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I. Introduction: Research Problem

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

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


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

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

---


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

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

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

---

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

This study analyzes how these two works have influenced library and
information science (LIS) scholars and practitioners, as evidenced by visible discussion, citation, and use of these works in LIS scholarly journal literature.

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

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

---

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

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

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

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


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

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

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

\(^{14}\) Certain other, otherwise-promising journals that are not electronically searchable at UCLA, such as *Knowledge Organization*, were not added to the list.
could or could not be accessed at UCLA; others just denied electronic searching and access altogether to editions not covered by subscription agreements. In certain cases, as with the leading Australian archival journal, *Archives & Manuscripts*, although UCLA has holdings in print covering many years, its electronic access is sharply limited to very recent years. For some journals, electronic access was available back into the 1980s or earlier; for others, digital access only extended back to the early 1990s or later. With certain journals, digital searchability deteriorated noticeably for earlier editions (early 1990s or before), perhaps due to older and lower-quality scans impeding optical character recognition (OCR). Thus, occasionally an article that did in fact contain the desired search term and was electronically available would fail to appear in a list of search results. With some other journals, although the search interfaces accurately reported the presence of “Foucault” within the text, footnotes, or bibliography of an article, the article, when downloaded as a PDF, could not be searched electronically using Adobe Reader and had to be searched manually. For some journals, part of their run was available only in one database, other years in a different database. Notwithstanding these complications, however, most journals were electronically available and readily full-text searchable from the early 1990s through 2013, 2014, or 2015—a research resource that would have been unimaginable only twenty years ago.

Ultimately, 105 journals were searched according to these parameters. Of these, six were entirely unavailable at UCLA; another six were unsearchable, either actually or practically (as with the *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, which proved to have far too many article authors or cited authors named Foucault). Another six journals were searchable, but any results searches produced were unavailable at UCLA. Another 24 journals were available and searchable, but showed no results for Michel Foucault. [For a list of these various categories of...
Of the 63 remaining journals that had electronically available articles including actual citations or references to the right Foucault, some searches still produced additional stray results: a fraction of the articles on the results list remained unavailable, the references in some articles were to a different Foucault (such as 19th-century physicist Leon Foucault of “Foucault’s Pendulum” fame or present-day computer scientist Alan Foucault), or references to Foucault were only duplicative stray references appearing in a journal’s front or back matter. Leaving aside such stray results and static, the next section will address the relevant findings from these journal searches.

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

The results of these various journal searches and close citation analyses were later entered into Excel spreadsheets to help with counting occurrences of particular phenomena, recognizing potential patterns, and the like. The journal search database includes columns for all journals that returned at least some relevant search results containing “Foucault,” the number of
articles in each journal showing positive results, articles found but unavailable electronically at UCLA, articles with a different Foucault or other stray or duplicative results, articles that only cite or mention works by Foucault other than Archaeology or Order (or the “Discourse on Language”), articles that cite Archaeology (and possibly other works by Foucault) but not Order, articles that cite Order (and possibly other works by Foucault) but not Archaeology, articles that cite both Archaeology and Order (and possibly other works by Foucault), articles that cite the “Discourse on Language” (usually but not always along with Archaeology), articles that mention Archaeology and/or Order only in the bibliography, articles that cite Archaeology and/or Order only relatively briefly and in passing in the main text or footnote text, articles that made substantial use of Archaeology and/or Order, articles that indicate at most only secondary use of Foucault (usually where Foucault’s name appears only in the title of a cited secondary source), articles where Foucault’s name appears only in passing in the text with no citation to his work, book reviews mentioning Foucault in passing, and editors’ introductory articles or letters to the editor mentioning Foucault.

The citation-specific database covers each separate citation to Archaeology or Order (or the “Discourse on Language”), with columns tracking the journals, the author(s) of the articles with the citation(s), the year of publication, how many citations per article, which of Foucault’s works was cited, the depth of use of the work indicated by the citation, the Foucauldian concept(s) used, whether the citation was only in a footnote, whether the author cited specific pages in Foucault and which ones if so, whether or not the citation to Archaeology or Order was part of a co-citation along with other works by Foucault, whether or not the citation was part of a co-citation along with other authors (such as, for example, Barthes, Derrida, Giddens, or Latour), and whether or not the citing author quoted Foucault and which quotations if so. Depth of use
was measured on a scale of five levels (or six, counting the bibliography-only category), ranging from general passing reference with a citation (very limited or almost no visible use of specifically Foucault’s ideas) to passing reference with a citation (limited use) to significant use (perhaps two or three sentences specifically focused on Foucault’s work(s)) to substantial use (about a short paragraph or more devoted primarily to one or the other (or both) of Foucault’s works) to very substantial use (multiple paragraphs or pages devoted largely or entirely to Foucault’s ideas as expressed in *Archaeology* or *Order*). This depth-of-use scale is thus a rough measure of how much attention the citing author devotes to *Archaeology* or *Order*, and how much visible “work” either book does in the citing article. Although just where to set the boundaries between neighboring levels of use on the scale admittedly might sometimes involve judgment calls in certain cases, there is a very clear difference between, for instance, “general passing reference” and “significant,” or between “passing reference” and “substantial.”

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

---

¹⁵ This notion of tertiary *use* as secondary use of secondary use is, notably, different from the established concept of primary, secondary, and tertiary *sources* in traditional librarianship and archival practice, where tertiary sources include resources such as dictionaries, indices, and almanacs that summarize and distill information from secondary sources that was originally derived from primary sources.
search list, especially those that revealed the most active use and awareness of Foucault’s two books, as well as other writings by significant users of Foucault in some cases. The results of these searches for secondary citations will be detailed in the following section.

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

A. Journal Search Results

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

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

Out of the remaining 886 articles, 259 of them cited works by Foucault, but only works other than The Archaeology of Knowledge, The Order of Things, or one or another version of the Discourse on Language. Although it was beyond the scope of this project to keep a complete
tally of such other sources, there was a clearly visible overall pattern favoring the use of certain of Foucault’s well-known later works, such as *Discipline and Punish* (published in French in 1975, translated in 1977), one or another volume of the three-volume *History of Sexuality* (which appeared in French and English from 1976 to 1986), and *Power/Knowledge*, a collection of essays written between 1972 and 1977, along with less frequent citations of other later works or of other early works such as *Madness and Civilization* (abridged and translated, 1964) or *Birth of the Clinic* (1963, translated 1973).

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

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

---

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

Perhaps unsurprisingly, journals vary in the amount of attention they have devoted both to Foucault in general and to *Archaeology* or *Order* in particular. Regarding mentions of Foucault in general, the journal searches statistically showed some tendency toward a rightward-skewed long-tail formation, with 42 of the 63 journals having ten or fewer articles with references (and 21 of those with three or less), while 12 journals had between 32 and 67 articles including references. The same trend intensifies when the focus is shifted to either articles citing *Archaeology* and/or *Order* or articles citing “Other” Foucault. Regarding “Other” Foucault, 26 of the 63 journals have zero citing articles, 49 have fewer than five, only nine have ten or more, and only four have more than twenty, ranging between 25 and 36. [See Appendix 4.] More significantly for purposes of this study, the distribution of articles including citations of *Archaeology*, *Order*, or the “Discourse on Language” is also skewed sharply rightward, with 22
of the 63 journals showing no citing articles, an additional 15 journals showing only one article, 49 showing less than five, and only six journals showing more than ten (up to sixteen). [See Appendix 5.]

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

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

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

---

sources). In all, fourteen of the same journals show up in the top sixteen slots on both lists.\(^\text{18}\)

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

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

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

B. Citation-Specific Search Results

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

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

---


²⁰ The concept of a “citing event” is introduced here to indicate that in some situations, either multiple citations of the same source, or citations of separate sources, may be used in very close proximity and may be harnessed to the same discussion or ideas. In such situations, rather than being (perhaps somewhat artificially) pulled apart, formally separate citations of the same or different sources are grouped together as a “citing event.”
often just used for a general concept and frequently in a co-citation with other works by Foucault or with other writers besides Foucault; Passing Reference (“PR”), sharing many of the characteristics of a GPR but not quite as vague or conceptually broad or non-specific, perhaps amounting to a sentence or two that lightly but recognizably draw specifically upon Foucault’s ideas; Significant Use, still usually somewhat brief but clearly focused specifically on Foucault and making Foucault’s ideas do some actual work in the article, usually up to two or three sentences’ worth; Substantial Use, noticeably heaver and generally longer than “Significant,” with at least a short paragraph’s worth of material focused on Foucault and his ideas with a generally higher level of specificity; and finally, Very Substantial Use, involving truly extensive use that may add up to multiple long paragraphs or pages. Because Very Substantial Use cannot be neatly broken down and categorized by separate citation as the other varieties of use can be, those articles that make very substantial use of Archaeology or Order are not included in the quantitative citation-specific data. As for the others, a single, moderately extensive, in-depth use of one book or the other (or both), if located all in one place and more or less continuously there, is categorized as one “substantial” use, for example, while three separate passing references scattered throughout an article are treated as just that: three separate passing references, each considered separately.

