

# Journal of Information Science

<http://jis.sagepub.com>

---

## Receiving the French: a bibliometric snapshot of the impact of 'French theory' on information studies

Blaise Cronin and Lokman I. Meho

*Journal of Information Science* 2009; 35; 398 originally published online Mar 31, 2009;

DOI: 10.1177/0165551508100831

The online version of this article can be found at:  
<http://jis.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/35/4/398>

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals

**Additional services and information for *Journal of Information Science* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://jis.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://jis.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav>

**Citations** <http://jis.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/35/4/398>

# Receiving the French: a bibliometric snapshot of the impact of 'French theory' on information studies

Blaise Cronin and Lokman I. Meho

*School of Library and Information Science, Indiana University, Bloomington, USA*

## Abstract.

This study explores the extent to which 'French theory' (Bourdieu, Derrida, Foucault et al.) has left its mark on the scholarly literature of information studies. A bibliometric analysis reveals which theorists (and which works) have been most highly cited over the course of the last four decades. The study also identifies the information studies journals and scholars who have been the most frequent citers of French theorists.

**Keywords:** bibliometrics; citation analysis; French theory; information studies

## 1. Introduction

The English translation of François Cusset's *French Theory*, originally published in 2003, appeared in early 2008. It was greeted effusively by Stanley Fish, doyen of American critical theorists, and came armed with glowing blurbs by Jacques Derrida ('a remarkable book') and Sylvère Lotinger ('a dazzling intellectual adventure') [1, 2]. The names of Derrida and Lotinger, it should be noted in the interest of full disclosure, appear frequently in the pages of Cusset's supremely self-confident account of America's love affair with the often prolix, occasionally arcane, and rarely pellucid philosophical writings of a loosely defined coterie of French intellectuals. The book's subtitle, *How Foucault, Derrida, Deluze & Co. Transformed the Intellectual Life of the United States*, summarizes succinctly, and accurately as it transpires, the scope of Cusset's ambitious project. Cusset is by no means the first to examine the influence of French structuralist and poststructuralist thinking on American intellectual life, but his manifest familiarity with the primary sources and many of the *dramatis personae*, allied to his grasp of American social and cultural history, makes for a sweeping narrative.

---

*Correspondence to:* Blaise Cronin, School of Library and Information Science, Indiana University, 1320 E. 10th Street, Bloomington, IN 47405-3907, USA. Email: bcronin@indiana.edu

Of course, there is no such thing as French theory, *per se*. The term is more likely than not to be italicized, capitalized, or to appear within quotation marks. As Lotringer and Cohen note dryly [3, p. 125]: 'French theory is an American creation anyway. The French themselves never conceived of it as such, although French philosophers had something to do with it'. Ironically, much *soi-disant* French theory draws significantly on the works of German philosophers such as Hegel, Heidegger and Husserl, as well as the writings of Freud and Marx. In addition, the *philosophes* – and strictly speaking not all of them were philosophers – who come to mind when we hear the term French theory bandied about were often at one another's throats. Certainly, they were not an intellectual SWAT team targeting sites of learning in North America with subversive or colonizing intent. Nor was this by any stretch of the imagination a coherent movement with an agreed upon manifesto, canon, discourse or ideology. As Mathy [4, p. 337] points out, the 'notion of a unitary, highly homogeneous philosophical corpus' is hopelessly wide of the mark.

The date and beachhead of the unplanned French invasion are not in dispute: a conference entitled 'The Language of Criticism and the Sciences of Man' held in October 1966 at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. That conference, 'the marker, the quasi-event' in Derrida's [5, p. 16] words, brought together in one location a group of leading French thinkers, including Barthes, Derrida, Hyppolite and Lacan. Thereafter, many of the Gallic glitterati took up visiting positions on American campuses, from Yale to Irvine, from Cornell to Berkeley, as their writings began to appear for the first time in translation and on the syllabi of leading universities. The 'messianic fervor' [6, p. B14] of those early days may have passed, but the French radicals left their mark on the American academy and their footprints all over ISI's (now Thomson Reuters) citation indexes.

Most of us in the North American higher education system, or at least those of us located in humanities or social sciences departments, probably have a fuzzy sense of what is connoted by the label 'French theory'. This may conceivably be true, too, in the hard sciences, but there the general reaction to things French has oscillated between indifference and disdain. The clinical demolition of deconstruction by the physicists Alan Sokal and Jean Bricmont in their bestseller, *Fashionable Nonsense*, was greeted rapturously in some parts of the academy, icily in others [7]. Unsurprisingly perhaps, at no time, either then or since, did French theory receive the red carpet treatment from the mainstream scientific community. While science studies, science and technology studies, and social studies of science may have grown in popularity since the 1970s, with French sociologists Pierre Bourdieu and Bruno Latour among the vanguard, scientists themselves remain sceptical of such ventures and generally troubled by 'the great postmodern pandemic' [8, p. 256].

That being said, most of us could, if pressed, name at least a few of the better known scholars gathered under the rubric 'French theory'. Most of us have a more or less vague sense of the kinds of critical discourse favoured by the French, and most of us could probably invoke a few of the neologisms, tropes, and key concepts associated with this erstwhile *nouvelle vague* of French thought – Baudrillard and hyperreality, Bourdieu's *habitus*, Derrida's *différance*, Foucault's notion of biopolitics, and Lyotard's *petits récits*. Nevertheless, it is a continuing source of wonderment that Derrida and compatriots traveled so easily across the Atlantic and were received so enthusiastically by so many public intellectuals and career academics. 'How', to quote Michèle Lamont, 'can a French philosopher gain acceptance in the land of empiricism?' [9, p. 585]. More specifically, what were the conditions that allowed a peculiarly French style of literary-philosophical production to be domesticated so swiftly in North American departments of literature, philosophy, and cultural studies?

This paper does not address these large questions, which, as it happens, have already been answered convincingly by Cusset and others mentioned above, but instead explores the diffusion of French theory into the literature of information studies. We suspect that the writings of scholars such as Foucault and Latour have become increasingly popular within the field over the course of the last decade or so. References to their work appear routinely in the *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, *Library Quarterly*, and *Journal of Documentation*, for example. Our primary objective here is to quantify in broad brush terms the receptivity of information studies to various strains of French theory using straightforward bibliometric techniques.

