Author-Constructs & Trojan Horse-ing: Academic Citation as a Strategic Discursive Practice

Michael R. Olsson
University of Technology, Sydney
Address
e-mail address

ABSTRACT
This paper draws on the findings of a study of 15 international information researchers' relationship with an author work prominent in the literature of their field (Brenda Dervin) to examine academic citation practices in a new light. Drawing on social constructivist theories, derived in part from Foucault's approach to discourse analysis, and a methodology drawing on aspects of Dervin's (1999) Sense-Making and Glaser & Strauss' (1967) inductive analytic techniques, it seeks to examine citation as a strategic discursive practice.

Keywords
Information use; citation behavior; discourse analysis; Sense-Making.

INTRODUCTION
Academic citation practices have long been of interest to information science researchers. White & McCain (1998), for example, have shown that the bibliometric analysis of citations make up a significant percentage of published research in the field. In addition to bibliometric studies, the last three decades have seen a range of studies examining academic writers' citation behavior – seeking to understand why researchers cite in the way they do (e.g. Gilbert, 1977; Cronin, 1982; Brooks, 1985; 1986, Garfield, 1989; Case & Higgins, 2000).

Yet despite the centrality of citation to much research in our field, many questions remain. The present study, through adopting both a different meta-theoretical lens, inspired in part by Foucauldian discourse analysis, and a different methodological approach, drawing on aspects of Dervin's (1999) Sense-Making and Glaser & Strauss' (1967) inductive analytic techniques, seeks to examine citation in a new light: as a strategic discursive practice.

EXISTING RESEARCH – CITATION AS PERSUASION
In addition to bibliometric studies mapping citation practices, the last three decades have seen a relatively small number of IS studies examining academic writers' citation behavior – seeking to understand why researchers cite in the way they do.

These studies have all contributed to a generally consistent portrait of academic citation behavior. The essentially rhetorical nature of much academic citation behavior has long been recognized by researchers such as Gilbert (1977), Cronin (1982) and Brooks (1985; 1986). Citations are used as "tools of persuasion" (Gilbert, 1977), a means by which a researcher can increase the credibility of his/her own work in the eyes of its audience. In doing so, they are able to increase the credibility of their own arguments by relating them to existing works whose authority have already been established. This construction closely parallels Foucault's notion of the discursive nature of knowledge/power.

Moravcsik & Murugsen (1975), Gilbert (1977) and others have pointed to perfunctory citation as an important indicator of the social role of citation. Firstly, the common practice of citing works in a cursory manner with little explanation can only make sense if citers know they will evoke an accepted set of shared meanings, as in the absence of such shared meanings, perfunctory citations would be either confusing or meaningless. Small (1978) and Case & Higgins (2000) suggest that highly cited documents act as "standard symbols" or "concept markers" for a research community – signifiers of particular well known theories and concepts.

Further, Gilbert (1977) has suggested that perfunctory citations may also serve to "signal allegiance" – a short-hand means for a writer to signal his/her affiliation with a particular approach or school of thought. Similarly, Moravcsik & Murugsen (1975), noting that many such citations are essentially redundant, argued that they are made to "'keep everybody happy' in the game of priority hunting" i.e. as a means of paying appropriate respect to the 'powerful' writers in the field.

Another important indicator of the social nature of meaning-making can be found in Cozzens (1982). Through an examination of the citations of a 1948 economics paper, he was able to establish two distinct patterns of meaning among its citers, each representing the views of a different community of researchers with different research interests and different primary audiences for their publication

THE STUDY
The present study examined academic citation behavior as part of a broader study of academic researchers' relationship with an author and her work prominent in the literature of their field. The participants in the study were 15 information researchers from eight universities in five countries in Europe and North America. The study examined their relationship with the prominent North American communication theorist, Brenda Dervin, and her work.

Dervin was chosen as the focal author for the study for a number of reasons. These included: White & McCain's finding that at the time Dervin was the most highly cited author amongst information behavior researcher's (1998, 351); her strong association with a major paradigmatic shift in the field – the 'user-centered paradigm' (Dervin & Nilan, 1986); and the fact that she was herself an active participant in the field/community being studied.