This system is then used to offer a somewhat finer-grained evaluation of articles at the whole-article level rather than the level of separate citing events. That is, however many separate citing events an article may contain, the article as a whole is categorized according to the highest level of use that occurs within it. This particularly makes sense in situations where, for example, an article includes a significant or substantial use of Archaeology or Order somewhere in the middle, with perhaps an earlier brief citation referring ahead to it and a later passing citation
referring back to it. This study occasionally may allow one rare exception to the rule of categorization of articles by highest level of use in any one separate citation: where there are multiple separate significant and thoughtful uses of Archaeology or Order in an article, that article sometimes may be categorized as Substantial Use. Multiple substantial uses already constitute Very Substantial Use.

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

Counting all multiple separate citations of Archaeology or Order occurring within the 188 articles identified by the journal search, and not counting those articles that make Very Substantial Use and are therefore too unwieldy to fit within the parameters of the citation database, there are 210 total citations to either or both of these works (or to the Discourse on Language). Of these, the clear majority, 147, are to Archaeology alone (including four that use Archaeology only indirectly through the work and words of secondary authors), plus five that draw exclusively upon the Discourse on Language. There are 43 citations of Order alone, plus 15 separate citing events that use both Archaeology and Order together. There are also 15 articles in the Very Substantial Use category that make extensive and repeated use of one or both sources and exceed the limits of the citation-specific database. [See Appendix 6.]
Reshuffling the citation-specific data to focus on it both by year and by work, 20 of the uses of Order occurred before 2001, 15 of them since 2005, and nine (three per year) occurred during a window of heightened activity from 2004-2006. Of the 15 uses of both works in the same citing event, seven appeared in the years up through 2002, and five during the years after 2007, with three from 2006-2007 and none in 2004 or 2005. As to citations of Archaeology, 31 had appeared before 2001 another 31 from 2001-2004, 29 just from 2005-2007, 30 from 2008-2010 (17 of those in 2010 alone), and 27 since 2010. In terms of the depth of these citation-specific uses, of the 43 such uses of Order alone, five were substantial, five were significant, and 20 were highly general passing references (GPR—the lowest level of use above Bibliography-Only, of which Order accounted for three of the six). Of the 152 citations of Archaeology and/or the Discourse on Language, 18 were substantial, 36 were significant, and 57 were GPRs. Of 15 citing events using both works, two were substantial, four significant, with six GPRs.

As discussed earlier, the citation-specific data also allows finer-grained categorization of articles according to the highest level of depth of use of any one citation appearing in them, and the Very Substantial uses can be brought back into the statistical picture. Again, there were a total of 126 uses of Archaeology (including the three specifically of the Discourse on Language), 37 uses of Order alone, and 25 uses of both works. [For a full list of all 188 of these articles, see Appendix 2.] Out of these, 15 ranked as Very Substantial, 24 as Substantial, 35 Significant, 41 Passing References, 67 GPRs, and six “Bibliography-Only.” [For a list of all articles categorized as Substantial Use, see Appendix 7.] In terms of depth of use by articles as a whole, articles citing Order alone showed one Very Substantial, four Substantial, and four Significant uses. Sources citing Archaeology alone included five Very Substantial, 15 Substantial, and 28 Significant uses. In the “Both” category, there were nine Very Substantial, four Substantial, and
three Significant uses. [See Appendix 8.] Especially considering that several of the “Both”
articles making Very Substantial use relied noticeably more heavily on Archaeology while only
one did so on Order, and the same overall pattern is generally true for substantial or significant
uses, also, the overall balance in visible depth of use swings markedly toward Archaeology.

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

Lumping Archaeology and Order together to focus on depth of use by year, an interesting
pattern emerges: to some extent frequency of use, but especially depth of use, appear to have
peaked during the period from 2005-2007. For instance, after several Substantial uses appearing
from 1991 through 2001, then none from 2002-2004 and only one in 2005, 2006-2007 saw seven
substantial uses. Since 2007, there have been only eight additional Substantial uses. A similar
pattern emerges for Significant uses: there were twelve during 2005-2007 (four each year), while
there were only eleven Significant uses during the entire period before 2005, with only eleven Significant uses since 2007 (three of those in 2010 alone). Other measurements, whether year by year or by groups of years, tend to show the same peak in active, in-depth use around 2005-2007, with a gradual buildup before and a noticeable decline afterward. The pattern for Very Substantial uses is more uneven and may also have tended to lead Substantial and Significant uses; for instance, there were five Very Substantial uses from 2001-2004, two of them in 2001, two in 2003, and none in 2004, while there were only two Substantial uses and five Significant uses during that period, whereas the period from 2005-2007 saw only two additional Very Substantial uses but eight Substantial and 12 Significant uses. Whether or not Very Substantial uses were thus somewhat “front-loaded” and may have helped to stimulate additional in-depth use, the pattern after 2007 has been even clearer regarding Very Substantial uses: there has been only one during the past seven years (the Radfords with Lingel in 2012). [See Appendices 9-10.]

Turning to the concepts that are addressed in these various uses of Archaeology or Order, the single most predominant category is (perhaps predictably) “Discourse,” which appeared as one of the concepts in 80 citing events (around 38 percent of the total), along with 9 appearances of the closely related concept, “Discursive formation.” Some other notable recurring conceptual categories, sometimes showing clustering around certain journals or authors, include: Archaeology (11); Archive (19, 11 of them from Archival Science alone and another 5 from Archivaria); Classification (12, four of them associated with articles written or co-written by LIS scholar Elin K. Jacob); Death (or Disappearance) of the Author (or Subject) (11); Discipline-Academic (10, four of them in JASIST); History/Historicity (13, seven of them in archival journals and 5 of them from archivist-historian Brien Brothman alone); Multiple Temporalities (3, related to History/Historicity and appearing exclusively in the writings of Brien Brothman);
Power/Knowledge (24, second most popular after Discourse); and Representation (10, 6 of them appearing in *Information & Organization* and three of those in Simon Lilley’s 1998 article).

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

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

---

21 Other recurring concepts include: Document (including Document/Monument) (6); Episteme (7); Epistemology (2); Genealogy (2); Postmodernism (5); Question of ‘Man’ (2); Statement (7); Structuralism (2); Sub-discourse (3, exclusively appearing in an article by Isto Huvila); Text (2), and Will to Knowledge (2). Identifiable concepts appearing only once include: Disordered Epistemologization, Everything Is Never Said, Evidence, Governmentality, Hegemony, Individuation, Intertextuality, Language Games, Linking of Statements, Materiality, Mode of Existence, Positivism, Posthumanism, Poststructuralism, Science, Self-Identity, Signification, Technology/Knowledge, Truth, Universal Language, Unsaid/Enunciative Field, Vicinity of Science, and Who is Speaking. Although the citation-specific database limited the concept count to three concepts per citing event because it was very rare for any scholars to go over that limit, certain scholars such as Anne Gilliland and Elin Jacob did include four or five concepts in a single substantial, complex citing event.
Regarding co-citations of *Archaeology* and/or *Order* together with other works by Foucault, 29 of the citing events were these; 28 of them included later works by Foucault (mostly *Discipline and Punish, History of Sexuality, Power/Knowledge*), while only one included an earlier work (*Birth of the Clinic*). As to co-citations with other authors, there were 51. Fellow French postmodernist philosopher Jacques Derrida appeared in 15 of these—more than any other single scholar—while other writers such as Barthes, Bourdieu, Habermas, and Rabinow (a noted scholar and interpreter of Foucault who also appears often in article bibliographies) appeared relatively frequently along with more sporadic references to figures such as Heidegger, Kuhn, Latour, Levi-Strauss, and Rorty, along with various more recent (and generally less towering) writers.

In 70 citing events, authors provided page numbers. That means that in the other 140 cases (two thirds of the total), they did not. In most cases where page numbers were used, they are relatively precise (either a single page or occasionally a range of two pages) and fairly often are linked to a particular quotation from Foucault. The single favorite page in *Archaeology* or *Order* among LIS scholars appears to be *Archaeology*, p. 49, cited eight times; another popular page was *Archaeology*, p. 129 (cited four times). In a few cases, authors cited specific pages plus *Archaeology*, Chapter 1 or 2; one author twice cited *Archaeology*’s introduction generally; another author pointed readers generally toward *Order*, Chapter 9, in connection with a discussion of the Question of ‘Man’ addressed at length in that chapter; and two different authors both cited generally to the relatively broad page range of “pp. 79-134 (Part III)” in *Archaeology*. Yet most authors who cited page numbers at all were fairly precise about them. Perhaps notably, out of the 70 citations that provided any sort of page numbers, 31 (over 44 percent) appeared in archival journals, specifically *Archival Science, Archivaria*, and the *Journal of the Society of*
Archivists (a rate roughly double the archivists’ percentage either of total citations or of journal articles, in each case around 20 percent). Of the citing events providing page numbers, the overwhelming majority cited Archaeology alone, with only seven citing Order alone, another three citing both Archaeology and Order, and another three citing only the Discourse on Language. It appears that only 52 authors or pairs/sets of authors used page numbers, in 57 articles (around 30 percent of the total).

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

C. Tertiary Use

As discussed in the previous section, this study attempts to trace tertiary use of Foucault’s works—in other words, secondary use of writings by secondary users of Archaeology or
Order—by searching the Web of Science Citation Index to track the use of writings regarding Foucauldian concepts by those authors who were found to have made especially substantial use of Archaeology or Order from the journal database searches.

