Emerald Insight

Journal of Documentation

Article information:

Users who downloaded this article also downloaded:

For Authors

About Emerald www.emeraldinsight.com

(Non-)use of Foucault's *Archaeology of Knowledge* and *Order of Things* in LIS journal literature, 1990-2015

Scott Hamilton Dewey
*Law Library, University of California Los Angeles,
Los Angeles, California, USA*

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to provide a close, detailed analysis of the frequency, nature, and depth of visible use of two of Foucault's classic early works, *The Archaeology of Knowledge* and *The Order of Things*, by library, and information science/studies (LIS) scholars.

Design/methodology/approach – The study involved conducting extensive full-text searches in a large number of electronically available LIS journal databases to find citations of Foucault's works, then examining each citing article and each individual citation to evaluate the nature and depth of each use.

Findings – Contrary to initial expectations, the works in question are relatively little used by LIS scholars in journal articles, and where they are used, such use is often only vague, brief, or in passing. In short, works traditionally seen as central and foundational to discourse analysis appear relatively little in discussions of discourse.

Research limitations/implications – The study was limited to a certain batch of LIS journal articles that are electronically available in full text at UCLA, where the study was conducted. The results potentially could change by focussing on a fuller or different collection of journals or on non-journal literature. More sophisticated bibliometric techniques could reveal different relative performance among journals. Other research approaches, such as discourse analysis, social network analysis, or scholar interviews, might reveal patterns of use and influence that are not visible in the journal literature.

Originality/value – This study's intensive, in-depth study of quality as well as quantity of citations challenges some existing assumptions regarding citation analysis and the sociology of citation practices, plus illuminating Foucault scholarship.

Keywords Discourse, Foucault, *Archaeology*, Bibliometrics, Citation analysis, Sociology of citation

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

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" (Viires, 2011, p. 451; Lopez and Potter, 2001, p. 3). As such, postmodernism has significantly impacted many academic fields, including archival, library, and information science/studies (hereinafter LIS) (Brothman, 1999, p. 65; Buschman and Brosio, 2006, p. 408).

Of all the figures associated with postmodernism, the most widely known and widely cited is French intellectual historian and theoretician Michel Foucault (1926-1984) (*Times Higher Education online*, 2009; Cronin and Meho, 2009, p. 401). Foucault has been

called "the central figure in the most noteworthy flowering of oppositional intellectual life in the twentieth century West" (Olsson, 2007, p. 221, quoting Radford, 1992, p. 416). 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" (Radford, 1998, p. 622). 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 is particularly identified with discourse (Day, 2005, pp. 589-593; Hannabuss, 1996; Radford, 2003; Frohmann, 1994, p. 119). 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 (1992) 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 not which system is true" (p. 418). Searches of academic journal article databases indicate that discourse analysis, whether expressly Foucauldian or not, has profoundly impacted many fields, including LIS.

In light of the significant influence of Foucault and discourse analysis upon LIS among other fields, this study attempts to trace the visible impact on LIS scholarship of two of Foucault's most influential early works exploring discourse and his trademark "archaeological" approach used 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": *The Order of Things* (Foucault, 1970) (hereinafter referred to as "*Order*" for brevity's sake) and *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (Foucault, 1972) (hereinafter referred to as "*Archaeology*"). This study analyzes how these two works have influenced LIS scholars and practitioners, as evidenced by visible discussion, citation, and use of the works in LIS scholarly journal literature. To do this, the study traces precisely which scholars have appropriated either or both of Foucault's works, for use in precisely which publications, out of a lengthy list of digitally available and electronically searchable LIS journals.

As originally conceived, the study also sought to trace any visible patterns of variation in the use and understanding of these two books between different sectors 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. This focus of the research was based upon 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. It was hoped that the study's fine-grained, bottom-up approach of monitoring and measuring appropriation and use of Foucault's two works within the wider LIS field/community might serve as a proof of concept experiment for using the bottom-up approach to map boundaries between sub-areas of LIS, rather than conventional, top-down assumptions regarding such disciplinary subdivisions.

In the end, the study failed to reveal this hoped-for result. This was partly due to a substantial disparity in use of the two works overall: within the LIS arena generally, *The Order of Things* appears to be relatively little used compared to *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Yet the fine-grained, bottom-up approach used in the study reveals other interesting, suggestive patterns regarding the particular dynamics of the dispersion, diffusion, and perhaps, dissipation of influential ideas and concepts within a scholarly community. Notably, and perhaps ironically, the study tends to confirm Foucault's 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.

Research methods

To locate a very large sample of citations and uses of *Archaeology* and *Order*, 105 LIS journals were identified as candidates for full-text digital searches. The journals selected were drawn from three different sources that rank LIS journals by leadership and/or impact on their fields or subfields: SCImago Journal and Country Rank's LIS journal rankings of the top 100 LIS journals for 2013 (the most recent year available), plus additional ranking proposals covering LIS generally or archival journals specifically (SCImago, 2013; Nixon, 2014; Anderson, 2009). These sources were consulted without regard to their specific rankings, but rather only to identify a large pool of relatively well-known, well-regarded, and widely read LIS journals.

Wherever possible, full-text searches for "Foucault" were conducted in all journals on the search list. Digital availability and searchability of these 105 journals depended upon the holdings and subscription agreements of the UCLA library system, however, and for various reasons, not all journals on the search list were searchable in full text. 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 20 years ago.

Ultimately, of the 105 journals on the search list, 18 were unsearchable or unavailable at UCLA. Another 24 journals were available and searchable, but showed no results for Michel Foucault. Of the 63 remaining journals with 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, or references to Foucault were only duplicative stray references appearing in a journal's front or back matter.

After legitimate citations and references to Foucault were identified and winnowed, the results were further refined by separating actual citations of *Archaeology* or *Order* from citations or references to other works of Foucault. 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, which ideas or concepts from Foucault were applied, whether the author cited page numbers and which page numbers, whether the author quoted Foucault and which quotes, whether citations were co-citations with other authors or with other Foucault works, and various other parameters, in hopes of providing a fine-grained overall picture of the nature of LIS scholars' use of *Archaeology* and *Order*.

Depth of use was measured on a scale of six levels: Bibliography-Only; General Passing Reference (GPR) with a citation (almost no visible use of specifically Foucault's

ideas, often in a co-citation); Passing Reference (PR) with a citation (brief, limited use); Significant use (perhaps two or three brief sentences specifically focussed on Foucault's work(s)); Substantial use (about a short paragraph or more devoted primarily to one or the other (or both) of Foucault's works); and Very Substantial Use (VSU) (multiple paragraphs or pages devoted largely or entirely to Foucault's ideas as expressed in *Archaeology* or *Order*). This depth of use scale thus measures how much attention the citing author devotes to *Archaeology* or *Order*, and how much visible "work" either book does in the citing article.

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, the study also traces evidence of tertiary use – scholarly use of works by secondary users who had made use of the primary sources. 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, were effectively impracticable. Instead, tertiary use was monitored by searches of the writings of major secondary users of *Archaeology* or *Order* in the Web of Science Citation Index database, which covers most of the journals on this study's journal search list.

