INTRODUCTION

This chapter reviews the post-1978 literature on information needs and uses. Since prior ARIST chapters on this topic have considered such studies to have included virtually all user studies, we have taken that stance as a chapter's normative mandate.

With this mandate as a baseline, a review of relevant databases yields more than 300 potentially useful citations since 1978. This finding agrees with earlier assessments of the immensity of the relevant literature (CRAWFORD; KRIKELAS).

Faced with such an immense task, we sought to narrow our focus in a way that would be generally illuminating of the state of information needs and uses research. We decided to focus on issues relating to the conceptualization that drive the research. This choice was made for two reasons. First, it seems the natural outgrowth of the critiques of the state of research presented in prior ARIST chapters. Second, it seemed the logical choice suggested by literature since 1978. Explanations of the basis for these two reasons follow.

A concern for conceptual impoverishment in the information needs and uses literature has run through past ARIST chapters like a thin but very vibrant thread of many colors. The concern has manifested itself as calls to: 1) develop the advantage of theory from the social sciences (MENZEL); 2) develop the...
and conceptual frameworks (CRANE; CRAWFORD; LIN & GARVEY; PAISLEY, 1968); and 3) improve the predictive value of theory (LIPETZ).

In addition, if issues of methodological choice and attitudinal perspective are seen as rooted in conceptualization, ARIST authors ALLEN, HERNER & HERNER, and MARTYN can also be defined as making a call for conceptual attention.

Three quotes typify the strongest of the statements from prior ARIST chapters:

... there is a growing realization...of the lack of and need for a conceptual framework within which the enormous amount of data...can be meaningfully integrated (LIN & GARVEY, p. 6).

Information is a human asset that can be exploited for the improvement of the human condition. In order to exploit this resource fully, a change in the attitudes of the whole community [i.e. information science community], of the scale of a social revolution, is required... (MARTYN, p. 21)

The predictive value of theory in this field is still extremely poor. ...But it seems clear that, at least for the next few years, the prevailing path to information system development will continue to be through only dimly enlightened trial and error. (LIPETZ, p. 26)

The second reason for focusing on conceptualization here is rooted in our observation of the current information needs and uses literature. This literature exhibits a tension. On the one hand, most of the empirical studies look very much like those reviewed in past ARIST chapters. On the other, a number of detailed critical essays have emerged calling for fundamental reassessments of what information needs and uses research is about. These essays address, in particular, a concern for conceptualization and, more particularly, a concern for the nature of basic assumptions and definitions. These essays (BELKIN, 1978; BELKIN ET AL., 1982a; DERR; DERVIN, 1983a; WERSIG & WINDEL; THOMAS D. WILSON, 1981, 1984) provide reviews of the treatment of basic concepts such as information and information need and/or underlying premises about the nature of information service and use and conclude that confusion about basic concepts is widespread and underlying premises may be untenable. Typical statements include these:

...assumptions underlying [typical information retrieval systems] are sufficiently divorced from reality to make them quite untenable. (BELKIN ET AL., 1982a, p. 63)

...the problem [in information needs research] seems to lie not so much with the lack of a single definition as with a failure to use a definition appropriate to the...investigation. (THOMAS D. WILSON, 1981, p. 3)

...the empirically supported theoretical basis of information science, as far as users are concerned, is extremely poor.... (WERSIG & WINDEL, p. 12)

In the above criticisms, the term “conceptualization” is used in two senses: The first refers to what is usually more commonly called theorizing—i.e., need for statements of expected relationships between variables. The second refers to lack of definition and clear premises for focusing on variables generating research questions.

Here conceptualization is used in the second sense for two reasons. First, definitional conceptualization is seen as a necessary precursor to formulating theories. Second, the innovative work in the literature since 1978 emphasizes definition. It is this definitional work that is the primary focus of this chapter.

In implementing this focus, this chapter deviates from prior ARIST rev in two significant ways. First, little mention is made in this review of differences between information systems (e.g., catalog, library, online systems) of subsets of users (e.g., students or adults, scientists or lay people), or context of use (e.g., occupational, recreational, educational). These distinctions are referred to only if they aid understanding. Otherwise, we ignore the highlight those features common to the conceptual issues addressed.

The second major deviation is that this chapter reviews both critical and empirical work. To focus only on empirical work since 1978 would represent the literature because so much of the attention to informational needs and uses research has been essentially calling for a change in empirical approaches.

THE IMPETUS FOR CONCEPTUAL GROWTH

The recent spurt of emphasis on conceptual growth does not appear to result only from criticisms of research per se. Rather, the literature points to a major tension between information science research and practice. Tension results from the charge that studies have not informed practice so dominates the recent literature and so influences recent advances that it deserves special review.