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

As noted, the journal full-text searches revealed fifteen articles that made Very Substantial Use of Archaeology or Order: Carol Brooke’s 2002 article in the Journal of Information Technology, Ronald Day’s 2005 article in ARIST, Bernd Frohmann’s 2001 article in Journal of Education for Librarianship, Stuart Hannabuss’ 1996 article in Aslib Proceedings, Maria Humphries’ 1998 article in Organization Science, Elin Jacob and Hanne Albrechtsen’s 1998 article in Information Research, Cheryl Knott Malone and Fernando Elichirigoity’s 2003 article in JASIST, six separate articles by Gary Radford either with or without Marie Radford in Library Quarterly (1992, 1997, 2001, 2003) or in Journal of Documentation (2005, 2012), Sanna Talja’s 1999 article in Library & Information Science Review, and Luke Tredinnick’s 2007 article in Aslib Proceedings. For good measure, various other authors and articles that made quite if not “very” substantial use of Archaeology or Order were added to the Web of Science search list: Jack Andersen and Laura Skouvig’s 2006 article in Library Quarterly, John Budd’s 2006 article in Library Trends, and Jutta Haider and David Bawden’s 2007 article in the Journal of Documentation. [Some other articles making substantial use of Archaeology or Order are too
recent to have left much if any citation trail.] Also added to the list are certain authors such as Bernd Frohmann and Michael Olsson, who have repeatedly demonstrated a substantial familiarity with various of Foucault’s works, even if their published articles do not always show much evidence of specific use of *Archaeology* or *Order. Archival Science* and *Archivaria*, regrettably, appear not to be covered by the Web of Science, so citations of Richard Brown’s two articles making quite substantial use of *Archaeology* or Terry Cook’s 2001 article citing both works may not be identified using that tool, and both authors’ names and title key words are so common as to make full-text searching impracticable. The results of the tertiary citation searches regarding these articles and authors are given below.

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

\(^{22}\) Day’s article, although it devotes extensive attention to Foucault, notably also discusses other authors and ideas related to poststructuralism and postmodernism.

\(^{23}\) Buschman, notably, is not a “user” of Foucault in the same sense as many of the other authors who appear on the list of users; he tends to reject various aspects of Foucault and his ideas, but he also stays very engaged with the scholarship of his fellow LIS scholars who are users, as his repeated appearance in citation lists attests. See, e.g., John Buschman, “Transgression or Stasis? Challenging Foucault in LIS Theory,” *Library Quarterly*, vol. 77, no. 1 (January 2007): 21-44; John Buschman and Richard A. Brosio, “A Critical Primer on Postmodernism: Lessons from Educational Scholarship for Librarianship,” *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, vol. 32, no. 4 (2006): 408-418.
of the LIS field and are noting Day’s article and related scholarship more or less as a milestone on that path (Burke, Cronin (two citing articles), Furner, McKechnie et al.). The remaining five articles on the list may or may not show a particular interest in Foucauldian ideas, but again, it is probably impossible to tell for certain without reading the articles closely. Five of the citing articles also appeared in ARIST like Day’s article; two others appeared in JASIST; two others in Journal of Documentation; one apiece in Information Research, Library Quarterly, and Libri; and five in other journals.

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

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

---


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

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

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


Regarding the Radfords’ various other very substantial uses of Archaeology or Order, the Radfords’ 2001 article shows 24 citing articles.\(^{30}\) In addition to four self-cites, the usual suspects account for 12 citing articles,\(^{31}\) leaving only eight scholar/authors who do not already appear in this study’s journal search results as users of Archaeology or Order. Seven citing articles appeared in Library Quarterly; three in Journal of Documentation; one in JASIST; and 13 in other journals. Radford’s 2003 article\(^{32}\) has been cited by 25 articles, including one self-cite along with eleven usual suspects.\(^{33}\) The Radfords’ 2005 article has been cited 13 times in the Web of Science.\(^{34}\) The usual suspects account for five of these.\(^{35}\) Both of the latter two articles show more of the same sort of journal clustering seen with the others. The Radfords’ and Lingel’s 2012 article does not yet show citations.\(^{36}\)

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


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


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


\(^{35}\) Andersen and Skouvig, Buschman, Haider and Bawden, Johannisson and Sundin, and Tredinnick.

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

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

---

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


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


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

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


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

---


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

Brooke (2002),\(^5\) cited 39 times, shows only two self-cites and an article by Willcocks from this study’s list of identified secondary users of *Archaeology* or *Order*. The journal list for citing articles also looks entirely different from most of the others featured in this study: *Information Systems Journal* appears nine times, the *European Journal of Information Systems* four times, the *Journal of Information Technology*, *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, and *Social Science Computer Review* all twice apiece, *Ethics & Information Technology* and *Information & Organization* each only once, and the usual journal suspects for the other substantial users of *Archaeology* or *Order*—*Journal of Documentation*, *Library Quarterly*, *Information Research*, *LISR*, etc.—not once.

In addition to the various substantial or very substantial uses/users discussed above, two additional authors who demonstrate substantial background and familiarity with Foucault, even though they make little use of *Archaeology* or *Order*, also were searched in the Web of Science. One of these is Michael Olsson, whose doctoral dissertation concerned Foucault’s ideas,\(^5\) but whose various articles mostly cite Foucault only in passing or rely upon secondary sources regarding Foucault. Olsson has eight articles showing citation lists in the Web of Science; these lists vary in length from one to ten citing articles and cumulatively add up to 42 citations, although with certain writers and articles citing several different Olsson articles in the same

---


citing article. Sixteen 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, Information Research, and Australian Academic and Research Libraries, one apiece from Journal of Documentation, JASIST, Library Quarterly, LISR, and Libri.

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

---

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


54 Strangely, there seemingly is not even a zero placeholder as there often is for articles that have not yet been cited by articles published in journals covered by the Web of Science.
Frohmann (1992), 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. Citing authors who appear in this study’s list of identified users account for 36 of the 76 citing events; adding Archie Dick as an honorary member of the list would raise the total to 38 (50%). Thirteen of these citing articles appeared in *Journal of Documentation*, eleven in *Library Quarterly*, nine in *ARIST*, eight in *JASIST*, and five a piece in *Information Research* and *LISR*, along with 16 in other journals and nine books or book chapters. The overall picture is mostly similar with Frohmann (1994), cited 61 times. Citing authors who are identified users/“usual suspects” include 35 out of the 61 citing authors. *LISR* accounted for nine of the citing articles, *ARIST* and *Library Quarterly* for eight a piece, *Journal of Documentation* for six, *JASIST* for five, and *Information Research* for four, along with other journals and books or book chapters. What appears to have been a conference-paper version of Frohmann’s 1992 article or an otherwise parallel study has been cited eleven times. Counting two self-cites, eight of these


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

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


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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---


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

One somewhat surprising pattern that did pop out from this comparative use data is that *Order* generally seems to be relatively more invisible in North America, and perhaps less so in the rest of the world, including other Anglophone nations such as Australia and the United Kingdom. To test this, the educational and professional backgrounds of all users of *Order* were searched. Out of the 37 articles and corresponding authors who used *Order* only, 22 of them showed either strong professional or strong educational associations outside North America, usually both. Six other articles involved geographically mixed authorship including scholars from North America along with others not from North America (two of these involving Elin K. Budd 2006, Frohmann 2001, Gilliland 2011, Girdwood 2009, Hannabuss 1996, Humphries 1998, Jacob 2001, Radford et al. 2012, Radford 2003, Radford & Radford 2001, Radford 1992, Tredinnick 2007.


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

---


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


67 This (relatively non-invasive) search mostly just involved checking for online resumes or similar sources of information indicating whether the scholars in question had received undergraduate or graduate degrees from universities outside of North America, have been employed long-term outside North America, or show other major national affiliations outside of North America, usually a combination of more than one.
Jacob as a co-author). There were only nine situations where all authors appeared to have entirely North American professional and educational associations; three of these involved articles by Ronald Day, one was by Jacob, while F. Allan Hanson is an anthropologist, not an LIS scholar. Out of 24 articles and their authors who used both Archaeology and Order, 16 of them showed substantial educational or professional background outside of North America, while only eight of them showed purely North American associations; of the latter, four articles were from the Radfords, one from Elin Jacob.

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

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

---

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

69 Non-North American nations represented on the list included the United Kingdom (7), Australia (3), Sweden (2), Denmark, Ireland, and New Zealand.
required reading for archivists,\(^7^0\) *Order* is almost entirely absent from the archival literature. Out of 101 articles in archival journals that mention Foucault in any way; out of 55 such articles that cite any work by Foucault; out of 33 such articles that cite *Archaeology, Order*, or both; and out of 43 actual citations of *Archaeology* or *Order* in these archival journal articles, there are five articles that use *Order* and five citing events, four of them citing *Archaeology* together with or in close proximity to *Order*, two of them as brief passing references. Also perhaps notably, of the handful of exceptions to that rule of overall non-use of *Order* by archivists (Cook 2001, Gilliland 2011, Girdwood 2009, Hardiman 2009, and Wake 2008), all authors save possibly Cook have substantial educational or professional associations with one or the other of the British Isles, and all articles appeared in journals of international reach and focus (*Archival Science*) or at least non-North American focus (the UK-based *Journal of the Society of Archivists*).

