucault 1972a). This is exactly what happened with computer hacking, where the concept was constituted by knowledge in a variety of disciplines and texts, and also projected knowledge back onto them.¹⁰³

In an article that delves thoughtfully and repeatedly into the generalized concept of discourse analysis, the passage above constitutes the sole mention of either *Archaeology* or *Order*—in this case *Archaeology*, notably without a page number. Moreover, there is only one other citation of any work by Foucault in the article—a relatively general use of *Discipline and*

¹⁰³ Reid Skibell, “The Myth of the Computer Hacker,” *Information, Communication & Society*, vol. 5, no. 3 (2002): 336-356, at p. 339. Skibell and his worthy article emphatically are not here being singled out for criticism, but rather are merely being used as an appropriate example of a much wider sociological phenomenon.

Punish regarding the psychology and discursive character of a society's penal system (again with no page number),¹⁰⁴ plus two more references in passing to Foucauldian concepts and a separate listing of the *Discourse on Language* in the article's bibliography.

Both generalized citations of Foucault's work in Skibell's article appear to both concisely and accurately summarize particular important concepts in Foucault's work; they thus tend to confirm that Skibell indeed has the familiarity with Foucault that he assumes his readers will share. For purposes of this study, though, the potential sociological signaling significance of the passage above is perhaps most interesting, when considered in the context of a wider discursive fabric of similar explicit or implicit signals to a wider scholarly community.

To analyze and dissect the key statement more closely, consider it again: "Rather than digressing into a full discussion of Foucault's thought, which is available in great detail in other places, it will be assumed that the reader has some familiarity with his work." After announcing that Foucault's concept of discursive formation/s is central to the article and necessary for understanding it, Skibell first notes, explicitly like Cook, that a fuller discussion of Foucault's specific ideas here would be an unnecessary digression; second, indicates that such discussion can be found in "other places," presumably secondary sources, though unlike Cook, Skibell is not specific about his recommendations; and third, again unlike Cook but probably like a good many other scholars, Skibell assumes readers' familiarity with Foucault.

This latter assumption potentially operates at several different levels, intellectually or sociologically/discursively. It may be a generally accurate assumption: the readers of this article in this journal may in fact generally be already familiar enough with Foucault's ideas to not need additional explication here to understand the rest of the article. At that level, the statement says,

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, at p. 342.

more or less, “We all know this already.” To the extent if any that the assumption is not entirely accurate, and some readers who have stumbled upon the article really are not up to speed with Foucault, the passage alludes generally to other places to find the missing information and says, in effect, “Readers *should* have familiarity with Foucault’s work.” Combining “We all know this already” with “Readers should have familiarity with Foucault’s work,” however, tends to create a new sociological dynamic in the assumption, probably entirely unintentionally on Skibell’s (or other authors’) part; it sort of says, in marketing-psychology terms, “Anybody who is anybody is already familiar with Foucault’s work.”

The sociological signaling function of that latter implicit statement leads in at least two (or three, or four?) possible directions. First, it creates a sociological incentive for laggards to get up to speed with Foucault’s ideas, so that they can actively join in the discussion and, in effect, speak the same language as “the cool kids” who already are fluently conversant in Foucauldianese. Second, and perhaps somewhat more dangerously, it creates a strong incentive for people to convey the impression that they are conversant, even if they really are not. [And third, and fourth: such a statement could also potentially trigger rejection responses, either active/hostile toward Foucault and his disciples, or passive/ignoring them.]

Given the sociological incentives at work, together with the human realities of limited time, limited energy, and the eternal temptation of intellectual laziness, explicit or implicit statements conveying a message similar to Skibell’s, and repeated countless times throughout a scholarly community’s discourse, may tend in practice to create a relatively strong incentive for community members to display familiarity with Foucault—and in so doing, act like “the cool kids”—together with a relatively weak incentive to delve extensively into Foucault’s work, or even perhaps into secondary works—given that “the cool kids” who “all know this already”

have, explicitly or implicitly, indicated that it is not particularly necessary to use the already known material with great precision. All this may tend toward an academic community's culture and discourse reflecting a relatively high frequency of emblems of display—passing name references, highly generalized citations mostly without page numbers, and the like, which indicate at least a shallow familiarity with the person and works mentioned but leave uncertain and may tend to mask the actual depth of understanding underneath the level of display—together with a relatively low frequency of substantial uses of works that more clearly demonstrate, in themselves, actual depth of understanding. In short, the sociological incentives and tendencies described above may tend, almost inevitably, to push toward turning a popular author and his or her ideas into a sort of fad or fashion statement, primarily for display. To the extent that happens, it will necessarily tend to distance the discourse in actual circulation from the original author and original sources.

D. Temporal Dimensions to the Disappearance of the Author

To veer perhaps slightly in the direction of Brien Brothman with his special interest in historicity and multiple temporalities, there is also an interesting and important temporal aspect to this whole process of progressive removal from an original author and original sources. That is, even assuming that at a certain point in time everybody within a particular scholarly community was indeed entirely conversant with a certain important body of literature and ideas—or in other words, assuming that Skibell's assumption was indeed entirely correct at the moment he (and others) made it—such an assumption likely will not and cannot apply to a later time when the interest and immediacy of that body of literature has faded. Yet ironically, because the community members at the time “all knew this already,” they also felt no need, or at

least only a lesser need, to leave careful signposts regarding their understandings and interpretations of that body of literature—such as specific supporting discussions of particular important concepts and ideas, or page numbers. Viewed from a longer-term temporal perspective, their discussions of the popular concepts of their time can become like an archival collection with missing provenance and other missing metadata; certain ideas and their origins that “everybody already knew,” and which thus might have seemed entirely evident to them, may be left in effect only hanging in the air, or seeming to appear abruptly from nowhere, to later readers.

Also perhaps ironically, the evidence in this study suggests that this process of ideas and concepts erasing their own footprints through the sociological practice of discourse may tend to be inevitably magnified and accelerated with the most popular works and ideas. At first glance, this may seem counterintuitive; certainly the works that make the greatest splash, that leave the deepest imprints on a community, should also leave the deepest, clearest tracks for others to follow? Yet in practice, the more proper analogy might be an explosion, or a flooding river, that suddenly washes away or destroys familiar signposts, landmarks, and records and leaves in its wake a trackless waste of confusion; or perhaps a desert sandstorm, covering over familiar markers with layers of sediment and leaving an unrecognizable landscape.

The key point here may be that although this process of erosion or sedimentation and covering over of memory and understanding is always inevitable and ongoing in the human realm, it can actually happen more quickly and explosively precisely regarding those ideas with the widest currency and popularity at a given moment in time: that which does not need to be explained will not be explained, and thus ultimately will cover its own tracks and pass into the realm of myth, or unmoored discourse, even more rapidly than smaller and more plodding

intellectual currents. In short, there may be a particular risk for that which “everybody knows” to soon become something that nobody really knows, at least not in much detail. Perhaps an analogy to evolutionary biology is appropriate: just as fruit flies can change and evolve away from any original settled evolutionary state far more rapidly than can slower-reproducing elephants or oak trees, so the higher rate of “reproduction” (or frequency, replication, etc.) of popular ideas during a discursive “feeding frenzy” can more rapidly unmoor and distance those ideas from their original sources than with less popular, slower-replicating ideas. In sum: intellectual popularity, rather than establishing deeper and clearer footprints associated with original sources as might traditionally be expected, instead may only accelerate the rate of change that erases links to original ideas. Even if the ideas in fact have a heavy impact, they and their footprints may be, ironically, harder to trace. An active discursive formation is thus inherently an engine of rapid change, or as Foucault put it, a “system of dispersion.”¹⁰⁵

Continuing in a temporal vein, this study provides some suggestive quantitative data tending to support the hypothesis of the gradual erasure of key works of Foucault from the very discourse they helped to form, and to which they are (or are supposed to be) conceptually central and crucial. This study grew out of an earlier, abortive study of postmodernist ideas in LIS that revealed intriguing if impressionistic indications of visible interest in specific postmodernist writers tending to rise, then recede, in the LIS journal literature. That study never reached the point of gathering quantifiable evidence of that possible trend. This study, however, does provide relatively convincing quantitative data indicating that visible interest in and substantial use of *Archaeology* and *Order* may have peaked between 2005 and 2007—which, if so, roughly matches the impressionistic tentative timeframe from the earlier study, also. This study’s data

¹⁰⁵ Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge*, p. 173.

shows a fairly clear overall decline in substantial use of the two works starting in 2008 and continuing since; should that trend continue, it would appear that *Archaeology* and *Order* may be doomed to largely disappear from the very discourse regarding discourse that they helped so much to stimulate, except perhaps for an occasional passing reference or quotation out of context—rather like Foucault’s famous “face in the sand” quote at the end of *The Order of Things*.¹⁰⁶

E. “Crowding Out” and the Principle of Least Effort

The tendency toward generalized citations concerning generalized topics may go with a parallel tendency toward using the name of a major, well-known work by Foucault to cover virtually any concepts associated with Foucault, even if the book in question may not be the work of Foucault most closely associated with the concept in question. So, for example, *Archaeology* is frequently used as a general placeholder for the concept of Discourse; but so is *Discipline and Punish*. Similarly, *Archaeology* sometimes appears to be used as a placeholder for Foucault’s ideas about the relationship between power and knowledge, which were indeed starting to appear in *Archaeology* (and more so in the slightly later *Discourse on Language*), but are perhaps more clearly associated with *Power/Knowledge* or *Discipline and Punish*. If this is indeed a trend, it would appear to be a trend ultimately favoring *Discipline and Punish* as the universal catch-all placeholder for Foucauldian concepts (including any such concepts more closely associated with *Archaeology* or other works).¹⁰⁷ Notably, though, even if there is such a

¹⁰⁶ Foucault, *The Order of Things*, at p. 422.

¹⁰⁷ Anthropologist and *Order*-user F. Allan Hanson, in an e-mail message, communicated his impression that scholars were generally shifting toward using and citing mostly just *Discipline and Punish*. Although this study did not undertake a fine-grained analysis of LIS scholars’ use of *Discipline and Punish*, the study results generally seemed to point in a similar direction—of *Discipline and Punish* becoming increasingly dominant and gradually tending to crowd out other works. Of course, in the new, post-9/11 digital economy and security environment,

trend, it would appear that those scholars who are especially concerned with classification tend to know that *Order* is really the “right” or best Foucault work to cite for that concept.

If *Discipline and Punish* is in fact tending to gradually crowd out *Archaeology* and other works by Foucault, that may raise a question whether a similar sort of crowding-out process might be inevitable, or at least probable, any time there are multiple works on a topic offering parallel insights, but readers pressed for time tend to gravitate only toward the one that is best known? At any rate, a similar phenomenon might have happened in the archival arena, and not just involving works by Foucault. Not only does there seem to be the same growing tendency among archivists to prefer *Discipline and Punish* to *Archaeology* (and especially *Order*), but also, strikingly, among the relatively few visible substantial uses of Foucault by archivists identified in this study, two of them—Richard Brown’s 1991 and 1995 articles in *Archivaria*—notably predated the appearance of Jacques Derrida’s *Archive Fever* in 1995.¹⁰⁸ Since then, some archival scholars have addressed Foucault’s concept of the archive,¹⁰⁹ either in conjunction with or separate from discussion of Derrida—but the traffic in Foucault’s ideas on the archive is minute compared to the discussion of Derrida. It appears that *Archive Fever* may have crowded out *Archaeology*’s section on the archive.

Archaeology and *Order* may also be, to some extent, victims of a chronological process of crowding out based upon both when they became available in English and when they were

surveillance and “Panopticism” are perennial hot topics (and may perhaps lead toward some degree of topical crowding out, also, as such?).

¹⁰⁸ Jacques Derrida, *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996 [English language translation of an original version in French]). Earlier translated versions appeared in Anglophone journals in 1995. See, e.g., Derrida with Eric Prenowitz (transl.), “Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression,” *Diacritics*, vol. 25, no. 2 (Summer 1995): 9-63.

¹⁰⁹ And, as noted in an earlier section, they are almost the only LIS scholars who do, even though, as other disciplines have recognized, Foucault’s concept of the archive is not necessarily only limited to the context of actual archives.

discovered by the LIS field. Although *Order*, *Archaeology*, and *Discipline and Punish* first appeared in French in 1966, 1969, and 1975 respectively, their appearance in English was more compressed: 1970, 1972, and 1977. *Order* thus did not have long to circulate in the Anglophone world before *Archaeology* in a sense landed on top of it, and neither had all that long before *Discipline and Punish* was available for scholars to turn to as their single, or at least primary, source of Foucault.

This compressed publication process may not have mattered so much for the LIS field, which mostly shows relatively little sign of awareness of Foucault or any other postmodernist writers before about 1990, except to the extent that LIS incorporation of Foucault may have (and probably actually) reflected the appropriation patterns of neighboring disciplines that became the main conduits for transmission of Foucauldian ideas into LIS. Instead, though, for LIS, a relative latecomer to poststructuralist theory in general,¹¹⁰ all of Foucault's works in effect may have appeared at the same time, on top of each other, with *Discipline and Punish* already available to start crowding out other works from the outset. This might partly help to explain not only why *Archaeology* casts such an obvious shadow over *Order*, but why *Discipline and Punish* appears to overshadow both of them to the extent it does.

Returning to the matter of secondary sources, but also touching on the question of tertiary use addressed in this study: the seeming pattern of some degree of avoidance of Foucault's original works and preference for more accessible secondary sources also seems to surface in the tertiary use of secondary articles that make very substantial use of *Archaeology* or *Order*. That is, it appears that frequently, those sources that delve especially deeply into Foucault and explore his ideas in relatively great detail are visibly used and cited far less often than articles that focus

¹¹⁰ See, e.g., Cronin and Meho, "Receiving the French," *supra* note 2, at p. 407 (finding LIS scholars "more laggards than early adopters" regarding postmodernist ideas and sources).

less on Foucault but provide more readily accessible exposure to more generalized Foucauldian ideas as filtered through secondary sources.

