The Construction of the Meaning and Significance of an 'Author' among Information Behaviour Researchers

A Social Constructivist Approach

Michael Russell Olsson

Doctor of Philosophy 2003

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP / ORIGINALITY

I certify that this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Candidate

Dedication

This Thesis is dedicated to the people whose support made it possible:

Harriet Jordan

and

Russell and Margaret Olsson

They kept faith in me, even when I doubted myself.

.

Acknowledgements

If I see further, it is because I stand on the shoulders of giants.

Isaac Newton

I wish to particularly thank my principal supervisor, Ms Susan Edwards, and my co-supervisor, Dr Ross Todd, for their support and guidance through the course of the research and writing of this thesis. Their advice, rigorous critique, insight and enthusiasm were central to the whole research process.

I also wish to thank Harriet Jordan for her aid in proof-reading the thesis and advice on layout and clarity of expression; and Margaret Olsson for her aid in entering reference material into Endnote.

I also wish to acknowledge the support, moral and financial, I have received from the Department of Media Arts, Communication and Information, University of Technology Sydney. In particular, their provision of funds to have the interview material professionally transcribed and to provide me with partial marking relief while I was in the final stages of writing was invaluable.

I would like to thank Professor Dervin for not only her cooperation, but her advice on a range of conceptual and methodological issues.

Last, but by no means least, I wish to thank the study's participants. Without their willingness to share their experiences and insights the research would not have been possible.

Table of Contents

CEI	RTIFI	CATE O	F AUTHORSHIP / ORIGI	NALITY	2	
DE	DICAT	ΓΙΟΝ			3	
AC	KNOW	VLEDGE	MENTS		4	
TA	BLE O	F CONT	ENTS		5	
ABS	STRAC	C T			10	
CH	IAPT	ER 1-	INTRODUCTION	ERROR! BO	OKMARK NOT DEFINED.	
1.1	THE	ORIGIN	OF THE STUDY	ERROR! BO	OKMARK NOT DEFINED.	
1.2	THE	AIM OF	THE STUDY	ERROR! BO	OKMARK NOT DEFINED.	
1.3	SIGN	IIFICAN	CE OF THE STUDY	ERROR! BO	OKMARK NOT DEFINED.	
CH	I A P T	ER 2 -	LITERATURE REV	/ IEW .error!bo	OKMARK NOT DEFINED.	
			_		OKMARK NOT DEFINED.	
					OKMARK NOT DEFINED.	
						V NOT DEFINE
2.2		Post-Di	ervin & Nilan Developme Internal Cognition of Ina 'Needy' Information Use	NTS ERROR lividuals Err rs Err	! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. or! Bookmark not defined. or! Bookmark not defined. or! Bookmark not defined.	K NOT BETTALE
2.3	SOCI	IAL APP	ROACHES TO INFORMA	TION BEHAVIOUR	RERROR! BOOKMARK NO	Γ DEFINED.
	2.3.2	SOCIAL I CONTEXT 2.3.3.1	NETWORK ANALYSIS TUALISED 'INTERNAL' APPR Wilson and Phenomenolo	ERROR OACHES ERROR gy Err	! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. ! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. ! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. or! Bookmark not defined. or! Bookmark not defined.	
2.4	SOCI	IAL CON	STRUCTIVISM	ERROR! BO	OKMARK NOT DEFINED.	
		2.4.1.1 2.4.1.2 FOUCAU 2.4.2.1 2.4.2.2 2.4.2.3 2.4.2.4 2.4.2.5 2.4.2.6	The Actor		! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. or! Bookmark not defined. or! Bookmark not defined. ! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. or! Bookmark not defined. Error! Bookmark not defined. or! Bookmark not defined. or! Bookmark not defined. or! Bookmark not defined. eError! Bookmark not defi	
	2.4 3	2.4.2.7 RESEARC			or! Bookmark not defined. ! Bookmark not defined.	