THE PRACTICE MANDATE FOR USER-NEED ORIENTED STUDY

In a series of critical essays, a number of authors have assessed these of the studies to date. They agree that the research has provided guidance. STONE, for example, asserts that the literature gives little guidance to librarians on how to meet the needs of humanities scholars and is likely to confuse than elucidate. THOMAS D. WILSON (1984) states that service implications from past work have not been clear. WHITE con that the studies have reiterated only what information systems have users' minds and have not helped us to deal with real problems. Other
made related charges (BELKIN, 1984; BELKIN ET AL., 1983; CRONIN; DERVIN, 1977, 1983b; MARON; MICK ET AL.; ZWEIZIG).

The call for research useful to practice arises also from the changing fundamental understandings of the nature of the services provided by information systems and services.

Not everyone agrees with these propositions, and the dissenting voices are reviewed below. Nevertheless, the agreement is so strong in the current critical literature that it constitutes a kind of rallying call for research on information needs and uses.

These fundamental understandings can be summarized in four propositions:

- Information systems could serve users better—increase their utility to their clients and be more accountable to them.
- To serve clientele better, user needs and uses must become the central focus of system operation.
- Serving clientele better may require implementation of a system redesign mandate.
- Information systems have not capitalized on technology to help them serve clientele better.

The discourse relevant to each proposition is reviewed below through a selection of germane authors.

The Call for Serving Clientele Better

Several intersecting trends appear to be driving this call. One is a wish to decrease the marginality (THOMAS D. WILSON (1981) used this term) of many information services—in essence, to increase use. Based on empirical evidence, a host of authors decry the low use of virtually every kind of information system. Examples include: CHEN & HERNON (1982), DERVIN (1980), and WHITE on the low use of libraries by citizens; MENDEZ on the low use of information services by humanists; and STIEG on the low use of information sources by historians. Other authors (BALLARD; COOPER, 1978a; MOHR; THOMAS D. WILSON, 1981) make the same observations in general terms.

Another trend leading to the call to serve clientele better is the concern for empirical evidence showing imbalances in information flows to traditionally underserved clientele (BARUGH; DERVIN, 1980; DURRANCE, 1982).

A third trend is the increased call for accountability to clientele communities manifested in shifts in system performance measurement from prescriptive professional standards to measures based at least partly on assessments of how well clientele needs have been served (BALLARD; BRENNER ET AL.; BENGE; BLAGDEN, 1980a, 1980b; BOOKSTEIN; COOPER, 1978b; D'ELIA, 1980b; DETWEILER; DUMONT & DUMONT; FORD; HEIM; LYNCH; MOHR; PALMOUR ET AL., 1980; ROBERTSON; SELL; PATRICK WILSON, 1978, 1983).

The Call for Implementing a System Invention Mandate

An important aspect of the general call for refocusing attention on underserved users is the potential for the results to be used in inventing and redesigning systems. For most of the voices, the call for user-oriented emphases is weak. No specific implications for service or system design result. In contrast, a few scholars converge in critical essays on explicit calls making information systems user-oriented and see user research as the way to implement the changes.
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The Call for the Centrality of User-Defined Information Needs and Uses

In a related series of critical essays, a general call has been made in a number of journals and in a central focus of information systems and, for authors, the central focus (BELKIN, 1984; GARVEY ET AL.; MICK ET AL.; THOMAS D. WILSON, 1981). This call is illustrated by two quotes:

. . . it becomes increasingly clear that the success of information services is more likely to be achieved through adjusting the services to meet the specific needs of an individual rather than trying to adapt the individual user to match the wholesale output of an information system. (GARVEY ET AL., p. 255)

Effective transition into the information age will require switching from information systems that are technology and content driven to information systems that are user driven. (MICK ET AL., p. 355)

These calls have generally focused on a recognition that both research practice now look at users in terms of the information seeking practices and that we need to focus on the users themselves. Among the most cited for the switch to user orientations in information system practice research are: BELKIN (1984), BELKIN ET AL. (1982a; 1982b), BRET; CRONIN, DERVIN (1977; 1980; 1983a; 1983b), DURRANCE (1983); FORD, GARVEY ET AL., JARVELIN & REPO, KRIKELAS, LOW; MACMULLIN & TAYLOR, MARON, OFORI-DWUMFUO, PAISLEY (1981); ROBERTSON, VERMEULEN, WHITE, WILLIAMSON, and WOOST. Other terms used to describe this switch are user orientations vs. technologically content, document, service, data, and observer orientations.

These calls point to the lack of user orientations as a major (for many major) stumbling block to more efficient and effective service. The technological relationship between practice and research in this regard was emphasized by DERVIN (1983b) and by MARON. System orientations gene the research, which in turn generates findings that reify system orientat}
The call for system changes includes virtually every aspect of what touches the user—i.e., the way that documents and materials are stored, the records that are created to locate documents and materials, and the person-machine or person-person links. Proposed user-oriented changes include:

- Treating documents in various ways to make the system more meaningful to users (SWIFT ET AL.).
- Devising new indexes based on user-relevant criteria to supplement subject-oriented indexes (BRETON; DERVIN, 1983b; MACMULLIN & TAYLOR).
- Including emotionally oriented indexes that address emotional dimensions of experience among the ways to access materials (DERVIN 1983b; MCMULLEN).
- Changing the procedures by which user needs are assessed in practice, from keyword, symbol-matching, and subject orientations to user-problematic situations (BELKIN ET AL., 1982a, 1982b; DERVIN & DEWDNEY; HOLLNAGEL; ODDY; OFORI-DENUMFUA).
- Presenting information in whatever form the end user requires (DAVIES).