Potential participants were identified using Clark & Archer's (1999) analysis of authors citing Dervin's work in the Institute of Scientific Information citation indexes – all participants had cited Dervin at least three times in their published work and the relevant articles were read by the researcher to ensure that they were not simply cases of perfunctory citation but rather represented a substantial engagement with Dervin's work, Participants were then purposefully sampled based on analysis of their published work to reflect a range of national and institutional contexts, experience levels and conceptual approaches. In keeping with Dervin's overall influence in LIS, the majority of participants were involved in information behavior research; however five participants were actively involved in information retrieval research, while another participant self-identified as a meta-theorist and critic. While three participants were relatively recent PhD graduates, three participants were drawn from White & McCain's (1998) list of the 'most cited authors' in library and information science. In addition, five participants were identified by Dervin herself as having a long-term personal association with her.

META-THEORETICAL APPROACH
The present study sought to develop a greater understanding of academic citation through adopting a meta-theoretical approach which was markedly different from that of earlier studies. This was informed by a range of social constructivist and discourse analytic theories, most notably Foucault's notion of the 'archive' (1972) and the discursive construction of 'knowledge/power' (1977) in order to look at citation as an example of a discursively-constructed information practice.

Savolainen has outlined the emergence of a new "umbrella discourse" (2007, 109) in information studies – 'information practice' – which has emerged in the first decade of the twenty-first century as a critical alternative to the 'information behavior' discourse which has dominated user research in recent decades. Savolainen follows Talja (2005) in suggesting that the key characteristic of this new discursive approach is that it represents "a more sociologically and contextually oriented line of research" (Talja, 2005), one which:

...shifts the focus away from the behavior, action, motives and skills of monological individuals. Instead the main attention is directed to them as members of various groups and communities that constitute the context of their mundane activities. (Savolainen, 2007, p. 120)

The present study might usefully be seen as being part of this emerging discursive approach.

In seeking to understand citation as a discursive practice, the study's analysis was informed by a number of concepts derived from Foucault's approach to discourse analysis. The study is based on a social constructionist epistemological framework:

By social constructionism I understand that people live in a common reality which they mainly share with the help of language. Language provides people with vocabularies, i.e. concepts and categories for use in different situations. This vocabulary differs according to the discourses they are participating in. By using the vocabulary people construct meaning or make sense in their lives. On a general level, the whole society and its organizations are socially constructed, their meaning is not given but construed. (Vakkari, 1997, p. 5)

The Foucauldian discourse analytic approach also calls for a re-conceptualization of the relationship between the author, the text and the reader. Foucault, in his essay 'What is an Author?' (in Rabinow, 1984, 101-120), echoed Barthes (1988 in talking of the "death of the author" – a phrase that has become a standard slogan of post-modernism. In the information transfer model (Tuominen, Talja & Savolainen, 2003), authors, texts and readers are constructed as separate entities. Texts are the vehicles by which 'chunks' of information are transferred from the author to the reader. In this model, authors are seen as the creators of information, and readers as passive recipients. Foucault argues instead that readers, individually and collectively, are actively involved in the construction of meaning: that meaning-making is a complex sociolinguistic process involving the reader, the text and their social context.

This theory then has two key features: firstly, that the meaning ('knowledge', 'truth') of a work is not something

governed or determined by the author, but rather is a social construct created (and constantly re-created) by the reader/s at a particular point in space and time; secondly, authors, as the originators of a body of work, are themselves the products of social construction within and between discourses.

In this conception, published texts have no single absolute meaning or truth, but only a socially constructed and located 'truth' or 'truths'. Nor is this 'truth' something that can be predetermined by the author. Rather, the established social practices and conventions within a community and the interactions of its members determine the meaning, significance, and authority of a work in the context of that particular community. This means that the meaning/knowledge-claims/truth of any work are constantly being questioned, re-examined and re-interpreted. For example, each time a member of a research community evaluates, critiques, cites, or re-interprets a work, or draws parallels between one work and another in his/her own publications, teaching or research practices, they are contributing to the on-going interpretation of the work's meaning. From a Foucauldian perspective, citation behavior is both dependent on and a key social practice underpinning these collective meaning-making processes.