This overall pattern perhaps appears most starkly by comparing the reception of Day's 2005 article in *ARIST* to the reception of Frohmann's 1992 and 1994 articles (particularly the 1992 article). And here it should be acknowledged that, as anybody who takes even a very amateur excursion into citation analysis is bound to observe, even popular articles often take some time to build "citation momentum" (to coin a phrase, if somebody else hasn't done so already), so the date of publication can matter a great deal, and obviously, articles published in the early 1990s have a long head start in building citation momentum over ones published in the twenty-first century. At the same time, though, there are bound to be plenty of articles from the 1990s that never gained much citation traction (such as Hannabuss (1996), which delved into Foucault deeply), and there are articles from the early twenty-oughts that already have been cited dozens of times (such as Jacob's 2004 article, which barely mentions Foucault but has, in the citation race, far outstripped her 1998 and 2001 articles that discuss Foucault at greater length). At any rate, Frohmann's 1992 and 1994 articles, which barely mention Foucault although they generally, and energetically, explore Foucauldian discourse, have been embraced by a good many LIS scholars; Day's 2005 article seemingly mostly has not been.¹¹¹

As noted in a previous section, Day's 2005 article in *ARIST* has been cited 17 times so far in the Web of Science, seven of those by scholars with a demonstrated interest in Foucault's ideas. Also as noted at various points previously, Day's article is among the richest explorations of Foucault's ideas yet to appear in the LIS journal literature. But it is not an easy article to read and process. Day accurately reflects the complexity of Foucault's thought, and as such, his

¹¹¹ See also the relative reception of Elin Jacobs' articles that dig into Foucault compared to one that only mentions him, *supra* note 96.

article demands a significant amount of effort and patience to wrap one's mind around it.¹¹² The comparatively modest rate of citation of Day's article suggests that most readers may not have expended that effort.

By contrast, Frohmann's 1992 and 1994 articles—particularly the especially influential 1992 article—mostly steer clear of the sometimes tangled actual complexity of Foucault's thoughts and writings and introduce readers to the Foucauldian concept of discourse in a much more accessible manner that relies less on Foucault and more on secondary discussions of Foucault or of Foucauldian ideas. The 1992 article is clear, concise, forcefully written, and includes an exciting, almost bomb-throwing aspect in its critique of other, non-critical, non-Foucauldian varieties of discourse analysis.¹¹³ The 1994 article is similarly punchy, announcing at the outset how “The kind of discourse analysis practiced by Michel Foucault and his followers is a useful research method in [LIS],” but thereafter spending relatively little time or attention on Foucault and never getting bogged down in the details of Foucault's specific thoughts.¹¹⁴

In sum, although Day's article and Frohmann's two articles all provide excellent exposure to concepts related to Foucault and discourse, Frohmann's two more readily accessible articles have been embraced and appropriated by the LIS community; Day's article mostly has not been (yet). The LIS market appears to have found Frohmann's articles more readily accessible and usable. Although Day perhaps helps readers to understand nuances of Foucault

¹¹² The author of the present study freely confesses that he had to read the article twice, separated by time and other authors' discussion of postmodernist ideas, before he felt like he really “got it.” It is, moreover, a fairly lengthy article, which along with its complexity means that it requires a significant investment of time. For the record, the author also feels that Day's article is an excellent contribution to the understanding of poststructuralist and Foucauldian ideas in the LIS field; but it doesn't come easily. As such, although Day's fine article probably deserves more attention and citations than it seems to have received, it is also perhaps understandable why it hasn't.

¹¹³ Frohmann, “The Power of Images,” *supra* note 91. For the record, the author of the present study considers Frohmann's 1992 article to be stimulating, even brilliant in its challenge to then-conventional ideas within the LIS field.

¹¹⁴ Frohmann, “Discourse Analysis as a Research Method,” *supra* note 7, at p. 119.

better than Frohmann's early articles in which Foucault is mostly invisible, Frohmann apparently helps to expose readers to ideas regarding critical and Foucauldian theory of discourse that they can use and run with better than Day. And the LIS market, seemingly, has spoken.

Nor is the relative under-appreciation of Day's valuable contribution the only example of this phenomenon. As noted in an earlier section, both Stuart Hannabuss' and Luke Tredinnick's valuable and extensive discussions of Foucault's thought have received almost no citations. Tredinnick's article is even younger than Day's, but Hannabuss' is already almost twenty years old, only four years younger than Frohman's 1992 contribution. Although it might be argued that Hannabuss and Tredinnick published in the "wrong" journal (*Aslib Proceedings*), they nevertheless did publish, and their articles were quite findable for those who were looking. As with Day, the general neglect of their significant contributions indicates that although LIS scholars may be interested in discourse analysis, they are not necessarily interested in tracing such analysis to its roots or in exploring Foucault's specific ideas in much detail.¹¹⁵

The Radfords might seem to represent an exception to this observed pattern, in that, cumulatively, their various articles addressing Foucauldian ideas have been cited relatively frequently (a total of 129 times) even though each of these articles devotes considerable attention specifically to Foucault.¹¹⁶ This could be partly because the Radfords are clearly masters of catchy titles and topics that might stimulate interest beyond the usual limited audience for studies regarding Foucault.¹¹⁷ The Radfords also manage to keep their discussion of Foucault and his

¹¹⁵ The same goes for the overall neglect and lack of citation traction regarding Malone and Elichirigoity's 2001 article and Humphries' 1998 article, discussed in the preceding section.

¹¹⁶ This citation tally also only includes the Radfords' articles that address *Archaeology*, *Order*, or the Discourse on Language, not others that do not.

¹¹⁷ E.g., "Positivism, Foucault, and the Fantasia of the Library," "Power, Knowledge, and Fear: Feminism, Foucault, and the Stereotype of the Female Librarian," "Flaubert, Foucault, and the Bibliotheque Fantastique," "Libraries, Librarians, and the Discourse of Fear," "Trapped in Our Own Discursive Formations," and, perhaps most of all,

ideas relatively accessible and engaging for non-specialist readers, sometimes drawing on Foucault more for illustrative examples rather than attempting systematic explanation. Finally, with a series of articles that often address related topics, the Radfords also have an unusually high rate of tertiary authors citing several of their articles in the same article—for instance, Andersen and Skouvig cite five of the Radfords’ articles in their one article, Haider and Bawden cite four in the same article, and four articles written or co-written by Buschman account for 11 of the 129 total citations (nearly ten percent)—along with a relatively high rate of self-citation (18 out of 129).

F. Journal Presence and Penetration

Based on the findings in this study, attention to Foucault, and particularly to *Archaeology* or *Order*, tends to be localized to certain journals in the LIS field. Notwithstanding this, however, awareness of Foucault and his ideas nevertheless has spread broadly throughout the LIS world, even surfacing in journals rather different from the “usual suspect” journals that publish most commentary regarding Foucauldian ideas. As such, while there is a clear core where most discussion of Foucault is located, there is also a notable dispersal to the periphery of the LIS field.

As noted in an earlier section, there tends to be a pronounced concentration of Foucault scholarship among particular journals on the list analyzed for this study. Moreover, the overall pattern observed regarding direct use of Foucault tends to be confirmed by the tertiary use of notable users of Foucauldian ideas.

Again, the roster of journals including most citations of *Archaeology* or *Order* reads as

“Librarians and Party Girls.” Perhaps notably, “Structuralism, Post-Structuralism, and the Library: De Saussure and Foucault” has been less of a hit in the citation arena.

follows: 1. *Archival Science*; 2. *JASIST*; 3. *Archivaria*; 4. *Library Quarterly*; 5. *Information & Organization*; 6. *Information Research*; 7. *Journal of Documentation*; 8. *Library Trends*; 9. *First Monday*; 10. *Information, Communication & Society*; 11. *Organization Science*; 12. *Library & Information Science Review*; 13. *Ethics & Information Technology*; 14. *Information Processing & Management*; 15. *Social Science Computer Review*; 16. *ARIST*.

Adjusting this list to focus on those journals including the most significant use of *Archaeology or Order*, the roster becomes: 1. *Library Quarterly*; 2. *Journal of Documentation*; 3. *Archivaria*; 4. *Archival Science*; 5. *JASIST*; 6. *Library Trends*; 7. *ARIST*; 8. *Aslib Proceedings* [followed by several journals that each show one significant or substantial use, including *LISR* and *Information Research*].

Although the Web of Science system unfortunately does not include *Archival Science* or *Archivaria*, otherwise, the roster of journals showing the most extensive tertiary use of very substantial secondary users of *Archaeology or Order* tracks the list for the most significant direct use of *Archaeology or Order* fairly closely: 1. *Library Quarterly*; 2. *Journal of Documentation*; 3. *ARIST*; 4. *JASIST*; 5. *LISR*; 6. *Information Research*; 7. *Library Trends*.

The journals showing elevated concentrations of Foucault scholarship tend to be among the intellectually “outward-looking” journals in the LIS field—those that hold open the door to contact and communication with disciplines outside of LIS as well as with multiple subfields or subdivisions within LIS. So, for instance, *Archival Science* is notable for hosting articles written by non-archivists (including Bernd Frohmann’s 2001 article in the very first volume of the newly founded journal), while *Library Quarterly* and the *Journal of Documentation* similarly have hosted articles written by archivists about archival issues. These journals also generally show a heightened interest in theory, including critical theory, unlike various other LIS journals that may

have a more practical focus concerning their respective particular areas of interest.

Among those journals that were found in this study to show no visible interest in Foucault whatsoever, whether early or late or even a passing name reference, such journals often have a relatively obvious and practical special focus—for example, *Journal of Cheminformatics*, *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, *Journal of Business and Finance Librarianship*, *Journal of Web Librarianship*, *Library Management*, *Library Resources and Technical Services*, *Science and Technology Libraries*. The same generally applies to the substantial number of journals that included no citations of *Archaeology* or *Order*.¹¹⁸ Notably regarding this latter group, though, although these journals showed no visible interest in *Archaeology* or *Order*, all of them did include citations of other works or at least name references to Foucault—in most cases only one or two, but *Behavioral and Social Sciences Librarian* and *Serials Librarian* both have six apiece, while *Reference Librarian* had seven. Such journals thus do not show a total lack of interest or awareness regarding Foucault, though some of them may reflect the overall shift of interest toward later Foucault noted in this study.¹¹⁹

Perhaps somewhat strikingly, also, the study results found Foucault and *Archaeology* or *Order* spreading far beyond the “core” journals listed above and showing up occasionally in some of the same sorts of journals that might have been expected to be non-users, like those mentioned in the preceding paragraph. So, for instance, various relatively practically focused

¹¹⁸ For instance, *Behavioral and Social Sciences Librarian*, *Collection Building*, *Education & Information Technologies*, *Health Information and Libraries Journal*, *Information Retrieval*, *Journal of Interlibrary Loan* (etc.), *Library Collections*, *Acquisition & Technical Services*, *Library Hi Tech*, *Library Hi Tech News*, *Reference Librarian*, *Serials Librarian*, *Serials Review*, and *Technical Services Quarterly* (among others).

¹¹⁹ One journal on this latter list that perhaps warrants special mention is *Scientometrics*, which had no citations of *Archaeology* or *Order* but had eleven articles mentioning Foucault. These typically did not involve writers using Foucault’s works or ideas in any way to craft arguments as in a typical journal article, but rather were usually related to bibliometric monitoring of Foucault’s citation footprint and impact, usually among many other authors. At any rate, Foucault is unquestionably a bibliometric presence on the scholarly landscape, and *Scientometrics* and its contributing authors are aware of him.

journals each showed one article citing *Archaeology* or *Order*.¹²⁰ In a few cases—*Electronic Library*, *IEEE Transactions*, and *Online Information Review*—this was the lowest category of visible use, “Bibliography Only,” but the *Journal of Information Technology* actually included one of the rare Very Substantial uses (Brooke 2002). Also notably, as with some of the journals alluded to in the preceding paragraph, most of the journals referred to in this paragraph evinced a significantly more active interest in other, later Foucault. Thus, for example, the *Government Information Quarterly* showed nine articles using other, probably later Foucault or otherwise mentioning him, possibly related to Foucault’s exploration of “governmentality” and surveillance along with, perhaps, power/knowledge; *Information Technology & People* showed thirteen other articles, many of them probably interested in some of the same topics. *Reference and User Services Quarterly* also particularly stands out, with a dozen articles that do not cite *Archaeology* or *Order* along with the one that does. Even *Collection Management*, *IEEE Transactions*, and the *Journal of Library Administration* each showed three additional articles not citing *Archaeology* or *Order* along with one that did.

Thus there seems to be a rather interesting core-periphery pattern taking shape regarding the use of *Archaeology* or *Order*, with the core represented by a cluster of relatively high-profile, academically oriented journals covering a wide range of LIS issues and interests, including critical theory, while the periphery is occupied mostly by more practically specialized and focused journals of the type most immediately valuable to various sorts of specialized LIS practitioners who generally may not have the time or inclination for theoretical ruminations. Yet notwithstanding the clustering of most of the use of *Archaeology* or *Order* among the

¹²⁰ These included *Collection Management*, *Electronic Library*, *Government Information Quarterly*, *IEEE Transactions*, *Information Technology & People*, *Journal of Information Technology*, *Journal of Library Administration*, *Online Information Review*, and *Reference and User Services Quarterly*, among others.

academically oriented core journals, there has actually been a significant, perhaps even surprising degree of penetration of the periphery by *Archaeology* or *Order* that appears to be even more pronounced with regard to other works by Foucault. That is, Foucault and *Archaeology* or *Order* are indeed showing up even in some relatively practical, focused journals rather far from the “core.” This suggests that there has been significant and relatively broad visible dispersal of Foucauldian ideas throughout the LIS arena—and the visible use of Foucault’s name and works may, and likely does, represent only the visible tip of the iceberg of even more extensive dispersal of Foucauldian ideas.

That is one way of viewing the core and the periphery. From another perspective, however, the more practical, focused journals might perhaps be seen as in some ways closer to the core, or heartland, of LIS, while the more academically oriented and theoretically broader-ranging “outward-looking” journals may in a sense be more on the periphery, like port cities where the insular territory of LIS reaches out to, and is penetrated by, the concepts and ideas from other disciplinary cultures.