Many of these calls imply a mandate for responsive, flexible system design that is oriented toward user needs. LANS, for example, asks for systems that are flexible and able to adapt to changing user needs. BRENNER ET AL. assert that information systems must constantly respond to end users and change as the users do. BELKIN (1980), DERVIN & DEWDNEY, and ODDY call for systems that can elicit user need statements through an interactive, responsive dialog.

The Call for Capitalizing on Technology

In this context, many authors view technology as the way to reorient systems to users. Many also believe that this potential has remained potential and that despite technological power, information systems remain mainly "giant matching devices" (BRENNER ET AL.; JARVELIN & REPO).

The Recognition of a Research Gap

It is in the context of these calls for reorienting the practice and evaluation of information systems to users that the criticism of the available research on information needs and uses is severest. Among these critics there is agreement that research has not yet provided guidance for the reorientation. Yet, most believe that the quest is still hopeful and issue a challenge for the coming decades of research on information needs and uses. Three authors illustrate this hope (BRENNER ET AL.; HEIM; MOHR).
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Counter Voices

Dissenting voices are also heard. SHINEBOURNE, for example, challenges that there is "something rather absurd in being constantly enjoined to in the needs of the users" (p. 137) and cites studies suggesting that when libraries have probed needs, the outcomes have been worse rather than better. Suggesting that the field has been "charmed by incantations about user needs," he calls for efforts to develop better procedures to more fully describe the features of texts and materials.

While SHINEBOURNE presents the most fully cast dissenting argument others agree with him. LANCASTER and MARTYN & LANCASTER discuss information needs assessment studies as weak or "largely a waste of time" (LANCASTER, p. 308); ABRAHAM warns against exaggerating user assessments in library evaluation; BALLARD cautions against expectations that are too high, referring to numerous social science studies that have shown how hard it is to change behavior.

A different counter voice from those above suggests that what is involved in these issues is not having to choose between user vs. system orientations but rather understanding when a particular orientation will be most productive. THOMAS D. WILSON (1981) makes this point when he calls for use research definitions that are appropriate to the purpose. DERVIN (1988) makes the same point when she suggests that there are utilities to be derived from both orientations.

BASELINE PORTRAIT OF INFORMATION NEEDS AND USES STUDIES

Without the context above, it would be difficult to make sense of the formation needs and uses literature since 1978. At best, one would be able to observe a certain schizophrenia. On the one hand, the brunt of the work looks much like work reviewed in prior ARISTS chapters. On the other hand, small but significant portion of the work is going off in seemingly unrelated directions.

In terms of the discussion above, it seems that most of the studies continue to observe users in terms of systems while a few studies are finding ways to observe users in terms of users.

The system-oriented studies are reviewed briefly here because they provide a baseline portrait of the context within which some researchers are forging ahead, against tradition, to provide conceptual alternatives.

A typical study in the system-oriented genre examines the extent to which a respondent (user or potential user of an information system) has used one or more information systems, used one or more different kinds of information services or materials; 2) sees one or more barriers to the user the information system; and 3) reports satisfaction with various attributes of the system and access to it.
A typical study has tried to explain differences among respondents of these “information behavior” dimensions with such predictors as demographic (e.g., age, education, sex), sociological (e.g., group membership), lifestyle (e.g., interests and activities), and task description (e.g., purpose for contacting system).

Many studies since 1978 fit primarily into this system-oriented genre. Examples include those by: AIYEPEKU (1982a; 1982b; 1982c), BEAL, BLACKIE & SMITH, BISHOP & LEWIS, BREMBER & LEGGATE, CHEN & BURGER, CHEN & HERNON (1980; 1982), FISCHER, HIBBERD & MEADOWS, HODOWANEK, MANCEALL & DROTT, MOREHEAD, PALMOUR ET AL. (1980), SELL, SINGH, STIEG, SUMMERS, and SUMMERS ET AL.

Since an emphasis on user needs permeates the mandate for user-oriented research and system design as described in earlier sections of this chapter, a description of how these studies have dealt with the concept of “information needs” is appropriate.

Most of these studies imply that the “information behaviors” observed are indexing information needs and uses. Usually, the studies have left the terms “information needs” and “information uses” undefined, and it is implied that by knowing how users have or might use systems, one knows what their needs are or might be.

Because various fundamental terms are used interchangeably and not defined in these studies, extracting definitional patterns is not straightforward. By focusing on what the studies seem to imply to be evidence of need, it becomes possible to extract six different approaches to “information needs assessment” that underlie this system-oriented literature. These six approaches are described below, each illustrated with a typical study that incorporates the approach. No study was found that used only one of these approaches; the typical study used three or more. The studies selected provide particularly clear examples of implementation.