IV. Analysis of Findings

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

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

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

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

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

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

72 Admittedly, part of the cause of the comparative lack of page numbers in citations of Archaeology or Order could arise from the longstanding convention in some of the sciences and social sciences of non-specifically citing entire sources that are usually relatively concise and compact journal articles in which the particular point cited may be relative easy to find even without page numbers. Yet even in such disciplines, authors often appear to adjust that convention by including page numbers, especially with citations of books, presumably recognizing that a non-specific citation of an entire book is usually not that helpful for those who wish to use and follow the citing author’s research.
by identifying *Archaeology* as a more complete theorization of ideas he started exploring in *Order* and other earlier works, and implicitly, by repeatedly and extensively referring back to those works, especially *Order*, throughout *Archaeology*. Thus, Foucault in a sense invited his readers to think of *Archaeology* and *Order* together, rather like two parts of a larger whole; but the visible evidence from this study suggests that relatively few LIS scholars have accepted or noticed that invitation.

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

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

---


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

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

---


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

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

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

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

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


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

82 This statement is based upon an electronic search of ten of Harris’ electronically available articles as well as a few additional book reviews written by Harris or written about Harris’ books, in addition to wider database searches.
Yet another noteworthy example from the archival world of a scholar who almost certainly is very well steeped in Foucault but uses him visibly only sporadically is Brien Brothman. Brothman’s oeuvre probably represents the most intensive and sophisticated exploration of postmodernist ideas that the archival arena has yet seen or is ever likely to, including the ideas of writers such as Lyotard, Deleuze, and Guattari along with figures better known in the LIS and archival world such as Foucault and Derrida. Like Harris, Brothman has spent most of his time and energy devoted to postmodernism on Derrida; also like Harris, Brothman reveals a deep familiarity with Foucault’s works, but cites or uses them only relatively rarely.83

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

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


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

One striking example is Michael Olsson, an Australian LIS scholar who used Foucauldian ideas prominently in his doctoral dissertation, which analyzed the “social/discursive construction” of LIS scholar Brenda Dervin.\(^8^5\) In his 2007 article in *Library Quarterly* that includes the fullest discussion of Foucault out of all his electronically available articles, Olsson notes, “A crucial conceptual starting point for the study was Michel Foucault’s work on the discursive construction of power/knowledge.”\(^8^6\) Yet of the five works by Foucault that Olsson co-cites near the beginning of his article, which include *Order, Archaeology, Discipline and Punish*, and the first volume of *The History of Sexuality* along with an essay from Foucault’s later period, two of these sources (*Order* and the essay) never reappear in the citations, while each of the other three makes only one brief reappearance. Instead, Olsson makes heavy and thoughtful use of various secondary sources that discuss Foucault and Foucauldian discourse, including Paul Rabinow’s *Foucault Reader* (published in 1984)\(^8^7\) along with a book and article by Radford, Frohmann’s influential 1992 and 1994 articles, a book by Talja, and others. Several of Olsson’s other articles that do not focus as closely on Foucault each contain three closely parallel passages in which Olsson notes the importance of Foucault’s influence upon his work with a co-citation to *Archaeology, Discipline and Punish*, and *Power/Knowledge* usually plus Rabinow or Derrida, notes Foucault together with Barthes in the context of the postmodernist concept of the “death of the author,” briefly explains Foucault’s belief in the fundamental


\(^{8^6}\) Ibid.

subjectivity of knowledge, and includes a quote from Rabinow on that point: “‘For Foucault, there is no external position of certainty, no universal understanding that is beyond history and society’ (Rabinow 1984, 4).”

Later in each article, there is also a reference to Foucault’s notion of the “Battle for Truth.” Yet beyond these limited appearances, Foucault is mostly absent from the main text and citations of the articles, and Olsson instead relies more on secondary sources, including Talja and Frohmann, especially Frohmann’s 1992 article, as well as his own earlier publications.

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

---


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

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


in the 1992 article almost as prominently as Foucault.\textsuperscript{93}

This relative absence of Foucault from some of Frohmann’s most influential works regarding the quintessentially Foucauldian concept of discourse might seem ironic and counterintuitive, particularly given that Frohmann, with an academic background in philosophy\textsuperscript{94} and a long record of demonstrating a strong interest in philosophy and critical theory in his many publications over the past 25 years, is almost certainly better versed in Foucault than all but a scant handful of LIS scholars in the Anglophone world. Certain later publications showcase Frohmann’s fluency and familiarity with Foucault much more than the earlier articles, though except for Frohmann’s 2001 article, they, too, usually make relatively little if any use of \textit{Archaeology or Order}.\textsuperscript{95} Also, although the articles from the early 1990s of course got a long head start in the race to accumulate citations, few of Frohmann’s other articles yet come anywhere close to showing the extent of impact on other LIS scholars seen with the oft-cited 1992 and 1994 articles.\textsuperscript{96}

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

\textsuperscript{93} Frohmann, “The Power of Images,” \textit{supra} note 91.

\textsuperscript{94} See Frohmann’s curriculum vitae, available at his faculty web page: http://www.fims.uwo.ca/people/faculty/frohmann/.


\textsuperscript{96} As another seeming example of the same phenomenon, Jacob’s 2004 article, which addresses Foucauldian ideas but barely mentions Foucault, has been cited 42 times, while her earlier articles that delve into Foucault and \textit{Order} more deeply have been cited markedly less (23 times cumulatively).
familiarity, and fluency regarding a wide range of abstruse postmodernist authors and writings, together with other critical theory and philosophy. As noted in an earlier section, Day’s 2005 article in ARIST on poststructuralism is one of the most important, in-depth explorations of postmodernism yet to appear in the LIS literature, and it digs deeply into Foucault’s work along with that of other postmodernist figures.97 Yet aside from that one striking foray, Foucault seems to be generally more notable for his absence from most of the rest of Day’s oeuvre, with usually only cameo appearances in other articles.98 Perhaps tellingly, even in Day’s excellent, thought-provoking book regarding the history of discourse in the LIS field, Foucault appears only once in a footnote.99

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


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

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

\(^\text{100}\) See, e.g., Cronin and Meho, “Receiving the French,” *supra* note 2, at p. 401.

\(^\text{101}\) See, e.g., the sources cited in note 98, *supra*. 
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more easily choose when to use Foucault and when not to. Yet it remains intriguing how often they choose not to.

B. Preference for Secondary Sources

Yet another advantage theoretically sophisticated and knowledgeable LIS scholars have over the rest of us is that in addition to having greater awareness and familiarity with original sources such as Foucault, they also have greater familiarity with the various secondary sources that help to explicate such original sources. As such, even if they wish to use ideas that appear in or are especially associated with Foucault’s works, they do not have to use those works directly, and can turn to other sources that may explain those ideas in ways that may be easier for readers to follow and understand. Although at first glance an author’s deliberate use of secondary sources to say what Foucault says might appear only to be a form of intellectual laziness, it might instead be calculated to maximize clarity and impact for readers, as well as to avoid getting on the potentially slippery slope of trying to neatly and accurately summarize exactly what Foucault said, and meant, on a particular topic. Thus, where an author is familiar with both Foucault’s original works and a secondary author’s explanation of parts of them, and where the citing author finds that the secondary author did an unusually good job of clarifying Foucault’s meaning, the citing author may be well justified in using the secondary work, and pointing readers toward it, instead of to the original—especially with works as complex and non-self-explanatory as Foucault’s.\footnote{See, e.g., Patrick Wilson, “Bibliographic Instruction and Cognitive Authority,” \textit{Library Trends}, vol. 39, no. 3 (1991): 259-270, at p. 264 (noting “Michel Foucault’s \textit{The Archaeology of Knowledge} (1972), a famous but abstract and difficult work that is hard to imagine serving as a textbook in an advanced [bibliographic instruction] course”); Rachel Hardiman, “En mal d’archive: Postmodernist Theory and Recordkeeping,” \textit{Journal of the Society of Archivists}, vol. 30, no. 1 (April 2009): 27–44, at p. 36 (noting “the criticism of Michel de Certeau that in Foucault’s writing, both the sources themselves and the links between them and his conclusions remain opaque”).}
In keeping with this, it is interesting to note how Terry Cook, who mostly does not cite Foucault at more than a general level yet who emphasizes the crucial importance of both *Archaeology* and *Order* for archival scholars, immediately also offers some recommended secondary sources as a helpful introduction to Foucault’s works—clearly and explicitly recognizing that most uninitiated scholars will need some secondary source as a guide. Although most other scholars in the group discussed above are not so overt, nevertheless, for a scholar who is versed in Foucault to discuss Foucault’s ideas using secondary sources is fairly clearly signaling to readers, first, that it is acceptable to draw on good secondary sources for help in understanding Foucault, and, second, that at least in some contexts, these secondary sources may be preferable to the original, certainly at least for gaining a working familiarity and a practical ability to use Foucault’s ideas. Such scholars are, in effect, tacitly encouraging the use of secondary sources at the very least in conjunction with exploration of Foucault’s original works; in actual practice, given human nature, the message received might be that it is all right to use the secondary sources instead of the originals. The latter message might come across particularly strongly especially where scholars give relatively little indication of having used Foucault themselves in more than a relatively general way.