## 2. The study's scope, sample and methods

Despite the growth of interest in theorizing within information studies – see [10] on the use of both endogenous and exogenous theory in the field – there is little evidence, either empirical or anecdotal, to suggest that a full-blown ‘critical turn’ is under way [11, 12]. Given the field’s traditional fondness for experimental research (e.g., information retrieval), survey research (e.g., user studies) and quantitative analysis (e.g., bibliometrics), information studies might seem an unlikely receptor site for French theory. Impressionistically, however, there does seem to be a fairly recent and still growing interest in the theoretical contributions of a number of French poststructuralists and others [13, pp. 468–469]. This, quite naturally, causes one to wonder whether some of the established research traditions, operating assumptions and modes of scholarly inquiry long associated with information studies are being influenced or challenged by adherents of ‘the New’. Is it possible, in other words, that information studies is experiencing, or may be about to experience, its very own ‘culture wars’, with all the internecine squabbling and damaging factionalism implied thereby? Or can information studies absorb beneficially elements of French theory without its established epistemic culture being weakened or subverted? Here we test our initial speculation by gathering longitudinal data on which French theorists and works are being imported into information studies; specifically, we identify the principal ports of entry (journals) and importers (citing authors).

We do acknowledge at the outset that citations are surrogates of impact, partial indicators of intellectual influence (see [14] for a useful overview of the issues). For instance, and at the risk of stating the obvious, I may cite Foucault without having read him; I may cite Foucault, but only in translation; I may cite Foucault having read only selections or summaries of his work, what Cusset [1, p. 220] dismisses as ‘parataxic reading’; I may cite Foucault for strategic, historical, or comparative purposes; I may mis-cite Foucault. There are many ways in, and reasons for, which I may cite (or not cite) Foucault, but my citing of him does not necessarily mean that I am (a) deeply familiar with his *oeuvre*, (b) actively promulgating his ideas, or (c) attempting to instantiate his theoretical and ideological positions in my own writings. In short, citing Foucault does not make one a Foucauldian or a post-modernist of any kind, though it may, if nothing else, make one look and feel chic in certain intellectual quarters; this is what Cusset [1, p. 93] seems to mean by ‘the charisma of a name-of-the-concept’. In response, it could be argued that denigrating French theory is itself in vogue in some quarters.

These facts should be borne in mind when looking at the data presented here. It is only by painstaking textual and contextual analysis that one can properly understand how a field, be it information studies, comparative literature, or law, appropriates epistemic resources (concepts, methods, models, terminology, etc.) from another and incorporates them into its theory base and discursive practices. That interpretative study we shall leave to others. The purpose of this short paper is to provide some baseline data that may stimulate more granular investigations. However, for those who are unfamiliar with what we are here labelling ‘French theory’ or who want to know why information studies scholars cite French theorists, we have attached an Appendix containing 20 illustrative abstracts from leading journals in the field. In each case we have highlighted the author’s stated rationale for drawing upon key concepts from the work of one or other of the French theorists whom we eventually included in our study.

Who, then, are the names associated with French theory? It all depends whom you ask. There isn’t a club, an association, a movement, or a collectivity to which one can point and say: ‘Anyone who is a member of this is a French theorist’. Nor is there a formally specified set of criteria which, if met, would qualify one for the *appellation* ‘French theorist’, at least as far as we can tell. Derrida and Foucault would surely appear on most people’s lists, but what about Julia Kristeva, who was born in Bulgaria and moved to Paris where she studied under Roland Barthes, or the peripatetic Belgian Luce Irigaray? Do we include precursors such as Ferdinand de Saussure (theory of language) or successors such as Bruno Latour, whose work is considered by some to occupy ‘a hybrid position between science studies and French theory’ [15, p. 280]?

Cusset states that his objective is to ‘focus on the seven authors whose works form the backbone of French theory and provide it with its major conceptual directions as well as its theoretical *style*’ [1, p. 277]. For the record, his magnificent seven are: Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Félix Guattari, Gilles Deleuze, Jean-François Lyotard, Jean Baudrillard and Roland Barthes. Interestingly, though, the inside

Table 1  
Citation ranking of French theorists in information studies journals

Rank	Name	Number of citing documents	Times cited
1	Latour, Bruno	235	315
2	Foucault, Michel	180	322
3	Bourdieu, Pierre	123	188
4	Barthes, Roland	57	67
5	Derrida, Jacques	45	73
6	Lyotard, Jean- François	37	37
7	Lévi-Strauss, Claude	32	34
8	Baudrillard, Jean	26	29
9	Ricoeur, Paul	24	44
10	Deleuze, Gilles	23	35
11	Merleau-Ponty, Maurice	15	19
12	Guattari, Félix	14	18
13	Kristeva, Julia	7	8
14	Althusser, Louis	6	7
15	Bataille, Georges	4	4
16	Lacan, Jacques	2	2
<b>Total</b>		<b>632</b>	<b>1,202</b>

cover of his book mentions only six anchor names; Barthes has somehow dropped out of the frame. In certain respects, the index to *French Theory* may be a more reliable guide to the author's actual coverage and emphases. One can see at a glance which theorists are most frequently mentioned throughout the text.

In an early study of the American market for the French brand of interpretative theory, Lamont used the 'elite identification technique' to generate a sample of *grandees* [9, p. 587]. Her list included Louis Althusser, Jean Baudrillard, François Châtlet, Gilles Deleuze, Jacques Derrida, Emmanuel Levinas, Michel Foucault, Jean-François Lyotard, Paul Ricoeur and Michel Serres. One could proceed in like manner, but it seems safe to say that any sample of French theorists of this fuzzily delineated period will inevitably reflect some degree of arbitrariness or selection bias, conscious or otherwise. In the end we settled on 16 names (see Table 1) based on our reading of the literature dealing with French theory and our insider knowledge of information studies.

We used as our literature sample all 80 information studies journals that were considered mainstream by Cronin and Meho [16] and also covered in Web of Science (WoS) between 1955 and late-2008. (We do recognize the limitations of using Web of Science as our sampling frame. For instance, WoS's coverage is restricted largely to journals, which means that citations in monographs and conference proceedings are mostly excluded from the analysis.) We used all 80 journals to reflect the diversity of publication outlets and breadth of topic coverage associated with the field. Our approach comprised six steps. First, we counted all citations to our chosen 16 French theorists using WoS from 1955 to late-2008. Second, we compared the frequency of citations in information studies journals with other fields, specifically the 25 fields that most frequently cited the French. Third, we identified which theorists' works were most frequently cited and in which information studies journals. Fourth, we analyzed the distribution of citations to the French theorists over time in information studies and the other fields we selected. Fifth, we recorded which faculty members had cited which theorists and how often. Sixth, we identified the institutional affiliations of those authors who most frequently cited the French theorists.