Research findings
Journal search results
Of the original list of 105 LIS journals, there were 69 journals and 1,062 articles containing any references to any Foucault, with 886 articles in 63 journals that mentioned the "right" (Michel) Foucault and were available for full-text searching. Of these 886 articles, 259 cited only works other than *Archaeology*, *Order*, or the Discourse on Language. Among articles citing "other" Foucault works, certain of Foucault's well-known later works appeared most frequently, particularly *Discipline and Punish*, *Power/Knowledge*, or *The History of Sexuality*. In 238 standard journal articles, plus 99 book reviews and 11 editors' introductions to special editions of particular journals or letters to the editor, no work by Foucault was cited, and Foucault was mentioned only in passing. In another 88 articles, Foucault's name only appeared in the title of a cited book or article or in passing in a quotation from another author.

The study found a total of 188 articles in which *Archaeology*, *Order*, and/or the Discourse on Language are cited. 123 articles cited *Archaeology* without *Order*; 37 cited *Order* without *Archaeology*; 25 cited both books in the same article; and three articles cited neither book but cited the Discourse on Language. An initial, rough evaluation of depth of usage indicated that 38 articles made relatively substantial use of *Archaeology* and/or *Order*, while 150 cited them mostly just in passing. Significantly, these numbers only indicate that *Archaeology* and/or *Order* were cited in a particular article, not whether the author also used other of Foucault's works, and in many cases, other, usually later, works of Foucault were more prominent.

Journals vary in the amount of attention they have devoted both to Foucault in general and to *Archaeology* or *Order* in particular. The distribution of articles citing *Archaeology*, *Order*, or the Discourse on Language is 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 16). Mentions of Foucault in general and citations of "Other" Foucault showed similar rightward-skewed long-tail formations. Closely similar performance in the respective long tails for "Other" and *Archaeology*/*Order*, including 16 journals that appear in the zero

column for both categories, suggests a similar overall lack of interest in Foucault generally among the majority of journals searched, while markedly higher numbers for "Other" citations relative to *Archaeology/Order* citations among those LIS journals showing more interest in Foucault indicate the higher overall level of interest in Foucault's later works.

In total, 14 of the same journals appear in the top 16 slots for both *Archaeology/Order* and "Other" Foucault, though there are variations in their relative rankings on each list and their relative frequencies of use of *Archaeology/Order* or "Other" works. For instance, *Archival Science*, first on the *Archaeology/Order* list with 16 citing articles, is only 11th on the "Other" list with seven. Some journals show relatively equal numbers of citations and comparatively close rankings on each list, such as *Archivaria*, *Library Quarterly* (*LQ*), *Information Research* (*IR*), and *Library Trends*; other journals vary widely in their citation tallies and ranking between the two lists, usually indicating 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* (*JDoc*), *Library & Information Science Review* (*LISR*), and *Information Processing & Management*. Even regarding journals that show 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 depth of use, the ranking of journals changes significantly – frequency of citing articles does not always correspond to substantial use of Foucault's works. Only eight journals – *LQ*, *JDoc*, *Archivaria*, *Archival Science*, *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* (*JASIST*), *Library Trends*, *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology* (*ARIST*), and *Aslib Proceedings* – show at least two substantial uses of *Archaeology* or *Order*, and only the first four of those show more than two. An additional dozen journals included at least one substantial use of *Archaeology* or *Order*, while 43 other journals did not.

Citation-specific search results
Because citations of *Archaeology* or *Order* sometimes may be scattered in different, discontinuous parts of a citing article, in such cases, the study traced and evaluated the use for each separate "citing event," where feasible, using the six-level scale described in the preceding section to measure and categorize depth of use: Bibliography-Only, GPR, PR, Significant, Substantial, and VSU. (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"). Because VSUs cannot be neatly broken down and categorized by separate citing events as the other use categories can be, articles making VSU of *Archaeology* or *Order* were not included in the quantitative citation-specific data. Articles were then categorized according to the highest level of use occurring within them.

Counting all multiple separate citations of *Archaeology* or *Order* occurring within the 188 articles identified by the journal search, and not counting the 15 VSUs, 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, plus five using only the

Discourse on Language. There are 43 citations of *Order* alone, plus 15 separate citing events that use both *Archaeology* and *Order* together. Curiously, *Order* is almost entirely absent from archival journals (only five mostly brief citations), and of the relatively few authors who do cite *Order*, a majority appear to have strong educational and/or professional associations outside of North America.

Reshuffling the citation-specific data to focus on it both by year and by work, 20 of the uses of *Order* occurred before 2001, 12 of them since 2006, 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 before 2003, five after 2007, and three from 2006-2007. 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 43 uses of *Order* alone, five were substantial, five were significant, and 20 were GPRs (plus three out of the six total Bibliography-Only). Of 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.

Using the citation-specific data to categorize articles by depth of use, and adding the VSUs back in, out of 188 articles, there were 126 uses of *Archaeology* (and/or the Discourse on Language), 37 uses of *Order* alone, and 25 uses of both works. Out of these, 15 ranked as VSUs, 24 as Substantial, 35 Significant, 41 PRs, 67 GPRs, and six Bibliography-Only. Articles citing *Order* alone showed one VSU, four Substantial, and four Significant uses. Sources citing *Archaeology* alone included five VSUs, 15 Substantial, and 28 Significant uses. In the "Both" category, there were nine VSUs, four Substantial, and three Significant uses. Especially considering that several of the "Both" articles making VSU relied 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, *LQ* hosted four of the 15 VSUs, two Substantial, and four Significant uses, while *JDoc* published two of the VSUs, four Substantial, and three Significant uses. *Archivaria* was notable in the archival arena for publishing three Substantial and six Significant uses. 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 VSUs to appear in *LQ* or *JDoc*, for instance, while of the one VSU and one Substantial use to appear in *IR*, Elin K. Jacob accounted for both 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 12 during 2005-2007 (four each year), while there were only 11 Significant uses during the entire period before 2005, with only 11 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 VSUs is more uneven and may also have tended to lead Substantial and Significant uses; for instance,

there were five VSUs 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 VSUs but eight Substantial and 12 Significant uses. Whether or not VSUs were thus somewhat "front-loaded" and may have helped to stimulate additional in-depth use, the pattern after 2007 has been even clearer regarding VSUs: there has been only one during the past seven years.

Turning to the concepts addressed in these various uses of *Archaeology* or *Order*, the single most predominant category is "Discourse," which appeared as a concept in 80 citing events (around 38 percent of the total), plus nine appearances of "Discursive Formation." Some other recurring conceptual categories include: archaeology (11); archive (19, 11 of them from *Archival Science* alone and another five from *Archivaria*); classification (12, four of them associated with Elin K. Jacob's articles); 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 five 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, six of them appearing in *Information & Organization* and three of those in Simon Lilley's 1998 article). Various other Foucauldian concepts appeared only once. 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.

There were 29 co-citations of *Archaeology* and/or *Order* together with other works by Foucault, 28 of them including later works by Foucault. There were 51 co-citations with other authors; French postmodernist philosopher Jacques Derrida appeared in 15 of these – more than any other single scholar – while other writers such as Barthes, Bourdieu, and Habermas appeared relatively frequently, and figures such as Heidegger, Kuhn, Latour, Levi-Strauss, Rorty, and various more recent writers surfaced less frequently. Co-citations were generally quite vague concerning Foucault's specific ideas.

In 70 citing events, authors provided page numbers; 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 a chapter or section generally, but most authors who cited page numbers were fairly precise. Perhaps notably, out of the 70 citations that provided any sort of page numbers, 31 (over 44 percent) appeared in archival journals, 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. 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. 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 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 six used more than two.