Whichever way the core and periphery may be construed, it seems clear that this study mostly did not find what it set out in hopes of finding: relatively clear mapping of the boundaries of a multi-lobed LIS field defined by differential use of *Archaeology* and *Order*. Perhaps the closest it came to doing so was with the citation-specific results regarding use of particular concepts, which found that archival scholars are virtually alone in LIS in drawing (fairly infrequently) on Foucault’s concept of the archive, while archivists were also notable for making little or no use of *Archaeology* or *Order* for the concept of discourse—which might indicate that they, like other LIS scholars, are increasingly turning to *Discipline and Punish* or other later works of Foucault for that concept if they use him at all, or else perhaps that archival scholars

may be tending to rely even more heavily than some other LIS scholars on secondary sources regarding discourse analysis? Also, as previously discussed, it was seen that archivists, particularly North American archivists, have made especially little use of *Order*. Aside from those rather limited findings, the only other clear finding related to disciplinary mapping might be that archivists appear to use page numbers in citations more religiously than other LIS scholars.¹²¹

G. Tertiary Use

This study's results regarding tertiary use of the most substantial secondary uses of *Archaeology* or *Order* may help to illuminate how the core communicates with the periphery, as well as with itself. As discussed in the preceding section, and with the fraction varying somewhat depending upon which examples are included or not, roughly half of all the tertiary users who showed up on Web of Science citation search lists were also already identified secondary users of *Archaeology* or *Order*; in a significant fraction of these cases, relatively substantial users. In some cases, this could indicate a reversed order of discovery of Foucault: that is, rather than an author being already familiar with Foucault, then discovering an article making substantial secondary use of Foucault, some authors might have been first introduced to Foucault by the secondary article. Yet in many, probably most cases, as where, for instance, Radford uses Frohmann, or Frohmann uses Radford, or Budd or Day use Frohmann or Radford or each other, the tertiary author has more than enough personal familiarity with Foucault to draw upon Foucault directly in order to work with Foucauldian ideas and concepts, yet nevertheless also

¹²¹ Another seeming pattern not studied or addressed in detail within the parameters of this study would appear to be that even though all sectors of LIS may be shifting toward an overall preference for later works of Foucault, those scholars and journals focused on information systems and technology, as well as on management and organization, would appear to be particularly drawn toward surveillance, Panopticism, governmentality, power/knowledge, and other ideas that mostly emerge in later Foucault.

draws upon other scholars' secondary interpretations of those ideas. Thus, among the core authors publishing in the core journals, secondary material is freely added to the general swirl of Foucauldian ideas along with original material, and such ideas eddy and recirculate among the core authors even as they also gradually disperse to other scholars outside the core. The visible citation and usage patterns suggest that through this process, secondary interpretations can, sometimes fairly quickly, become equal or even paramount to the original works even among the core cognoscenti who are familiar with Foucault's works; that is, after a certain time, the insiders may be having their ongoing, recirculating discussion more about the secondary layers of interpretation they have helped to create than about the original sources. Again, perhaps the classic examples of this are Frohmann's two early articles, which directly use and address Foucault's works rather little but nevertheless appear to have had a major impact on overall understanding of Foucauldian discourse analysis in LIS, both within the core and outside of it.

If even the core cognoscenti happily rely on secondary materials to assist themselves with determining how best to think about Foucauldian ideas, it is perhaps no surprise that sub-cognoscenti who are curious about Foucauldian ideas would also tend to grasp the secondary interpretations in preference to the often heavy, complex, difficult original works. This would help to account for both the limited and often generalized use of *Archaeology* or *Order* discussed earlier, as well as the observed general pattern that tertiary users outside the core cognoscenti, admittedly judged rather summarily by their article titles in this study, tend to show little sign of any reintensification of attention and interest specifically regarding Foucault and his works. That is, at least in theory, tertiary users of secondary materials could use that exposure to discover, or rediscover, and explore Foucault more intensively. If they did so and actually cited *Archaeology* or *Order*, they would of course then appear in this study's list of identified secondary users,

depending upon the journals in which they published—which may have happened in some cases, as already noted. But tertiary users also might cite other works by Foucault, or they might include his name or key, characteristically and recognizably Foucauldian concepts in their article titles. But the Web of Science citation search lists showed little sign of any such process, aside from occasional, usually very generic references to discourse or discourse analysis appearing in article titles, usually in the context of applying discourse analysis to some specific practical issue. The overall impression from the tertiary citation searches is that, outside the recirculation of ideas among the cognoscenti, the signal specifically relating to Foucault only dissipates further, and awareness of Foucault's trademark ideas, especially the concept of discourse, while dispersing and spreading farther, tends to grow progressively more general and largely detached from Foucault himself. It almost appears as though the more Foucauldian discourse analysis gets picked up, the more Foucault himself and his works may be left behind.

One implication from all this, which may be merely related to the general human tendency to try to maximize impact while minimizing effort, would seem to be that scholars, both on the individual level but especially at the group level, cumulatively tend to favor the most readily accessible sources of ideas that are currently generating interest. Such more accessible sources may tend, inexorably, to overshadow and crowd out more difficult, less accessible sources, even if the latter sources might sometimes be richer and more in-depth regarding the particular ideas in question. This would appear to happen in part due to the relative frequency and rapidity of circulation of sources. A highly successful, accessible, widely circulated secondary source gradually may tend to become something like a widely shared, established account or version in the group mind of a scholarly community, while other, less popular or accessible treatments will tend to remain relatively marginalized or ignored. To whatever degree

a popular secondary interpretation of original sources may sincerely intend to be about those original materials, in actual practice, the popular secondary source may inevitably come to replace the original materials and become itself the focus of attention and understanding. Moreover, to the extent any one interpretation becomes relatively standard and established, most scholars likely will feel little need to go back to original sources, and to undertake all the effort that would entail. As tertiary scholarship appears that is based on secondary interpretations and not the primary materials, any connection to the primary materials and their original author likely will tend to become increasingly stretched and tenuous, with the original author perhaps vanishing from the picture altogether, or else continuing to hover over it like a mythical forefather, to be occasionally genuflected to dutifully but otherwise to be largely ignored.

This picture is, however, greatly oversimplified, even if it may be accurate enough in some of its broad outlines. For as this study found, there remains a core of cognoscenti working actively with both the original materials (to some extent) and with each others' secondary interpretations (perhaps to an even greater extent), and these scholars continue to produce new secondary/tertiary treatments for circulation both to each other as well as to a potential wider audience of scholars. Some of their products gain significant citation momentum and traction (whether with each other or with the wider community); some don't. Each one in effect constitutes a bid to adjust any prevailing, mostly secondarily-derived understanding and perhaps bend it in new directions. This in turn emphasizes that unlike the vision of a single, static established secondary interpretation as presented in the paragraph above, in reality the established interpretation is itself a dynamic process, constantly changing or at least always capable of change, that arises from the interactions of the cognoscenti actively engaged in interpretation both with each other and with the wider community of scholars who make use of

their secondary works (or not).

If this resulting, more complex picture resembles the leadership of the Roman Catholic Church in its interactions with itself as well as its community of believers, or the theocratic government of Iran, or indeed any other priesthood in any other community or civilization throughout human history, that resemblance is probably not merely coincidental but rather a reflection of the classic and recurring human psychological and sociological manifestations that lie at the core of Foucault's understanding of knowledge, meaning, and communication.

V. Conclusion

From some of the rambling discussion above, readers familiar with Foucault might sense they are seeing the fuzzy outlines of one of the most archetypally Foucauldian concepts: a discursive formation. And indeed, this study's results seem to illuminate various aspects of a process whereby Foucault himself has become something of a discursive formation within LIS—a particular system of discourse involving a certain disciplinary community and a certain set of issues and interests in which it becomes impossible to specifically identify either a beginning or an ending, or even who if anyone is in control of the discourse; a “system of dispersion,” as Foucault himself put it.¹²² Another key feature of discourse and discursive formations that Foucault (along with Barthes) famously discussed is the disappearance of the subject/death of the author, and, particularly with regard to *Archaeology* and *Order* and the ideas they contain, the limited and general use of the books in LIS scholarship surveyed here shows a progressive distancing of the discourse from the original works and author and their replacement by intervening layers of secondary commentary that may originally have started out as secondary commentary on the original works but gradually may tend to become mostly secondary commentary on earlier secondary commentary, from which Foucault himself frequently largely vanishes or hangs overhead like a mythical forefather.

In short, rather ironically, two of the most key books about discourse appear to be vanishing into that discourse.

If this conversion of Foucault and his works into a discursive formation has indeed happened or is happening, not only is it precisely what he would have predicted; it is also in a sense precisely what he encouraged. Some of the LIS scholars who appear in this study's

¹²² Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge*, p. 173.

database have quoted from an interview of Foucault conducted in 1974:

I would like my books to be a kind of tool-box which others can rummage through to find a tool which they can use however they wish in their own area I would like the little volume that I want to write on disciplinary systems to be useful to an educator, a warden, a magistrate, a conscientious objector. I don't write for an audience, I write for users, not readers.¹²³

In other words, rather than later scholars being preoccupied with the correct finding of an original true meaning to his words, which Foucault's various writings declare to be an impossible project anyway, he urged his "users" (not "readers") to take his ideas and run with them any way they felt like or could figure out. This sentiment, in turn, is in harmony with both the principle of least effort and the seeming preference for easier, more accessible secondary interpretations of Foucault and his ideas found in this study. The widespread dispersion of Foucauldian-inspired discourse analysis in a variety of forms into many corners of LIS as well as countless other disciplines, whether explicitly associated with Foucault and his work or not, would appear to represent precisely the sort of activity Foucault encouraged.

In light of Foucault's views on the discursive nature of human knowledge and meaning, this study might appear to be in an incongruous relationship to Foucault's overall project, because to some extent, it makes an effort to trace specific origins and linkages in precisely the way that Foucault declared to be both useless and impossible.¹²⁴ The research approach used in this study—full-text database searching—did not exist in Foucault's day, and the research findings of this study would indeed have been totally impossible without such new technology.

¹²³ Michel Foucault, 'Prisons et asiles dans le mécanisme du pouvoir,' in *Dits et Ecrits vol. 11* (Paris: Gallimard, 1974), at pp. 523-4. [This passage was translated by Clare O'Farrell.]

¹²⁴ Foucault referred to such efforts to trace origins as "'harmless enough amusements for historians who refuse to grow up.'" Rachel Hardiman, "En mal d'archive: Postmodernist Theory and Recordkeeping," *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, vol. 30, no. 1 (April 2009): 27-44, at p. 35, fn. 80 (quoting Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge*, at p. 144).

And in theory at least, and in the hands of truly obsessed and obsessive individuals or perhaps someday robots, tools such as full-text searching could provide ways of actually and conclusively tracing some intellectual trends, concepts, indeed discourses, all the way back to their origins.

Ironically, though, what this study and its use of full-text searching tend to reveal instead is that human knowledge and understanding do indeed tend to evolve much as Foucault described. Discourses do, over time, “systematically form the objects of which they speak,” whatever those objects initially may have been; they take on a life of their own, with rhythms and momentum of their own that seem to be largely free of identifiable agency or control, and they promptly bury their own origins in a constructed, semi-remembered mythical past. The discursive formation involving Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, and *The Order of Things* that has developed in the LIS field would appear to be no exception.

Regarding more specific findings in this study: contrary to one of the fundamental preliminary assumptions underlying this research—that *The Archaeology of Knowledge* and *The Order of Things* are so crucial to understanding Foucauldian discourse analysis that they must both be used extensively and intensively by scholars concerned with discourse—this study’s results indicate that at least in LIS journal literature, these two important works see relatively little visible use, as measured both by raw citation tallies as well as analysis of the depth of use of those citations. *The Archaeology of Knowledge* appears to be vastly overshadowed by other, later works of Foucault; *The Order of Things* is, comparatively, almost invisible. A high proportion of the identifiable uses of both works show relatively passing references only, often general and without page numbers.

In place of visible, direct use of these works of Foucault, this study found evidence of a

seemingly strong overall preference for secondary sources discussing Foucauldian ideas rather than Foucault's original works, even among some of those scholars who are likely to be unusually well-versed in Foucault. This study's analysis of tertiary use of Foucault's two works (that is, secondary use of secondary uses of the original works) found that much of such tertiary use is by scholars who are themselves already secondary users of the original works; it also found evidence of a general preference for more accessible secondary uses that may touch upon Foucault's specific works and ideas only relatively briefly, as opposed to those secondary sources that explore Foucault's works in greater detail and depth.

To attempt to explain the relatively limited, general use of Foucault's two works, this study posits that widespread familiarity—or the assumption of such widespread familiarity—with complex, difficult original works within a scholarly community may tend, perhaps inevitably, to create a situation favoring display of general familiarity with the original works without the need to demonstrate detailed and specific use of those works—a situation where everybody already knows, or at least appears to know, what is in them. In such a situation, there will be a reduced sense of need to leave careful signposts regarding particularized use of the original sources for either contemporaneous or future scholars. Moreover, influential original sources that generate enough excitement within a scholarly community to produce active secondary commentary upon the originals, and then secondary commentary on the secondary commentary, may be especially likely to become buried and obscured especially rapidly by the proliferation of secondary commentary that becomes a surrogate for original works, or ultimately even for earlier secondary sources. For all these reasons—rather ironically and perhaps counter-intuitively—important, influential original works and their authors may be particularly fated to effectively vanish from the very discussion and discourse they triggered surprisingly quickly.

Regarding both secondary and tertiary use of *The Archaeology of Knowledge* and *The Order of Things*, this study found pronounced concentration of such use among a relatively small circle of academically oriented, theoretically inclined LIS journals. Notwithstanding this overall centralization of Foucauldian activity around a core of journals, though, use—sometimes substantial or significant use—of Foucault’s two works also surfaced occasionally in journals that usually might be seen as relatively far from that core and more practically focused, indicating some gradual but ongoing visible penetration of Foucauldian ideas from the core outward toward the periphery of the LIS field.

The preceding paragraphs described what this study accomplished (or attempted). There are various other potential issues, angles, or topics for exploration, however, that the study did not attempt (or accomplish).

Although collecting, compiling, and analyzing the data and databases used in this study required substantial time and effort, notwithstanding that, the resulting picture presented in this study of the LIS field’s use of Foucault’s important early works remains, in a sense, only a snapshot, inherently incomplete and imperfect. Although the study involved searches of a large number of journals, many others were left out just for lack of inclusion on the SCImago or other lists that were used to select journals to search. Of the journals selected, a significant fraction of these journals or articles in them also were effectively left out of the search process due either to unavailability specifically at UCLA or general electronic unavailability, unsearchability, or unidentifiability. As a reviewer of this thesis pointed out, moreover, some of the journals that appear on the SCImago list and were searched are ones that may fairly clearly fall outside the boundaries of the LIS field, even broadly conceived. Thus, for all the effort expended, this study does not provide fully complete or accurate coverage even of LIS journal literature.

Nor is journal literature the only, or perhaps even the best, place to look for footprints of use of Foucault's works by LIS scholars. Experienced LIS scholars have suggested that much of the most substantial delving into Foucault's oeuvre might more likely be found among the growing number of monographs exploring theoretical issues published by LIS scholars. Some reverberations of such book-based discussions might perhaps be expected to show up alongside references to Foucault's works in journal articles, or perhaps might be caught by the study's less-than-perfect monitoring of tertiary use using the Web of Science citation index; but some such use might escape detection altogether, particularly if, in practice, it mostly involved LIS scholars addressing each others' arguments in their respective monographs or in conference interactions that may not result in journal articles, for example.