### 3. Results and discussion

Our 16 theorists were cited 1202 times in 632 documents: 524 journal articles, 57 review articles, 22 editorials, 18 book reviews, 4 bibliographies, 3 notes, and 4 other items.<sup>1</sup> The frequency distribution is shown in Table 1. Even in a relatively small field such as information studies, a total of 632 citing articles to a group of 16 authors over the course of roughly four decades constitutes rather modest impact, especially when compared with fields such as literature, sociology, and philosophy (see Table 2).

Table 2  
Fields most frequently citing French theorists (limited to journal articles, 1980 to late-2008)<sup>a</sup>.

Rank	Web of Science subject category	No. of journal articles in the field	No. of journal articles citing French theorists	Percentage of citing journal articles
1	Literature, General	81,940	13,983	17.1
2	Literature, Romance	35,905	5,629	15.7
3	Anthropology	34,444	4,251	12.3
4	Sociology	62,602	7,579	12.1
5	Arts & Humanities, General <sup>b</sup>	80,601	8,348	10.4
6	Philosophy	93,999	8,600	9.1
7	Theater	18,332	1,531	8.4
8	Women's Studies	16,948	1,393	8.2
9	Communication	25,151	1,986	7.9
10	History & Philosophy of Science	17,464	1,362	7.8
11	Social Sciences, Interdisciplinary	54,011	3,971	7.4
12	Literary Reviews	58,784	4,013	6.8
13	Film, Radio, Television	20,947	1,342	6.4
14	Religion	48,123	2,770	5.8
15	Language & Linguistics	55,055	2,445	4.4
16	Education & Educational Research	96,186	4,087	4.2
17	Geography	51,536	2,056	4.0
18	History	115,094	4,146	3.6
19	Environmental Studies	41,596	1,462	3.5
20	Art	68,434	1,679	2.5
21	Political Science	95,911	1,782	1.9
22	Law	83,085	1,325	1.6
23	Management	124,175	1,665	1.3
<b>24</b>	<b>Information Studies</b>	<b>44,982</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>1.2</b>
25	Psychology <sup>c</sup>	219,038	2,347	1.1
26	Psychiatry	204,538	1,876	0.9

<sup>a</sup> Source: Web of Science

<sup>b</sup> Includes multidisciplinary humanities.

<sup>c</sup> Includes experimental and multidisciplinary psychology.

Moreover, as we note later, not all of the 632 citing articles in the 80-journal set were written by authors affiliated with departments of information studies; many were the work of authors from other disciplines (for more on this, see [16]).

Bruno Latour led the pack (235 citing articles) followed by Michel Foucault (180) and Pierre Bourdieu (123). Roland Barthes and Jacques Derrida came next with 57 and 45, respectively. Georges Bataille and Jacques Lacan ranked last with four and two citing articles, respectively. From Table 3 we can see that the bulk of Latour's citations were to just two publications, his 1979 co-authored (with Steve Woolgar) book, *Laboratory Life* (108 citations), closely followed by his 1987 monograph, *Science in Action* (99). For the record, 15 others works of his were also cited. Foucault's citation footprint is the widest of the 16 theorists, though not the deepest. He has five publications in the top 10 most highly cited texts: *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (74), *Discipline and Punish* (55), *The Order of Things* (36), *Power/Knowledge* (34), and *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice* (18). As can be seen from Table 3, very few of the citations to the works of Foucault et al. are to French language texts. Most researchers in information studies are apparently content to rely on translations, though it is possible that some read the texts in the original and cite in translation for the reader's benefit. It seems not inconceivable that some authors may occasionally come away with a partial or less than fully nuanced appreciation of what was actually said in the original.

The distribution of citations by source journal is shown in Table 4. Strictly speaking, one would want to normalize frequency of publication, average article length, etc., but here we are simply looking for coarse-grained indicators of influence. The quantitatively inclined *Scientometrics* has the highest number of articles citing French theorists, but these are all to the two sociologists in our sample, Bourdieu (6) and Latour (68). By way of contrast, Derrida and Foucault are frequently cited by authors publishing in



Table 3  
The top 10 most frequently cited texts

Rank	Text	Number of citing documents <sup>a</sup>
1	B. Latour and S. Woolgar, <i>Laboratory Life: The Social Construction of Scientific Facts</i> (Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, 1979) Reprinted in 1986.	108
2	B. Latour, <i>Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society</i> (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1987).	99
3	M. Foucault, <i>The Archaeology of Knowledge</i> (Pantheon Books, New York, 1972). Translation of <i>L'archéologie du savoir</i> (1969).	74 (3)
4	M. Foucault, <i>Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison</i> (Pantheon Books, New York, 1977). Translation of <i>Surveiller et punir</i> (1975).	55 (2)
5	M. Foucault, <i>The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences</i> (Pantheon Books, New York, 1970). Translation of <i>Les mots et les choses</i> (1966).	36 (4)
6	M. Foucault, <i>Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977</i> (Pantheon Books, New York, 1980). Edited by Colin Gordon.	34
7	J.-F. Lyotard, <i>The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge</i> (University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1984). Translation of <i>La condition postmoderne</i> (1979).	30 (5)
8	P. Bourdieu, <i>Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste</i> (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1984). Translation of <i>La distinction: critique sociale du jugement</i> (1979).	29 (3)
9	M. Foucault, <i>Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews</i> (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY, 1977). Edited and introduced by D.F. Bouchard. Translated from the French by D.F. Bouchard and S. Simon.	18
10	R. Barthes, <i>Image, Music, Text</i> (Hill and Wang, New York, 1977). Essays selected and translated by S. Heath.	17

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses refer to the number of documents citing the French edition of the text.

*Library Quarterly* or *Library Trends*, both of which can be characterized for present purposes as humanities journals. The more general journals, such as *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* and *The Information Society*, have the highest number of cited theorists.