Foucault refers to this shared set of socially-ascribed meanings as the 'archive' (1972), emphasizing that members of a discourse community are connected not only by a shared engagement with a collection of texts, but also by a set of interpretations of these texts that the members of the community share. For example, Kuhn's work on paradigms is interpreted differently by, and has had a different influence in, the discourses of information science from those of the history of science. A single text, the Bible being a useful example, may have hundreds of different 'identities' for different discourse communities, each of them legitimate in their own discursive context.

Furthermore, a community's discursive meaning-making will, according to Foucault, lead to the social construction not only of individual works, but also of authors themselves. In the context of a particular discourse, an author is not primarily a living, breathing human being (after all, they may be long dead) but rather a social construct derived from the community's interpretation of the significance (truth) of their body of work. Thus Kuhn as an author-construct in information science may well be a very different figure, with a very different significance, from Kuhn as an author-construct in the sociology of knowledge or the history of science.

While studies of information behavior and use have been criticized (e.g. Frohmann, 1994; Dervin, 1999) for largely ignoring issues of power and power relations, Foucault, by contrast, constructed the relationship between knowledge and power as central to his conceptual framework. Indeed, he constructed knowledge and power not as separate entities but as conjoined products of the same social processes - power/knowledge (*pouvoir/savoir*):

We should admit ... that power produces knowledge (and not simply by encouraging it because it serves power or by applying it because it is useful); that power and knowledge directly imply one another; that there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations. (Foucault, 1977, p. 27)

This led the present study to seek to understand citation behavior in a different light: as grounded in power relations, both the product and the generator of power/knowledge. It would seek to understand the ways in which participants actively engaged with existing regimes of power/knowledge in their community/ies, through examining their relationship with and use of a powerful author-construct.

METHODOLOGY

The present study marks a significant methodological departure both from existing studies of citation, such as Gilbert (1977), Cronin (1982) and Brooks (1985; 1986) and from the discourse analytic approaches used by Foucault himself and adopted in LIS by Frohmann (1994) and Radford (1998). Both these approaches have based their analysis on the study of documents – the published literature of the field/s examined. However such document-based approaches can be criticized for privileging the researcher's perspective. The present study has therefore sought a more inclusive methodological approach, one which allowed the citing researchers a more active role in developing an understanding of their citation practices.

In order to facilitate this, the research adopted semi-structured qualitative interviews as its primary method of data collection. The interview guide was based in part on the 'Life-Line' and 'Time-line' techniques developed by Dervin and her collaborators (Dervin & Frenette, 2001). Each participant was interviewed in person by the researcher about their relationship with Dervin and her work. Their discussion of their citation practices did not, therefore, occur in isolation but placed in the broader context of the importance of the author for their own research.

Talja has pointed out that Sense-Making's "epistemological and ontological basis closely corresponds to that of the discourse analytic viewpoint" ((1997, p. 71). This can be seen, for example, in the fact that:

Sense-Making ...assumes information to be an in-flux creation of a power structure always subject to the forces of power both for its maintenance and its resistance and change. (Dervin, 1999, p. 741)

During the interviews participants described the events and relationships they regarded as significant in their relationship with the author and her work.

Whilst clearly informed by Foucault's theories of discourse, the interview analysis was carried out inductively based on the 'constant comparison' approach of Glaser & Strauss (1967). Feedback from participants was sought throughout the analysis process via email.

THE AUTHOR AS 'CONCEPT MARKER'

The present study's findings were supportive of Case & Higgins (2000) notion that highly cited documents act as "concept markers" or signifiers for a research community. As discussed in earlier publications (Olsson, 2005; 2007), participants' constructions of the meaning/s and significance's of the author's work were grounded in their relationship with the accepted authorities, theories, practices and approaches of their field and other related disciplines – their existing knowledge, beliefs and understandings were the (discursive) lens through which participants 'saw' the author and her work.

Participants' accounts included four different types of constructions: *substantive* constructions – constructions of the meaning/aboutness of the author's work; *evaluative constructions* which go beyond aboutness to construct the relative merits of the author's work, distinguishing its strengths and weaknesses relative to other writers and/or theoretical approaches in the field; *Affective constructions of the author* which relate to participants' constructions of the author as a human being rather than as an author-construct; and *constructions of authority*, of which there were two types, one relating to participants' assessment of the author's authority in the field, the other to her influence on their own work.