Beyond limitations such as these, however, lies a broader inherent shortcoming to this study: it is necessarily limited to tracing clear, visible use of Foucault's early works. In doing so, the study identified a seeming overall mismatch between Foucault's known, or at least generally perceived and recognized, influence on LIS scholarship and the visible use of some of his key works. Yet the visible use may not be the most important input contributing to Foucault's influence. To use another analogy, this study might be thought of as operating only within the spectrum of visible light, and not covering even that whole visible spectrum, while leaving the infrared and ultraviolet frequencies entirely unexamined. Yet much of the energy producing Foucault's influence may reside in the trans-visible spectrum.

To attempt to more fully explore either visible or non-/less-visible use of Foucault, there are many possible directions future research might take. Some rather obvious ones already have been alluded to above—such as, seek an even fuller, more accurate corpus of LIS journal literature or trace use of Foucault also in monographic or other literature. With or without such

an expansion, the data reported in this study could be processed and analyzed in a more sophisticated fashion. The present reporting of results regarding, for example, cumulative citations of Foucault, and comparative ranking of journals based upon those totals, may tend to conceal more significant and interesting relationships that might be revealed through more sensitive measurements of relative frequency, density, and concentration of citations. For example, the citation performance of the journal *Archival Science*, which only started publication in 2001 and only appears twice a year, might actually be much more impressive on a frequency/density basis than a journal with similar cumulative numbers that has been published and is electronically available from the 1980s onward and might have up to twelve issues per year. Thus a more sensitive and sophisticated comparative bibliometric approach would have to attempt to account for and compare various additional factors, including the beginning and ending dates for each journal's respective window of electronic availability/searchability, the total number of articles published within that window of availability as a comparative baseline, and possibly other parameters or peculiarities particular to specific journals.

Certain potentially interesting, and perhaps obvious, additional angles of attack were left out of this study due to time constraints. For instance, it would be possible to check all of the tertiary uses that appeared on the Web of Science citation lists for the depth of use of the cited secondary sources as well as the extent of visible application of recognizably Foucauldian ideas. As was the pattern with other research results in this study, most such tertiary uses likely would prove to be relatively in passing; yet it would be interesting to find exceptions to that rule. It also might be possible to more carefully trace tertiary uses of monographs by specifically identifying such works that make substantial use of Foucault's early works, then tracing citations using the Web of Science, Google Scholar, or possibly full-text journal databases.

This study did not attempt the sort of intensive, qualitative comparative analysis of substantial secondary uses of Foucault's work that such articles really deserve. An overview of all such articles together suggests that they make use of *The Archaeology of Knowledge* or *The Order of Things* in a surprisingly broad variety of mostly different ways. Yet more careful analysis might reveal interesting points of comparison or observable trends—along with similar intensive analysis of use of those works in monographs.

One relatively straightforward way to extend the research in this study would be to apply the same frequency of citation and depth of use metrics to the rest of Foucault's works, including *Discipline and Punish*, *Power/Knowledge*, and *The History of Sexuality* among others. This study only alluded to seeing such works very frequently cited and suggested, somewhat impressionistically, that they may vastly overshadow Foucault's earlier works. Such impressions could be tested and confirmed (or not) more systematically. Any results might tend to confirm the overall trends identified in this study, or they might illuminate potentially interesting differences and nuances in LIS scholars' use of later Foucault compared to earlier Foucault.

A more careful attention to the specific academic interests and backgrounds of the authors who cite Foucault in LIS journals might be illuminating as well, since a number of the contributing authors in the study are not LIS scholars, for example. It might be interesting to explore the extent to which such ambassadors from other disciplines publish in LIS journals, why they choose to do so, and what effect this cross-disciplinary fertilization has upon LIS scholarship. This would appear to be potentially yet another interesting aspect of the sort of port-city penetration of the LIS realm by "foreign" ideas and concepts noted in an earlier section.

To seek to transcend the various technical shortcomings of the present study and explore additional nuances more fully, a variety of other research methods might fruitfully be applied:

for example, discourse analysis, social network analysis, or interviews with key scholars, along with more sophisticated bibliometric techniques.

Notwithstanding any shortcomings, though, it is hoped that this thesis has contributed in a positive, concrete way to the wider ongoing discussion and exploration of scholarly citation and what citation practices reveal about the nature of communication, meaning, and understanding within scholarly communities—the sociology of citation. In particular, this thesis offers a case study tending to confirm the classic postmodernist (and sociological) concept of the disappearance of the author from discourse, along with some relatively close, detailed examination of some of the specific mechanisms by which that disappearing act may take place. That this (at least partial) erasure from the record involves the godfather of discourse himself, Foucault, only adds to the irony and, hopefully, impact of this study.

This thesis also contributes to some aspects of the ongoing debate over the theoretical and practical value of citation analysis. For citation analysis, traditionally, has tended to focus on quantity of citations and assume their corresponding quality and significance.¹²⁵ This study dug down deeper to explore more intensively the quality of citations regarding two classic, influential works by a towering figure upon a scholarly community or interrelated cluster of communities. The overall results and data suggest that it may be dangerous to assume quality, measured as visible use and demonstrated depth of understanding, simply from quantity of citations. For in this case, the great majority of citations analyzed were brief, in passing, and of ambiguous meaning and significance. That in turn raises questions about the precise meaning of other statistics, such as Foucault being found to be the single author most cited by humanities scholars

¹²⁵ The MacRobertses, among others, have long and vigorously challenged this propensity on the part of citation analysis, among others. See, e.g., M.H. MacRoberts and B.R. MacRoberts, “Problems of Citation Analysis: A Critical Review,” *JASIST*, vol. 40, no. 5 (1989): 342-349; MacRoberts and B.R. MacRoberts, “Problems of Citation Analysis,” *Scientometrics*, vol. 36, no. 3 (1996): 435-444; MacRoberts and MacRoberts, “Problems of Citation Analysis: A Study of Uncited and Seldom-Cited Influences,” *JASIST*, vol. 61, no. 1 (2010): 1-13.

in 2007. In particular, the observed vague generality of co-citations of either or both of Foucault's works with other works or other authors tends to call into question the significance of co-citations in general.¹²⁶

Which is not to say that Foucault and his (seemingly) relatively neglected early works may not be continuing to have a powerful influence, both in LIS and elsewhere; only that such influence may be expressed in ways that may not register on citation analysis' radar screen as they are supposed to according to traditional assumptions. This study suggests that such influence may have gone underground, to some extent, and may be expressed more through its largely invisible continuing pull on more visibly and actively used secondary sources and the whole bubbling broth of secondary and tertiary interpretations described earlier. As such, this study also hopefully contributes somewhat to the literature on Mertonian obliteration by incorporation—"the obliteration of the sources of ideas, methods, or findings by their being anonymously incorporated in current canonical knowledge," or in other words, influential and impactful ideas becoming so commonplace that their specific origins are forgotten and ignored, and their sources are cited less frequently than their impact warrants.¹²⁷ To the extent that Mertonian obliteration may have a somewhat different face in humanistic and social scientific disciplines than in the sciences where it more often has been studied, this thesis offers a glimpse of that face, and of some of the processes by which its features may be erased, like Foucault's famous face in the sand at the edge of the sea.

¹²⁶ For an early challenge to the validity of co-citation analysis, see, e.g., David Edge, "Why I Am Not a Co-Citationist," *Essays of an Information Scientist*, vol. 3 (1977-1978): 240-246 (a reprint of an earlier-published version), available at <http://www.garfield.library.upenn.edu/essays/v3p240y1977-78.pdf>.

¹²⁷ Katherine W. McCain, "Eponymy and Obliteration by Incorporation: The Case of the 'Nash Equilibrium,'" *JASIST*, vo. 62, no. 7 (2011): 1412-1424, at p. 1413 (quoting R.K. Merton, "The Matthew Effect in Science II: Cumulative Advantage and the Symbolism of Intellectual Property," *ISIS*, vol. 79 (1988): 606-623, at p. 622).

Appendix 1: Unavailable, Unsearchable, and Zero-Results Journals

Unavailable: (6)

European Journal of Information Systems
International Journal of Data Mining & Bioinformatics
Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries
Journal of Library & Information Services in Distance Learning
Knowledge Management Research & Practice
VINE

Unsearchable: (6)

Advances in Librarianship
Canadian Journal of Information & Library Science
Cybermetrics
Insights
Journal of the Medical Library Association
Program

Zero Results for Foucault: (24)

Bottom Line
College & Undergraduate Libraries
College & Research Libraries News
Communications in Information Literacy
Computers in Libraries
Computers in the Schools
Information Systems Management
Information Technology & Libraries
Interlending & Document Supply
Issues in Science & Technology Librarianship
Journal of Access Services
Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship
Journal of Cheminformatics
Journal of Classification
Journal of Enterprise Information Management
Library Resources & Technical Services
Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science
Medical Reference Services Quarterly
New Review of Academic Librarianship
OCLC Systems & Services
Performance Measurement & Metrics
Public Library Quarterly
Science & Technology Libraries
World Patent Information

Appendix 2: Bibliography of 188 Articles Citing *Archaeology* or *Order* in This Study's Database

[Alphabetically by Author]

1. Alvarado, Felix. "Concerning Postmodernity and Organizations in the Third World: Opening a Debate and Suggestions for a Research Agenda." *Organization Science*, vol. 7, no. 6 (Nov.-Dec., 1996): 667-681.
2. Andersen, Jack. Review of Ylva Lindholm-Romantschuk, *Scholarly Book Reviewing in the Social Sciences and Humanities. The Flow of Ideas Within and Among Disciplines* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998). *JASIST*, vol. 50, no. 13 (1999): 1259-1261.
3. Andersen, Jack, and Laura Skouvig. "Knowledge Organization: A Sociohistorical Analysis and Critique." *Library Quarterly*, vol. 76, no. 3 (July 2006): 300-322.
4. Anderson, Scott R., and Robert B. Allen. "Envisioning the Archival Commons." *American Archivist*, vol. 72 (Fall/Winter 2009): 383-400.
5. Barzilai-Nahon, Karine. "Gatekeeping: A Critical Review." *ARIST*, vol. 43, no. 1 (2009): 1-79.
6. Bassett, Elizabeth H., and Kate O'Riordan. "Ethics of Internet Research: Contesting the Human Subjects Research Model." *Ethics and Information Technology*, vol. 4 (2002): 233-247.
7. Bastian, Jeannette A. "The Records of Memory, the Archives of Identity: Celebrations, Texts and Archival Sensibilities." *Archival Science*, vol. 13 (June 2013): 121-131.
8. Beagle, Donald. "Visualizing Keyword Distribution Across Multidisciplinary C-Space." *D-Lib Magazine*, vol. 9 no. 6 (June 2003).
9. Beaven, Brian P. N. "Macro-Appraisal: From Theory to Practice." *Archivaria* 48 (Fall 1998): 154-198.
10. Berg, Elisabeth, Christina Mörtberg, and Maria Jansson, "Emphasizing Technology: Socio-Technical Implications." *Information Technology & People*, vol. 18, no. 4 (2005): 343-358.
11. Berger, Stefan. "The Role of National Archives in Constructing National Master Narratives in Europe." *Archival Science*, vol. 13 (2013): 1-22.
12. Bowker, Geoffrey C. "The History of Information Infrastructures: The Case of the International Classification of Diseases." *Information Processing & Management*, vol. 32, no. 1 (January 1996): 49-61.

13. Brännström, Inger. "Gender and Digital Divide 2000–2008 in Two Low-Income Economies in Sub-Saharan Africa: Kenya and Somalia in Official Statistics." *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 29 (2012): 60–67.
14. Brooke, Carole. "What Does It Mean to Be 'Critical' in IS Research?" *Journal of Information Technology*, vol. 17 (2002): 49–57.
15. Brothman, Brien. "Perfect Present, Perfect Gift: Finding a Place for Archival Consciousness in Social Theory." *Archival Science*, vol. 10 (2010):141–189.
16. Brothman, Brien. "Archives, Life Cycles, and Death Wishes: A Helical Model of Record Formation." *Archivaria*, vol. 61 (Spring 2006): 235-269.
17. Brothman, Brien. "The Past that Archives Keep: Memory, History, and the Preservation of Archival Records." *Archivaria*, vol. 51 (Spring 2001): 48-80.
18. Brothman, Brien. "The Limits of Limits: Derridean Deconstruction and the Archival Institution." *Archivaria*, vol. 36 (Autumn 1993): 205-230.
19. Brown, Richard. "Macro-Appraisal Theory and the Context of the Public Records Creator." *Archivaria*, vol. 40 (Fall 1995): 121-172.
20. Brown, Richard. "Records Acquisition Strategy and its Theoretical Foundation: The Case for a Concept of Archival Hermeneutics." *Archivaria*, vol. 33 (Winter 1991-92): 34-56.
21. Budd, John M. "Discourse Analysis and the Study of Communication in LIS." *Library Trends*, vol. 55, no. 1 (Summer 2006): 65-82.
22. Budd, John M. "A Critique of Customer and Commodity." *College & Research Libraries*, vol. 58 (July 1997): 309-320.
23. Budd, John M., and Douglas Raber. "The Cultural State of the Fin De Millénaire Library." *Library Quarterly*, vol. 68, no. 1 (January 1998): 55-79.
24. Budd, John M., and Douglas Raber. "Discourse Analysis: Method and Application in the Study of Information." *Information Processing & Management*, vol. 32, no. 2 (March 1996): 217-226.
25. Buschman, John. "Transgression or Stasis? Challenging Foucault in LIS Theory." *Library Quarterly*, vol. 77, no. 1 (January 2007): 21-44.
26. Carter, Rodney G. S. "Of Things Said and Unsaid: Power, Archival Silences, and Power in Silence." *Archivaria*, vol. 61 (Spring 2006): 215-233.
27. Carusi, Annamaria, and Giovanni De Grandis. "The Ethical Work that Regulations Will Not Do." *Information, Communication & Society*, vol. 15, no. 1 (2012): 124-141.