Tertiary use

Again, this study used the Web of Science Citation Index to trace tertiary use of writings by substantial secondary users of *Archaeology* or *Order*. As noted, there were 15 articles that made VSU of *Archaeology* or *Order*: Brooke (2002), Day (2005), Frohmann (2001), Hannabuss (1996), Humphries (1998), Jacob and Albrechtsen (1999), Malone and Elichirigoity (2003), six separate articles by the Radfords (1992, 2003), Talja (1999), and Tredinnick (2007). 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 (2006), Budd (2006), and Haider and Bawden (2007). Also added to the list was Michael Olsson, who has repeatedly demonstrated a substantial familiarity with various of Foucault's works but makes little specific use of *Archaeology* or *Order*. The Web of Science still does not cover top archival journals, so certain important articles by Richard Brown and Terry Cook could not be searched. A complete evaluation of the impact of particular Foucauldian ideas upon tertiary articles would require extensive analysis of all such articles, which was unfortunately impracticable. Yet searches in the Web of Science regarding tertiary uses nevertheless revealed some interesting patterns in such usage: namely, that there is pronounced clustering of such tertiary use in a relatively small group of journals, and that a substantial proportion of such use, up to nearly half, is by known secondary users. (Such identified users are referred to hereinafter as the "usual suspects," and appear as authors in the list of 188 articles citing either *Archaeology* or *Order*).

Ronald Day's (2005) article in *ARIST* includes one of the most extensive and intensive discussions of Foucault's ideas to appear in LIS journal literature to date. The Web of Science shows 17 articles citing Day's article. Seven of these were authored by "usual suspects," in most cases significant or substantial users of *Archaeology* or *Order* (Buschman (two separate citing articles), Haider and Bawden, Lindh and Haider, Lund, and Tredinnick (two citing articles)). Five other citing articles on the list come from scholars not necessarily that interested in using Foucauldian ideas themselves, but rather reflecting more broadly on the intellectual state, history, or evolution of the LIS field and noting Day's article as a milestone on that path. 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 *JDoc*; one apiece in *IR*, *LQ*, 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; their various articles extensively exploring Foucauldian ideas span more than two decades and account for six of the 15 VSUs found in this study. As with Day's article, only perhaps more so, Web of Science searches regarding the Radfords' various contributions tend to show significant clustering in terms of both citing authors and journals.

First published and most cited among Radford's (1992) articles is "Positivism, Foucault, and the Fantasia of the Library", cited 39 times in the Web of Science. Along with five self-citations, 17 other citing articles come from usual suspects. Like the article itself, 16 of the citing articles appeared in *LQ*; another four in *JDoc*; two apiece in *JASIST*, *LISR*, and *Library Trends*; one in *ARIST*; and 12 in various other journals.

The Radfords' article regarding stereotypes of female librarians has been cited 28 times. 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," half of the citing articles come from known *Archaeology* or *Order* users. Seven citing articles appeared in *LQ*; three apiece in *JDoc* and *Library Trends*; two in *LISR*; and 13 in other journals.

The Radfords' other VSUs generally showed similar author- and journal-clustering. Cumulatively regarding the Radfords' contributions, including 18 self-cites, "usual suspects" account for 71 of 129 total citing articles. In total, 41 of the 129 citing articles appeared in *LQ* (like four of the six Radford articles); another 18 citing articles appeared in *JDoc* (like the other two Radford articles). Although various other journals appeared repeatedly on the lists of citing articles, no others were as salient. Notably, 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.

The Substantial uses by Andersen and Skouvig, Budd, and Haider and Bawden show much of the same "usual journal suspect" clustering seen with Day and the Radfords, although with somewhat reduced author clustering and mostly lower citation counts so far.

An example of a VSU that displays some clustering of tertiary authors but relatively little clustering of journals is Talja (1999), which has been cited 45 times. Along with four self-cites, nine articles and six "usual suspects" appear in the Web of Science's list of citing authors. Talja's article has been cited four times in *IR*, three times apiece in *LQ*, *JDoc*, and *JASIST*, as well as twice apiece in *ARIST* and *LISR*, but it is also 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.

In sharp contrast to the frequently cited works of Talja and the Radfords, or even to Day's highly important but modestly cited contribution, some VSUs show few if any citations on the Web of Science. So, for instance, Stuart Hannabuss' (1996) article on Foucault in *Aslib Proceedings*, which like Day's (2005) article is among the most significant reflections on Foucault's thought within LIS journal literature, has been cited three times, one of these a self-cite (also in *Aslib Proceedings*) along with citations from Haider and Bawden and from Bawden alone (both in *JDoc*). Luke Tredinnick's (2007) article in *Aslib Proceedings*, which made VSU of *Archaeology* and *Order* among other works of Foucault, has been cited only once (by a usual suspect). Maria Humphries' (1998) article in *Organization Science*, which made extensive and thoughtful use of Foucault's early works applied to the context of business information, has been cited only twice. Malone and Elichirigoity (2003) has been cited only four times, one a self-cite, one by Andersen and Skouvig. Even allowing that the Web of Science may give an imperfect and incomplete measure of a publication's full impact,

the results for these articles suggests that their visible wider impact may have been (undeservedly) limited.

Two other VSUs, or their authors, display little, or else rather different, clustering of tertiary citing authors or journals: Brooke (2002) and Jacob and Albrechtsen (1999). 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 and Albrechtsen (1999), a VSU, has been cited in only six articles, including one self-cite plus three usual suspects. Jacob (2001), a Substantial use cited 17 times, includes only two self-cites plus three usual suspects. The third Jacob article (2004), 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 two usual suspects. Thus, out of a total of 65 articles citing Jacob's articles, usual suspects 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 VSUs, and citing journals' and authors' 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 *JDoc* and *IR*, and two in *ARIST*. By contrast, and showing a markedly different sort of clustering, Jacob's works have been cited in *Knowledge and Organization* 14 times – twice as many times as all the other VSUs and 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), cited 39 times, shows only two self-cites and one usual suspect. The journal list for citing articles also looks entirely different from most of the other VSUs: *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 principal usual journal suspects – *JDoc*, *LQ*, *IR*, *LISR*, etc. – not once.

Michael Olsson, whose doctoral dissertation concerned Foucault's ideas, mostly cites Foucault only in passing or relies upon secondary sources regarding Foucault in his various articles. 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 citing article. In total, 16 of the citations are self-cites; other "usual suspects" account for eight citations. Olsson's citation lists show some slight journal clustering: two articles apiece from *ARIST*, *IR*, and *Australian Academic and Research Libraries*, one apiece from *JDoc*, *JASIST*, *LQ*, *LISR*, and *Libri*.

Bernd Frohmann has been saved for last as a special and somewhat peculiar situation. Frohmann (2001) is categorized as a VSU in this study; however, even though the Web of Science recognizes the publishing journal, the *Journal of Education for Library & Information Science*, there seems to be no record for that particular article among Frohmann's more than 30 publications that do appear in the Web of Science. 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, may have been an earlier conference paper 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.

Frohmann (1992b), 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. Usual suspects account for 36 of the 76 citing events. In total, 13 of these citing articles appeared in *JDoc*, 11 in *LQ*, nine in *ARIST*, eight in *JASIST*, and five apiece in *IR* and *LISR*, along with 16 in other journals and nine books or book chapters. The overall picture is mostly similar with Frohmann (1994), cited 61 times. Usual suspects include 35 out of the 61 citing authors. *LISR* accounted for nine of the citing articles, *ARIST* and *LQ* for eight apiece, *JDoc* for six, *JASIST* for five, and *IR* for four, along with other journals and books or book chapters. The third Frohmann (1992a) essay shows 11 citing articles, with two self-cites and eight usual suspects; citing articles include three apiece in *ARIST* and *JDoc*, and one apiece in *IR*, *LQ*, and *LISR*.