The study also revealed that many of these constructions were shared – found in the account of more than one participant. Participants' accounts suggested that these shared constructions arose out of participants' common context. The findings show that all the study's participants held a number of beliefs about the author in common. All 15 participants shared four substantive constructions while a fifth was shared by 14 of the 15 participants (See Table 1). Of the 23 different constructions of the author, 12 were found in the accounts of more than half of the participants. To this degree, then, the participants can be seen as belonging to a single community that shares certain beliefs.

Furthermore, the participants' themselves revealed an awareness of certain ideas being widely held among researchers in the field. For example, nine participants regularly described the four most common constructions listed above as commonly accepted views:

I think there is a conventional way Dervin is looked at in information seeking...because of the strong position of this 1986 paper ...they see her in terms of the change of paradigm ...as relating to individual information seeking – the gap...Sense-Making is seen in that way

Construction	Type	Participants
Information Behavior	Substantive	15
Meta-theorist	Substantive	15
User-Centered Paradigm	Substantive	15
Sense-Making	Substantive	15
Methodology	Substantive	14

Table 1. Shared Constructions – All Participants.

Although six of these participants drew attention to what they considered to be the 'field's view' in order to contrast it with their own constructions of the author, they acknowledged that it played an important role in their own constructions. Differentiation against their construction of this field's view was often a defining characteristic of participants' constructions of the author.

However, echoing Cozzens (1982), the findings also suggest a range of discursive sub-communities within information research, as they indicate that participants with a particular research interest in common are more likely to share common constructions of the author and her work.

Construction	Type	Participants
Related to Cognitivism	Substantive	5
Information Behavior	Substantive	5
Meta-theorist	Substantive	5
User-Centered Paradigm	Substantive	5
Sense-Making	Substantive	5
Methodology	Substantive	5
"Too Philosophical"	Evaluative	5
As a Person	Affective	5
"Difficult"	Evaluative	4
Lacking Enough Empirical Support	Evaluative	4
Changed Over Time	Evaluative	4
Authority Figure – Powerful	Authority	4

Table 2. Shared Constructions – IR Researchers.

For example, the five participants who self-identified with information retrieval research shared eight constructions of the author, while a further four were shared by four of the five (See Table 2). Furthermore, there were only four examples of constructions that occurred in only one of these participants' accounts. In addition, all these participants themselves emphasized the importance of their engagement with information retrieval research in shaping their existing constructions and defining the context of their constructions of the author and her work.

Ultimately, this led them to construct her differently from other more information behavior-oriented researchers:

> To a certain extent I was also looking at ...IR research ...I'm not strictly speaking either an IR researcher or a pure information needs researcher, which is one of the reasons I see Dervin as less directly relevant ...the IR perspective means a somewhat different focus...

All this suggests that these participants' common engagement with information retrieval research has led them to very similar constructions of the author and her work.

As well as engagement with particular research fields and specializations, participants reported that their engagement with a particular school of thought or conceptual framework, such as 'social constructivism', 'cognitivism' or 'Sense-Making', was of central importance for their constructions of the author and her work. In identifying with such a framework, participants suggested it equipped them with a shared way of looking at and 'talking about' research. The study explored the question of the extent to which participants who self-identified with a particular conceptual framework shared a common set of constructions of the author.

For example, four participants identified their approach with a social constructivist and/or discourse analytic approach to research e.g.

> There is very critical focus to Foucault [in my research]… And I also get some of my ideas from the discourse analytic work from the British social psychologists

These four participants shared eight constructions of the author (See Table 3). A further six constructions were found in three of the four participants' accounts – in every case, the same three participants. It was notable, however, that these three participants, sharing 14 constructions of the author, were colleagues from the same department.