The Demand on System/Resources Approach

This approach measures the extent to which users use different kinds of sources, media, systems, documents, materials, or channels. Need is implied as assessed from portraits of where demand is greatest or where it is less than it ought to be, by professional judgment. A typical example is the study by STIEG of the information needs of historians, which focused primarily on how much the historians used different information channels.

The Awareness Approach

These measurements focus on determining respondent awareness of current services. Need is implied as assessed where areas of awareness are deemed lower than they ought to be, by professional judgment. A typical example is the study by BISHOP & LEWIS of users and uses of the British
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National Bibliography (BNB) and its online computer-handled form, BLAISE-LINE. Among the measurements were assessments of user awareness of overlap between BNB and BLAISE-LINE.

The Likes–Dislikes Approach

These measurements focus on determining how much people are satisfied or dissatisfied with different aspects of service. Those aspects that satisfy seen as indicating a need for more service. Those that do not satisfy usually seen as indicating a need for system improvement. A typical exam of a study using this approach is that by HODOWANEK, which examined among other dimensions, library user assessments of convenience and ease access to information.

The Priorities Approach

In these measurements, respondents are asked to indicate what they would like the information to be like. Activities or characteristics indicated as high priorities indicate need for development of service. CHEN & HERNON (1982) used this approach and asked their citizen respondents to generate library wish list.

The Community Profile Approach

In these measurements, demographic and environmental profiles of a community are developed. The profiles are then used to infer program development needs. A typical example of this approach is illustrated in the PALMOUR ET AL. (1980) protocol for community analysis, which proposes the library should develop a profile of the demographic characteristics of community members and the nature of community environments and facilities.

The Interests, Activities, and Group Memberships Approach

In these measurements, respondents are asked to detail their interests, activities, and their group memberships. Extrapolations are then made to the data to infer program development needs. An example of this approach is the PALMOUR ET AL. (1980) protocol for a citizen survey, which asks for assessing citizen memberships and involvement in clubs and community activities as well as citizens’ interests and hobbies.

From these approaches to “information needs assessment” several patterns emerge. One is that most of the approaches are constrained by system definitions of what “needs” are and they are limited to examining behavior primarily within user intersections with systems. In fact, it could be said the needs of interest are system needs not user needs.
Another manifestation of the system-oriented research emphasis on system rather than user needs is how the studies reify systems as they presently exist. Respondents are usually offered a menu of options that originate in system worlds, not user worlds. As DERVIN (1980) suggests, the results can only reinforce system stereotypes. When respondents are asked about worlds with which they are unfamiliar, they respond from contexts of fleeting images rather than from experiential realities.

A third manifestation is the fact that even when the work addresses aspects of user worlds outside the system intersection, it still does so in ways that are removed from user needs. Thus, it is assumed that if we know who people are, what groups they belong to, or what their activities and interests are, we know what their needs are.

Within these system-oriented studies one finds numerous attempts to break out of system-oriented constraints. The studies that propose looking at user interests and activities in contexts outside system intersection are prime examples. Other frequent examples are studies that have proposed or measured some aspect of actual user situations (BEAL; CHEN & BURGER; PALMOUR ET AL., 1980; WOOD).

These attempts usually remain constrained, however. An example is the CHEN & BURGER study of citizen information needs that assesses the kinds of troublesome everyday situations in which citizens find themselves but which then focuses prime attention on citizen library use and satisfaction.

Recent critiques of the literature suggest that in order to develop user-oriented research alternatives for the study of information needs and uses what is required is not merely the introduction of new methods or variables but rather a shifting away from the traditional paradigm that guides information science research.

CALL FOR A PARADIGM SHIFT

Since 1978 some scholars have focused their primary efforts on identifying the underlying premises and assumptions that they see as having guided information needs and uses research. They call for developing an alternative set of premises and assumptions—in essence, for the introduction of an alternative paradigm. Notable among these are: BELKIN (1978), BROOKES, DERVIN (1977; 1983b), HAMMARBERG, JARVELIN & REPO, LEVITAN, MARKEY, MICK ET AL., NEILL, RUDD, and THOMAS D. WILSON (1981; 1984).

These authors categorize the underlying premises and assumptions in different ways. Despite these differences, the authors all discuss alternative approaches for thinking about fundamental elements of information needs and uses research—the definitions of information and need, the nature of information, the utility of different approaches for studying information behaviors, and the consequences of using different models for prediction. Each author, either directly or indirectly, also pits at least two alternative perspectives against one another: one is the perspective now used, the other is a suggested alternative.
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For our purposes, the assumptions and premises seen as now operable research are labeled “traditional” and are contrasted to “alternative” assumptions and premises. The pitfall is not presented to label assumption premises as inherently good or bad but rather to pursue the implications of alternative approaches.