28. Chelton, Mary K. "Behavior of Librarians in School and Public Libraries with Adolescents: Implications for Practice and LIS Education." *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, vol. 40, no. 2 (Spring, 1999): 99-111.
29. Clark, Nigel. "Materializing Informatics: From Data Processing to Molecular Engineering." *Information, Communication & Society*, vol. 1, no. 1 (1998): 70-90.
30. Clarke, Juanne. "Portrayal of Childhood Cancer in English Language Magazines in North America: 1970–2001." *Journal of Health Communication*, vol. 10, no. 7 (2005): 593-607.
31. Coll, Sami. "Power, Knowledge, and the Subjects of Privacy: Understanding
32. Cook, Terry. "Archival Science and Postmodernism: New Formulations for Old Concepts." *Archival Science*, vol. 1(2001): 3-24.
33. Dafermos, George, and Michel J.G. van Eeten. "Images of Innovation in Discourses of Free and Open Source Software." *First Monday*, vol. 19, no. 12 (December 2014).
34. Dalbello, Marija, and Anselm Spoerri. "Statistical Representations from Popular Texts for the Ordinary Citizen, 1889–1914." *Library & Information Science Review*, vol. 28, no. 1 (Spring 2006): 83-109.
35. Daniel, Dominique. "Archival Representations of Immigration and Ethnicity in North American History: From the Ethnicization of Archives to the Archivization of Ethnicity." *Archival Science*, vol. 14 (2014):169–203.
36. Darms, Lisa. "The Archival Object: A Memoir of Disintegration." *Archivaria*, vol. 67 (Spring 2009): 143-155.
37. Day, Mark Tyler. "Transformational Discourse: Ideologies of Organizational Change in the Academic Library and Information Science Literature." *Library Trends*, vol. 46, no. 4 (Spring 1998): 635-667.
38. Day, Ronald E. "Poststructuralism and Information Studies." *ARIST*, vol. 39, no. 1 (2005): 575–609.
39. Day, Ronald E. "Community as Event." *Library Trends*, vol. 52, no. 3 (2004): 408-426.
40. Day, Ronald E. "The 'Conduit Metaphor' and the Nature and Politics of Information Studies." *JASIST*, vol. 51, no. 9 (2000): 805–811.
41. Day, Ronald E. "Tropes, History, and Ethics in Professional Discourse and Information Science." *JASIST*, vol. 51, no. 5 (2000): 469–475.

42. Denegri-Knott, Janice, and Jacqui Taylor. "The Labeling Game: A Conceptual Exploration of Deviance on the Internet." *Social Science Computer Review*, vol. 23, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 93-107.
43. Dennis, Dion, and Jabbar Al-Obaidi. "Vanguard, Laggard or Relic? The Possible Futures of Higher Education after the Epistemic Revolution." *First Monday*, vol. 15, no. 3 (March 2010).
44. Dervin, Brenda. "Information ↔ Democracy: An Examination of Underlying Assumptions." *JASIST*, vol. 45, no. 6 (July 1994): 369-385.
45. Dervin, Brenda, CarrieLynn D. Reinhard, and Fei C. Shen. "Beyond Communication: Research as Communicating. Making User and Audience Studies Matter—Paper 2." *Information Research*, vol. 12, no. 1 (October 2006).
46. Dever, Maryanne. "Archiving Feminism: Papers, Politics, Posterity." *Archivaria*, vol. 77 (Spring 2014): 25-42.
47. Dilevko, Juris, and Kalina Crewal. "Neutrality and Media Literacy at the Reference Desk: A Case Study." *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, vol. 24, no. 1 (January 1998): 21-32.
48. Dong, Dong, Tsan-Kuo Chang, and Dan Chen. "Reporting AIDS and the Invisible Victims in China: Official Knowledge as News in the People's Daily, 1986-2002." *Journal of Health Communication*, vol. 13, no. 4 (2008): 357-374.
49. Douglas, J. Yellowlees. "Social Impacts of Computing: The Framing of Revolutionary for Whom?" *Social Science Computer Review*, vol. 11, no. 4 (December 1993): 417-428.
50. Duff, Wendy M., and Verne Harris. "Stories and Names: Archival Description as Narrating Records and Constructing Meanings." *Archival Science*, vol. 2 (2002): 263-285.
51. Eastman, Wayne, and James R. Bailey. "Mediating the Fact-Value Antinomy: Patterns in Managerial and Legal Rhetoric, 1890-1990." *Organization Science*, vol. 9, no. 2 (March-April 1998): 232-245.
52. Ellis, David, Rachel Oldridge, and Ana Vasconcelos. "Community and Virtual Community." *ARIST*, vol. 38, no. 1 (2004): 145-186.
53. Ferraioli, Leatrice. "An Exploratory Study of Metadata Creation in a Health Care Agency." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, vol. 40, nos. 3-4 (2005): 75-102.
54. Fleming-May, Rachel A. "Concept Analysis for Library and Information Science: Exploring Usage." *Library & Information Science Review*, vol. 36, nos. 3-4 (October 2014): 203-210.
55. Fleming-May, Rachel A. "What Is Library Use? Facets of Concept and a Typology of Its Application in the Literature of Library and Information Science." *Library Quarterly*, vol. 81, no. 3 (July 2011): 297-320.

56. Frické, Martin. "Reflections on Classification: Thomas Reid and Bibliographic Description." *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 69, no. 4 (2013): 507-522.
57. Frohmann, Bernd. "Subjectivity and Information Ethics." *JASIST*, vol. 59, no. 2 (2008): 267-277.
58. Frohmann, Bernd. "Discourse and Documentation: Some Implications for Pedagogy and Research." *Journal of Education for Library & Information Science*, vol. 42, no. 1 (Winter, 2001): 12-26.
59. Frohmann, Bernd. "Documentation Redux: Prolegomenon to (Another) Philosophy of Information." *Library Trends*, vol. 52, no. 3 (Winter 2004): 387-407.
60. Gallagher, H. M. "Dr. Osborn's 1941 'The Crisis in Cataloging': A Shift in Thought toward American Pragmatism." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, vol. 12, nos. 3-4 (1991): 3-33.
61. Garay, Kathleen, and Christl Verduyn. "Special Section on Taking a Stand!: Activism in Canadian Cultural Archives." *Archivaria*, vol. 67 (Spring 2009): 59-61.
62. Gilliland, Anne J. "Reflections on the Value of Metadata Archaeology for Recordkeeping in a Global, Digital World." *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, vol. 32, no. 1 (April 2011): 103-118.
63. Girdwood, James R. S. "(Re)Conceptualising Mnemonic Technology in Light of Hermeneutic Ontology." *Archival Science*, vol. 9 (2009): 143-155.
64. Given, Lisa M., and Hope A. Olson. "Knowledge Organization in Research: A Conceptual Model for Organizing Data." *Library & Information Science Review*, vol. 25, no. 2 (Summer 2003): 157-176.
65. Golden-Biddle, Karen, and Karen Locke. "Appealing Work: An Investigation of How Ethnographic Texts Convince." *Organization Science*, vol. 4, no. 4 (Nov., 1993): 595-616.
66. Gomez, Pierre-Yves, and Brittany C. Jones. "An Interpretation of Deep Structure in Organizations." *Organization Science*, vol. 11, no. 6 (Nov.-Dec. 2000): 696-708.
67. Guttman, Nurit, and William Harris Ressler. "On Being Responsible: Ethical Issues in Appeals to Personal Responsibility in Health Campaigns." *Journal of Health Communication*, vol. 6, no. 2 (2001): 117-136.
68. Haider, Jutta, and David Bawden. "Conceptions of 'Information Poverty' in LIS: A Discourse Analysis." *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 63 no. 4 (2007): 534-557.
69. Haider, Jutta, and David Bawden. "Pairing Information with Poverty: Traces of Development Discourse in LIS." *New Library World*, vol. 107, no. 9/10 (2006): 371-385.

70. Haikola, Simon, and Sara Jonsson. "State Surveillance on the Internet—The Swedish Debate and the Future Role of Libraries and LIS." *Libri*, vol. 57, no. 4 (April 2008): 209-218.
71. Hannabuss, Stuart. "Foucault's View of Knowledge." *Aslib Proceedings*, vol. 48, no. 4 (April 1996): 87-102.
72. Hanson, F. Allan. "Beyond the Skin Bag: On the Moral Responsibility of Extended Agencies." *Ethics & Information Technology*, vol. 11 (2009): 91-99.
73. Hardiman, Rachel. "En mal d'archive: Postmodernist Theory and Recordkeeping." *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, vol. 30, no. 1 (April 2009): 27-44.
74. Hatch, Mary Jo. "Irony and the Social Construction of Contradiction in the Humor of a Management Team." *Organization Science*, vol. 8, no. 3 (May-June 1997): 275-288.
75. Head, Randolph C. "Historical Research on Archives and Knowledge Cultures: An Interdisciplinary Wave." *Archival Science*, vol. 10 (2010): 191-194.
76. Head, Randolph C. "Mirroring Governance: Archives, Inventories and Political Knowledge in Early Modern Switzerland and Europe." *Archival Science*, vol. 7 (2007): 317-329.
77. Heizmann, Helena. "Workplace Information Practices among Human Resources Professionals: Discursive Boundaries in Action." *Information Research*, vol. 17, no. 3 (September 2012).
78. Herb, Ulrich. "Sociological Implications of Scientific Publishing: Open Access, Science, Society, Democracy, and the Digital Divide." *First Monday*, vol. 15, no. 2 (February 2010).
79. Higgins, Joan Wharf, and P. J. Naylor, Tanya Berry, Brian O'Connor and David McLean. "The Health Buck Stops Where? Thematic Framing of Health Discourse to Understand the Context for CVD Prevention." *Journal of Health Communication*, vol. 11, no. 3 (2006): 343-358.
80. Hill, Heather, and Marni Harrington. "Beyond Obscenity: An Analysis of Sexual Discourse in LIS Educational Texts," *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 70, no. 1 (2014): 62-73.
81. Hjørland, Birger. "Domain Analysis in Information Science." *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 58, no. 4 (2002): 422-462.
82. Horn, Jim. "Qualitative Research Literature: A Bibliographic Essay." *Library Trends*, vol. 46, no. 4 (Spring 1998): 602-615.
83. Horner, David Sanford. "Frameworks for Technology Analysis and Classification." *Journal of Information Science*, vol. 18, no. 1 (February 1992): 57-68.

84. Hubbard, Taylor E. "Bibliographic Instruction and Postmodern Pedagogy." *Library Trends*, vol. 44, no. 2 (Fall 1995): 439-452.
85. Huber, Jeffrey T., and Mary L. Gillaspay. "Social Constructs and Disease: Implications for a Controlled Vocabulary for HIV/AIDS." *Library Trends*, vol. 47, no. 2 (1998): 190-208.
86. Humphries, Maria. "For the Common Good? New Zealanders Comply with Quality Standards." *Organization Science*, vol. 9, no. 6 (Nov.-Dec. 1998): 738-749.
87. Huvila, Isto. "The Unbearable Lightness of Participating? Revisiting the Discourses of 'Participation' in Archival Literature." *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 71, no. 2 (2015): 358-386.
88. Huvila, Isto. "The Politics of Boundary Objects: Hegemonic Interventions and the Making of a Document." *JASIST*, vol. 62, no. 12 (December 2011): 2528-2539.
89. Iivari, Netta. "Discursive Construction of 'User Innovations' in the Open Source Software Development Context." *Information & Organization*, vol. 20 (2010): 111-132.
90. Introna, Lucas D. "Maintaining the Reversibility of Foldings: Making the Ethics (Politics) of Information Technology Visible." *Ethics & Information Technology*, vol. 9, no. 1 (March 2007): 11-25.
91. Jacob, Elin K. "Classification and Categorization: A Difference that Makes a Difference." *Library Trends*, vol. 52, no. 3 (Winter 2004): 515-540.
92. Jacob, Elin K. "The Everyday World of Work: Two Approaches to the Investigation of Classification in Context." *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 57, no. 1 (2001): 76-99.
93. Jacob, Elin K., and Hanne Albrechtsen. "When Essence Becomes Function: Post-Structuralist Implications for an Ecological Theory of Organizational Classification Systems." *Information Research*, (1998): 519-534. [Low-quality, non-OCR PDF scan with little bibliographic information appears in *Information Research* search.]
94. Jacobs, Neil. "Information Technology and Interests in Scholarly Communication: A Discourse Analysis." *JASIST*, vol. 52, no. 13 (2001): 1122-1133.
95. Jashapara, Ashok. "Moving Beyond Tacit and Explicit Distinctions: A Realist Theory of Organizational Knowledge." *Journal of Information Science*, vol. 33, no. 6 (2007): 752-766.
96. Johannisson, Jenny, and Olof Sundin. "Putting Discourse to Work: Information Practices and the Professional Project of Nurses." *Library Quarterly*, vol. 77, no. 2 (April 2007): 199-218.
97. Joyce, Steven. "The Creation of Bent Knowledge: How Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Youth Negotiate and Reconfigure Homophobic and Heterosexist Discourse." *Information Research*, vol. 6, no. 2 (January 2001).

98. Kallas, John, and Apostolos Linardis. "A Question Documentation Model on the Needs of Comparative Research." *Archival Science*, vol. 10 (2010): 65-83.
99. Kallinikos, Jannis. "Computer-Based Technology and the Constitution of Work: A Study on the Cognitive Foundations of Work." *Accounting, Management & Information Technology* (predecessor journal of *Information & Organization*), vol. 9 (1999): 261-291.
100. Kenix, Linda Jean. "In Search of Utopia: An Analysis of Non-Profit Web Pages." *Information, Communication & Society*, vol. 10, no. 1 (2007): 69-94.
101. Klein, Heinz K., and Rudy Hirschheim. "The Structure of the IS Discipline Reconsidered: Implications and Reflections from a Community of Practice Perspective." *Information & Organization*, vol. 18, no. 4 (October 2008): 280-302.
102. Lilley, Simon. "Regarding Screens for Surveillance of the System." *Accounting, Management & Information Technology*, vol. 8 (1998): 63-105.
103. Lin, Chi-Shiou, and Yi-Fan Chen. "Examining Social Tagging Behaviour and the Construction of an Online Folksonomy from the Perspectives of Cultural Capital and Social Capital." *Journal of Information Science*, (2012): 1-18.
104. Lincoln, Yvonna S. "Insights into Library Services and Users from Qualitative Research." *Library & Information Science Review*, vol. 24, no. 1 (2002): 3-16.
105. Lindh, Karolina, and Jutta Haider. "Development and the Documentation of Indigenous Knowledge: Good Intentions in Bad Company?" *Libri*, vol. 60, no. 1 (April 2010): 1-14.
106. Lloyd, Annemaree. "Information Literacy: Different Contexts, Different Concepts, Different Truths?" *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, vol. 37, no. 2 (June 2005): 82-88.
107. Lund, Niels Windfeld. "Document Theory." *ARIST*, vol. 43, no. 1 (2009): 1-55.
108. MacNeil, Heather. "Contemporary Archival Diplomatics as a Method of Inquiry: Lessons Learned from Two Research Projects." *Archival Science*, vol. 4 (2004): 199-232.
109. Mak, Bonnie. "Archaeology of a Digitization." *JASIST*, vol. 65, no. 8 (2014): 1515-1526.
110. Malone, Cheryl Knott, and Fernando Elichirigoity. "Information as Commodity and Economic Sector: Its Emergence in the Discourse of Industrial Classification." *JASIST*, vol. 54, no. 6 (April 2003): 512-520.
111. Manninen, Ari. "The Problem and the Solution of Accounting in a Text." *Accounting, Management & Information Technology*, vol. 3, no. 1 (1993): 33-49.