Cumulatively, counting all the VSUs together (including the two extra articles by Jacob), without Olsson or Frohmann and without the additional Substantial users such as Andersen and Skouvig, Budd, and Haider and Bawden, 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 VSU in the same article) (36.75 percent). Excluding the somewhat anomalous results for Jacob and Brooke, the ratio changes to 94 (with 24 self-cites) out of 198 (47.47 percent). Further excluding the also somewhat anomalous Talja (1999) article with its broad appeal beyond the LIS field, the ratio changes to 81 (20 self-cites) out of 153 (52.94 percent). Adding in the substantial users, the ratio changes to 91 (22 self-cites) out of 186 (48.92 percent); 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 percent). Including everybody all together (i.e. Brooke, Jacob, and Talja with the others) gives a ratio of 223 (with 54 self-cites) out of 525 (42.48 percent).

In terms of cumulative results for journal clustering, *LQ* accounted for 69 of the citations, *JDoc* for 59, *ARIST* for 34, *JASIST* for 27, *LISR* for 25, *IR* for 22, and *Library Trends* for 10 – in other words, 246 out of 525 total citations, or 46.86 percent, with *LQ* and *JDoc* together representing 24.38 percent. Excluding Brooke, Jacob, and Talja, these tallies become 66, 53, 33, 18, 23, 18, and 9, respectively – 220 out of 376, or 58.51 percent, with *LQ* and *JDoc* together representing 31.65 percent.

Analysis of findings
Limited visible use 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 crucial to the understanding and use of Foucault and his work in general. Thus, the study anticipated finding relatively extensive and intensive use of both 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.

The data on visible use of the two works, however, indicates that rather than being seen as crucial, both works have instead been treated as relatively marginal in the LIS field. Not only do a substantial majority of the articles in this study's database that cite Foucault at all only cite works other than *Archaeology* or *Order* (259 vs 188), but 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*.

Uses of *Archaeology* or *Order* also tend to be non-specific. Almost two-thirds of all uses are only brief, G/PRs, while even those uses categorized as "Significant" remain relatively brief and generally indicate relatively little reliance upon Foucault's works. 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; such co-citations cumulatively account for almost 40 percent of all citing events involving *Archaeology* or *Order*. 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 PR to the concept of discourse, perhaps with a mention of Foucault's name, followed by a general citation of *Archaeology*.

There is also 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 (1972, pp. 14-15) himself emphasized the close relationship between the two works both explicitly, by identifying *Archaeology* as a more complete theorization of ideas he started exploring in *Order* and other earlier works, and implicitly, by repeatedly and extensively referring back to those works, especially *Order*, throughout *Archaeology*. Thus, Foucault invited his readers to think of *Archaeology* and *Order* together, like two parts of a larger whole; but the data from this study suggests that relatively few LIS scholars have accepted or noticed that invitation.

Limited evidence of extensive visible use of *Archaeology* or *Order* begs the question whether the works might nonetheless have had significant but invisible impact on LIS scholars. 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.

One dramatic example from archival scholarship is Terry Cook, perhaps the most influential archival scholar of his generation, who in footnotes in several articles repeatedly emphasizes the influence Foucault had on his thinking (Cook, 2001a, b, p. 8, fn. 8 and p. 24, fn. 21; Cook, 1994, p. 326, fn. 27) and also specifically points to both *Archaeology* and *Order* as key works for archivists (Cook, 2001a, p. 16, fn. 22; Cook, 1994, p. 327, fn. 33), but who also only rarely cites or quotes Foucault in his numerous articles. Indeed, aside from two articles each with a substantial and fairly lengthy paragraph devoted entirely to Foucault plus a footnote non-specifically citing both *Archaeology* and *Order* (Cook, 2001a, p. 16, fn. 22; Cook, 1994, p. 327, fn. 33), and 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 seems to have rarely made it into the main text of Cook's articles as more than a PR if that, notwithstanding the great importance Cook clearly saw in Foucault both for himself personally and for the archival profession generally. (Statements in this and following paragraphs regarding authors' infrequent citation of Foucault are based upon electronic searches of the authors' electronically available articles).

Another striking example from the archival arena of demonstrated awareness together with limited visible use of Foucault is South African archivist Verne Harris. Harris, a particularly devoted disciple of French postmodernist philosopher Jacques Derrida, occasionally evinces familiarity with Foucault, also (Duff and Harris, 2002, p. 64, fn. 1, pp. 276-277, fn. 49 and pp. 135-136, 137, 140), even chiding a fellow scholar

for using Foucault's ideas only narrowly regarding surveillance, "but nothing else from his vast oeuvre". Yet Foucault mostly only haunts Harris' many publications like a ghost in occasional passing name references.

Yet another noteworthy example from the archival world of a scholar who almost certainly is very well steeped in Foucault but visibly uses him 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, including writers such as Lyotard, Deleuze, and Guattari along with Foucault and Derrida. Like Harris, Brothman has spent most of his time and energy devoted to postmodernism on Derrida; he reveals a deep familiarity with Foucault's works, but cites or uses them only relatively rarely (Brothman, 2006, p. 260, fn. 48; Brothman, 1993, p. 212, fn. 28 and p. 215, fn. 52; Brothman, 2010, pp. 142-143, fn. 4; Brothman, 2001, p. 62, fn. 20 and p. 63, fn. 24).

Other archival scholars who have evinced a significant and persistent interest in postmodernist ideas, such as Joan Schwartz and Tom Nesmith, 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*.

Although the archival arena may be somewhat striking in its roster of scholars who demonstrate an awareness of Foucault but do not visibly cite or use him much in their work, various LIS scholars show the same tendency. One notable example is Michael Olsson, an Australian LIS scholar who used Foucauldian ideas prominently in his doctoral dissertation (Olsson, 2007, p. 219). In his 2007 article in *LQ* offering 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" (p. 219). Yet of the five works by Foucault that Olsson co-cites near the beginning of his article – *Order*, *Archaeology*, *Discipline and Punish*, the first volume of *The History of Sexuality*, and 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 (1984) *Foucault Reader* along with a book and article by Gary Radford, Frohmann's (1992b, 1994) influential articles, a book by Talja, and others. Several of Olsson's other articles that do not focus as closely on Foucault each contain three 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," and briefly explains Foucault's belief in the fundamental subjectivity of knowledge with a quote from Rabinow on that point (Olsson, 2009, pp. 22-23; Olsson, 2010a, b, pp. 241, 244-245 and pp. 273-274). Later in each article, there is also a reference to Foucault's notion of the "Battle for Truth" (Olsson, 2009, p. 28; Olsson, 2010a, b, p. 245 and p. 278). 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 as well as his own earlier publications.

The reliance of Olsson, along with many other authors, on Frohmann's (1992b, 1994) articles as sources regarding Foucauldian concepts relating to discourse is perhaps somewhat ironic, given that Foucault, directly, is mostly absent from both these

articles, and *Archaeology* and *Order* are entirely absent. 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 Poster (1984) or Dreyfus and Rabinow (1983). Indeed, other postmodernist thinkers such as Lyotard and Baudrillard appear in the 1992 article almost as prominently as Foucault.