Six categories are used below to overview the underlying premises assumptions that have been identified as operating in traditional information needs and uses research. A summary describes how the six categories in try to yield a “traditional” paradigm and “traditional” studies and what a “alternative” paradigm is proposed. Most of the literature pertaining to alternative approaches is conceptual and critical. However, a significant subset advanced to empirical implementation. This literature is the focus.

Objective vs. Subjective Information

In many ways this distinction is the least precise dimension of the for paradigm shift, but it is also the one that has received the most attention. Most observers agree that information needs and uses studies have focused on objective information, on a conception of information as something with constant meaning and some element of absolute correspondence to reality.

Whether information needs and uses studies ought to focus on objective information is a matter in contention. Scholars such as BROOKE FARRADANE (1979; 1980b) argue cogently that it ought to, that it constant meanings that information systems ideally are in the business of transferring from information producer to receiver. Farradane, for ex的认可nowledges that human subjectivity results in a reality in which information does not transmit constant meaning. He proposes, however, that effort ought to be made to describe and transmit the information present.

In contrast, some authors reject the objective information idea. SWAL., as one example, call the objectivist assumptions inappropriate to of human beings. Others who specifically address this issue are BI (1978), DERVIN (1977; 1983a), NATOLI, NEILL, RUDD, and THOM WILSON (1984).

Mechanistic, Passive vs. Constructivist, Active Users

It has been challenged that traditional studies of information need use have posited the user as a passive recipient of objective information the task of information delivery being to get the information package in user’s hands. In this context it has been assumed that all information use is by definition useful (BLAGDEN, 1980a). A focus on behavior of what people do) has actually been ignored. People have been thought to have robotic information-processing systems (STEVenson). States of being formed or benefited have been assumed to ensue directly from doc
delivery with no intervening user behavior (KRIKELAS; MAGUIRE). In short, people have not been seen as purposive, self-controlling, sense-making beings (JAMES). As a result, much user behavior remains unexamined--e.g., how users construct needs out of situations or helps out of services, or the strategies they use for bridging their information needs (BEAL; DERVIN, 1977, 1983a; MOHR).

Trans-Situationality vs. Situationality

Traditional information needs and uses studies have attempted to predict user behavior according to static, across time-space models. The intent was to find ways to describe user information behavior that apply across situations. Ideally, the resulting observations would fit all users in all situations.

Of all the assumptions that have driven information needs and uses research this was the one that received the earliest assault. The calls by PAISLEY (1968) and ALLEN for delineating sociological contexts of use are manifestations of a recognition that trans-situational prediction has not been productive.

Yet, despite the many years during which sociological and other situational context variables have been addressed in the literature, few conceptual approaches have been developed to deal with situational variables that are anything other than cumbersome laundry lists of unordered dimensions of experience. Recently, however, calls have been issued for doing so. HALL suggests that individuals operate from different centers at different times and that the shapes of their cognitive maps shift accordingly. He wants to see information science address the systematic patterns underlying these situational moments. DERVIN (1983a) and MACMULLIN & TAYLOR make a similar request.

Another aspect of the call for a situational orientation is manifested in the references from scholars to the need for measurements that will allow users to be understood as a result of dialog between system and user in which need articulation goes through situationally bound iterations (BELKIN ET AL., 1982a, 1982b; CURRAN; DERVIN & DEWDNEY; ODDY). A final aspect of the situationality focus is the calls that require systems to make repetitive needs assessment a mandate (CURRAN; DERVIN, 1984).

Atomistic vs. Wholistic Views of Experience

Traditional information needs and uses studies have zeroed in on user behavior primarily in the context of user interaction with systems. They have not examined factors that lead to a user's encounter with information systems or the consequences of such an encounter. It is as if a still photograph were taken of a scene that would be more adequately portrayed by moving pictures.

Various scholars have urged more wholistic approaches. BENGE, for example, wants us to focus on the whole social interaction; THOMAS D. WILSON (1981) and MACMULLIN & TAYLOR want the focus to go beyond the system intersection to the points where use and effects occur; DERVIN (1980) calls for looking at information behaviors outside system context; that they can be examined independently of system constraints.

External Behavior vs. Internal Cognitions

Perhaps the aspect of the paradigm shift that is most contentious focuses on whether information needs and uses research ought to focus on external behaviors or internal cognitions. Traditionally, research has focused on external (e.g., contacts with sources and use of systems as indicators needs) rather than internal (e.g., cognitive assessments).

Because of its roots in the physical sciences, the call for focusing on external and the assumption that psychological, cognitive states cannot scientifically observed permeated even the early years of research. The ARIST review (MENZEL) called for work that stuck to observables, constraining itself to contact with systems. The concern is still manifested in recent work (DERVIN; MICK ET AL.).