112. Massanari, Adrienne L. "DIY Design: How Crowdsourcing Sites are Challenging Traditional Graphic Design Practice." *First Monday*, vol. 17, no. 10 (October 2012).
113. Mauws, Michael K., and Nelson Phillips. "Understanding Language Games." *Organization Science*, vol. 6, no. 3 (May-June 1995): 322-334.
114. Maynard, Steven. "Police/Archives." *Archivaria*, vol. 68 (Fall 2009): 159-182.
115. McKenzie, Pamela J., and Rosamund K. Stooke. "Producing Storytime: A Collectivist Analysis of Work in a Complex Communicative Space." *Library Quarterly*, vol. 77, no. 1 (January 2007): 3-20.
116. McSweeney, L. Brendan. "Accounting in Organizational Action: A Subsuming Explanation or Situated Explanations?" *Accounting, Management & Information Technology*, vol. 5, nos. 3-4 (1995): 245-282.
117. Millar, Laura. "Touchstones: Considering the Relationship between Memory and Archives." *Archivaria*, vol. 61 (Spring 2006): 105-126.
118. Miller, Thea. "Action, Transaction, and *Vorgang*: Gaining New Insights from an Old Practice." *Archival Science*, vol. 3 (2003): 413-430.
119. Milojević, Staša, Cassidy R. Sugimoto, Erjia Yan, and Ying Ding. "The Cognitive Structure of Library and Information Science: Analysis of Article Title Words." *JASIST*, vol. 62, no. 10 (October 2011): 1933–1953.
120. Munro, Rolland. "Just When You Thought It Safe to Enter the Water: Accountability, Language Games and Multiple Control Technologies." *Accounting, Management & Information Technology*, vol. 3, no. 4 (1993): 249-211.
121. Nakata, Martin. "Indigenous Knowledge and the Cultural Interface: Underlying Issues at the Intersection of Knowledge and Information Systems." *IFLA Journal*, vol. 28, nos. 5-6 (2002): 281-291.
122. Olsson, Michael. "Gently to Hear, Kindly to Judge: The Affective Information Practices of Theatre Professionals and Journalists." *Information Research*, vol. 18, no. 3 (September 2013).
123. Olsson, Michael R. "The Play's the Thing: Theater Professionals Make Sense of Shakespeare." *Library & Information Science Review*, vol. 32, no. 4 (October 2010): 272-280.
124. Olsson, Michael R. "All the World's a Stage – the Information Practices and Sense-Making of Theatre Professionals." *Libri*, vol. 60 (September 2010): 241–252.
125. Olsson, Michael R. "Re-Thinking Our Concept of Users." *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, vol. 40, no. 1 (2009): 22-35.

126. Olsson, Michael. "Power/Knowledge: The Discursive Construction of an Author." *Library Quarterly*, vol. 77, no. 2 (April 2007): 219-240.
127. Olsson, Michael. "Discourse: A New Theoretical Framework for Examining Information Behavior in its Social Context." *Information Research*, (1998): 136-149. [Low-quality, non-OCR PDF scan with little bibliographic information appears in *Information Research* search.]
128. Page, Margaret, and Anne Scott. "Change, Agency and Women's Learning: New Practices in Community Informatics." *Information, Communication & Society*, vol. 4, no. 4 (2001): 528-559.
129. Paling, Stephen. "Thresholds of Access: Paratextuality and Classification." *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, vol. 43, no. 2 (Spring, 2002): 134-143.
130. Parrine, Mary Jane. "Modern Views of Marginality in Pre-Industrial Europe." *Collection Management*, vol. 15, nos. 3-4 (1992): 263-277.
131. Pawley, Christine. "Information Literacy: A Contradictory Coupling." *Library Quarterly*, vol. 73, no. 4 (Oct., 2003): 422-452.
132. Preston, Alistair M. "The 'Problem' In and Of Management Information Systems." *Accounting, Management & Information Technology*, vol. 1, no. 1 (1991): 43-69.
133. Qayyum, M. Asim. "Designing an Intercultural Training Framework for Information Professionals." *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, vol. 51, no. 3 (Spring 2012): GPR, no
134. Radford, Gary P. "Trapped in Our Own Discursive Formations: Toward an Archaeology of Library and Information Science." *Library Quarterly*, vol. 73, no. 1 (January 2003): 1-18.
135. Radford, Gary P. "Positivism, Foucault, and the Fantasia of the Library: Conceptions of Knowledge and the Modern Library Experience." *Library Quarterly*, vol. 62, no. 4 (October 1992): 408-424.
136. Radford, Gary P., and Marie L. Radford. "Structuralism, Post-structuralism, and the Library: de Saussure and Foucault." *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 61, no. 1 (2005): 60-78.
137. Radford, Gary P., and Marie L. Radford. "Libraries, Librarians, and the Discourse of Fear." *Library Quarterly*, vol. 71, no. 3 (July 2001): 299-329.
138. Radford, Gary P., Marie L. Radford, and Jessica Lingel. "Alternative Libraries as Discursive Formations: Reclaiming the Voice of the Deaccessioned Book." *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 68, no. 2 (2012): 254-267.
139. Radford, Marie L. "Encountering Users, Encountering Images: Communication Theory and the Library Context." *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, vol. 42, no. 1 (Winter, 2001): 27-41.

140. Radford, Marie L., and Gary P. Radford. "Power, Knowledge, and Fear: Feminism, Foucault, and the Stereotype of the Female Librarian." *Library Quarterly*, vol. 67, no. 3 (July 1997): 250-266.
141. Rajagopal, Indhu. "Does the Internet Shape a Disciplinary Society? The Information-Knowledge Paradox." *First Monday*, vol. 19, no. 3 (March 2014).
142. Ramiller, Neil C. "The 'Textual Attitude' and New Technology." *Information & Organization*, vol. 11 (2001): 129-156.
143. Rayward, W. Boyd. "The Origins of Information Science and the International Institute of Bibliography/International Federation for Information and Documentation (FID)." *JASIST*, vol. 48, no. 4 (1997): 289-300.
144. Rayward, W. Boyd. "The History and Historiography of Information Science: Some Reflections." *Information Processing & Management*, vol. 32, no. 1 (January 1996): 3-17.
145. Reece, Gwendolyn J. "Multiculturalism and Library Exhibits: Sites of Contested Representation." *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, vol. 31, no. 4 (July 2005): 366-372.
146. Refinetti, Roberto. "Information Processing as a Central Issue in Philosophy of Science." *Information Processing & Management*, vol. 25, no. 5 (1989): 583-584.
147. Rymarczuk, Robin, and Maarten Derksen. "Different Spaces—Exploring Facebook as Hetertopia." *First Monday*, vol. 19, no. 6 (June 2014).
148. San Segundo, Rosa. "A New Concept of Knowledge." *Online Information Review*, vol. 26, no. 4 (2002): 239 – 245.
149. Sanford, Clive, and Jeremy Rose. "Characterizing eParticipation." *International Journal of Information Management*, vol. 27 (2007): 406-421.
150. Savolainen, Reijo. "Information Behavior and Information Practice: Reviewing the 'Umbrella Concepts' of Information-Seeking Studies." *Library Quarterly*, vol. 77, no. 2 (April 2007): 109-132.
151. Scholz, Trebor. "Market Ideology and the Myths of Web 2.0." *First Monday*, vol. 13, no. 3 (March 2008).
152. Seadle, Michael. "Sound, Image, Action." *Journal of Library Administration*, vol. 30, no. 1-2 (2000): 139-155.
153. Sinclair, Kathy. "Victoria: The Keep-It-All State? The Impact on Archives of the Crimes (Document Destruction) Act 2006 and the Evidence (Document Unavailability) Act 2006." *Archivaria*, vol. 69 (Spring 2010): 117-142.

154. Skibell, Reid. "The Myth of the Computer Hacker." *Information, Communication & Society*, vol. 5, no. 3 (2002): 336-356.
155. Sköld, Olle. "Documenting Virtual World Cultures." *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 71, no. 2 (2015): 294-316.
156. Sotto, Richard. "The Virtual Organisation." *Accounting, Management & Information Technology*, vol. 7, no. 1 (1997): 37-51.
157. Spraggins, Johnnie D. Review of Darren Tofts, Annemarie Jonson, and Alessio Cavallaro (Eds.), *Prefiguring Cyberculture: An Intellectual History* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003). *Social Science Computer Review*, vol. 22, no. 4 (Winter 2004): 533-534.
158. Stade, Philip. "'This Video Is Not Available in Germany': Online Discourses on the German Collecting Society GEMA and YouTube." *First Monday*, vol. 19, no. 10 (October 2014).
159. Stoler, Ann Laura. "Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance." *Archival Science*, vol. 2 (2002): 87-109.
160. Sturges, Paul. Humanities Information Research: Proceedings of a Seminar: Sheffield, 1980." *Social Science Information Studies*, vol. 2 (1982): 39-45.
161. Sukovic, Suzana, David Litting, and Ashley England. "Playing with the Future: Library Engagement and Change." *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, vol. 42, no. 2 (2011): 70-87.
162. Talja, Sanna. "Analyzing Qualitative Interview Data: The Discourse Analytic Method." *Library & Information Science Review*, vol. 21, no. 4 (November 1999): 459-477.
163. Talja, Sanna. "Constituting 'Information' and 'User' as Research Objects: A Theory of Knowledge Formations as an Alternative to the Information Man-Theory." *Information Research*, (1996). [Low-quality, non-OCR PDF scan with little bibliographic information appears in *Information Research* search.]
164. Talja, Sanna, and Pamela J. McKenzie. "Editors' Introduction: Special Issue on Discursive Approaches to Information Seeking in Context." *Library Quarterly*, vol. 77, no. 2 (April 2007): 97-108.
165. Talja, Sanna, Kimmo Tuominen, and Reijo Savolainen. "'Isms' in Information Science: Constructivism, Collectivism and Constructionism." *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 61, no. 1 (2005): 79-101.

166. Tennis, Joseph T. and Stuart A. Sutton. "Extending the Simple Knowledge Organization System for Concept Management in Vocabulary Development Applications." *JASIST*, vol. 59, no. 1 (January 2008): 25–37.
167. Thelwall, Mike. "Interpreting Social Science Link Analysis Research: A Theoretical Framework." *JASIST*, vol. 57, no. 1 (January 2006): 60–68.
168. Tredinnick, Luke. "Post-Structuralism, Hypertext, and the World Wide Web." *Aslib Proceedings*, vol. 59, no. 2 (2007): 169-186.
169. Truex, Duane, Richard Baskerville, and Julie Travis. "Amethodical Systems Development: The Deferred Meaning of Systems Development Methods." *Accounting, Management & Information Technology*, vol. 10 (2000): 53–79.
170. Tuominen, Kimmo, Sanna Talja, and Savolainen, Reijo. "Multiperspective Digital Libraries: The Implications of Constructionism for the Development of Digital Libraries." *JASIST*, vol. 54, no. 6 (April 2003): 561–569.
171. Tuominen, Kimmo, and Reijo Savolainen. "A Social Constructionist Approach to the Study of Information Use as Discursive Action." *Information Research*, (1996). [Low-quality, non-OCR PDF scan with little bibliographic information appears in *Information Research* search.]
172. Turner, Deborah, and Warren Allen. "Investigating Oral Information." *Information Research*, vol. 15, no. 3 (September 2013).
173. Unsworth, Kristene. "Ethical Concerns of Information Policy and Organization in National Security." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, vol. 47, no. 7 (2009): 642-656.
174. Upward, Frank, and Sue McKemmish. "Teaching Recordkeeping and Archiving Continuum Style." *Archival Science*, vol. 6 (2006): 219-230.
175. Vuorinen, Jukka. "Ethical Codes in the Digital World: Comparisons of the Proprietary, the Open/Free and the Cracker System." *Ethics & Information Technology*, vol. 9, no. 1 (2007): 27-38.
176. Wake, Paul. "Writing from the Archive: Henry Garnet's Powder-Plot Letters and Archival Communication." *Archival Science*, vol. 8 (2008): 69-84.
177. Wallmannsberger, Josef. "Poridge: Postmodern Rhizomatics in Digitally Generated Environments—Do We Need a Metatheory for W3?" *Electronic Library*, vol. 12, no. 6 (December 1994): 345-351.
178. Walton, Geoff, and Jamie Cleland. "Information Literacy in Higher Education - Empowerment or Reproduction? A Discourse Analysis Approach." *Information Research*, vol.

19, no. 4 (December 2014).

179. Wareham, Evelyn. "From Explorers to Evangelists: Archivists, Recordkeeping, and Remembering in the Pacific Islands." *Archival Science*, vol. 2 (2002): 187-207.

180. Wersig, Gernot. "Information Science: The Study of Postmodern Knowledge Usage." *Information Processing & Management*, vol. 29, no. 2 (March-April 1993): 229-239.

181. White, Michele. "Regulating Research: The Problem of Theorizing Community on LambdaMOO." *Ethics & Information Technology*, vol. 4, no. 1 (2002): 55-70.

182. Wiegand, Wayne A. "Out of Sight out of Mind: Why Don't We Have Any Schools of Library and Reading Studies?" *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, vol. 38, no. 4 (Fall, 1997): 314-326.

183. Wiegand, Wayne A. "Introduction: The Library Bill of Rights." *Library Trends*, vol. 45, no. 1 (Summer 1996): 1-6.

184. Willcocks, Leslie P. "Michel Foucault in the Social Study of ICTs—Critique and Reappraisal." *Social Science Computer Review*, vol. 24, no. 3 (Fall 2006): 274-295.

185. Withers, Charles W. J., and Andrew Grout. "Authority in Space?: Creating a Digital Web-based Map Archive." *Archivaria*, vol. 61 (Spring 2006): 27-46.

186. Zeggio Martinez, J. "Teacher Education and Miseducation: An Experience from a Community of English Teacher Educators in Brazil." *IEEE Proceedings (2013 IEEE 63rd Annual Conference International Council for Educational Media (ICEM))*: 1-7.

187. Zhang, Guo, and Elin K. Jacob. "Understanding Boundaries: Physical, Epistemological and Virtual Dimensions." *Information Research*, vol. 18, no. 3 (September, 2013).