2.4.4 SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST INFORMATION BEHAVIOUR RESEARCH ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

	2.4.4.2 Discourse Analytic I	
PAI	RT II – EXISTING RESEARCH	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
2.5	INFORMATION BEHAVIOUR - S	OCIAL SCIENTISTSERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
	2.5.1.1 Information Transfe. 2.5.1.2 Source Use and Exp. 2.5.1.3 Problems and Unans 2.5.2 QUALITATIVE STUDIES 2.5.2.1 Social Scientists Ob. 2.5.2.2 Literature Searching 2.5.2.3 Documents, Authorit 2.5.2.4 Information Educator	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. r and Informal NetworksError! Bookmark not defined. erience Level Error! Bookmark not defined. wered Questions Error! Bookmark not defined. ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. served Error! Bookmark not defined. g and Evaluation Error! Bookmark not defined. by and Discipline Error! Bookmark not defined. error! Bookmark not defined. error! Bookmark not defined.
2.6	DOCUMENT-BASED RESEARCH	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
	2.6.2 CITATION ANALYSIS AND CITA 2.6.2.1 Citation as Persuasi	ALYSIS
2.7	SUMMARY	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
2.8	GLOSSARY OF TERMS	
CII	ADTED 2 METHODOLOG	GY OF THE STUDYERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
		ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
3.2		BEHAVIOUR RESEARCHERSERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED
		ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. EARCHERS AS A COMMUNITYERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
3.3	THE AUTHOR – BRENDA DERVI	N ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
	3.3.1 AUTHORIAL CONSENT	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.4	PARTICIPANT SELECTION	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
3.5	3.4.1.1 Problems	PARTICIPANTS ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED
	3.5.1 JUSTIFICATION	Error! Bookmark not defined.
	3.5.2 DEVELOPING THE INTERVIEW G 3.5.2.1 The Initial Interview 3.5.2.2 Pilot Testing	erviewing Error! Bookmark not defined. UIDE ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. Guide Error! Bookmark not defined. Error! Bookmark not defined. ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. On Error! Bookmark not defined. Error! Bookmark not defined. Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.6	FOLLOWING UP	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
СН	IAPTER 4 - DATA ANALYS	IS ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