Although these are dissenting voices, most scholars who have explicitly addressed the issue join the call for focusing on cognitive behavior and developing cognitive approaches to assessing information needs and uses (BELKIN, 1978; BELKIN ET AL., 1982a, 1982b; DERVIN, 1977, 1983a, 1983b; FORD; GARVEY ET AL.; PAISLEY, 1980; THOMAS D. WILSON, 1983b). Both Ford and Paisley, in particular, reviewed a large amount of literature on cognitive psychology suggesting potential contributions for information science.

Chaotic vs. Systematic Individuality

A fundamental issue of this paradigm debate is the concern for research yield systematic observations and for systems to be based on orderly patterns of behavior. In the context of the traditional paradigm assumptions, research was always a tradeoff between the increasingly evident need to deal with individuality and a fear that lack of predictability would result. A recent article by MICK ET AL., for example, sees a focus on individual behavior yielding too much variation for systems to integrate.

Until recently, it was assumed that individuality meant chaos, an implicit descent into solipsism. Recent calls now challenge that point (BELKIN 1978, 1984; DERVIN 1983a, 1983b; DERVIN ET AL; HOLLNAGEL). HALL, for example, calls for the inclusion of individual "values" in information science research and for the right of the user to be different. He observes that just because values are variable "does not mean they are erratic." As puts it: "we are concerned...with trying to characterize 'bias' systematically so it can be put to constructive use" (p. 110).

Others have made the same claim. DERVIN (1983b) calls for assessing the fundamentals of the human condition as a means for systematizing
individuality. PAISLEY (1980) suggests that people seem to share some common dimensions for constructing experience. What is emerging is an understanding that the seeming complexity of individuality can be addressed (as HOLLNAGEL puts it) "in a completely satisfactory way which fulfills every reasonable demand of a scientific investigation" (HOLLNAGEL, p. 186).

Quantitative vs. Qualitative Research

The traditional approaches to information needs and uses research have aspired to sophisticated quantitative techniques. This theme has run through all prior ARIST reviews of the topic. In the context of the traditional paradigm, quantitative approaches are seen as most compatible with traditional assumptions. Yet in the context of the impetus of the paradigm shift, scholars are now calling for supplementing quantitative approaches with inductive, qualitative approaches. These calls have come primarily from BEAL, HALL, JAMES, JARVELIN & REPO, MARKEY, and THOMAS D. WILSON (1984).

The Paradigms--"Traditional" and "Alternative"

An intersection of the above categories yields a portrait of the "traditional" paradigm. It is one in which information is seen as objective and users are seen as input-output processors of information. It is one that searches for trans-situational propositions about the nature of the use of information systems. It does this by focusing on externally observable dimensions of behavior and events.

A study generated within such a paradigm would frequently focus on research questions that start with the system—the source of the packages of information that are to be transferred from system to user. Such a study looks at how much use people make of these systems. It asks what demographic and observable sociological dimensions of people's lives predict this use. It is concerned with whether people are aware of these systems and like them or dislike them. It asks many "what" questions—e.g., what people use what systems, and what services do people use.

In contrast, the "alternative" paradigm posits information as something constructed by human beings. It sees users as beings who are constantly constructing, as beings who are free (within system constraints) to create from systems and situations whatever they choose. It focuses on how people construct sense, searching for universal dimensions of sense-making. It focuses on understanding information use in particular situations and is concerned with what leads up to and what follows intersections with systems. If focuses on the user. It examines the system only as seen by the user. It asks many "how questions"—e.g., how do people define needs in different situations, how do they present these needs to systems, and how do they make use of what systems offer them.

THE IMPACT OF PARADIGMATIC CONSTRAINTS ON CONCEPTUALIZATION

The impact of the constraints of the old paradigm and the changes introduced with the new are more clearly shown than in an examination of the alternative definitions of the two central concepts of information needs and uses research that are now emerging—information and information need. Both terms have been universally considered troublesome. Many different definitions have been used or implied. For example, information has been defined as: 1) a property of matter; 2) any message, document, or information resource; 3) any publicly available symbolic material; or 4) any data. BELKIN (1978), LEVITAN, and THOMAS D. WILSON (1981) all review the various definitions.

Similarly, "information need" has been defined as a state of needing anything the researcher called information. Almost without exception "information needs" have not been defined as what users think they need but rather in terms that designate what it is in the information system that is needed. The definitions have not focused on what is missing for users (i.e., what gaps they face) but rather on what the system possesses.

The constraint of the traditional paradigm in this regard is most clearly illustrated in the amount of discussion that has focused on whether information needs can be accurately measured. When information needs are viewed in terms of the traditional paradigm, they are indeed shifty and vague. The evidence shows, for example, that users frequently have trouble stating these needs, particularly when pressed to specify what resources will fill them. Further, the ways needs are expressed changes over time, even during a brief interview. Users frequently refer to gaps, which information systems see as falling outside their purview or as being unnamable to objective stores of knowledge. Numerous references have been made to the difficulty of dealing with the concept (DERVIN; JARVELIN & REPO; MARKEY; THOMAS D. WILSON, 1981).