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 philosophy 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 nearly all other 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* (Frohmanns', 2001, 2008).

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 for sophistication, familiarity, and fluency regarding a wide range of abstruse postmodernist authors and writings, together with other critical theory and philosophy. Aside from Day's important, in-depth exploration of Foucault in his 2005 article in *ARIST*, Foucault is mostly absent from the rest of Day's oeuvre, with usually only brief appearances in other articles (Day, 2000a, p. 809, fn. 10; Day, 2000b, p. 472, fn. 9; Day, 2004, p. 414). 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 (Day, 2001, p. 123, fn. 2).

Although a handful of LIS scholars does not make a 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, special set of scholars might have had 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 among other LIS scholars who are likely to be far less conversant with Foucault or postmodernism. That is, both leading LIS theoreticians, and scholars with other, more usual preoccupations, 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 do not have to reach for Foucault for their general theoretical needs; they can (and do) equally well draw on other authors such as Baudrillard, Deleuze, or Lyotard (or Habermas, or Heidegger),

and they may use Foucault only for precise, limited purposes. Thus, theoretical leaders, with a wider range of more precise theoretical tools at their disposal, can more easily choose when to use Foucault and when not to. Yet it remains intriguing how often they choose not to.

Preference for secondary sources

Yet another advantage theoretically sophisticated LIS scholars have is that along with their greater familiarity with original sources, 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 (Wilson, 1991, p. 264; Hardiman, 2009, p. 36).

On that point, Terry Cook, who mostly does not cite Foucault at more than a general level yet 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. Such scholars are, in effect, tacitly encouraging the use of secondary sources at least in conjunction with exploration of Foucault's original works; in actual practice, the message received might be that it is all right to use the secondary sources instead of the originals.

Along with their generally limited, vague use of *Archaeology* and *Order*, 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 (10 percent of the original total of 886 articles) in which Foucault's name only appears in the title of a cited secondary source. 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 may still be 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.

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 is not (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 PR with a citation and a PR 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 may still 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.

Possible incentives for display of use of Foucault?
Along with the various examples described above, another related example of use/ nonuse of Foucault and his early works may further illuminate the wider overall phenomenon found in this study.

In his 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 [generally citing Foucault 1972] (Skibell, 2002, p. 339).

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*. Moreover, there is only one other citation of any work by Foucault in the article – a relatively general use of *Discipline and Punish* regarding the psychology and discursive character of a society's penal system (2002, p. 342), plus two more PRs 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. (Skibell and his worthy article emphatically are not being singled out for criticism here).

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, 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 temptations of intellectual laziness, explicit or implicit statements conveying a (perhaps inadvert) 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 – 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 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.

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 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 – assuming that Skibell's assumption was indeed entirely correct at the moment he (or 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 less 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 or other metadata; certain ideas and their origins that "everybody already knew," and which thus might have seemed entirely evident to them, may be left 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 (we always see the past only through a glass darkly), it can actually happen more quickly and explosively regarding precisely 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 (1972, p. 173) put it, a "system of dispersion".

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 suggestive 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. This study's data indicates an 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 PR or quotation out of context – rather like Foucault's famous "face drawn in the sand" quote at the end of *The Order of Things* (Foucault, 1970, p. 422).

"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. In particular, it appears that *Discipline and Punish* gradually may be coming to serve as a universal placeholder for virtually all of Foucault's ideas. If *Discipline and Punish* is indeed 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 or most readily accessible?

Returning to the matter of secondary sources, but also touching on the question of tertiary use addressed in this study: the seeming pattern of preference for more accessible secondary sources instead of Foucault's original works also seems to surface in the tertiary use of secondary articles that make VSU 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 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 (1992b, 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 has not 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 20 oughts that already have been cited dozens of times (such as Jacob, 2004, 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 (1992b, 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.

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

By contrast, Frohmann's (1992b, 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. 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 (Frohmann, 1994, p. 119).

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 specific nuances of Foucault better than Frohmann's early articles in which Foucault is mostly invisible, Frohmann exposes readers to general ideas regarding critical and Foucauldian theory of discourse that they can use and run with more easily than Day.

Nor is the relative under-appreciation of Day's valuable contribution the only example of this phenomenon. As noted in an earlier section, both Hannabuss' and 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 20 years old, only four years younger than Frohman's 1992 contribution. The same goes for the overall neglect and lack of citation traction regarding Malone and Elichirigoity (2003) and Humphries (1998). As with Day, the general neglect of these 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.

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. Moreover, the overall pattern observed regarding direct use of Foucault tends to be confirmed by the tertiary use of notable users of Foucauldian ideas. 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.

Again, the roster of journals including the most significant use of *Archaeology* or *Order* reads: *LQ*; *JDoc*; *Archivaria*; *Archival Science*; *JASIST*; *Library Trends*; *ARIST*; *Aslib Proceedings* (followed by several journals that each show one significant or substantial use, including *LISR* and *IR*). 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: *LQ*; *JDoc*; *ARIST*; *JASIST*; *LISR*; *IR*; *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. These journals also generally show a heightened interest in theory, including critical theory, unlike various other LIS journals that may have a more particular practical focus.

Practically focussed LIS journals generally tended to show limited interest in Foucault. Yet perhaps somewhat surprisingly, the study results found Foucault and *Archaeology* or *Order* spreading far beyond the "core" journals listed above and showing up occasionally in journals that might have been expected to be non-users. Thus there seems to be a 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, while the periphery is occupied mostly by more practically specialized and focussed journals. Yet notwithstanding the clustering of most of the use of *Archaeology* or *Order* among the academically oriented core journals, there has also been a significant degree of penetration of the periphery by *Archaeology* or *Order* (which appears to be even more pronounced regarding other works by Foucault). That is, Foucault and *Archaeology* or *Order* are indeed showing up even in some relatively practical, focussed 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 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, focussed 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.

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 noted, 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*, often relatively substantial users. 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. 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 would seem to be that scholars, both as individuals but especially as groups, 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 in effect an 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 the extent any one interpretation becomes relatively standard and established, most scholars likely will feel little need to undertake the effort to work through original sources. 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, occasionally genuflected to dutifully but otherwise 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 other's 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 do not. 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).

Conclusion

Readers familiar with Foucault might sense they are seeing in this study the fuzzy outlines of one of the most archetypally Foucauldian concepts: a discursive formation. Indeed, this study portrays a process whereby Foucault himself has become something of a discursive formation within LIS – a particular system of discourse involving a certain disciplinary community with 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 (1972) himself put it (p. 173). 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 from which Foucault himself frequently largely vanishes or hangs overhead like a mythical forefather.

In short, 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, not only is it precisely what he would have predicted; it is also in a sense precisely what he encouraged. As Foucault observed:

> 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 (Foucault, 1974, pp. 523-524).

In other words, rather than later scholars preoccupying themselves with finding an original correct, 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 may have 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. (He characterized such efforts as "harmless enough amusements for historians who refuse to grow up") (Foucault, 1972, p. 144). The research approach used in this study – full-text database searching – did not exist in Foucault's day, and its findings would have been impossible without such new technology. In theory at least, in the hands of truly obsessive humans 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 indicates 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 – the 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 and depth of use. *Archaeology* appears to be vastly overshadowed by later works of Foucault; *Order* is almost invisible. A high proportion of the identifiable uses of both works show relatively PRs only, often general and without page numbers. Scholars – including those relatively well-versed in Foucault – tend to prefer accessible secondary sources of Foucauldian ideas.