The temporal distribution of citations to the French theorists is shown in Table 5. The decade-by-decade increase in information studies, from the pre-1980 period to late-2008, is striking: 7, 48, 217, 360. Clearly, awareness of the French theorists continues to grow within information studies, even if the aggregate citation impact of Foucault et al. is, as we pointed out above, rather modest. It is important to note here, however, that the increase in awareness is more pronounced in information studies than many other fields due in part to the low initial base (see Table 5). To oversimplify somewhat, literary fields were enthusiastic adopters of French theory, while some others, notably information studies, communication, and environmental studies, were slower to follow prevailing fashion.

Table 6 lists the 11 authors (five from the USA, three from the UK, and one each from Finland, France and the Netherlands) with the most articles in our sample of information studies journals citing one or more of the 16 French theorists. John Budd has the highest number. Three of these authors – Courtial, Leydesdorff and Radford – are not affiliated with an information studies department and several earned their doctorates in fields other than information studies (e.g., history [Wiegand], sociology [Leydesdorff], mathematics [Thelwall]). We have sufficient familiarity with the work of all 11 authors to state, cautiously to be sure, that the ways in which and reasons for which they cite the French are often very different (Courtial, by the way, is French). For instance, our colleague Ronald Day's academic training is in philosophy and comparative literature, with a specialization in literary theory. One might thus say that 'French theory' is constitutive of his intellectual persona and his scholarly production. That is not true for most of the other citing authors, at least not to the same extent.

A clearer picture of who cites whom is given in Table 7. Here we do not just see how many articles have cited the French but how many times each of the 16 theorists has been cited. So, for example, all of Leydesdorff's 12 citations are to the work of Bruno Latour while eight of Radford's nine are to Foucault. Budd and Day range most widely in their referencing behaviour. Budd cites 10 of the 16 French theorists and is the only one to reference the anthropologist Lévi-Strauss and phenomenologist Merleau-Ponty, while Day is the only one among the top-citing authors to invoke the work of Bataille and Guattari.

Table 4  
The 10 information studies journals that most frequently cite French theorists

	Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology																			
	Scientometrics	The Information Society	Library Quarterly	Library Trends	Journal of Documentation	Annual Review of Information Science and Technology	Library & Information Science Research	Knowledge Organization	Journal of Information Science	No. of Times citing articles										
Latour, Bruno ( <i>n</i> = 235)	68	94	35	39	29	49	7	9	11	17	16	17	12	24	7	8	3	3	6	9
Foucault, Michel ( <i>n</i> = 180)	18	29	21	32	27	32	27	86	15	21	8	9	7	12	6	13	12	20	6	6
Bourdieu, Pierre ( <i>n</i> = 123)	6	10	11	15	16	21	9	15	10	15	8	17	8	14	8	12	1	1	3	3
Barthes, Roland ( <i>n</i> = 57)	9	9	3	3	2	3	2	3	4	4	6	8	3	4	2	3	2	2	2	2
Derrida, Jacques (45)	3	3	4	4	5	4	5	6	6	6	3	3	3	5	2	2	1	1	1	1
Liotard, Jean-François ( <i>n</i> = 37)	5	5	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	4	4	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
Lévi-Strauss, Claude ( <i>n</i> = 32)	1	1	1	5	6	4	4	4	4	4										
Baudrillard, Jean ( <i>n</i> = 26)	10	10	11	1	1	11	1	1	1	1			2	2					1	1
Ricoeur, Paul ( <i>n</i> = 24)	7	9	4	5	3	5	3	3	3	4	4	9	1	1	3	3				
Deleuze, Gilles ( <i>n</i> = 23)	7	9	4	5	3	5	3	3	3	4			1	7			1			
Merleau-Ponty, Maurice ( <i>n</i> = 15)	7	9	4	5	3	5	3	3	3	4	1	2	1	2						
Guattari, Félix ( <i>n</i> = 14)	7	8	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1			1	5				1	1	1
Kristeva, Julia ( <i>n</i> = 7)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1								2	2	2
Althusser, Louis ( <i>n</i> = 6)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1										
Bataille, Georges ( <i>n</i> = 4)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1										
Lacan, Jacques ( <i>n</i> = 2)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1										
Total	72	104	70	120	66	138	53	160	39	75	36	69	25	79	22	41	21	32	17	22

This table should be read as follows: according to Web of Science, *Scientometrics* has cited two of the 16 French theorists 104 times in a total of 72 articles, Bruno Latour 94 times in 68 articles and Pierre Bourdieu 10 times in six articles.



Table 5  
Authors with highest number of articles citing French theorists.

Web of Science subject category	Pre-1980 Count	1980–9		1990–9		2000–8	
		Count	% change <sup>a</sup>	Count	% change <sup>a</sup>	Count	% change <sup>a</sup>
Anthropology	773	915	18	1,417	55	1,919	35
Art	88	423	381	665	57	591	-13
Arts & Humanities, General <sup>b</sup>	359	2,365	559	3,245	37	2,738	-19
Communication	25	219	776	746	241	1,021	37
Education & Educational Research	181	531	193	1,301	145	2,255	73
Environmental Studies	8	84	950	416	395	962	131
Film, Radio, Television	76	422	455	539	28	381	-41
Geography	37	81	119	538	564	1,437	167
History	317	986	211	1,560	58	1,600	3
History & Philosophy of Science	36	159	342	558	251	645	16
<b>Information Studies</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>57</b>
Language & Linguistics	302	314	4	887	182	1,244	40
Law	49	362	639	567	57	396	-43
Literary Reviews	337	1,387	312	1,486	7	1,140	-30
Literature, General	868	3,868	346	5,645	46	4,470	-26
Literature, Romance	420	1,629	288	2,105	29	1,895	-11
Management	17	57	235	446	682	1,162	161
Philosophy	561	1,946	247	3,593	85	3,061	-17
Political Science	268	358	34	640	79	784	23
Psychiatry	383	599	56	709	18	568	-25
Psychology <sup>c</sup>	414	496	20	905	82	946	5
Religion	283	780	176	1,012	30	978	-3
Social Sciences, Interdisciplinary	701	704	0	1,267	80	2,000	58
Sociology	918	1,133	23	2,550	125	3,896	53
Theater	33	272	724	573	111	686	20
Women's Studies	8	102	1,175	459	350	832	81

<sup>a</sup>Percentage change over previous decade. Regarding the last decade, note that the percentage change takes into account only those citations found in articles published between 2000 and late 2008, and that citations from late-2008 to end of 2009 are not accounted for in the figures. Thus, the percentage will very likely increase once all the citations for the entire decade are included in the calculation.

<sup>b</sup>Includes multidisciplinary humanities.