It should be noted, however, an affiliation with a social constructivist/discourse analytic approach did not preclude participants constructing the author in markedly different ways. For example, three of the participants constructed her not only as a 'social constructivist', but also as central to the field. The other, however, regarded their approach as

Construction	Type	Participants
Meta-theorist	Substantive	5
User-Centered Paradigm	Substantive	5
Sense-Making	Substantive	5
Methodology	Substantive	5
"Evangelist"	Affective	5
As a Person	Affective	5
Authority Figure – Powerful	Authority	5
Local Significance	Authority	5
Social Constructivist	Substantive	4
Cutting Edge/Different	Evaluative	4
Changed Over Time	Evaluative	4
Central – Gap Filler	Authority	4
Widely Misinterpreted	Authority	4

Table 3. Shared Constructions – Social Constructivist Researchers.

antithetical to the discourse analytic approach, viewing it as "*incipient mentalism*":

> *Wittgenstein has a very nice phrase at one point where he says there's a tendency of thought that assumes every action flows from a mental reservoir, so that everything one does is grounded somehow inside the mind, in cognitive kind of processing, rather than as he would like it, of course, certain practices laid down.*

It may be significant that the research practices of this 'dissenting' participant were quite different from the other three. While the others were all actively engaged in empirical information behavior research, this participant described his involvement with the field as that of a critic:

> *So my approach is ...if people want to do that they can do it. I'm just saying that here are some questions over here that are interesting too and you don't get at those questions by doing that kind of research.*

Although all participants constructed Sense-Making as an important aspect of the author's work, only three identified themselves as 'Sense-Making researchers'. The accounts of these three participants included 11 constructions shared by all three of them, with a further three constructions shared by two. The fact that all three shared the 'practical –

methodology' construction also suggested the importance of common research practices for understanding their common constructions of the author. This point was raised by two of the participants themselves:

> *I think actually using the Sense-Making methodology really deepened my understanding ...I think you have to have used it to really understand Dervin.*

Similarly, although 13 participants talked about cognitivist writers and theories, only two participants explicitly identified themselves with the cognitivist conceptual framework:

> *I would say sure I'm interested in people's cognitive processes because I think that's important for us in understanding how to support them.*

These two participants shared 11 constructions of the author. However, understanding the role of their shared conceptual framework in shaping these participants' constructive processes was complicated by the fact that they were both engaged in information retrieval research, and tended to relate their conceptual framework to the context of this kind of research.

The study's findings would therefore indicate that those who share a conceptual framework also share many constructions of the author and her work. However, they would also suggest that this commonality is most marked in those who engage in similar areas of research and/or share common research practices.

This suggests that while citation can and does work effectively as semiotic signifier amongst information behavior researchers, the meanings and significances conveyed are multiple. Six participants' accounts showed an awareness of this e.g.

> *I tend to cite Dervin more, if I'm trying to get published in an American journal or writing something specifically about information seeking. If I'm doing an IR piece or something for here in the UK, I probably wouldn't.*

CITATION & POWER/KNOWLEDGE

Discussions of citation practices formed a part of nine participants' accounts of their relationship with the author and her work. Their accounts indicate that these participants were very conscious of citation's strategic importance i.e. that it was a process that could be used to enhance their own work's authority in the eyes of its potential audience:

> *...using Dervin in your research, citing her papers, gives your own work a certain credibility in the eyes of other researchers ...they already know – or think they know – her ideas ... her name gives the work more weight – you need that, especially when you're starting out...*

To borrow Dreyfus & Rabinow's (1982) phrase, participants exhibit a clear understanding of the "*rules of the game*" in relation to having their work published and accepted by its readers. This related to the participants' awareness of the role that citing the work of recognized authors – and evoking what they perceive as widely held constructions thereof - could play in this process.

Participants quite explicitly linked their discussion of the *strategic* nature of their citation of the author to their construction of her as 'powerful' in the context of information behavior research.

For, example, echoing Moravcsik & Murugsen (1975), eight participants talked about how they believed it was "important" or "necessary" to cite the author's work in an information behavior related article in order to signal to the audience that one is aware of it and its significance in the field. They felt there was an expectation that a "*properly researched*" paper in the field should include references to the author's work:

> *...if I would be a reviewer of a paper on information seeking I would expect ... [there] should be at least the reference to Dervin ... because those persons are aware of what happens in the field of information seeking*

Another example of the strategic use of a common construction to succinctly convey a desired meaning related to the construction of the author's work as being about - even epitomizing – the 'user-centered paradigm':

> *It's a way of saying 'I'm user-centered'", "...you sort of stake out your territory in a way, or say who you're aligned with your citations*

Their discussion indicated that participants were acutely aware not only of Dervin as a concept marker/cultural siginifier amongst IS researchers, but also of the power/knowledge associated with the author in the discourses of information behavior research, Showing a strong understanding of his own status as a powerful author-construct, one participant, among the most cited authors in the field, contrasted the authority of an established, high-profile writer like himself with that of a neophyte researcher in the field:

> *Well, the different perspective is, if you compare myself with the average graduate student or the average Ph.D. candidate, well I don't have anything to prove. They do, and they have to find in effect a prop to help them through the process. I don't need props because I don't need to do what I don't want to do. I'm not doing things in order to enter the community, as a Ph.D. student, and who have to demonstrate to thesis entities and so forth that they do know what the background is, who the people are, who the scholars are that they should know about. So, there's a whole apparatus of the entry into the community process that these people*

have to engage in that the established scholar doesn't. So, yes I mean there's differences in that respect. And there are differences in people like say Kuhlthau, and Elfreda Chatman, myself and someone who is through that process but seeking to establish themselves.

This construction of citation as a necessary means for a new researcher to establish their credibility – "*a prop to help them through the process*" – and the suggestion that, as a senior high-profile author one might be 'exempt' from the need to use such a strategy, was echoed in the account of another participant, who was also among the most cited authors in the field:

You know ASIST will publish anything that I give them - JASIST, IP&M...even with no citations at all, they'd probably publish it...you develop a reputation over time…

A third participant provided a further insight into the role of power relations in relation to citation practices by suggesting that citations by such prominent figures had much greater significance for him than those of other writers:

...some citations are worth more than others ...in a sense it takes someone like Dan {a prominent researcher in the field] who's not really got an investment in any of her models ... And he's not, and no one would ever think he was Dervinite or Kuhlthite because he's been around so long. So in a sense, he looks at them and integrates them, people will not think 'Oh Dan has become a Dervinite'.

This view received strong support from six other participants asked to comment on it.

Participants' accounts support a view of citation practice as a widely understood social convention among researchers in the field. Through citing an author they construct as 'powerful' in the field, a researcher can bolster his/her own position as a knowledgeable member of the research community. This will, in effect, increase the authority of his/her own work by linking it to the prominent author's work – clothing, to a degree, their own work in the mantle of the author's established authority.

Participants' accounts contain six examples of participants consciously making strategic use of citing the author's work:

The first reason [for citing the author] is ... because she is a widely cited author, has a strong position. ... Perhaps we can use Wilson's term cognitive authority; she has some cognitive authority in information studies. ... and also of course because I want to make ideas that are not so familiar in information studies, to get them known, to get them more familiar, because you are

able to read Dervin's work as well from the ... social constructivist point of view, as well as from the constructivist point of view ...using Dervin makes my new ideas more acceptable…

This is an example of what I have called 'Trojan-Horse-ing'. The participant's aim was to introduce an unfamiliar and/or divergent theory or approach to the information behavior community. In order to render the new approach/theory more "acceptable" to its intended audience, the participant chose to emphasize its relationship to the author's work – to cloak the unfamiliar in the power/knowledge of an established author construct. Three participants' accounts include explicit of this strategy.

In addition, seven participants talk about using citation to "support" or "lend authority" to their own writing:

...so I'm using Dervin and Nilan there to sort of buttress the statement of the paradigm shift and I'm doing that also to provide some authority, separate authority and authentication to that argument…

CONCLUSION

The study's findings demonstrate the essentially discursive nature of participants' citation practices – grounded in participants' engagement with their field, their research interests, their theoretical framework. Furthermore, participants' accounts show that they are themselves very much aware of citation's role as a discursive practice and their ability, through 'Trojan-horsing' etc., to strategically employ it to further their own ends. This is a good example both of Talja's (1997) contention that we should endeavor to understand through understanding people's discursive interests and of Dervin's (1999) principle that people be seen as experts in their life-worlds.

The findings of the study are generally consistent with those of earlier studies of citation behavior, such as Moravcsik & Murugsen (1975), Gilbert (1977), Cozzens (1982) and Case & Higgins (2000). However, the lens of Foucauldian discourse analysis has allowed for a more theoretically-grounded appreciation of citation as one aspect of a network of discursively constructed power/knowledge relations.