4.1 INTRODUCTION ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

4.2	THE QUESTION OF VALIDITY ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
4.3	INDUCTIVE DATA ANALYSIS ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
4.4	ANALYSIS AND DEVELOPMENTS DURING THE INTERVIEW PROCESSERROR! BOOKMARK NOT
4.5	DEVELOPMENT OF THE CODING FRAMEWORKERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
1.5	
	4.5.1 CODING PRINCIPLES ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. 4.5.2 DESCRIPTIVE CODING ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
	4.5.3 THEMATIC CODING ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
	4.5.4 Coding & Reductionism Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.6	FEEDBACK FROM PARTICIPANTS ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
~	
СН	IAPTER 5 - FINDINGS OF THE STUDYERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
5.1	INTRODUCTION ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
5.2	INITIAL INTERACTIONS ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
	5.2.1 INITIAL INTERACTIONS – SOURCES ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
	5.2.2 EXISTING CONSTRUCTIONS
	5.2.2.1. Information Science Constructions Error! Bookmark not defined.
	5.2.2.2. Constructions from Other Fields Error! Bookmark not defined.
	5.2.2.3. 'National' Constructions and Cultural Differences Error! Bookmark not defined.
	5.2.3 ACCEPTED AND CONTESTED CONSTRUCTIONS ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
	5.2.3.1 Accepted Constructions
	5.2.3.3 Other Constructions Error! Bookmark not defined.
5 2	
5.3	SUBSEQUENT INTERACTIONS AND RELATIONSHIPSERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
	5.3.1 Subsequent Interactions - Sources and Relationships Error! Bookmark not defined.
	5.3.1.1. Colleagues - Long-Term Relationships Error! Bookmark not defined.
	5.3.1.2. Supervisors
	5.3.1.4. The Author
	5.3.1.5. Author Associates Error! Bookmark not defined.
	5.3.1.6. Conferences Error! Bookmark not defined.
	5.3.1.7. "Critical Distance" Error! Bookmark not defined.
	5.3.1.8. Author Texts
	5.3.2 THE ROLE OF EXISTING CONSTRUCTIONS ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
	5.3.2.1. Conceptual Frameworks Error! Bookmark not defined.
	5.3.2.2. Other Fields Error! Bookmark not defined.
	5.3.3 Subsequent Accepted and Contested Constructions Error! Bookmark not defined.
	5.3.3.1. Accepted Constructions Error! Bookmark not defined.
	5.3.3.2. Contested Constructions Error! Bookmark not defined.
	5.3.3.3. Common Ground Error! Bookmark not defined.
5.4	DIFFERENTIATION ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
	5.4.1 DIFFERENTIATION - CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
	5.4.2 DIFFERENTIATION - AUTHOR
	5.4.3 DIFFERENTIATION - FIELD
5.5	CONSTRUCTIONS OF THE AUTHOR ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
	5.5.1 SUBSTANTIVE CONSTRUCTIONS ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
	5.5.1.1. Information Behaviour Research Constructions Error! Bookmark not defined. 5.5.1.2. Sense-Making
	5.5.1.3. Cognitivism
	5.5.1.4. Social Constructivism Error! Bookmark not defined.
	5.5.1.5. Meta-Theorist Error! Bookmark not defined.
	5.5.1.6. Methodology Error! Bookmark not defined.
	5.5.1.7. User-Centred Paradigm Error! Bookmark not defined.
	5.5.2 EVALUATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS
	5.5.2.2. Lacking Enough Empirical Support Error! Bookmark not defined.

		5 5 2 3	Changed Ove	r Time		Error! Ro	okmark not de	fined
		5.5.2.4.	"Too Philoso	phical"		Error! Bo	okmark not de	fined.
		5.5.2.5.	"Difficult"			Error! Bo	okmark not de	fined.
	5 5 3	5.5.2.6. AFFECTI	American/Cul	turally Specific	THOR ERR	Error! Bo or! Book	<i>okmark not de</i> Mark not del	fined.
	3.3.3							
	5 5 1	5.5.3.3.	"Controlling	" ГНОRITY	Enn	Error! Bo	okmark not de	fined.
	3.3.4							
		5.5.4.2.	Marginal			Error! Bo	okmark not de	fined.
		5.5.4.3.	Widely Misin	terpreted		Error! Bo	okmark not de	fined.
		5.5.4.4.	What's the Fi	cance uss about?"		Error: Bo Error! Bo	okmark not ae okmark not de	ginea. Ained
		5.5.4.6.	Central - Gap	-Filler		Error! Bo	okmark not de	fined.
		5.5.4.7.	One of a Gro	oup'		Error! Bo	okmark not de	fined.
	5 5 5			of Sense-Making NTS' CONSTRUCT				
5.6				S				
2.0								OR! BOOKMARK NOT DE
				niversity				
				<i>ty</i>				-
5.7								
				ION				
6.1	INT	RODUCT	TION		ERROR!	BOOKMA	RK NOT DEF	INED.
PAR	RTI –	CONCLU	SIONS OF TH	IE STUDY	ERROR!	BOOKMA	RK NOT DEF	INED.
6.2	THE	ROLE O	F PEOPLE AN	ND TEXTS	ERROR!	BOOKMA	RK NOT DEF	INED.
	6.2.1.			UNICATION				
	())	6.2.1.1.	Affective Fac	tors Tan Informant	Enn	on! Door		235
				TAN INFORMANT				
6.3				AND RELATION				
	6.3.1.	On-Goin	IG RELATIONSH	IPS	Err	or! Book	MARK NOT DEI	FINED.
		6.3.1.1.	On-Going Rea	ationship with S	Sources	Error! Bo	okmark not de	fined.
	(22			tionship with At				
				ON BEHAVIOUR A				
6.4								KMARK NOT DEFINE
				BORATION				FINED. OKMARK NOT DEFINED.
	0.4.2			& 'Objective Ki				
	6.4.3							DR! BOOKMARK NOT DE
				ces and Collecti munities				
				<i>ts</i>				
6.5	CREI	DIBILIT	Y AND AUTH	ORITY	ERROR!	BOOKMA	RK NOT DEF	INED.
	6.5.1.	. MEANING	G AND AUTHOR	TY - KNOWLEDG	GE/POWER Err	or! Book	MARK NOT DEI	FINED.
				ATION				
								ARK NOT DEFINED.
PART II - EVALUATION AND IMPLICATIONS ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. 6.7 STRENGTHS & WEAKNESSES OF THE STUDYERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.								
6.7	STRE	ENGTHS	& WEAKNES	SES OF THE S	TUDYERROF	R! BOOKM	MARK NOT DE	EFINED.
	6.7.1.	PARTICII	PANT SELECTION	Ν	ERR	or! Book	KMARK NOT DEI	FINED.