<sup>c</sup>Includes experimental and multidisciplinary psychology.

Table 6  
Authors who most frequently cite French theorists in information studies journals

Author	University	Number of citing papers in IS journals	Number of citing papers in all journals
Budd, John M.	Missouri	17	17
Cronin, Blaise	Indiana	15	16
Courtial, J. P.	Nantes	12	17
Leydesdorff, Loet	Amsterdam	12	27
Day, Ronald E.	Indiana	11	11
Davenport, Elisabeth	Napier, Edinburgh	10	10
Warner, Julian	Queen's, Belfast	9	9
Radford, G.P.	Fairleigh Dickinson	8	9
Talja, Sana	Tampere	6	6
Thelwall, Mike	Wolverhampton	6	6
Wiegand, W.A.	Florida State	6	6

Table 6 shows the institutional affiliations of the 10 authors, but it should be remembered that scholars often relocate in the course of their careers. Thus, Day's move from Wayne State to Indiana in 2005 helped boost the latter's count. In any case, these are small numbers in the main and the presence of even one research-active scholar (think of John Budd at Missouri) can explain an

Table 7  
Authors in information studies journals who most frequently cite French theorists

	Budd	Cronin	Courtial	Leydesdorff	Day	Davenport	Warner	Radford	Talja	Theilwall	Wiegand											
	No. of citing articles	No. of citing articles	No. of citing articles	No. of citing articles	Times cited articles	Times cited articles	Times cited articles	Times cited articles	Times cited articles	Times cited articles	Times cited articles											
Latour, Bruno ( <i>n</i> = 235)	1	8	9	11	24	12	16	4	4	4	6	2	2	3	3	3	3					
Foucault, Michel ( <i>n</i> = 180)	10	2	2		5	7		2	2	8	45	4	6	1	1	6	6					
Bourdieu, Pierre ( <i>n</i> = 123)	6	8	11			5	7										2					
Barthes, Roland ( <i>n</i> = 57)	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	4	6	1	1	1	1	1								
Derrida, Jacques (45)	2				4	5		1	1						1		1					
Lyotard, Jean- François ( <i>n</i> = 37)	4				2	2		3														
Lévi-Strauss, Claude ( <i>n</i> = 32)	1																					
Baudrillard, Jean ( <i>n</i> = 26)	2	1	1																			
Ricoeur, Paul ( <i>n</i> = 24)	6				1	1		1	1													
Deleuze, Gilles ( <i>n</i> = 23)					7	17									1		1					
Merleau-Ponty, Maurice ( <i>n</i> = 15)	2	3																				
Guattari, Félix ( <i>n</i> = 14)					7	13																
Kristeva, Julia ( <i>n</i> = 7)																						
Althusser, Louis ( <i>n</i> = 6)																						
Bataille, Georges ( <i>n</i> = 4)					1	1																
Lacan, Jacques ( <i>n</i> = 2)																						
Total	17	50	15	26	12	25	12	16	11	52	10	14	9	14	8	46	6	10	6	6	8	8

This table should be read as follows: according to Web of Science, John M. Budd has cited 10 of the 16 French theorists 50 times in 17 articles, Cronin has cited five of the 16 French theorists 26 times in 15 articles, and so on.

institution's relatively high count. Overall, the data certainly do not permit us to say that pockets of French resistance have been established in the heartland of information studies. Nor, it must be said, do the data suggest that the predominantly positivist, and experimental character of information studies research and scholarship has been weakened noticeably by recent interest in new forms of critical inquiry. Mild skirmishes between proponents of French theory and advocates of the status quo within information studies do occur occasionally, but the field has not experienced the kind of radicalization or open warfare that departments of literature did in the 1980s.

#### 4. Conclusion

French theory may have become 'merely one critical paradigm among others' [6, p. B14] in the academy, but it is not yet *passé* in information studies. If anything, the rate of absorption has been somewhat slow. The number of citations to our group of 16 French thinkers may be small in both absolute and relative terms (see Table 2), but it continues to rise. In the language of diffusion theory, we are more laggards than early adopters. As shown, citations to the work of the French are to be found in a cross-section of information studies journals, which seems to suggest a growing interest in, and tolerance of, Continental philosophy (names such as Antonio Gramsci and Jürgen Habermas are also increasingly common in the literature of the field) and 'isms' in general [17, 18]. This trend may well continue, as former students of scholars such as John Budd, Ronald Day, and Sanna Talja join the ranks of the professorate, in the process raising awareness of poststructuralism and its legacy within information studies. As of now, however, there is no evidence that the field has been populated by radicals and relativists, or that departments of information studies are systematically hiring faculty sympathetic to, for want of a more precise term, French theory.

Of course, citation analysis is a rather crude instrument with which to capture the receptivity or resistance of a field towards a congeries of new theoretical and methodological approaches, whether French theory or something else. The ways in, and reasons for, which two scholars such as, say, Mike Thelwall and Wayne Wiegand, cite French theorists will be quite different, though such differences will only be appreciated properly through contextual analysis of their writings, as should be clear from the examples in the Appendix. Moreover, resistance to 'the New', or what Kling [19] tellingly termed 'critical chill', may in certain cases cause authors to minimize direct citation of French theorists for fear of provoking the ire of the establishment. Needless to say, cultural resistance of this kind cannot be captured using bibliometric techniques.

We have provided here a first snapshot of the impact of French theory on information studies, but we have certainly not told the full story, not least because the effects of recent French imports on the intellectual economy of information studies are necessarily lagged and up to this point at least, as our findings suggest, diffuse in nature. Others may wish to extend our approach by, for instance, examining the extent to which French theorists are featured in the course syllabi of North American information studies programs or the frequency with which such thinkers are cited in doctoral dissertations.

#### Acknowledgment

We are most grateful to Ronald E. Day and two anonymous referees for their constructive comments and suggestions.

#### Endnotes

1 According to Web of Science (1955 to late-2008), our 16 theorists were cited in a total of 123,375 documents: 108,260 journal articles, 6054 review articles, 3343 book reviews, 3319 editorials, 657 notes, 652 bibliographies, and 1090 others in journals covering 245 different subject categories. Thus, the 632 citing documents in information studies journals constitute 0.5% of all citations to these theorists. The first citation in an information studies journal appeared in a 1962 review article.