In many western countries, including Australia, Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom, citation counts are being increasingly used, not only by universities but by governments and other funding bodies as a quantifiable measure of the 'impact' of research. The findings of this study however demonstrate that both the relationship with between authors and researchers and researchers' reasons for choosing to cite a particular author's work are complex and multi-faceted. Clearly the findings of bibliometric research need to be followed up by other, more qualitative approaches, such as the present study, if we are to develop an understanding of the complexity of citation as a discursive practice.

White & McCain (1998) concluded that LIS is "like Australia" made up of clusters of 'coastal' communities around the edges of their co-citation map with little common ground between bibliometricians on the one side and information behavior research on the other. The findings of this study however, give a clear indication of the potential benefits for both communities from future 'bi-coastal' research.

More generally, the study provides an example of how a different meta-theoretical and methodological approach can provide new insights, even into behaviors and practices that have been extensively studied before. It is hoped that the emergence of the new more socially-oriented 'umbrella discourse' in our field identified by Savolainen (2007) will lead to many such revelations in the near future.

REFERENCES

Barthes, R. (1988) *A BarthesRreader*. New York, Noonday Press.

Brooks, T. (1985). Private Acts and Public Objects: An Investigation of Citer Motivations. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 36(4): 223-229.

Brooks, T. (1986). Evidence of Complex Citer Motivations. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 37(1): 34-36.

Case, D. & Higgins, G. (2000) How Can We Investigate Citation Behaviour? A Study of Reasons for Citing Literature in Communication. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 51(7): 635-645.

Clark, K. and Archer D. (1999) *Bibliography of journal articles indexed in the Institute of Scientific Information databases as citing Brenda Dervin* [On-line manuscript]. Previously available at: http://communication.sbs.ohio-state.edu/sense-making/

Cronin, B. (1982). Norms and functions in citation: The view of journal editors and referees in psychology. *Social Science Information Studies* 2: 65-78.

Dervin, B. (1999). On studying information seeking and use methodologically: The implications of connecting metatheory to method. *Information Processing & Management*. 35, 727-750.

Dervin, B., and Frenette, M. (2001). Sense-Making Methodology: Communicating communicatively with campaign audiences. In R. E. Rice & C. K. Atkin (Eds.), *Public communication campaigns* (3rd ed., pp. 69-87). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dervin, B. & Nilan, M. (1986). Information needs and uses. *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*. 21: 3-33.

Dreyfus, H. L. and P. Rabinow (1982). *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London, Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London, Allen Lane.

Frohmann, B. (1994). Discourse Analysis as a Research Method in Library and Information Science. *Library and Information Science Research* 16(2): 119-138.

Garfield, E. (1989) Citation Behavior—An Aid or a Hindrance to Information Retrieval? Essays of an Information Scientist: Creativity, Delayed Recognition, and other Essays, 12: *Current Contents*, 18, .3-8.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, Aldine Pub. Co.

Moravcil, M. and Murugesan, P. (1975) Some Results on the Function and Quality of Citations. *Social Studies of Science* 5, 86-92.

Olsson, M. (2005) Making Sense of Sense-Making: Information Behavior Researchers Construct an 'Author'. *Canadian Journal of Information & Library Science*. 29 (3), 315-334.

Olsson, M. (2007) Power/Knowledge: the Discursive construction of an Author. *Library Quarterly*. 77 (2), 219-240.

Rabinow, P. (1984) *The Foucault Reader*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, Peregrine Books.

Radford, G. (1998) Flaubert, Foucault, and the Bibliotheque Fantastique: toward a postmodern epistemology for library science. *Library Trends* 46 (4), 616-34.

Savolainen, R. (2007). Information Behavior and Information Practice: Reviewing the "Umbrella Concepts" of Information-Seeking Studies. *Library Quarterly* 77 (2), 109-132.

Talja, S. (1997). Constituting "information" and "user" as research objects: a theory of knowledge formations as an alternative to the information-man theory. In. P. Vakkari, R. Savolainen & B. Dervin (Eds). *Information Seeking in Context* (pp. 67-80). London: Taylor Graham.

Tuominen, K., Talja S. & Savolainen, R (2003) Multiperspective digital libraries: the implications of constructionism for the development of digital libraries. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 54, 561 – 569.

White, H. D. & McCain, K. W. (1998). Visualizing a Discipline: An Author Co-Citation Analysis of Information Science. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*. 49, 327-355.