188. Zwick, Detlev, and Nikhilesh Dholakia. "Consumer Subjectivity in the Age of Internet: The Radical Concept of Marketing Control through Customer Relationship Management." *Information & Organization*, vol. 14 (2004): 211–236.

Appendix 3: Journals with Articles Citing *Archaeology, Order, Both, or the Discourse on Language, with Depth of Use, Plus Citations of Other Foucault Works*

Journals with Foucault Works Cited	(Other)	Arch.	Order	Both	D. on L.	Brief Use	Substantial Use
American Archivist	3	1				1	
Archival Science	7	13		3		13	3
Archivaria	10	14				11	3
ARIST	4	4				2	2
Aslib Proceedings	1			2			2
Australian Academic & Research Lib's	2	2				2	
Cataloging & Classification Quarterly	3	2	1			3	
Collection Management		1				1	
College & Research Libraries	1	1				1	
D-Lib Magazine		1				1	
Electronic Library			1			1	
Ethics & Information Technology	25	3	2			5	
First Monday	28	5	3			7	1
Government Information Quarterly	2	1				1	
IEEE Transactions	3		1			1	
IFLA Journal				1		1	
Information & Organization (AM&IT)	27	6	5	1		11	1
Information Communication & Society	36	5	1			5	1
Information Processing & Mgmt.	1	2	3			5	
Information Research	10	7	3	1		9	2
Information Technology and People	5		1			1	
International Journal of Info. Mgmt.	4	2				2	
JASIST	14	9	3	1	1	12	2
Journal of Academic Librarianship		2				2	
Journal of Documentation	6	6	1	3		4	6
Journal of Education for Librarianship	2	2	1	1	1	4	1
Journal of Health Communication	2	4				4	
Journal of Information Science	4		3			3	
Journal of Information Technology	1	1					1
Journal of Librarianship & Info. Sci.	1	1				1	
Journal of Library Administration	3		1			1	
Journal of the Society of Archivists				2		1	1
Library & Information Sci. Research	2	5		1		5	1
Library Quarterly	12	8		5	1	8	6
Library Trends	7	6	2	1		7	2
Libri		3				2	1
New Library World		1					1
Online Information Review		1				1	
Organization Science	15	2	3	2		6	1
Reference and User Services Quarterly				1		1	
Social Science Computer Review	5	2	2	0	0	4	0
Totals:	246	123	37	25	3	150	38

[For journals that cite only “Other” Foucault works but not works relevant to this study, see Appendix 3a on the next page.]

Appendix 3a: Journals with Known Citations Only to “Other” Foucault

Journals with "Foucault" Results	Other Foucault	Total References	Unavailable Online
Accountability in Research	1	2	0
Archives & Manuscripts	3	6	0
Education & Information Technologies	1	4	2
Information Science Research	4	7	0
International Info. & Library Review	1	1	0
Serials Review	3	6	0
Totals:	13	26	2

Appendix 4: Top Journals for Use of “Other” Foucault

Journals with “Foucault” Search Results	Other	Arch/Order/Both	Total References
Information Communication & Society	36	6	67
First Monday	28	8	56
Information & Organization	27	12	54
Ethics & Information Technology	25	5	43
Organization Science	15	7	37
JASIST	14	14	65
Library Quarterly	12	14	76
Archivaria	10	14	52
Information Research	10	11	44
Archival Science	7	16	41
Library Trends	7	9	52
Journal of Documentation	6	10	33
Social Science Computer Review	5	4	32
Information Technology & People	5	1	20
ARIST	4	4	14
Journal of Information Science	4	3	19
International Journal of Information Mgmt.	4	2	9
Information Science Research	4		7
Cataloging & Classification Quarterly	3	3	9
IEEE Transactions	3	1	58
American Archivist	3	1	9
Journal of Library Administration	3	1	4
Serials Review	3		6
Archives & Manuscripts	3		6
Library & Information Science Research	2	6	12
Journal of Education for Librarianship	2	5	10
Journal of Health Communication	2	4	9
Australian Academic & Research Libraries	2	2	8
Government Information Quarterly	2	1	10

[All journals after these 29 have only one use of “Other” Foucault or less (only eight journals show just one use; 21 show none). Cumulative uses of Arch/Order/Both/D.onL. and total references to Foucault are included for comparison. Again, it is important to remember that articles listed as citing *Archaeology* or *Order* frequently *also* cite other Foucault works; articles listed as citing “Other” only do not cite *Archaeology* or *Order*.]

Appendix 5: Top Journals for Use of *Archaeology*, *Order*, or Both

Journals with “Foucault” Results	Arch/Order/Both	Other	Total References
Archival Science	16	7	41
JASIST	14	14	65
Library Quarterly	14	12	76
Archivaria	14	10	52
Information & Organization	12	27	54
Information Research	11	10	44
Journal of Documentation	10	6	33
Library Trends	9	7	52
First Monday	8	28	56
Organization Science	7	15	37
Information Communication & Society	6	36	67
Library & Information Science Research	6	2	12
Ethics & Information Technology	5	25	43
Journal of Education for Librarianship	5	2	10
Information Processing & Management	5	1	9
Social Science Computer Review	4	5	32
ARIST	4	4	14
Journal of Health Communication	4	2	9
Journal of Information Science	3	4	19
Cataloging & Classification Quarterly	3	3	9
Libri	3		8
International Journal of Information Mgmt.	2	4	9
Australian Academic & Research Libraries	2	2	8
Aslib Proceedings	2	1	10
Journal of the Society of Archivists	2		14
Journal of Academic Librarianship	2		14

[All journals after these 26 have only one use of Arch/Order/Both/D.onL. or less (15 additional journals show one use; 27 show none). Uses of “Other” Foucault and total references to Foucault are included for comparison. Again, it is important to remember that articles listed as citing *Archaeology* or *Order* frequently *also* cite other Foucault works; articles listed as citing only “Other,” however, do not cite *Archaeology* or *Order*.]

Appendix 6: Very Substantial Uses of *Archaeology*, *Order*, or *Both*

Author(s) of Articles	Journal	Work(s) Used	Year
Brooke (2002)	Journal of Information Technology	Arch	2002
Day, R. (2005)	ARIST	Arch	2005
Frohmann (2001)	Journal of Education for Librarianship	Both	2001
Hannabuss (1996)	Aslib Proceedings	Both	1996
Humphries (1998)	Organization Science	Both	1998
Jacob & Albrechtsen (1998)	Information Research	Order	1998
Malone & Elichirigoity (2003)	JASIST	Arch	2003
Radford & Radford (1997)	Library Quarterly	Arch & DoL	1997
Radford & Radford (2001)	Library Quarterly	Both & DoL	2001
Radford & Radford (2005)	Journal of Documentation	Arch	2005
Radford et al. (2012)	Journal of Documentation	Both	2012
Radford, G. (1992)	Library Quarterly	Both & DoL	1992
Radford, G. (2003)	Library Quarterly	Both	2003
Talja (1999)	Library & Information Science Research	Arch	1999
Tredinnick (2007)	Aslib Proceedings	Both	2007

Appendix 7: Substantial Uses of *Archaeology, Order, or Both*

Author(s) of Articles	Journal	Work(s) Used	Year
Andersen & Skouvig (2006)	Library Quarterly	Arch & DoL	2006
Brothman (2010)	Archival Science	Arch	2010
Brown (1991)	Archivaria	Arch	1991
Brown (1995)	Archivaria	Arch	1995
Budd & Raber (1998)	Library Quarterly	DoL only	1998
Budd (2006)	Library Trends	Both	2006
Clark (1998)	Information Communication & Society	Order	1998
Cook (2001)	Archival Science	Both	2001
Frohmann (2008)	JASIST	DoL only	2008
Gilliland (2011)	Journal of the Society of Archivists	Both	2011
Haider & Bawden (2006)	New Library World	Arch & DoL	2006
Haider & Bawden (2007)	Journal of Documentation	Arch & DoL	2007
Haikola & Jonsson (2007)	Libri	Arch & DoL	2007
Head (2007)	Archival Science	Arch	2007
Herb (2010)	First Monday	Arch	2010
Hubbard (1995)	Library Trends	Arch	1995
Huvila (2015)	Journal of Documentation	Arch	2015
Introna (2007)	Ethics & Information Technology	Order	2007
Jacob (2001)	Journal of Documentation	Both	2001
Lund (2009)	ARIST	Arch	2009
Maynard (2010)	Archivaria	Arch	2010
Sotto (1997)	Information & Organization	Order	1997
Talja et al. (2005)	Journal of Documentation	Arch	2005
Zhang & Jacob (2013)	Information Research	Order	2013

Appendix 8: Very Substantial, Substantial, and Significant Uses, by Work/Depth of Use

Author(s) of Articles	Work(s)	Depth of Use
Jacob & Albrechtsen (1998)	Order	Very Substantial
Sotto (1997)	Order	Substantial
Clark (1998)	Order	Substantial
Introna (2007)	Order	Substantial
Zhang & Jacob (2013)	Order	Substantial
Lilley (1998)	Order	Significant
Jacob (2004)	Order	Significant
Berg et al. (2005)	Order	Significant
Frické (2013)	Order	Significant
Budd & Raber (1998)	DoL only	Substantial
Frohmann (2008)	DoL only	Substantial
Radford, G. (1992)	Both	Very Substantial
Radford & Radford (2001)	Both	Very Substantial
Hannabuss (1996)	Both	Very Substantial
Humphries (1998)	Both	Very Substantial
Frohmann (2001)	Both	Very Substantial
Radford, G. (2003)	Both	Very Substantial
Tredinnick (2007)	Both	Very Substantial
Radford et al. (2012)	Both	Very Substantial
Cook (2001)	Both	Substantial
Jacob (2001)	Both	Substantial
Budd (2006)	Both	Substantial
Gilliland (2011)	Both	Substantial
Munro (1993)	Both	Significant
Johannisson & Sundin (2007)	Both	Significant
Girdwood (2009)	Both	Significant
Radford & Radford (1997)	Arch	Very Substantial
Talja (1999)	Arch	Very Substantial
Brooke (2002)	Arch	Very Substantial
Malone & Elichirigoity (2003)	Arch	Very Substantial
Day, R. (2005)	Arch	Very Substantial
Radford & Radford (2005)	Arch	Very Substantial
Andersen & Skouvig (2006)	Arch	Substantial
Haider & Bawden (2006)	Arch	Substantial
Haider & Bawden (2007)	Arch	Substantial
Haikola & Jonsson (2007)	Arch	Substantial
Brown (1991)	Arch	Substantial

Brown (1995)	Arch	Substantial
Hubbard (1995)	Arch	Substantial
Talja et al. (2005)	Arch	Substantial
Head (2007)	Arch	Substantial
Lund (2009)	Arch	Substantial
Brothman (2010)	Arch	Substantial
Herb (2010)	Arch	Substantial
Maynard (2010)	Arch	Substantial
Huvila (2015)	Arch	Substantial
Carusi & De Grandis (2012)	Arch	Significant
Budd (1997)	Arch	Significant
Buschman (2007)	Arch	Significant
Hill & Harrington (2014)	Arch	Significant
Alvarado (1996)	Arch	Significant
Budd & Raber (1996)	Arch	Significant
Talja (1996)	Arch	Significant
Andersen (1999)	Arch	Significant
Skibell (2002)	Arch	Significant
Stoler (2002)	Arch	Significant
Given & Olson (2003)	Arch	Significant
Zwick & Dholakia (2004)	Arch	Significant
Clarke (2005)	Arch	Significant
Denegri-Knott & Taylor (2005)	Arch	Significant
Reece (2005)	Arch	Significant
Brothman (2006)	Arch	Significant
Carter (2006)	Arch	Significant
Millar (2006)	Arch	Significant
Withers & Grout (2006)	Arch	Significant
McKenzie & Stooke (2007)	Arch	Significant
Savolainen (2007)	Arch	Significant
Klein & Hirschheim (2008)	Arch	Significant
Darms (2009)	Arch	Significant
Iivari (2010)	Arch	Significant
Sinclair (2010)	Arch	Significant
Turner & Allen (2010)	Arch	Significant
Walton & Cleland (2014)	Arch	Significant
Sköld (2015)	Arch	Significant

Appendix 9: Very Substantial, Substantial, and Significant Uses, by Depth of Use/Year

Author(s) of Articles	Depth of Use	Year	Work(s)
Radford, G. (1992)	Very Substantial	1992	Both & DoL
Hannabuss (1996)	Very Substantial	1996	Both
Radford & Radford (1997)	Very Substantial	1997	Arch & DoL
Humphries (1998)	Very Substantial	1998	Both
Jacob & Albrechtsen (1998)	Very Substantial	1998	Order
Talja (1999)	Very Substantial	1999	Arch
Frohmann (2001)	Very Substantial	2001	Both
Radford & Radford (2001)	Very Substantial	2001	Both & DoL
Brooke (2002)	Very Substantial	2002	Arch
Malone & Elichirigoity (2003)	Very Substantial	2003	Arch
Radford, G. (2003)	Very Substantial	2003	Both
Day, R. (2005)	Very Substantial	2005	Arch
Radford & Radford (2005)	Very Substantial	2005	Arch
Tredinnick (2007)	Very Substantial	2007	Both
Radford et al. (2012)	Very Substantial	2012	Both
Brown (1991)	Substantial	1991	Arch
Brown (1995)	Substantial	1995	Arch
Hubbard (1995)	Substantial	1995	Arch
Sotto (1997)	Substantial	1997	Order
Budd & Raber (1998)	Substantial	1998	DoL only
Clark (1998)	Substantial	1998	Order
Cook (2001)	Substantial	2001	Both
Jacob (2001)	Substantial	2001	Both
Talja et al. (2005)	Substantial	2005	Arch
Andersen & Skouvig (2006)	Substantial	2006	Arch & DoL
Budd (2006)	Substantial	2006	Both
Haider & Bawden (2006)	Substantial	2006	Arch & DoL
Haider & Bawden (2007)	Substantial	2007	Arch & DoL
Haikola & Jonsson (2007)	Substantial	2007	Arch & DoL
Head (2007)	Substantial	2007	Arch
Introna (2007)	Substantial	2007	Order
Frohmann (2008)	Substantial	2008	DoL only
Lund (2009)	Substantial	2009	Arch
Brothman (2010)	Substantial	2010	Arch
Herb (2010)	Substantial	2010	Arch
Maynard (2010)	Substantial	2010	Arch
Gilliland (2011)	Substantial	2011	Both