## References

- [1] F. Cusset, *French Theory: How Foucault, Derrida, Deleuze & Co. Transformed the Intellectual Life of the United States*, translated by J. Fort (University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 2008).
- [2] S. Fish, *French Theory in America*. Available at: <http://fish.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/04/06/french-theory-in-america/> (accessed 6 April 2008).
- [3] S. Lotringer and S. Cohen (eds), *French Theory in America* (Routledge, New York, 2001).
- [4] J.P. Mathy, The resistance to French theory in the United States: a cross-cultural enquiry, *French Historical Studies* 19(2) (1995) 331–347.
- [5] J. Derrida, Deconstructions: the im-possible. In: S Lotringer and S. Cohen (eds), *French Theory in America* (Routledge, New York, 2001) 13–31.
- [6] R. Wolin, America's tolerance for French radicalism, *Chronicle of Higher Education* (13 June 2008) B14–B15.
- [7] A. Sokal and J. Bricmont, *Fashionable Nonsense: Postmodern Intellectuals' Abuse of Science* (Picador, New York, 1997).
- [8] R. Kohler, Moral economy, material culture, and community in *Drosophila* genetics. In: M. Biagioli (ed.), *The Science Studies Reader* (Routledge, London, 1999) 243–57.
- [9] M. Lamont, How to become a dominant French philosopher: the case of Jacques Derrida, *American Journal of Sociology* 3 (1987) 584–622.
- [10] K.E. Pettigrew and L.E.F. McKechnie, The use of theory in information science research, *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 52(1) (2001) 62–73.
- [11] R.E. Day, Poststructuralism and information studies. In: B. Cronin (ed.), *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology* 39 (2005) 575–609.
- [12] A.K. Pyati, Critical theory and information studies: a Marcusean infusion, *Policy Futures in Education* 4(1) (2006) 83–89.
- [13] B. Cronin, The sociological turn in information science, *Journal of Information Science* 34(4) (2008) 465–475.
- [14] H.F. Moed, *Citation Analysis in Research Evaluation* (Springer, Dordrecht, 2005).
- [15] M. Biagioli, From difference to blackboxing: French theory versus science studies' metaphysics of presence. In: S. Lotringer and S. Cohen (eds), *French Theory in America* (Routledge, New York, 2001) 271–287.
- [16] B. Cronin and L.I. Meho, The shifting balance of intellectual trade in information studies, *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 59(4) (2008) 551–564.
- [17] S. Talja, K. Tuominen and R. Savolainen, 'Isms' in information science, *Journal of Documentation* 61(1) (2005) 79–101.
- [18] J. Buschman, Transgression or stasis? Challenging Foucault in LIS theory, *Library Quarterly* 77(1) (2007) 21–44.
- [19] R. Kling, *Critical Professional Education about Information and Communication Technologies*. Available at: <http://rkcsi.indiana.edu/archive/CSI/WP/WP02-06B.html> (accessed 17 August 2008).

## Appendix

Sample of information studies papers that have cited one or more of our 16 French theorists. The reason why, or the context in which, the theorists were invoked is highlighted.

Citing paper	Abstract
<p>J. Andersen and L. Skouvig, Knowledge organization: A sociohistorical analysis and critique. <i>The Library Quarterly</i> 76(3) (2006) 300–322.</p>	<p>In this article, <b><i>the authors examine the discipline of knowledge organization by harnessing the theories of Michel Foucault and Jurgen Habermas.</i></b> The argument is that knowledge organization is not just a question of improved technology; as an academic discipline, it has to define and legitimize its relevance for society. <b><i>The authors use the theories of Foucault and Habermas to provide a sociohistorical analysis and critique of knowledge organization in order to point out how the discipline understands itself and how it is a de facto human activity. The self-understanding of the discipline is investigated through the case of knowledge organization in the Danish public libraries at the beginning of the twentieth century, using the theories of Foucault.</i></b> The second part of the article deals with the correspondence between the organization of society and knowledge organization based on the concept of Habermas's public sphere.</p>
<p>A. Black, The library as clinic: A Foucauldian interpretation of British public library attitudes to social and physical disease, ca. 1850–1950, <i>Libraries &amp; Culture</i> 40(3) (2005) 416–434.</p>	<p>Characterized by the pursuit of enlightenment and progress, the municipal public libraries that began to appear in Britain after 1850 were notable cultural ingredients of modern society. Yet public libraries also displayed less liberal dimensions of modernity, as places where scientific rationality was at times mobilized to counter perceived 'social' diseases, broadly constituted by disorder, deviancy, poor discipline, irrational recreation, and economic and political radicalism. The public library's role as a meaningful clinic for the eradication of social diseases, to which the masses were seen to be prone, necessarily required the attraction of a mass clientele, which, ironically, generated fears of physical disease arising from the spatial mixing of users and the sharing of printed materials. <b><i>Just as Foucault employed the 'birth of the clinic' as a metaphor for the emergence of modern medicine and its expert discourse in the setting of the scientific hospital around the turn of the nineteenth century, so also the notion of 'library as clinic' can be seen to encapsulate later discourses of control associated with public librarianship.</i></b></p>
<p>F. Bouthillier, The meaning of service: Ambiguities and dilemmas for public library service providers, <i>Library &amp; Information Science Research</i>, 22(3) (2000) 243–272.</p>	<p>An ethnographic study was designed to understand the nature and the role of public library service in a specific context. <b><i>Using mostly the theoretical frameworks of Pierre Bourdieu and Anthony Giddens, the study provides an analysis of the two basic systems of meaning that service providers bring to their interaction with users.</i></b> Service is conceptualized as a set of organizational processes involving the production, distribution, control, and consumption of various types of resources. Research findings reveal that service providers experience various types of ambiguities and dilemmas stemming from the broad mission of the public library. Similar tensions regarding the nature of the institution were found in the social environment and at the institutional level. The study offers a framework for studying service practices in relation to social and historical issues.</p>
<p>J.M. Budd, Phenomenology and information studies, <i>Journal of Documentation</i> 61(1) (2005) 44–59.</p>	<p>Purpose: <b><i>To examine work on phenomenology and determine what information studies can learn and use from that work. Design/methodology/approach: The paper presents a literature-based conceptual analysis of pioneering work in phenomenology (including that of Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, Paul Ricoeur, and others), application of such ideas as intentionality and being in information studies work, and the potential for greater application of the information seeker as other.</i></b> Findings: The literature on phenomenology contains thought that is directly relevant to information studies and information work. Close examination of perception, intentionality, and interpretation is integral to individuals' activities related to searching for and retrieving information, determining relevance, and using technology. Essential to the realization of phenomenology's potential is adoption of communication by dialogue so that an information seeker is able both to conceptualize need and to articulate that need. Some promising work in information studies demonstrates an openness to the ongoing and continuous perceptual experiences of information seekers and the relation of that process of perceiving to the growth of knowledge. Originality/value: Offers a different way of thinking about human–information relationships and the ways that information professionals can interact with information seekers.</p>