When the paradigm shifts described above are brought to bear on defining "information" and "information need," quite different definitions begin to emerge. What is most remarkable about them is their similarity. As examples of two recent sources define "information" as: 1) that which is capable of transforming image structures (BELKIN, 1978), and 2) any stimulus that alters the cognitive structure of a receiver (PAISLEY, 1980).

"Information needs" are similarly defined: 1) a conceptual incongruity in which the person's cognitive structure is not adequate to a task (FORD); 2) when a person recognizes something wrong in his or her state of knowledge and wishes to resolve the anomaly (BELKIN, 1978); 3) when the current state of possessed knowledge is less than needed (KRIKELAS); 4) when internal sense runs out (DERVIN, 1977; 1980); and 5) when there is insufficient knowledge to cope with voids, uncertainty, or conflict in a knowledge area (HORNE).

All of the alternative definitions bring the proposed paradigmatic changes to bear on conceptualization. Those who propose these changes see bot
traditional definitions and alternative definitions as useful, depending on purpose (DERVIN, 1983a; LEVITAN; THOMAS D. WILSON, 1981). They see the alternative definitions as more useful for research that proposes to understand users and to apply its findings to system design and practice. Some scholars have begun to make substantial progress in implementing these definitions in conceptual and empirical efforts. These are described briefly below.

EXAMPLES OF ALTERNATIVE SCHOLARSHIP

This section focuses both on extensive conceptual efforts that point to research directions and on efforts that have actually moved to the research stage. In addition, both small-scale innovations and comprehensive efforts are described.

Small-Scale Innovations

Only a few scholars have produced efforts large enough to be labeled comprehensive. However, the literature manifests some researchers who have begun to add elements of the alternative paradigm to research efforts. These small-scale innovations are important, both as a symptom of dissatisfaction with the constraints imposed by the traditional paradigm and as input for the collective struggle to emerge from it. As examples:

- GARVEY ET AL. have examined the different kinds of information that scientists need at different research stages. Their kinds of information were defined functionally. Sample categories include aid in perception, definition of problem, place in context of other work, and select design strategy.
- BLACDEN (1980a) showed users some documents that they had borrowed and found that users could vividly recall the circumstances surrounding each particular information-seeking incident.
- DURRANCE (1982; 1984) examined public policy information needs of citizen groups by eliciting statements of problematic situational activities.
- WILSON & STREATHFIELD and WILSON ET AL. tracked 22 respondents through 6,000 communication events occurring in work situations in a social services department to examine their information seeking and use.
- WOOD focused on specific situational problems when interviewing 136 occupational health practitioners.
- HORNE defined questions as the observable behavioral indicators of information needs. She examined the questions of 198 students in four different problem-solving situations and used linguistic categorization techniques (e.g., open vs. closed questions) to unearth fundamental question types.

Comprehensive Innovations

Three different kinds of comprehensive innovations are described. Each represents a different way of implementing most of the elements of the paradigm shift described earlier.

The User-Values Approach

The most fully developed version of this approach comes from TAYLOR (1984; 1985) and MACMULLIN & TAYLOR, who term it the value-added approach. It focuses on the perceptions of utility and value that users bring to systems. At this stage, the work as represented in the published literature is primarily conceptual, but it points to research directions.

MacMullin and Taylor call for making the user's problem the central focus. They are concerned with eventually identifying different classes of problems and linking them to different information traits that users are more likely to value when faced with each class of problem. They propose a variety of situationally based problem dimensions—e.g., design vs. discovery, well-structured vs. poorly structured, complex vs. simple, specific vs. amorphous, and assumptions agreed on vs. those not agreed on; they see these as contexts that establish the criteria for judging the relevance of information.

They also propose various information traits—e.g., quantitative vs. qualitative, hard vs. soft data, single solution vs. options, precedence vs. forecasting vs. futures modeling time perspectives, and clinical vs. census aggregation. These information traits, they say, are as "characteristic of stored information as are subject descriptors" (MACMULLIN & TAYLOR, p. 101).

In an effort to further understand the potential for indexing user-oriented information traits, TAYLOR (1984; 1985) analyzes 13 abstracting and indexing operations to ascertain what steps might help users to make choices from the information displayed. He examined: 1) different kinds of user criteria (e.g., ease of use, quality, adaptability); 2) different kinds of interfaces (e.g., browsing, formatting, accuracy, comprehensiveness); and 3) different system processes (e.g., alphabetizing, grouping, highlighting, indexing, citation links). Again the implication is that these indicators of values can be formalized and addressed directly in information-system activity.

This body of conceptual work can be seen as reaching for two different kinds of understandings: 1) of problems (or cognitive criteria) users bring to bear on systems; and 2) of different characteristics of information and information bases that would allow users to locate whatever might serve their criteria. This work clearly draws on a long tradition of cognitively oriented work in information processing.