- 6.7.2. THE PARTICIPANT-RESEARCHER RELATIONSHIP ... ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
- 6.7.3. THE PARTICIPANTS AND RESEARCHER'S SHARED BACKGROUNDERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
- 6.7.4. Outside Influences and Inductive Research Error! Bookmark not defined.
- 6.7.5. TIME DIFFERENCE AND RE-INTERPRETATION...... ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
- 6.8 IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH .. ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
- 6.9 IMPLICATIONS FOR PROFESSIONAL PRACTICEERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

APPENDIX A - LETTER TO POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTSERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

APPENDIX B - PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM . ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

APPENDIX C - INTERVIEW GUIDE ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

Abstract

This study identifies and explores the social processes that influence the construction by academic researchers of the meaning/s and significance/s of an author and her work prominent in the literature of their field. It examines the construction by 15 information behaviour researchers of Brenda Dervin and her work, using semi-structured interviewing and inductive analysis techniques.

In focusing theoretical attention on social processes, the study seeks to address critiques of prevailing approaches to information behaviour research, such as: a focus on individual cognition at the expense of social and affective factors; a construction of information users defined by their areas of ignorance and uncertainty, rather than their expertise; and a focus on purposive rather than non-purposive information behaviour.

Conceptually, the study has been influenced by a range of theoretical approaches from both information behaviour research and a variety of other disciplines, including Dervin's Sense-Making and Foucauldian discourse analysis.

The study found that participants' initial contact with the author and her work, and the subsequent important events in their relationship, occurred not because of purposeful searching, but rather 'socially' – as a part of non-purposive events and relationships related to the participants' role as academic researchers. The source most frequently discussed by participants was informal discussions with colleagues, and participants' interactions with 'author texts' were commonly mediated by their interpersonal communication. The study found that the significant influences on participants' constructive processes were people and texts with whom they had a long-term relationship.

Participants' constructions of the author and her work were an essentially social process. Their sense-making was inextricably linked to their social context/s: their interactions with their colleagues and mentors; their engagement with the literature and theories of information science and other fields; their research interests and

specialisations; and their educational and cultural backgrounds. Participants' constructive processes largely involved elaborating existing constructions – radical changes in construction were both rare and traumatic. Participants' constructions were neither objective nor wholly subjective, but intersubjective - based on shared understandings, conventions and social practices.

Participants' constructive processes had two interdependent aspects: the construction of meaning and the construction of authority (knowledge/power). Participants' informal behaviour, as well as their engagement with formal information sources, involved constructions of authority. Their constructions of the authority of their informant/s determined whether they accepted or rejected the constructions of the author conveyed to them. Participants were able to strategically use shared constructions to add to the credibility and authority of their own work