(Continued)

Appendix:  
(Continued)

Citing paper	Abstract
G. Burnett, The scattered members of an invisible republic: Virtual communities and Paul Ricoeur's hermeneutics, <i>The Library Quarterly</i> 72(2) (2002) 155–178.	Communities, whether they are 'real' or virtual, are mediated by interpretation. One's place within a community is also constituted by an ongoing metaphoric 'reading' through which one attempts to understand what others within the community say and do. Virtual communities are unique in making such reading explicit through further acts of writing: participants form their communities through public performances of writing, reading, and interpreting of texts. Any analysis of virtual communities must take into account both the exchange of meaning through texts and the fact of a mediating distance between participants. <b>The hermeneutic theories of Paul Ricoeur can support an analysis of these activities, which accounts for temporal and spatial distance in the exchange of the community's texts. Ricoeur's hermeneutic theory can be used to describe the process that drives virtual communities, which makes them into forums that attempt to 'connect the scattered members of an invisible republic' [1, p. 43] in an electronic world.</b>
J. Dilevko, An ideological analysis of digital reference service models, <i>Library Trends</i> 50(2) (2001) 218–244.	<b>Using the theories of Pierre Bourdieu about occupational fields of struggle and species of capital, this article examines the ideological implications of the digital reference call-center model.</b> This model has the potential to lead to deprofessionalization of reference work because of increased automation and the replication of employment conditions prevailing in private sector call-centers. Call-center work typically involves unskilled women earning low wages in jobs that present little opportunity for career building. Library directors who advocate digital reference call centers as models of the future have neglected the negative aspects of call centers in their rush to cut costs and provide efficient services. One answer to the deskilling dilemma is the simple act of reading: the more a librarian reads, the more he or she becomes an irreplaceable contribution in the reference transaction. <b>The kind of discourse analysis practiced by Michel Foucault and his followers is a useful research method in library and information science (LIS).</b> The method is introduced, some examples of its use are suggested, and several research questions are posed. The method permits analysis of the ways in which information, its uses, and its users are discursively constructed, especially in the theoretical discourses of LIS, such that power over them can be exercised in specific ways.
B. Frohmann, Discourse analysis as a research method in library and information science, <i>Library &amp; Information Science Research</i> 16(2) (1994) 119–138.	This article contributes to what we hope will become a vigorous debate on Internet surveillance and privacy issues, ensuring that privacy issues will not be neglected in the future when political propositions on state surveillance are made. The relevant question to ask is not how to protect privacy at all costs, but how a balance can be found between the need of the state to know about its citizens and those same citizens' need for privacy from state intrusion. This paper explores the future role of the library pertaining to the issue of state surveillance. <b>After a short introduction, we present the procedure and theoretical background for the article. The latter is grounded on Foucault's theory on discourse, power and the modern state.</b> We then discuss our two main findings, and finally we relate those findings to the library and its future roles, and to library and information science research and teaching. We find one of these roles to be as instigator of and facilitator and forum for a healthy debate on surveillance and privacy issues.
S. Haikola and S. Jonsson, State surveillance on the internet: The Swedish debate and the future role of libraries and LIS, <i>Libri</i> 57(4) (2007) 209–218.	<b>Liotard's work on postmodern knowledge has been influential on our thinking of paradigms, meta-narratives, legitimation, and contemporary trends in the information economy. These issues are discussed, criticisms of his work examined, and implications for information professionals explored.</b>
S. Hannabuss, Lyotard and postmodern knowledge, <i>Aslib Proceedings</i> 49(8) 1997, 217–224.	Continued development of the Internet requires the development of efficient, easy-to-use search engines. Ideally, such development should call upon knowledge and skills from a variety of disciplines, including computer science, information science, psychology, and ergonomics. The current study is intended to determine whether search engine design shows a pattern of interdisciplinarity. Two disciplines were selected as the focus for the study: computer science, and library/information science. A citation analysis was conducted to measure levels of interdisciplinary research and publishing in internet search engine design and development. The results show a higher level of interdisciplinarity among library

(Continued)



Appendix:  
(Continued)

Citing paper	Abstract
J. Jablonski, Defining the object of study: Actants in library and information science, <i>Libri</i> 51(3) (2001) 129–134.	and information scientists than among computer scientists or among any of those categorized as ‘other’. This is reflected both in the types of journals in which the authors publish, and in the references they cite to support their work. However, almost no authors published articles or cited references in fields such as cognitive science, ergonomics, or psychology. <b><i>The results of this study are analyzed in terms of the writings of Patrick Wilson, Bruno Latour, Pierre Bourdieu, Fritz Ringer, and Thomas Pinelli, focusing on cognitive authority within a profession, interaction between disciplines, and information-gathering habits of professionals. Suggestions for further research are given.</i></b>
T. Luukkonen, Why has Latour’s theory of citations been ignored by the bibliometric community? Discussion of sociological interpretations of citation analysis, <i>Scientometrics</i> 38(1) (1997) 27–37.	Various definitions of information are used in the service of library and information science, a discipline that currently is in a state of flux. The discipline of Science and Technology Studies examines the production of scientific knowledge, and its methods are best used during times of instability in scientific disciplines. <b><i>Arguments from Bruno Latour’s Pandora’s Hope are used with historical context to explain the coevolution of librarianship and information science in the 20(th) century. Latour’s circulating chains of reference model illustrates how real-world phenomena are gradually abstracted into scientific ideas and artifacts. The information thus produced becomes the chief actant in library and information science. These chains have five main components: links and knots, public representation, alliances, autonomisation, mobilisation of the world.</i></b> Illustrative examples are given relating each component to library and information science, and an alternative definition of information is developed from this model.
M. Manoff, Theories of the archive from across the disciplines, <i>portal: Libraries and the Academy</i> 4(1) (2004) 9–25.	<b><i>The paper discusses the often lamented lack of a theory of citations, and the lack of a sociological theory in particular. It draws attention to one proposed theory and discusses the potential reasons why it has not been generally accepted as the theory of citations, despite its merits in explaining many phenomena in the citation behaviour of scientists. This theory has been expounded by Latour and presented, in particular, in his book entitled Science in Action.</i></b>
R. McNabb, Making all the right moves: Foucault, journals, and the authorization of discourse, <i>Journal of Scholarly Publishing</i> 31(1) (1999) 20–41.	<b><i>Creative and compelling theoretical formulations of the archive have emerged from a host of disciplines in the last decade. Derrida and Foucault, as well as many other humanists and social scientists, have initiated a broadly interdisciplinary conversation about the nature of the archive. This literature suggests a confluence of interests among scholars, archivists, and librarians that is fueled by a shared preoccupation with the function and fate of the historical and scholarly record. The following essay provides an exploration and overview of this archival discourse.</i></b>
G.P. Radford, Trapped in our own discursive formations: Toward an archaeology of library and information science, <i>The Library Quarterly</i> 73(1) (2003) 1–18.	<b><i>The author applies Michel Foucault’s theories of discourse to the industry of journal publishing.</i></b> Using the specific example of scholarly journals on rhetoric and composition studies, McNabb argues that these journals establish and maintain significant influence over the conventions of particular disciplines by supporting the notion that publication is more important to professional development than pedagogy, defining the acceptable scholarly language (discourse) of a discipline, and limiting the approach of an author to the popular theoretical framework of a discipline. The author concludes that the editorial policies of academic journals can restrict the definition of knowledge and limit the degree of scholarly innovation that occurs within academe.