Another factor that could be at work regarding theoretically sophisticated scholars, and another way they differ from most of the rest of us, is that they are likely to be more aware of the actual complexity of Foucault’s work and the difficulty and danger of trying to neatly and concisely summarize writing that frankly often resists such neat repackaging. As such, for example, it is likely much easier for those of us who are relatively uninitiated to go to a particular page of Foucault, see an enticing quote regarding some Foucauldian concept such as “the archive” or “discursive formations,” and take it out of context, assuming we understand
sufficiently what it means, and that Foucault’s meaning is reasonably straightforward and self-explanatory as in most authors’ books. More theoretically sophisticated scholars who are better versed in Foucault, however, might be aware that any one concept in Foucault usually is linked closely and conditionally to an almost endless array of other, often complex concepts, few of them self-explanatory and perhaps dangerous to take out of context. At any rate, this is another possible reason why some scholars who are quite familiar with Foucault and emphasize his importance and influence nevertheless make limited visible, specific use of his works or rely more on secondary sources.

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

Along with the comparatively limited use and vagueness of use, it appears likely that many LIS scholars may be following the example of the scholars discussed above by getting most of their Foucauldian discourse analysis from secondary sources rather than delving directly into Foucault’s works. That is perhaps especially obvious with the 88 articles (ten percent of the original total of 886 articles) in which Foucault’s name only appears in the article as part of the title of a cited secondary source (sometimes an article by the Radfords, who usually include
Foucault’s name in their article titles). The same sort of primary reliance on secondary sources is likely at work in many of the 238 journal articles that mentioned Foucault’s name but did not cite any of his works. Moreover, it likely is still at work with a substantial percentage of those articles that do cite *Archaeology* or *Order*, particularly if the citation was highly general or in passing (or only in the bibliography). For instance, a relatively typical mention of the general concept of discourse, together with a non-specific citation of *Archaeology* (the entire book), could mean one of a few different things: the author might be indicating that she had indeed read all of *Archaeology* and knows what is in there, including the extended discussion of discourse; she could be indicating that she had at least read through some or all of the passages specifically concerning discourse; she could be trying to make it look as though she is familiar with the book when she really isn’t (as we scholars do from time to time); she could be making no claim to familiarity with the contents of the book, but merely be using the book as a general placeholder for the concept of discourse with which it is so closely associated while giving a respectful nod toward Foucault; or she could be making no claim to familiarity but be helpfully pointing readers toward an additional source of information that she knows is respected regarding the topic of discourse. With some of these possibilities, there may be little difference in practice between a passing reference with a citation and a passing reference without a citation. With all of these possibilities, even where the author is truthfully flaunting the fact that she has read the entire book, in terms of the actual writing of her article, she is still likely to be relying more on secondary sources that speak directly to her particular issues of concern and help to focus thinking about them. The same, ironically, often will tend to be true even in cases where an author includes page numbers or a quotation, because a helpful secondary source often may have been the actual original source of the idea or quotation used, even if the author then went and
found the same quote in the original. For that reason, Olsson’s practice of explicitly quoting Foucault through Rabinow rather than directly, for example, might provide fuller disclosure regarding the actual process by which the ideas in a particular publication were assembled.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

104 Ibid., at p. 342.
more or less, “We all know this already.” To the extent if any that the assumption is not entirely accurate, and some readers who have stumbled upon the article really are not up to speed with Foucault, the passage alludes generally to other places to find the missing information and says, in effect, “Readers should have familiarity with Foucault’s work.” Combining “We all know this already” with “Readers should have familiarity with Foucault’s work,” however, tends to create a new sociological dynamic in the assumption, probably entirely unintentionally on Skibell’s (or other authors’) part; it sort of says, in marketing-psychology terms, “Anybody who is anybody is already familiar with Foucault’s work.”

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

Given the sociological incentives at work, together with the human realities of limited time, limited energy, and the eternal temptation of intellectual laziness, explicit or implicit statements conveying a message similar to Skibell’s, and repeated countless times throughout a scholarly community’s discourse, may tend in practice to create a relatively strong incentive for community members to display familiarity with Foucault—and in so doing, act like “the cool kids”—together with a relatively weak incentive to delve extensively into Foucault’s work, or even perhaps into secondary works—given that “the cool kids” who “all know this already”
have, explicitly or implicitly, indicated that it is not particularly necessary to use the already known material with great precision. All this may tend toward an academic community’s culture and discourse reflecting a relatively high frequency of emblems of display—passing name references, highly generalized citations mostly without page numbers, and the like, which indicate at least a shallow familiarity with the person and works mentioned but leave uncertain and may tend to mask the actual depth of understanding underneath the level of display—
together with a relatively low frequency of substantial uses of works that more clearly demonstrate, in themselves, actual depth of understanding. In short, the sociological incentives and tendencies described above may tend, almost inevitably, to push toward turning a popular author and his or her ideas into a sort of fad or fashion statement, primarily for display. To the extent that happens, it will necessarily tend to distance the discourse in actual circulation from the original author and original sources.

D. Temporal Dimensions to the Disappearance of the Author

To veer perhaps slightly in the direction of Brien Brothman with his special interest in historicity and multiple temporalities, there is also an interesting and important temporal aspect to this whole process of progressive removal from an original author and original sources. That is, even assuming that at a certain point in time everybody within a particular scholarly community was indeed entirely conversant with a certain important body of literature and ideas—or in other words, assuming that Skibell’s assumption was indeed entirely correct at the moment he (and others) made it—such an assumption likely will not and cannot apply to a later time when the interest and immediacy of that body of literature has faded. Yet ironically, because the community members at the time “all knew this already,” they also felt no need, or at
least only a lesser need, to leave careful signposts regarding their understandings and interpretations of that body of literature—such as specific supporting discussions of particular important concepts and ideas, or page numbers. Viewed from a longer-term temporal perspective, their discussions of the popular concepts of their time can become like an archival collection with missing provenance and other missing metadata; certain ideas and their origins that “everybody already knew,” and which thus might have seemed entirely evident to them, may be left in effect only hanging in the air, or seeming to appear abruptly from nowhere, to later readers.

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

The key point here may be that although this process of erosion or sedimentation and covering over of memory and understanding is always inevitable and ongoing in the human realm, it can actually happen more quickly and explosively precisely regarding those ideas with the widest currency and popularity at a given moment in time: that which does not need to be explained will not be explained, and thus ultimately will cover its own tracks and pass into the realm of myth, or unmoored discourse, even more rapidly than smaller and more plodding
intellectual currents. In short, there may be a particular risk for that which “everybody knows” to soon become something that nobody really knows, at least not in much detail. Perhaps an analogy to evolutionary biology is appropriate: just as fruit flies can change and evolve away from any original settled evolutionary state far more rapidly than can slower-reproducing elephants or oak trees, so the higher rate of “reproduction” (or frequency, replication, etc.) of popular ideas during a discursive “feeding frenzy” can more rapidly unmoor and distance those ideas from their original sources than with less popular, slower-replicating ideas. In sum: intellectual popularity, rather than establishing deeper and clearer footprints associated with original sources as might traditionally be expected, instead may only accelerate the rate of change that erases links to original ideas. Even if the ideas in fact have a heavy impact, they and their footprints may be, ironically, harder to trace. An active discursive formation is thus inherently an engine of rapid change, or as Foucault put it, a “system of dispersion.”

Continuing in a temporal vein, this study provides some suggestive quantitative data tending to support the hypothesis of the gradual erasure of key works of Foucault from the very discourse they helped to form, and to which they are (or are supposed to be) conceptually central and crucial. This study grew out of an earlier, abortive study of postmodernist ideas in LIS that revealed intriguing if impressionistic indications of visible interest in specific postmodernist writers tending to rise, then recede, in the LIS journal literature. That study never reached the point of gathering quantifiable evidence of that possible trend. This study, however, does provide relatively convincing quantitative data indicating that visible interest in and substantial use of Archaeology and Order may have peaked between 2005 and 2007—which, if so, roughly matches the impressionistic tentative timeframe from the earlier study, also. This study’s data
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105 Foucault, Archaeology of Knowledge, p. 173.
shows a fairly clear overall decline in substantial use of the two works starting in 2008 and continuing since; should that trend continue, it would appear that Archaeology and Order may be doomed to largely disappear from the very discourse regarding discourse that they helped so much to stimulate, except perhaps for an occasional passing reference or quotation out of context—rather like Foucault’s famous “face in the sand” quote at the end of The Order of Things.¹⁰⁶

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

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

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

¹⁰⁷ Anthropologist and Order-user F. Allan Hanson, in an e-mail message, communicated his impression that scholars were generally shifting toward using and citing mostly just Discipline and Punish. Although this study did not undertake a fine-grained analysis of LIS scholars’ use of Discipline and Punish, the study results generally seemed to point in a similar direction—of Discipline and Punish becoming increasingly dominant and gradually tending to crowd out other works. Of course, in the new, post-9/11 digital economy and security environment,
trend, it would appear that those scholars who are especially concerned with classification tend to know that *Order* is really the “right” or best Foucault work to cite for that concept.

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

*Archaeology* and *Order* may also be, to some extent, victims of a chronological process of crowding out based upon both when they became available in English and when they were
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109 And, as noted in an earlier section, they are almost the only LIS scholars who do, even though, as other disciplines have recognized, Foucault’s concept of the archive is not necessarily only limited to the context of actual archives.
discovered by the LIS field. Although *Order, Archaeology, and Discipline and Punish* first appeared in French in 1966, 1969, and 1975 respectively, their appearance in English was more compressed: 1970, 1972, and 1977. *Order* thus did not have long to circulate in the Anglophone world before *Archaeology* in a sense landed on top of it, and neither had all that long before *Discipline and Punish* was available for scholars to turn to as their single, or at least primary, source of Foucault.