Zhang & Jacob (2013)	Substantial	2013	Order
Huvila (2015)	Substantial	2015	Arch
Munro (1993)	Significant	1993	Both
Alvarado (1996)	Significant	1996	Arch
Budd & Raber (1996)	Significant	1996	Arch
Talja (1996)	Significant	1996	Arch
Budd (1997)	Significant	1997	Arch & DoL
Lilley (1998)	Significant	1998	Order
Andersen (1999)	Significant	1999	Arch
Skibell (2002)	Significant	2002	Arch
Stoler (2002)	Significant	2002	Arch
Given & Olson (2003)	Significant	2003	Arch
Jacob (2004)	Significant	2004	Order
Zwick & Dholakia (2004)	Significant	2004	Arch
Berg et al. (2005)	Significant	2005	Order
Clarke (2005)	Significant	2005	Arch
Denegri-Knott & Taylor (2005)	Significant	2005	Arch
Reece (2005)	Significant	2005	Arch
Brothman (2006)	Significant	2006	Arch
Carter (2006)	Significant	2006	Arch
Millar (2006)	Significant	2006	Arch
Withers & Grout (2006)	Significant	2006	Arch
Buschman (2007)	Significant	2007	Arch & DoL
Johannisson & Sundin (2007)	Significant	2007	Both
McKenzie & Stooke (2007)	Significant	2007	Arch
Savolainen (2007)	Significant	2007	Arch
Klein & Hirschheim (2008)	Significant	2008	Arch
Darms (2009)	Significant	2009	Arch
Girdwood (2009)	Significant	2009	Both
Iivari (2010)	Significant	2010	Arch
Sinclair (2010)	Significant	2010	Arch
Turner & Allen (2010)	Significant	2010	Arch
Carusi & De Grandis (2012)	Significant	2012	Arch-2dry
Frické (2013)	Significant	2013	Order
Hill & Harrington (2014)	Significant	2014	Arch & DoL
Walton & Cleland (2014)	Significant	2014	Arch
Sköld (2015)	Significant	2015	Arch

Appendix 10: Very Substantial, Substantial, and Significant Uses, by Work/Year

Author(s) of Articles	Work(s)	Year	Depth of Use
Sotto (1997)	Order	1997	Substantial
Lilley (1998)	Order	1998	Significant
Jacob & Albrechtsen (1998)	Order	1998	Very Substantial
Clark (1998)	Order	1998	Substantial
Jacob (2004)	Order	2004	Significant
Berg et al. (2005)	Order	2005	Significant
Introna (2007)	Order	2007	Substantial
Zhang & Jacob (2013)	Order	2013	Substantial
Frické (2013)	Order	2013	Significant
Budd & Raber (1998)	DoL only	1998	Substantial
Frohmann (2008)	DoL only	2008	Substantial
Radford, G. (1992)	Both	1992	Very Substantial
Munro (1993)	Both	1993	Significant
Hannabuss (1996)	Both	1996	Very Substantial
Humphries (1998)	Both	1998	Very Substantial
Radford & Radford (2001)	Both	2001	Very Substantial
Jacob (2001)	Both	2001	Substantial
Frohmann (2001)	Both	2001	Very Substantial
Cook (2001)	Both	2001	Substantial
Radford, G. (2003)	Both	2003	Very Substantial
Budd (2006)	Both	2006	Substantial
Tredinnick (2007)	Both	2007	Very Substantial
Johannisson & Sundin (2007)	Both	2007	Significant
Girdwood (2009)	Both	2009	Significant
Gilliland (2011)	Both	2011	Substantial
Radford et al. (2012)	Both	2012	Very Substantial
Brown (1991)	Arch	1991	Substantial
Hubbard (1995)	Arch	1995	Substantial
Brown (1995)	Arch	1995	Substantial
Talja (1996)	Arch	1996	Significant
Budd & Raber (1996)	Arch	1996	Significant
Alvarado (1996)	Arch	1996	Significant
Radford & Radford (1997)	Arch	1997	Very Substantial
Budd (1997)	Arch	1997	Significant
Talja (1999)	Arch	1999	Very Substantial
Andersen (1999)	Arch	1999	Significant
Stoler (2002)	Arch	2002	Significant

Skibell (2002)	Arch	2002	Significant
Brooke (2002)	Arch	2002	Very Substantial
Malone & Elichirigoity (2003)	Arch	2003	Very Substantial
Given & Olson (2003)	Arch	2003	Significant
Zwick & Dholakia (2004)	Arch	2004	Significant
Talja et al. (2005)	Arch	2005	Substantial
Reece (2005)	Arch	2005	Significant
Radford & Radford (2005)	Arch	2005	Very Substantial
Denegri-Knott & Taylor (2005)	Arch	2005	Significant
Day, R. (2005)	Arch	2005	Very Substantial
Clarke (2005)	Arch	2005	Significant
Withers & Grout (2006)	Arch	2006	Significant
Millar (2006)	Arch	2006	Significant
Haider & Bawden (2006)	Arch	2006	Substantial
Carter (2006)	Arch	2006	Significant
Brothman (2006)	Arch	2006	Significant
Andersen & Skouvig (2006)	Arch	2006	Substantial
Savolainen (2007)	Arch	2007	Significant
McKenzie & Stooke (2007)	Arch	2007	Significant
Head (2007)	Arch	2007	Substantial
Haikola & Jonsson (2007)	Arch	2007	Substantial
Haider & Bawden (2007)	Arch	2007	Substantial
Buschman (2007)	Arch	2007	Significant
Klein & Hirschheim (2008)	Arch	2008	Significant
Lund (2009)	Arch	2009	Substantial
Darms (2009)	Arch	2009	Significant
Turner & Allen (2010)	Arch	2010	Significant
Sinclair (2010)	Arch	2010	Significant
Maynard (2010)	Arch	2010	Substantial
Iivari (2010)	Arch	2010	Significant
Herb (2010)	Arch	2010	Substantial
Brothman (2010)	Arch	2010	Substantial
Carusi & De Grandis (2012)	Arch	2012	Significant
Walton & Cleland (2014)	Arch	2014	Significant
Hill & Harrington (2014)	Arch	2014	Significant
Sköld (2015)	Arch	2015	Significant
Huvila (2015)	Arch	2015	Substantial

Supplemental Bibliography

[Note to readers: the principal bibliography for this study already appears in the quite lengthy Appendix 2: Bibliography of 188 Articles Citing *Archaeology* or *Order* in This Study's Database, which appears at pp. 92-105 above and will not be duplicated here. Because those 188 articles are the focus of this study, constitute its primary data sources, and are closely linked to the various other appendices, it was seen as appropriate and necessary to set them apart. This bibliography, however, provides information on various other sources used or mentioned in this thesis.]

Anderson, Karen. "Proposed Journal Ranking List for Archives and Records Management" (2009). Available at aeri2009.files.wordpress.com/2009/05/archival-journal-ranking-aeri.doc or at <http://ebook-free-downloads.com/ebook-doc-free-doc-download-journal-page-5.htm>.

Aylesworth, Gary. "Postmodernism." In *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy Online*, available at <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/postmodernism/>.

Brothman, Brien. "Declining Derrida: Integrity, Tensegrity, and the Preservation of Archives from Deconstruction." *Archivaria*, vol. 48 (Fall 1999): 64-88.

Brothman, Brien. "The Society of American Archivists at Seventy-Five: Contexts of Continuity and Crisis, A Personal Reflection." *American Archivist*, vol. 74 (Fall/Winter 2011): 387-427.

Burke, Colin. "History of Information Science," *ARIST*, vol. 41 (2007): 3-53.

Buschman, John, and Richard A. Brosio. "A Critical Primer on Postmodernism: Lessons from Educational Scholarship for Librarianship," *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, vol. 32, no. 4 (2006): 408-418, at 408.

Cook, Terry. "Electronic Records, Paper Minds: The Revolution in Information Management and Archives in the Post-Custodial and Post-Modernist Era." *Archives & Manuscripts*, vol. 22, no. 2 (November 1994): 300-328.

Cook, Terry. "Fashionable Nonsense or Professional Rebirth: Postmodernism and the Practice of Archives." *Archivaria*, vol. 51 (2001): 14-35.

Cook, Terry. "Macroappraisal in Theory and Practice: Origins, Characteristics, and Implementation in Canada, 1950-2000." *Archival Science*, vol. 5 (2005): 101-161.

Cronin, Blaise. "The Sociological Turn in Information Science." *Journal of Information Science*, vol. 34, no. 4 (August 2008): 465-475.

Cronin, Blaise, and Lokman I. Meho. "Receiving the French: A Bibliometric Snapshot of the Impact of 'French Theory' on Information Science." *Journal of Information Science*, vol. 35 (2009): 398-413.

Cusset, Francois. *French Theory: How Foucault, Derrida, Deleuze & Co. Transformed the Intellectual Life of the United States* (J. Fort, translator). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

Day, Ronald E. *The Modern Invention of Information: Discourse, History, and Power*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2001.

Derrida, Jacques. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression* (Eric Prenowitz, transl.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996. [English language translation of an original version in French, Paris: Éditions Galilée, 1995.]

Dick, Archie L. "Epistemological Positions and Library and Information Science." *Library Quarterly*, vol. 69, no. 3 (July 1999): 305-323.

Dick, Archie L. "Library and Information Science as a Social Science: Neutral and Normative Conceptions." *Library Quarterly*, vol. 65, no. 2 (April 1995): 216-235.

Dreyfus, Hubert L., and Paul Rabinow. *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Duff, Wendy M., and Verne Harris, "Stories and Names: Archival Description as Narrating Records and Constructing Meanings." *Archival Science*, vol. 2 (2002): 263-285.

Edge, David. "Why I Am Not a Co-Citationist." *Essays of an Information Scientist*, vol. 3 (1977-1978): 240-246. Available at <http://www.garfield.library.upenn.edu/essays/v3p240y1977-78.pdf>.

Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972.

Foucault, Michel. *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*. New York: Vintage, 1975.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage, 1979.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality, vol. 1: An Introduction*. New York: Vintage, 1980.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality, vol. 2: The Use of Pleasure*. New York: Vintage, 1985.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality, vol. 3: The Care of the Self*. New York: Vintage, 1986.

Foucault, Michel. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. New York: Vintage, 1988.

Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage, 1970.

Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977* (Colin Gordon, ed.). Brighton, UK: Harvester Press, 1980.

Foucault, Michel. "Prisons et asiles dans le mécanisme du pouvoir" (Clare O'Farrell, transl.). In *Dits et Ecrits, vol. 11*. Paris: Gallimard, 1974.

Frohmann, Bernd. "Discourse Analysis as a Research Method in Library and Information Science." *Library & Information Science Research*, vol. 16 (1994): 119-138.

Frohmann, Bernd. "Documentary Ethics, Ontology, and Politics." *Archival Science*, vol. 8 (2008): 165-180

Frohmann, Bernd. "Knowledge and Power in Library and Information Science—Toward a Discourse Analysis of the Cognitive Viewpoint." In Vakkari & Cronin, eds., *Proceedings of the International Conference on Conceptions of Library and Information Science: Historical, Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives*, Tampere, Finland, August 16, 28, 1991 (Tampere, 1992), at pp. 135-148.

Frohmann, Bernd. "The Power of Images: A Discourse Analysis of the Cognitive Viewpoint." *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 48, no. 4 (1992): 365-386.

Furner, Jonathan. "Philosophy and Information Studies." *ARIST*, vol. 44 (2010): 161-200.

Gutting, Gary. "Michel Foucault." In *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy Online*, available at <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/foucault/>.

Harris, Verne. "Against the Grain: Psychologies and Politics of Secrecy." *Archival Science*, vol. 9 (2009): 133-142.

Harris, Verne. "Antonyms of Our Remembering." *Archival Science*, vol. 14 (2014): 215-229.

Harris, Verne. "The Archival Sliver: Power, Memory, and Archives in South Africa." *Archival Science*, vol. 2 (2002): 63-86.

Lopez, Jose, and Garry Potter, eds. *After Postmodernism: An Introduction to Critical Realism*. New York: Athlone, 2001.

MacRoberts, M.H., and B.R. MacRoberts. "Problems of Citation Analysis: A Critical Review." *JASIST*, vol. 40, no. 5 (1989): 342-349.

MacRoberts, M.H., and B.R. MacRoberts. "Problems of Citation Analysis." *Scientometrics*, vol. 36, no. 3 (1996): 435-444.

MacRoberts, M.H., and B.R. MacRoberts. "Problems of Citation Analysis: A Study of Uncited and Seldom-Cited Influences." *JASIST*, vol. 61, no. 1 (2010): 1-13.

McCain, Katherine W. "Eponymy and Obliteration by Incorporation: The Case of the 'Nash Equilibrium.'" *JASIST*, vo. 62, no. 7 (2011): 1412-1424.

McKechnie, Lynne, et al. "Dancing Around the Edges: The Use of Postmodern Approaches in Information Behaviour Research as Evident in the Published Proceedings of the Biennial ISIC Conferences, 1996-2010." *Information Research*, vol. 17, no. 4 (December 2012).

"Most Cited Authors of Books in the Humanities, 2007." *Times Higher Education* online, March 26, 2009, available at <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/405956.article>,

Nixon, Judith M. "Core Journals in Library and Information Science: Developing a Methodology for Ranking LIS Journals." *College & Research Libraries*, vol. 75, no. 1 (January 2014): 66-90.

Poster, Mark. *Foucault, Marxism, and History: Mode of Production Versus Mode of Information*. Cambridge and New York: Polity Press, 1984.

Rabinow, Paul, ed. *The Foucault Reader*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.

Radford, Gary P. "Flaubert, Foucault, and the Bibliotheque Fantastique: Toward a Postmodern Epistemology for Library Science." *Library Trends*, vol. 46, no. 4 (Spring 1998): 616-634.

Radford, Marie L., and Gary P. Radford. "Librarians and Party Girls: Cultural Studies and the Meaning of the Librarian." *Library Quarterly*, vol. 73, no. 1 (January 2003): 54-69.

Schwartz, Joan M., and Terry Cook. "Archives, Records, and Power: The Making of Modern Memory." *Archival Science*, vol. 2 (2002):1-19.

SCImago Journal and Country Rank, Top 100 LIS Journals, 2013. Available at <http://www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php?category=3309>.

Viires, Piret. "End of Irony? Estonian Literature after Postmodernism." *Interlitteraria*, vol. 16, no. 2 (2011): 451-463.

Wikipedia contributors. "Michel Foucault." In *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michel_Foucault.

Wilson, Patrick. "Bibliographic Instruction and Cognitive Authority." *Library Trends*, vol. 39, no. 3 (1991): 259-270.