To explain such results, this study posits that widespread familiarity with complex, difficult original works within a scholarly community may inevitably tend to favor display of general familiarity with, rather than detailed and specific use of, the original works – a situation where everybody already knows, or appears to know, what is in them. This may produce a reduced sense of need to leave careful signposts regarding particularized use of the original sources for either contemporaneous or future scholars. Influential original sources that stimulate active secondary commentary regarding them may become buried under, and in effect replaced by, such secondary especially rapidly, and so vanish from the very discussion and discourse they triggered.

Notwithstanding the effort that went into this study, it remains, admittedly and inevitably, an incomplete snapshot of a much wider picture. Further research either to confirm, rebut, or modify the results could take various potentially fruitful directions.

For instance, a larger, perhaps more accurately focussed sample of LIS journals could be used. Non-journal literature such as monographs and unpublished conference papers might prove to contain more intensive theoretical use and discussion of Foucault's works. Such approaches might produce additional evidence of visible use of Foucault. Other techniques might be used to identify and measure Foucault's (potentially more significant) non- or less-visible influence upon the LIS community, such as discourse analysis, social network analysis, or interviews with key scholars, along with more sophisticated bibliometric techniques.

Yet hopefully this study has contributed to the wider 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 – as well as 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 (MacRoberts and MacRoberts, 1989, 1996, 2010). This study, analyzing depth of use, suggests that it may be dangerous to make that assumption. 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 (Edge, 1977/1978).

In tracing the limited visible footprints left by works that nonetheless appear to have had substantial non-visible influence, this study also contributes 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" (McCain, 2011, p. 1413, quoting Merton, 1988, p. 622), 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. 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 drawn in the sand at the edge of the sea.

References

Andersen, J. and Skouvig, L. (2006), "Knowledge organization: a sociohistorical analysis and critique", *Library Quarterly*, Vol. 76 No. 3, pp. 300-322.

Anderson, K. (2009), "Proposed journal ranking list for archives and records management", available at: aeri2009.files.wordpress.com/2009/05/archival-journal-ranking-aeri.doc; http://ebook-free-downloads.com/ebook-doc-free-doc-download-journal-page-5.htm (accessed May 11, 2015).

Brooke, C. (2002), "What does it mean to be 'Critical' in IS research?", *Journal of Information Technology*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 49-57.

Brothman, B. (1993), "The limits of limits: Derridean deconstruction and the archival institution", *Archivaria*, Vol. 36, Autumn, pp. 205-230.

Brothman, B. (1999), "Declining Derrida: integrity, tensegrity, and the preservation of archives from deconstruction", *Archivaria*, Vol. 48, Fall, pp. 64-88, available at: http://journals.sfu.ca/archivar/index.php/archivaria/issue/archive

Brothman, B. (2001), "The past that archives keep: memory, history, and the preservation of archival records", *Archivaria*, Vol. 51, Spring, pp. 48-80.

Brothman, B. (2006), "Archives, life cycles, and death wishes: a helical model of record formation", *Archivaria*, Vol. 61, Spring, pp. 235-269.

Brothman, B. (2010), "Perfect present, perfect gift: finding a place for archival consciousness in social theory", *Archival Science*, Vol. 10, Summer, pp. 141-189.

Brown, R. (1991/1992), "Records acquisition strategy and its theoretical foundation: the case for a concept of archival hermeneutics", *Archivaria*, Vol. 33, Winter, pp. 34-56.

Brown, R. (1995), "Macro-appraisal theory and the context of the public records creator", *Archivaria*, Vol. 40, Fall, pp. 121-172.

Budd, J.M. (2006), "Discourse analysis and the study of communication in LIS", *Library Trends*, Vol. 55 No. 1, pp. 65-82.

Buschman, J. (2007), "Transgression or stasis? Challenging Foucault in LIS theory", *Library Quarterly*, Vol. 77 No. 1, pp. 21-44.

Buschman, J. and Brosio, R.A. (2006), "A critical primer on postmodernism: lessons from educational scholarship for librarianship", *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 32 No. 4, pp. 408-418.

Cook, T. (1994), "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, pp. 300-328.

Cook, T. (2001a), "Archival science and postmodernism: new formulations for old concepts", *Archival Science*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 3-24.

Cook, T. (2001b), "Fashionable nonsense or professional rebirth: postmodernism and the practice of archives", *Archivaria*, Vol. 51, Spring, pp. 14-35.

Cronin, B. and Meho, L.I. (2009), "Receiving the French: a bibliometric snapshot of the impact of 'French Theory' on information science", *Journal of Information Science*, Vol. 35 No. 4, pp. 398-413.

Day, R.E. (2000a), "The 'Conduit Metaphor' and the nature and politics of information studies", *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 51 No. 9, pp. 805-811.

Day, R.E. (2000b), "Tropes, history, and ethics in professional discourse and information science", *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 51 No. 5, pp. 469-475.

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

Day, R.E. (2004), "Community as event", *Library Trends*, Vol. 52 No. 3, pp. 408-426.

Day, R.E. (2005), "Poststructuralism and information studies", *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp. 575-609.

Dreyfus, H.L. and Rabinow, P. (1983), *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Duff, W.M. and Harris, V. (2002), "Stories and names: archival description as narrating records and constructing meanings", *Archival Science*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 263-285.

Edge, D. (1977/1978), "Why I am not a co-citationist", Essays of an Information Scientist, Vol. 3, pp. 240-246, available at: www.garfield.library.upenn.edu/essays/v3p240y1977-78.pdf (accessed May 11, 2015).

Foucault, M. (1970), *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, Vintage, New York, NY.

Foucault, M. (1972), *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Pantheon Books, New York, NY.

Foucault, M. (1974), "Prisons et asiles dans le mécanisme du pouvoir", (trans by Clare O'Farrell), *Dits et Ecrits, Vol. II*, Gallimard, Paris, pp. 521-525, available at: www.michel-foucault.com/quote/2004q.html

Frohmann, B. (1992a), "Knowledge and power in library and information science – toward a discourse analysis of the cognitive viewpoint", in Vakkari, P. and Cronin, B. (Eds), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Conceptions of Library and Information Science: Historical, Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives, August 16, 28, 1991*, University of Tampere, Tampere, pp. 135-148.

Frohmann, B. (1992b), "The power of images: a discourse analysis of the cognitive viewpoint", *Journal of Documentation*, Vol. 48 No. 4, pp. 365-386.

Frohmann, B. (1994), "Discourse analysis as a research method in library and information science", *Library & Information Science Research*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 119-138.

Frohmann, B. (2001), "Discourse and documentation: some implications for pedagogy and research", *Journal of Education for Library & Information Science*, Vol. 42 No. 1, pp. 12-26.

Frohmann, B. (2008), "Documentary ethics, ontology, and politics", *Archival Science*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 165-180.

Haider, J. and Bawden, D. (2007), "Conceptions of 'Information Poverty' in LIS: a discourse analysis", *Journal of Documentation*, Vol. 63 No. 4, pp. 534-557.

Hannabuss, S. (1996), "Foucault's view of knowledge", *Aslib Proceedings*, Vol. 48 No. 4, pp. 87-102.

Hardiman, R. (2009), "En mal d'archive: postmodernist theory and recordkeeping", *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 27-44.

Harris, V. (2002), "The archival sliver: power, memory, and archives in South Africa", *Archival Science*, Vol. 2 Nos 1-2, pp. 63-86.