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

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

\(^{110}\) See, e.g., Cronin and Meho, “Receiving the French,” *supra* note 2, at p. 407 (finding LIS scholars “more laggards than early adopters” regarding postmodernist ideas and sources).
less on Foucault but provide more readily accessible exposure to more generalized Foucauldian ideas as filtered through secondary sources.

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

As noted in a previous section, Day’s 2005 article in *ARIST* has been cited 17 times so far in the Web of Science, seven of those by scholars with a demonstrated interest in Foucault’s ideas. Also as noted at various points previously, Day’s article is among the richest explorations of Foucault’s ideas yet to appear in the LIS journal literature. But it is not an easy article to read and process. Day accurately reflects the complexity of Foucault’s thought, and as such, his
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111 See also the relative reception of Elin Jacobs’ articles that dig into Foucault compared to one that only mentions him, *supra* note 96.
article demands a significant amount of effort and patience to wrap one’s mind around it. The comparatively modest rate of citation of Day’s article suggests that most readers may not have expended that effort.

By contrast, Frohmann’s 1992 and 1994 articles—particularly the especially influential 1992 article—mostly steer clear of the sometimes tangled actual complexity of Foucault’s thoughts and writings and introduce readers to the Foucauldian concept of discourse in a much more accessible manner that relies less on Foucault and more on secondary discussions of Foucault or of Foucauldian ideas. The 1992 article is clear, concise, forcefully written, and includes an exciting, almost bomb-throwing aspect in its critique of other, non-critical, non-Foucauldian varieties of discourse analysis. 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.

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

---

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

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

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

Nor is the relative under-appreciation of Day’s valuable contribution the only example of this phenomenon. As noted in an earlier section, both Stuart Hannabuss’ and Luke Tredinnick’s valuable and extensive discussions of Foucault’s thought have received almost no citations. Tredinnick’s article is even younger than Day’s, but Hannabuss’ is already almost twenty years old, only four years younger than Frohman’s 1992 contribution. Although it might be argued that Hannabuss and Tredinnick published in the “wrong” journal (Aslib Proceedings), they nevertheless did publish, and their articles were quite findable for those who were looking. As with Day, the general neglect of their significant contributions indicates that although LIS scholars may be interested in discourse analysis, they are not necessarily interested in tracing such analysis to its roots or in exploring Foucault’s specific ideas in much detail.\footnote{The same goes for the overall neglect and lack of citation traction regarding Malone and Elichirigoity’s 2001 article and Humphries’ 1998 article, discussed in the preceding section.}

The Radfords might seem to represent an exception to this observed pattern, in that, cumulatively, their various articles addressing Foucauldian ideas have been cited relatively frequently (a total of 129 times) even though each of these articles devotes considerable attention specifically to Foucault.\footnote{This citation tally also only includes the Radfords’ articles that address Archaeology, Order, or the Discourse on Language, not others that do not.} This could be partly because the Radfords are clearly masters of catchy titles and topics that might stimulate interest beyond the usual limited audience for studies regarding Foucault.\footnote{E.g., “Positivism, Foucault, and the Fantasia of the Library,” “Power, Knowledge, and Fear: Feminism, Foucault, and the Stereotype of the Female Librarian,” “Flaubert, Foucault, and the Bibliothèque Fantastique,” “Libraries, Librarians, and the Discourse of Fear,” “Trapped in Our Own Discursive Formations,” and, perhaps most of all,}
ideas relatively accessible and engaging for non-specialist readers, sometimes drawing on Foucault more for illustrative examples rather than attempting systematic explanation. Finally, with a series of articles that often address related topics, the Radfords also have an unusually high rate of tertiary authors citing several of their articles in the same article—for instance, Andersen and Skouvig cite five of the Radfords’ articles in their one article, Haider and Bawden cite four in the same article, and four articles written or co-written by Buschman account for 11 of the 129 total citations (nearly ten percent)—along with a relatively high rate of self-citation (18 out of 129).

F. Journal Presence and Penetration

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---


\(^{119}\) One journal on this latter list that perhaps warrants special mention is *Scientometrics*, which had no citations of *Archaeology* or *Order* but had eleven articles mentioning Foucault. These typically did not involve writers using Foucault’s works or ideas in any way to craft arguments as in a typical journal article, but rather were usually related to bibliometric monitoring of Foucault’s citation footprint and impact, usually among many other authors. At any rate, Foucault is unquestionably a bibliometric presence on the scholarly landscape, and *Scientometrics* and its contributing authors are aware of him.
journals each showed one article citing Archaeology or Order. In a few cases—Electronic Library, IEEE Transactions, and Online Information Review—this was the lowest category of visible use, “Bibliography Only,” but the Journal of Information Technology actually included one of the rare Very Substantial uses (Brooke 2002). Also notably, as with some of the journals alluded to in the preceding paragraph, most of the journals referred to in this paragraph evinced a significantly more active interest in other, later Foucault. Thus, for example, the Government Information Quarterly showed nine articles using other, probably later Foucault or otherwise mentioning him, possibly related to Foucault’s exploration of “governmentality” and surveillance along with, perhaps, power/knowledge; Information Technology & People showed thirteen other articles, many of them probably interested in some of the same topics. Reference and User Services Quarterly also particularly stands out, with a dozen articles that do not cite Archaeology or Order along with the one that does. Even Collection Management, IEEE Transactions, and the Journal of Library Administration each showed three additional articles not citing Archaeology or Order along with one that did.

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

---

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

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

Whichever way the core and periphery may be construed, it seems clear that this study mostly did not find what it set out in hopes of finding: relatively clear mapping of the boundaries of a multi-lobed LIS field defined by differential use of Archaeology and Order. Perhaps the closest it came to doing so was with the citation-specific results regarding use of particular concepts, which found that archival scholars are virtually alone in LIS in drawing (fairly infrequently) on Foucault’s concept of the archive, while archivists were also notable for making little or no use of Archaeology or Order for the concept of discourse—which might indicate that they, like other LIS scholars, are increasingly turning to Discipline and Punish or other later works of Foucault for that concept if they use him at all, or else perhaps that archival scholars
may be tending to rely even more heavily than some other LIS scholars on secondary sources regarding discourse analysis? Also, as previously discussed, it was seen that archivists, particularly North American archivists, have made especially little use of *Order*. Aside from those rather limited findings, the only other clear finding related to disciplinary mapping might be that archivists appear to use page numbers in citations more religiously than other LIS scholars.\textsuperscript{121}

G. Tertiary Use

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

\textsuperscript{121} Another seeming pattern not studied or addressed in detail within the parameters of this study would appear to be that even though all sectors of LIS may be shifting toward an overall preference for later works of Foucault, those scholars and journals focused on information systems and technology, as well as on management and organization, would appear to be particularly drawn toward surveillance, Panopticism, governmentality, power/knowledge, and other ideas that mostly emerge in later Foucault.
draws upon other scholars’ secondary interpretations of those ideas. Thus, among the core authors publishing in the core journals, secondary material is freely added to the general swirl of Foucauldian ideas along with original material, and such ideas eddy and recirculate among the core authors even as they also gradually disperse to other scholars outside the core. The visible citation and usage patterns suggest that through this process, secondary interpretations can, sometimes fairly quickly, become equal or even paramount to the original works even among the core cognoscenti who are familiar with Foucault’s works; that is, after a certain time, the insiders may be having their ongoing, recirculating discussion more about the secondary layers of interpretation they have helped to create than about the original sources. Again, perhaps the classic examples of this are Frohmann’s two early articles, which directly use and address Foucault’s works rather little but nevertheless appear to have had a major impact on overall understanding of Foucauldian discourse analysis in LIS, both within the core and outside of it.

If even the core cognoscenti happily rely on secondary materials to assist themselves with determining how best to think about Foucauldian ideas, it is perhaps no surprise that sub-cognoscenti who are curious about Foucauldian ideas would also tend to grasp the secondary interpretations in preference to the often heavy, complex, difficult original works. This would help to account for both the limited and often generalized use of Archaeology or Order discussed earlier, as well as the observed general pattern that tertiary uses outside the core cognoscenti, admittedly judged rather summarily by their article titles in this study, tend to show little sign of any reintensification of attention and interest specifically regarding Foucault and his works. That is, at least in theory, tertiary users of secondary materials could use that exposure to discover, or rediscover, and explore Foucault more intensively. If they did so and actually cited Archaeology or Order, they would of course then appear in this study’s list of identified secondary users,
depending upon the journals in which they published—which may have happened in some cases, as already noted. But tertiary users also might cite other works by Foucault, or they might include his name or key, characteristically and recognizably Foucauldian concepts in their article titles. But the Web of Science citation search lists showed little sign of any such process, aside from occasional, usually very generic references to discourse or discourse analysis appearing in article titles, usually in the context of applying discourse analysis to some specific practical issue. The overall impression from the tertiary citation searches is that, outside the recirculation of ideas among the cognoscenti, the signal specifically relating to Foucault only dissipates further, and awareness of Foucault’s trademark ideas, especially the concept of discourse, while dispersing and spreading farther, tends to grow progressively more general and largely detached from Foucault himself. It almost appears as though the more Foucauldian discourse analysis gets picked up, the more Foucault himself and his works may be left behind.