(Continued)

Appendix:  
(Continued)

Citing paper	Abstract
M.L. Radford and G.P. Radford, Power, knowledge, and fear: Feminism, Foucault, and the stereotype of the female librarian, <i>The Library Quarterly</i> 67(3) (1997) 250–266.	<p><b>standing Wiegand in terms of Foucault can help to generate a new self-reflexive and critical attitude among LIS scholars to their own discursive formation and the discursive formations of others.</b></p> <p>The stereotype of the female librarian is a common, well-defined, and easily recognized phenomenon in American popular culture. A large body of literature in librarianship reflects a deep professional concern over the negative effect of this stereotypical image. This essay, however, approaches the librarian stereotype as an element in a wider cultural test: that of the relationship between power, knowledge, and fear. <b>Drawing on the work of Michael Foucault and feminist thought, the claim is developed that the form and the voice of the female librarian is a function of a system of power and rationality that is not of her own making.</b></p>
C.H. Rasmussen and H. Jochumsen, Problems and possibilities: The public library in the borderline between modernity and late modernity, <i>The Library Quarterly</i> 77(1) (2007) 45–59.	<p>The public library is a product of modernity that follows in the wake of industrialization, urbanization, and popular movements, while at the same time the public library itself supports the building up and development of the modern. This article will examine the arrival of modernity and the prerequisites for the rise of public libraries, as well as some crucial aspects of the relationship between the public library and modernity. <b>Furthermore, by means of contributions from recent significant, sociologists, such as Anthony Giddens, Jean-Francois Lyotard, and Scott Lash, we shall discuss the implications of the development of late modern or postmodern society for the present public library.</b></p>
J. Sterne, Digital media and disciplinarity, <i>The Information Society</i> 21(4) (2005) 249–256.	<p>This article asks two related questions: Is digital media studies a discipline, and should scholars within the field desire to move toward disciplinarity? <b>Drawing on the writings of Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu, as well as several Anglo-American cultural studies of disciplinarity, the essay argues that digital media studies has not yet constituted a truly novel scholarly discourse.</b> Because of that, our reasons for disciplinizing – to the extent that it is possible to choose to become a discipline – would be largely strategic. Given that the field is already successfully reproducing itself, the symbolic benefits of becoming a discipline are relatively limited, and such a move would also have significant intellectual costs.</p>
N.A. Van House and S.A. Sutton, The Panda Syndrome: An ecology of LIS education, <i>Journal of Education for Library and Information Science</i> 41(1) (2000) 52–68.	<p>The fundamental changes that are shaping the future environment of educational programs in library and information studies (LIS) are explored in the context of two overlapping ecosystems, the rapidly changing information universe in which the LIS profession operates and the university settings in which the LIS educational programs are housed. <b>We use ecological theory – biological, organizational, and professional – and the sociological theory of Pierre Bourdieu to describe the radical nature of the change facing LIS education and to identify adaptive strategies.</b> We warn that survival of LIS education does not necessarily mean the survival of current programs, and certainly not in their current forms. We warn that the increasing value of information is bringing other professions into the information field and changing the boundaries and rules of competition. We suggest that LIS education needs to further substitute an information-centered focus for its traditional institutional focus. Finally, we suggest that the habitus or system of dispositions of LIS, derived from libraries and the public sector, may disadvantage LIS in its competition with professions and their associated educational programs that are more accustomed to competition for domain. Because habitus consists of largely unexamined assumptions and interpretations, an awareness of it is the essential first step to determining whether it is conducive to the survival of a profession's knowledge basis, values, and practices.</p>
T. Weller and J. Haider, Where do we go from here? An opinion on the future of LIS as an academic discipline in the UK, <i>Aslib Proceedings</i> 59(4–5) (2007) 475–482.	<p>The purpose of this paper is to discuss the current situation of academic LIS research, specifically in the UK and to provide some thoughts considering the future of the discipline. According to the opinion of the authors, this situation is characterised by a lack of cohesion, the need for justification of academic research in terms of its immediate applicability to the professional education of practitioners, and a disjuncture between the information profession and information</p>

(Continued)

Appendix:  
(Continued)

---

Citing paper	Abstract
	<p>research. The paper attempts to offer introductory thoughts regarding these circumstances. The current situation is briefly reviewed and commented on from the authors' viewpoint. <i>Aspects of Pierre Bourdieu's study of the university as a hierarchically structured field of forces are considered. Some reference is made to previous literature.</i> The paper advances the view that the role of academic LIS research, debate and theory formation needs to be strengthened and that this needs to be reflected in the curriculum more strongly. The paper attempts to highlight consistently overlooked contributing factors, and thus aims to shift the perspective towards role and position of LIS research within academia, rather than <i>vis-à-vis</i> the professional education it is connected to. It aims to stimulate discussion of the current situation, of how it can be perceived, and of ways to address it.</p>

---