Humphries, M. (1998), "For the common good? New Zealanders comply with quality standards", *Organization Science*, Vol. 9 No. 6, pp. 738-749.

Jacob, E.K. (2001), "The everyday world of work: two approaches to the investigation of classification in context", *Journal of Documentation*, Vol. 57 No. 1, pp. 76-99.

Jacob, E.K. (2004), "Classification and categorization: a difference that makes a difference", *Library Trends*, Vol. 52 No. 3, pp. 515-540.

Jacob, E.K. and Albrechtsen, H. (1999), "Exploring the contexts of information behaviour", in Wilson, T.D. and Allen, D.K. (Eds), *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Research in Information Needs, Seeking and Use in Different Contexts, August 13-15, 1998*, Taylor Graham, Sheffield and London, 625pp, available at: www.informationr.net/isic/ISIC1998/98_Jacob.pdf

Lilley, S. (1998), "Regarding screens for surveillance of the system", *Accounting, Management & Information Technology*, Vol. 8 Nos 2-3, pp. 63-105.

Lopez, J. and Potter, G. (Eds) (2001), *After Postmodernism: An Introduction to Critical Realism*, Athlone, New York, NY.

McCain, K.W. (2011), "Eponymy and obliteration by incorporation: the case of the 'Nash Equilibrium'", *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 62 No. 7, pp. 1412-1424.

MacRoberts, M.H. and MacRoberts, B.R. (1989), "Problems of citation analysis: a critical review", *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 40 No. 5, pp. 342-349.

MacRoberts, M.H. and MacRoberts, B.R. (1996), "Problems of citation analysis", *Scientometrics*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 435-444.

MacRoberts, M.H. and MacRoberts, B.R. (2010), "Problems of citation analysis: a study of uncited and seldom-cited influences", *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 61 No. 1, pp. 1-13.

Malone, C.K. and Elichirigoity, F. (2003), "Information as commodity and economic sector: its emergence in the discourse of industrial classification", *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 54 No. 6, pp. 512-520.

Merton, R.K. (1988), "The Matthew Effect in Science, II: cumulative advantage and the symbolism of intellectual property", *Isis*, Vol. 79 No. 4, pp. 606-623.

Nixon, J.M. (2014), "Core journals in library and information science: developing a methodology for ranking LIS journals", *College & Research Libraries*, Vol. 75 No. 1, pp. 66-90.

Olsson, M. (2007), "Power/knowledge: the discursive construction of an author", *Library Quarterly*, Vol. 77 No. 2, pp. 219-240.

Olsson, M.R. (2009), "Re-thinking our concept of users", *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 22-35.

Olsson, M.R. (2010a), "All the world's a stage – the information practices and sense-making of theatre professionals", *Libri*, Vol. 60 No. 3, pp. 241-252.

Olsson, M.R. (2010b), "The play's the thing: theater professionals make sense of Shakespeare", *Library & Information Science Review*, Vol. 32 No. 4, pp. 272-280.

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

Rabinow, P. (Ed.) (1984), *The Foucault Reader*, Pantheon Books, New York, NY.

Radford, G.P. (1992), "Positivism, Foucault, and the Fantasia of the Library: conceptions of knowledge and the modern library experience", *Library Quarterly*, Vol. 62 No. 4, pp. 408-424.

Radford, G.P. (1998), "Flaubert, Foucault, and the bibliotheque fantastique: toward a postmodern epistemology for library science", *Library Trends*, Vol. 46 No. 4, pp. 616-634.

Radford, G.P. (2003), "Trapped in our own discursive formations: toward an archaeology of library and information science", *Library Quarterly*, Vol. 73 No. 1, pp. 1-18.

Radford, G.P. and Radford, M.L. (2001), "Libraries, librarians, and the discourse of fear", *Library Quarterly*, Vol. 71 No. 3, pp. 299-329.

Radford, G.P. and Radford, M.L. (2005), "Structuralism, post-structuralism, and the library: de Saussure and Foucault", *Journal of Documentation*, Vol. 61 No. 1, pp. 60-78.

Radford, G.P., Radford, M.L. and Lingel, J. (2012), "Alternative libraries as discursive formations: reclaiming the voice of the deaccessioned book", *Journal of Documentation*, Vol. 68 No. 2, pp. 254-267.

Radford, M.L. and Radford, G.P. (1997), "Power, knowledge, and fear: feminism, Foucault, and the stereotype of the female librarian", *Library Quarterly*, Vol. 67 No. 3, pp. 250-266.

SCImago (2013), "Top 100 LIS journals, 2013", available at: www.scimagojr.com/journalrank. php?category=3309 (accessed May 11, 2015).

Skibell, R. (2002), "The myth of the computer hacker", *Information, Communication & Society*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 336-356.

Talja, S. (1999), "Analyzing qualitative interview data: the discourse analytic method", *Library & Information Science Review*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 459-477.

Times Higher Education online (2009), "Most cited authors of books in the humanities, 2007" March 26, available at: www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/405956.article (accessed May 11, 2015).

482

Tredinnick, L. (2007), "Post-structuralism, hypertext, and the world wide web", *Aslib Proceedings*, Vol. 59 No. 2, pp. 169-186.

Viires, P. (2011), "End of irony? Estonian literature after postmodernism", *Interlitteraria*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 451-463.

Wilson, P. (1991), "Bibliographic instruction and cognitive authority", *Library Trends*, Vol. 39 No. 3, pp. 259-270.

Further reading

Aylesworth, G. (2015), "Postmodernism", Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy online, available at: http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/postmodernism/ (accessed May 11, 2015).

Brothman, B. (2011), "The society of American archivists at seventy-five: contexts of continuity and crisis, a personal reflection", *American Archivist*, Vol. 74 No. 2, pp. 387-427.

Burke, C. (2007), "History of information science", *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 41 No. 1, pp. 3-53.

Cook, T. (2005), "Macroappraisal in theory and practice: origins, characteristics, and implementation in Canada, 1950-2000", *Archival Science*, Vol. 5, pp. 101-161.

Cronin, B. (2008), "The sociological turn in information science", *Journal of Information Science*, Vol. 34 No. 4, pp. 465-475.

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

Derrida, J. (1996), *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, (Trans by Eric Prenowitz), University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Dewey, S.H. (2015), "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", master's thesis, UCLA, Library and Information Science.

Foucault, M. (1975), *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*, Vintage, New York, NY.

Foucault, M. (1979), *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Vintage, New York, NY.

Foucault, M. (1980a), in Gordon, C. (Ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*, Harvester Press, Brighton.

Foucault, M. (1980b), *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An Introduction*, Vintage, New York, NY.

Foucault, M. (1985), *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 2: The Use of Pleasure*, Vintage, New York, NY.

Foucault, M. (1986), *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 3: The Care of the Self*, Vintage, New York, NY.

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

Furner, J. (2010), "Philosophy and information studies", *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 44 No. 1, pp. 161-200.

Gutting, G. (2013), "Michel Foucault", Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy online, available at: http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/foucault/ (accessed May 11, 2015).

Harris, V. (2009), "Against the grain: psychologies and politics of secrecy", *Archival Science*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 133-142.

Harris, V. (2014), "Antonyms of our remembering", *Archival Science*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 215-229.