One implication from all this, which may be merely related to the general human tendency to try to maximize impact while minimizing effort, would seem to be that scholars, both on the individual level but especially at the group level, cumulatively tend to favor the most readily accessible sources of ideas that are currently generating interest. Such more accessible sources may tend, inexorably, to overshadow and crowd out more difficult, less accessible sources, even if the latter sources might sometimes be richer and more in-depth regarding the particular ideas in question. This would appear to happen in part due to the relative frequency and rapidity of circulation of sources. A highly successful, accessible, widely circulated secondary source gradually may tend to become something like a widely shared, established account or version in the group mind of a scholarly community, while other, less popular or accessible treatments will tend to remain relatively marginalized or ignored. To whatever degree
a popular secondary interpretation of original sources may sincerely intend to be about those original materials, in actual practice, the popular secondary source may inevitably come to replace the original materials and become itself the focus of attention and understanding. Moreover, to the extent any one interpretation becomes relatively standard and established, most scholars likely will feel little need to go back to original sources, and to undertake all the effort that would entail. As tertiary scholarship appears that is based on secondary interpretations and not the primary materials, any connection to the primary materials and their original author likely will tend to become increasingly stretched and tenuous, with the original author perhaps vanishing from the picture altogether, or else continuing to hover over it like a mythical forefather, to be occasionally genuflected to dutifully but otherwise to be largely ignored.

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

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

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

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

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

\(^{122}\) Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge*, p. 173.
database have quoted from an interview of Foucault conducted in 1974:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

To attempt to explain the relatively limited, general use of Foucault’s two works, this study posits that widespread familiarity—or the assumption of such widespread familiarity—with complex, difficult original works within a scholarly community may tend, perhaps inevitably, to create a situation favoring display of general familiarity with the original works without the need to demonstrate detailed and specific use of those works—a situation where everybody already knows, or at least appears to know, what is in them. In such a situation, there will be a reduced sense of need to leave careful signposts regarding particularized use of the original sources for either contemporaneous or future scholars. Moreover, influential original sources that generate enough excitement within a scholarly community to produce active secondary commentary upon the originals, and then secondary commentary on the secondary commentary, may be especially likely to become buried and obscured especially rapidly by the proliferation of secondary commentary that becomes a surrogate for original works, or ultimately even for earlier secondary sources. For all these reasons—rather ironically and perhaps counter-intuitively—important, influential original works and their authors may be particularly fated to effectively vanish from the very discussion and discourse they triggered surprisingly quickly.
Regarding both secondary and tertiary use of *The Archaeology of Knowledge* and *The Order of Things*, this study found pronounced concentration of such use among a relatively small circle of academically oriented, theoretically inclined LIS journals. Notwithstanding this overall centralization of Foucauldian activity around a core of journals, though, use—sometimes substantial or significant use—of Foucault’s two works also surfaced occasionally in journals that usually might be seen as relatively far from that core and more practically focused, indicating some gradual but ongoing visible penetration of Foucauldian ideas from the core outward toward the periphery of the LIS field.

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

Although collecting, compiling, and analyzing the data and databases used in this study required substantial time and effort, notwithstanding that, the resulting picture presented in this study of the LIS field’s use of Foucault’s important early works remains, in a sense, only a snapshot, inherently incomplete and imperfect. Although the study involved searches of a large number of journals, many others were left out just for lack of inclusion on the SCIImago or other lists that were used to select journals to search. Of the journals selected, a significant fraction of these journals or articles in them also were effectively left out of the search process due either to unavailability specifically at UCLA or general electronic unavailability, unsearchability, or unidentifiability. As a reviewer of this thesis pointed out, moreover, some of the journals that appear on the SCIImago list and were searched are ones that may fairly clearly fall outside the boundaries of the LIS field, even broadly conceived. Thus, for all the effort expended, this study does not provide fully complete or accurate coverage even of LIS journal literature.
Nor is journal literature the only, or perhaps even the best, place to look for footprints of use of Foucault’s works by LIS scholars. Experienced LIS scholars have suggested that much of the most substantial delving into Foucault’s oeuvre might more likely be found among the growing number of monographs exploring theoretical issues published by LIS scholars. Some reverberations of such book-based discussions might perhaps be expected to show up alongside references to Foucault’s works in journal articles, or perhaps might be caught by the study’s less-than-perfect monitoring of tertiary use using the Web of Science citation index; but some such use might escape detection altogether, particularly if, in practice, it mostly involved LIS scholars addressing each others’ arguments in their respective monographs or in conference interactions that may not result in journal articles, for example.

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

To attempt to more fully explore either visible or non-/less-visible use of Foucault, there are many possible directions future research might take. Some rather obvious ones already have been alluded to above—such as, seek an even fuller, more accurate corpus of LIS journal literature or trace use of Foucault also in monographic or other literature. With or without such
an expansion, the data reported in this study could be processed and analyzed in a more sophisticated fashion. The present reporting of results regarding, for example, cumulative citations of Foucault, and comparative ranking of journals based upon those totals, may tend to conceal more significant and interesting relationships that might be revealed through more sensitive measurements of relative frequency, density, and concentration of citations. For example, the citation performance of the journal *Archival Science*, which only started publication in 2001 and only appears twice a year, might actually be much more impressive on a frequency/density basis than a journal with similar cumulative numbers that has been published and is electronically available from the 1980s onward and might have up to twelve issues per year. Thus a more sensitive and sophisticated comparative bibliometric approach would have to attempt to account for and compare various additional factors, including the beginning and ending dates for each journal’s respective window of electronic availability/searchability, the total number of articles published within that window of availability as a comparative baseline, and possibly other parameters or peculiarities particular to specific journals.

Certain potentially interesting, and perhaps obvious, additional angles of attack were left out of this study due to time constraints. For instance, it would be possible to check all of the tertiary uses that appeared on the Web of Science citation lists for the depth of use of the cited secondary sources as well as the extent of visible application of recognizably Foucauldian ideas. As was the pattern with other research results in this study, most such tertiary uses likely would prove to be relatively in passing; yet it would be interesting to find exceptions to that rule. It also might be possible to more carefully trace tertiary uses of monographs by specifically identifying such works that make substantial use of Foucault’s early works, then tracing citations using the Web of Science, Google Scholar, or possibly full-text journal databases.
This study did not attempt the sort of intensive, qualitative comparative analysis of substantial secondary uses of Foucault’s work that such articles really deserve. An overview of all such articles together suggests that they make use of *The Archaeology of Knowledge* or *The Order of Things* in a surprisingly broad variety of mostly different ways. Yet more careful analysis might reveal interesting points of comparison or observable trends—along with similar intensive analysis of use of those works in monographs.

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

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

To seek to transcend the various technical shortcomings of the present study and explore additional nuances more fully, a variety of other research methods might fruitfully be applied:
for example, discourse analysis, social network analysis, or interviews with key scholars, along with more sophisticated bibliometric techniques.

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

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

in 2007. In particular, the observed vague generality of co-citations of either or both of Foucault’s works with other works or other authors tends to call into question the significance of co-citations in general.\footnote{126 For an early challenge to the validity of co-citation analysis, see, e.g., David Edge, “Why I Am Not a Co-Citationist,” *Essays of an Information Scientist*, vol. 3 (1977-1978): 240-246 (a reprint of an earlier-published version), available at http://www.garfield.library.upenn.edu/essays/v3p240y1977-78.pdf.}

Which is not to say that Foucault and his (seemingly) relatively neglected early works may not be continuing to have a powerful influence, both in LIS and elsewhere; only that such influence may be expressed in ways that may not register on citation analysis’ radar screen as they are supposed to according to traditional assumptions. This study suggests that such influence may have gone underground, to some extent, and may be expressed more through its largely invisible continuing pull on more visibly and actively used secondary sources and the whole bubbling broth of secondary and tertiary interpretations described earlier. As such, this study also hopefully contributes somewhat to the literature on Mertonian obliteration by incorporation—“‘the obliteration of the sources of ideas, methods, or findings by their being anonymously incorporated in current canonical knowledge,’” or in other words, influential and impactful ideas becoming so commonplace that their specific origins are forgotten and ignored, and their sources are cited less frequently than their impact warrants.\footnote{127 Katherine W. McCain, “Eponymy and Obliteration by Incorporation: The Case of the ‘Nash Equilibrium,’” *JASIST*, vo. 62, no. 7 (2011): 1412-1424, at p. 1413 (quoting R.K. Merton, “The Matthew Effect in Science II: Cumulative Advantage and the Symbolism of Intellectual Property,” *ISIS*, vol. 79 (1988): 606-623, at p. 622).} To the extent that Mertonian obliteration may have a somewhat different face in humanistic and social scientific disciplines than in the sciences where it more often has been studied, this thesis offers a glimpse of that face, and of some of the processes by which its features may be erased, like Foucault’s famous face in the sand at the edge of the sea.
Appendix 1: Unavailable, Unsearchable, and Zero-Results Journals

Unavailable: (6)

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

Unsearchable: (6)

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

Zero Results for Foucault: (24)

Bottom Line
College & Undergraduate Libraries
College & Research Libraries News
Communications in Information Literacy
Computers in Libraries
Computers in the Schools
Information Systems Management
Information Technology & Libraries
Interlending & Document Supply
Issues in Science & Technology Librarianship
Journal of Access Services
Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship
Journal of Cheminformatics
Journal of Classification
Journal of Enterprise Information Management
Library Resources & Technical Services
Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science
Medical Reference Services Quarterly
New Review of Academic Librarianship
OCLC Systems & Services
Performance Measurement & Metrics
Public Library Quarterly
Science & Technology Libraries
World Patent Information
Appendix 2: Bibliography of 188 Articles Citing Archaeology or Order in This Study’s Database

[Alphabetically by Author]


43. Dennis, Dion, and Jabbar Al-Obaidi. “Vanguard, Laggard or Relic? The Possible Futures of Higher Education after the Epistemic Revolution.” First Monday, vol. 15, no. 3 (March 2010).


56. Frické, Martin. “Reflections on Classification: Thomas Reid and Bibliographic Description.” 


120. Munro, Rolland. “Just When You Thought It Safe to Enter the Water: Accountability, Language Games and Multiple Control Technologies.” *Accounting, Management & Information Technology*, vol. 3, no. 4 (1993): 249-211.


158. Stade, Philip. “‘This Video Is Not Available in Germany’: Online Discourses on the German Collecting Society GEMA and YouTube.” *First Monday*, vol. 19, no. 10 (October 2014).


177. Wallmannsberger, Josef. “Poridge: Postmodern Rhizomatics in Digitally Generated Environments—Do We Need a Metatheory for W3?” *Electronic Library*, vol. 12, no. 6 (December 1994): 345-351.

19, no. 4 (December 2014).


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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals with &quot;Foucault&quot; Results</th>
<th>Other Foucault</th>
<th>Total References</th>
<th>Unavailable Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability in Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives &amp; Manuscripts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Information Technologies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Science Research</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Info. &amp; Library Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials Review</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4: Top Journals for Use of “Other” Foucault

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

[All journals after these 29 have only one use of “Other” Foucault or less (only eight journals show just one use; 21 show none). Cumulative uses of Arch/Order/Both/D.onL. and total references to Foucault are included for comparison. Again, it is important to remember that articles listed as citing Archaeology or Order frequently also cite other Foucault works; articles listed as citing “Other” only do not cite Archaeology or Order.]
### Appendix 5: Top Journals for Use of *Archaeology*, *Order*, or Both

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

[All journals after these 26 have only one use of Arch/Order/Both/D.onL. or less (15 additional journals show one use; 27 show none). Uses of “Other” Foucault and total references to Foucault are included for comparison. Again, it is important to remember that articles listed as citing *Archaeology* or *Order* frequently *also* cite other Foucault works; articles listed as citing only “Other,” however, do not cite *Archaeology* or *Order.*]
### Appendix 6: Very Substantial Uses of *Archaeology, Order, or Both*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) of Articles</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Work(s) Used</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talja (1999)</td>
<td>Library &amp; Information Science Research</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7: Substantial Uses of *Archaeology, Order, or Both*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) of Articles</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Work(s) Used</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budd &amp; Raber (1998)</td>
<td>Library Quarterly</td>
<td>DoL only</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frohmann (2008)</td>
<td>JASIST</td>
<td>DoL only</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb (2010)</td>
<td>First Monday</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lund (2009)</td>
<td>ARIST</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talja et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Journal of Documentation</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 8: Very Substantial, Substantial, and Significant Uses, by Work/Depth of Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) of Articles</th>
<th>Work(s)</th>
<th>Depth of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacob &amp; Albrechtsen (1998)</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Very Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sotto (1997)</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark (1998)</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introna (2007)</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang &amp; Jacob (2013)</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilley (1998)</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob (2004)</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berg et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frické (2013)</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budd &amp; Raber (1998)</td>
<td>DoL only</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frohmann (2008)</td>
<td>DoL only</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford &amp; Radford (2001)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Very Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannabuss (1996)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Very Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphries (1998)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Very Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frohmann (2001)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Very Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tredinnick (2007)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Very Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Very Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook (2001)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob (2001)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budd (2006)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilliland (2011)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munro (1993)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannisson &amp; Sundin (2007)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girdwood (2009)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford &amp; Radford (1997)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Very Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talja (1999)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Very Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford &amp; Radford (2005)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Very Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andersen &amp; Skouvig (2006)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haider &amp; Bawden (2007)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haikola &amp; Jonsson (2007)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown (1991)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard (1995)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talja et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head (2007)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lund (2009)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothman (2010)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb (2010)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynard (2010)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huvila (2015)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carusi &amp; De Grandis (2012)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budd (1997)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buschman (2007)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill &amp; Harrington (2014)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvarado (1996)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budd &amp; Raber (1996)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talja (1996)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andersen (1999)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skibell (2002)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoler (2002)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given &amp; Olson (2003)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke (2005)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denegri-Knott &amp; Taylor (2005)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reece (2005)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothman (2006)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter (2006)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millar (2006)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withers &amp; Grout (2006)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie &amp; Stooke (2007)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savolainen (2007)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klein &amp; Hirschheim (2008)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darms (2009)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iivari (2010)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair (2010)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner &amp; Allen (2010)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton &amp; Cleland (2014)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sköld (2015)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9: Very Substantial, Substantial, and Significant Uses, by Depth of Use/Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) of Articles</th>
<th>Depth of Use</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Work(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talja (1999)</td>
<td>Very Substantial</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Very Substantial</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard (1995)</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sotto (1997)</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budd &amp; Raber (1998)</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>DoL only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook (2001)</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob (2001)</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talja et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andersen &amp; Skouvig (2006)</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Arch &amp; DoL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budd (2006)</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haider &amp; Bawden (2006)</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Arch &amp; DoL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haider &amp; Bawden (2007)</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Arch &amp; DoL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haikola &amp; Jonsson (2007)</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Arch &amp; DoL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head (2007)</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frohmann (2008)</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>DoL only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lund (2009)</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothman (2010)</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb (2010)</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynard (2010)</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilliland (2011)</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zhang & Jacob (2013) Substantial 2013 Order
Huvila (2015) Substantial 2015 Arch
Munro (1993) Significant 1993 Both
Alvarado (1996) Significant 1996 Arch
Budd & Raber (1996) Significant 1996 Arch
Talja (1996) Significant 1996 Arch
Budd (1997) Significant 1997 Arch & DoL
Andersen (1999) Significant 1999 Arch
Given & Olson (2003) Significant 2003 Arch
Berg et al. (2005) Significant 2005 Order
Clarke (2005) Significant 2005 Arch
Reece (2005) Significant 2005 Arch
Brothman (2006) Significant 2006 Arch
Carter (2006) Significant 2006 Arch
Millar (2006) Significant 2006 Arch
Withers & Grout (2006) Significant 2006 Arch
Buschman (2007) Significant 2007 Arch & DoL
Savolainen (2007) Significant 2007 Arch
Darms (2009) Significant 2009 Arch
Girdwood (2009) Significant 2009 Both
Iivari (2010) Significant 2010 Arch
Sinclair (2010) Significant 2010 Arch
Carusi & De Grandis (2012) Significant 2012 Arch-2dry
Frické (2013) Significant 2013 Order
Hill & Harrington (2014) Significant 2014 Arch & DoL
Walton & Cleland (2014) Significant 2014 Arch
Appendix 10: Very Substantial, Substantial, and Significant Uses, by Work/Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) of Articles</th>
<th>Work(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Depth of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sotto (1997)</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berg et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang &amp; Jacob (2013)</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frické (2013)</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budd &amp; Raber (1998)</td>
<td>DoL only</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frohmann (2008)</td>
<td>DoL only</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munro (1993)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob (2001)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook (2001)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budd (2006)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girdwood (2009)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilliland (2011)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Very Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budd &amp; Raber (1996)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budd (1997)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andersen (1999)</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skibell (2002)</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given &amp; Olson (2003)</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zwick &amp; Dholakia (2004)</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talja et al. (2005)</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reece (2005)</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denegri-Knott &amp; Taylor (2005)</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke (2005)</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withers &amp; Grout (2006)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millar (2006)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter (2006)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothman (2006)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andersen &amp; Skouvig (2006)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savolainen (2007)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie &amp; Stooke (2007)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head (2007)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haikola &amp; Jonsson (2007)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haider &amp; Bawden (2007)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buschman (2007)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klein &amp; Hirschheim (2008)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lund (2009)</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darms (2009)</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner &amp; Allen (2010)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair (2010)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynard (2010)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iivari (2010)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb (2010)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothman (2010)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carusi &amp; De Grandis (2012)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton &amp; Cleland (2014)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill &amp; Harrington (2014)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sköld (2015)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huvila (2015)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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[Note to readers: the principal bibliography for this study already appears in the quite lengthy Appendix 2: Bibliography of 188 Articles Citing Archaeology or Order in This Study’s Database, which appears at pp. 92-105 above and will not be duplicated here. Because those 188 articles are the focus of this study, constitute its primary data sources, and are closely linked to the various other appendices, it was seen as appropriate and necessary to set them apart. This bibliography, however, provides information on various other sources used or mentioned in this thesis.]