McKechnie, L., Cedeira Serantes, L. and Hoffman, C. (2012), "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, available at: www.informationr.net/ir/17-4/paper548.html

Olsson, M. (1999), "Exploring the contexts of information behaviour", in Wilson, T.D. and Allen, D.K. (Eds), *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Research in Information Needs, Seeking and Use in Different Contexts*, Taylor Graham, Sheffield and London, August 13-15, 1998, available at: www.informationr.net/isic/ISIC1998/98_Jacob.pdf

Olsson, M. (2013), "Gently to hear, kindly to judge: the affective information practices of theatre professionals and journalists", *Information Research*, Vol. 18 No. 3, availble at: www.informationr.net/ir/18-3/colis/paperC22.html.

Schwartz, J.M. and Cook, T. (2002), "Archives, records, and power: the making of modern memory", *Archival Science*, Vol. 2, pp. 1-19.

(The Appendix follows overleaf.)

Appendix

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
Annual Review of Information Science and Technology	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 & Management	1	2	3			5	
Information Research	10	7	3	1		9	2
Information Technology and People	5		1			1	
International Journal of Information Management	4	2				2	
Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology	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 and Information Science	1	1				1	
Journal of Library Administration	3		1			1	
Journal of the Society of Archivists				2		1	1
Library & Information Science 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

Table AI.
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" 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
Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology	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
Annual Review of Information Science and Technology	4	4	14
Journal of Information Science	4	3	19
International Journal of Information Management	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

Notes: 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. on L. 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*

Table AII.
Top journals for use
of "other" Foucault

Journals with "Foucault" results	Arch/Order/both	Other	Total references
Archival Science	16	7	41
Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology	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
Annual Review of Information Science and Technology	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 Management	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

Notes: All journals after these 26 have only one use of *Arch/Order*/both/D. on L. 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*

Table AIII.
Top journals for use of *Archaeology*, *Order*, or both

Author(s) of articles	Journal	Work(s) used	Year
Brooke (2002)	*Journal of Information Technology*	*Arch*	2002
Day (2005)	*Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*	*Arch*	2005
Frohmann (2001)	*Journal of Education for Librarianship*	Both	2001
Hannabuss (1996)	*Aslib Proceedings*	Both	1996
Humphries (1998)	*Organization Science*	Both	1998
Jacob and Albrechtsen (1999)	*Information Research*	*Order*	1998
Malone and Elichirigoity (2003)	*Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*	*Arch*	2003
Radford and Radford (1997)	*Library Quarterly*	*Arch* and DoL	1997
Radford and Radford (2001)	*Library Quarterly*	Both and DoL	2001
Radford and Radford (2005)	*Journal of Documentation*	*Arch*	2005
Radford *et al.* (2012)	*Journal of Documentation*	Both	2012
Radford (1992)	*Library Quarterly*	Both and DoL	1992
Radford (2003)	*Library Quarterly*	Both	2003
Talja (1999)	*Library & Information Science Research*	*Arch*	1999
Tredinnick (2007)	*Aslib Proceedings*	Both	2007

Table AIV.
Very substantial
uses of *Archaeology*,
Order, or both

Author(s) of articles	Depth of use	Year	Work(s)
Radford (1992)	Very substantial	1992	Both and DoL
Hannabuss (1996)	Very substantial	1996	Both
Radford and Radford (1997)	Very substantial	1997	*Arch* and DoL
Humphries (1998)	Very substantial	1998	Both
Jacob and Albrechtsen (1999)	Very substantial	1998	*Order*
Talja (1999)	Very substantial	1999	*Arch*
Frohmann (2001)	Very substantial	2001	Both
Radford and Radford (2001)	Very substantial	2001	Both and DoL
Brooke (2002)	Very substantial	2002	*Arch*
Malone and Elichirigoity (2003)	Very substantial	2003	*Arch*
Radford	Very substantial	2003	Both
Day (2005)	Very substantial	2005	*Arch*
Radford and Radford (2005)	Very substantial	2005	*Arch*
Tredinnick (2007)	Very substantial	2007	Both
Radford *et al.* (2012)	Very substantial	2012	Both
Brown (1991/1992)	Substantial	1991	*Arch*
Brown (1995)	Substantial	1995	*Arch*
Hubbard	Substantial	1995	*Arch*
Sotto	Substantial	1997	*Order*
Budd and Raber	Substantial	1998	DoL only
Clark	Substantial	1998	*Order*
Cook (2001)	Substantial	2001	Both
Jacob (2001)	Substantial	2001	Both
Talja *et al.*	Substantial	2005	*Arch*
Andersen and Skouvig (2006)	Substantial	2006	*Arch* and DoL
Budd (2006)	Substantial	2006	Both
Haider and Bawden	Substantial	2006	*Arch* and DoL
Haider and Bawden (2007)	Substantial	2007	*Arch* and DoL
Haikola and Jonsson	Substantial	2007	*Arch* and DoL
Head	Substantial	2007	*Arch*
Introna	Substantial	2007	*Order*
Frohmann (2008)	Substantial	2008	DoL only
Lund	Substantial	2009	*Arch*
Brothman (2010)	Substantial	2010	*Arch*
Herb	Substantial	2010	*Arch*
Maynard	Substantial	2010	*Arch*
Gilliland	Substantial	2011	Both
Zhang and Jacob	Substantial	2013	*Order*
Huvila	Substantial	2015	*Arch*
Munro	Significant	1993	Both
Alvarado	Significant	1996	*Arch*
Budd and Raber	Significant	1996	*Arch*
Talja	Significant	1996	*Arch*
Budd	Significant	1997	*Arch* and DoL
Lilley (1998)	Significant	1998	*Order*
Andersen	Significant	1999	*Arch*
Skibell (2002)	Significant	2002	*Arch*
Stoler	Significant	2002	*Arch*
Given and Olson	Significant	2003	*Arch*
Jacob (2004)	Significant	2004	*Order*

Table AV.
Very substantial,
substantial, and
significant uses, by
depth of use/year

(*continued*)

Author(s) of articles	Depth of use	Year	Work(s)
Zwick and Dholakia	Significant	2004	*Arch*
Berg *et al.*	Significant	2005	*Order*
Clarke	Significant	2005	*Arch*
Denegri-Knott and Taylor	Significant	2005	*Arch*
Reece	Significant	2005	*Arch*
Brothman (2006)	Significant	2006	*Arch*
Carter	Significant	2006	*Arch*
Millar	Significant	2006	*Arch*
Withers and Grout	Significant	2006	*Arch*
Buschman (2007)	Significant	2007	*Arch* and DoL
Johannisson and Sundin	Significant	2007	Both
McKenzie and Stooke	Significant	2007	*Arch*
Savolainen	Significant	2007	*Arch*
Klein and Hirschheim	Significant	2008	*Arch*
Darms	Significant	2009	*Arch*
Girdwood	Significant	2009	Both
Iivari	Significant	2010	*Arch*
Sinclair	Significant	2010	*Arch*
Turner and Allen	Significant	2010	*Arch*
Carusi and De Grandis	Significant	2012	*Arch*-2dry
Frické	Significant	2013	*Order*
Hill and Harrington	Significant	2014	*Arch* and DoL
Walton and Cleland	Significant	2014	*Arch*
Sköld	Significant	2015	*Arch*

Table AV.

Corresponding author
Scott Hamilton Dewey can be contacted at: dewey@law.ucla.edu

This article has been cited by:

1. Yutao Sun, Belle Selene Xia. 2016. The scholarly communication of economic knowledge: a citation analysis of Google Scholar. *Scientometrics* . [CrossRef]