In a related piece of fairly well-developed conceptual work, HALL focuses on the "parameters of value" that scientific/technical information users bring
to use situations. “Each separate viewpoint or way of looking at things,” he says, “has its own characteristic priorities for evaluating information. (HALL, p. 105)”

He examines different parameters of value for information (e.g., specificity, depth vs. breadth, timeliness) and how the kinds of information that would serve each value parameter might vary with different situations (i.e., function stages). For example, in the planning stage, the value parameter of hands-on access is posited as calling for information in the form of abstracts of points of view. In contrast, in the research and development stage, the same parameter is posited as calling for all pertinent original documents, and in the information-operations stage, the call is for abstracts and references.

Related proposals to link different cognitively and/or situationally described problem situations to different information traits have been made by FORD, GARVEY ET AL., MOHR, and PAISLEY (1980). In addition, the work of FARRADANE (1979; 1980a; 1980b) to develop a “relational indexing system” is a related effort.

Farradane, in fact, operates far more out of traditional assumptions than alternative assumptions. He acknowledges that different people see different things in messages. Given this discontinuity, he says that we need to develop a way to more fully represent the intents of sources in order to achieve greater indexing accuracy. He builds indexing procedures that are based on analyses of thought processes drawn from cognitive psychology. The actual indexing procedures are complex, and it is not necessary to describe them here. His reliance on objective information assumptions has been soundly criticized (HAMMARBERG), and applications of his system have been described as both uneconomical and unpromising in terms of recall and relevance results (FORD).

From the perspective of the alternative paradigm, Farradane goes astray in expecting the language of documents to yield exact descriptions of either source intent or receiver understanding of source intent. However, his work is useful where it applies cognitive psychology to descriptions of documents.

The Sense-Making Approach

The sense-making approach has been developed by Dervin and her colleagues over the past 13 years. It consists of a set of conceptual and theoretical premises and a set of related methodologies for assessing how people make sense of their worlds and how they use information and other resources in the process (DERVIN, 1977, 1980, 1981, 1983a, 1983b; Dervin & Fraser). It is one of several related approaches which are being developed in the field of communication (EDELSTEIN; GRUNIG; STAMM & GRUNIG), all of which implement aspects of the alternative paradigm for studying communication behavior. Sense-making is the only one of these approaches that has been applied to librarianship and information science.

The approach has been used to describe information needs and uses of people in diverse contexts—e.g., blood donors, cancer patients, immigrants, developmentally disabled adults, library users, computer software users, and

children using television (ATWOOD ET AL.; Dervin, 1983b). One primary use has been to study the everyday information needs of average citizens and to apply the findings to public library service (ATWOOD & Dervin; Dervin, 1984; Dervin ET AL.; Palmour ET AL., 1979).

The bottom-line intent of the approach is to yield data that are directly useful for information and communication practice. In looking for ways to deal systematically with the chaos of individuality, it draws heavily on the work of Carter (1980) and Carter ET AL. In particular, it rests heavily on his posited discontinuity condition as presenting a mandate for humans to take steps to construct sense in constantly changing life situations.

In this context, Dervin emphasizes the mandate for step-taking as an organizing focus for conceptualizing. She posits an information-need situation as one in which the individual’s internal sense has “run out.” The person must create new sense. In the latest version of the sense-making approach, a three-part model points to the “essences” of information-need (i.e., sense-making) situations. The model is labeled SITUATION-GAP-USE. The sense-maker is stopped in a situation. Movement is prevented by some kind of gap (operationalized for information-need situations as a question or question set). The sense-maker is seen as potentially making some kind of use of whatever bridge is built across the “gap” the user faces.

In the various sense-making methodologies that have been developed, this model becomes operational when respondents describe moments when they got stopped, how they saw themselves stopped, what questions they had in their minds (i.e., what cognitive gaps they faced), what strategies they found useful for answering these questions (i.e., building bridges across the gaps), and how they used the cognitive bridges once they built them (i.e., how information helps).

In the 13 years of development, SITUATION-GAP-USE statements have been collected and their contents analyzed both inductively and deductively. The result has been the development of a stable set of categories for coding situations, gaps, and uses into what are assumed to be universally relevant dimensions of human movement.

Situations have been coded primarily in terms of how they are seen by users as constraining movement because it is assumed that this is where the situational essence of the information need lies. Categories have included the nature of the stop, described in terms of such categories as decision (facing a road with two or more branches ahead), problematic (being dragged down a road not of your own choosing), or spin-out (having no road). Other situation categorizations have focused on judgments of perceptual embeddedness (how foggy is the road), situational embeddedness (how many intersections are on the road), social embeddedness (how many people are also traveling), and constraint (what stands in the way).

When gaps are operationalized as questions, they have been coded into categories, tapping what are considered to be some universal elements of the ideas humans need to construct to guide their movements. A recent version codes questions into attempts to bridge gaps relating to the timing and location of events, understanding causes, projecting outcomes, and identifying characteristics of self, others, events, and objects.
Uses, also called helps, have been conceptualized as the ways in which people put answers to questions to work. A recent version codes uses into: got picture, ideas, understandings; found direction; gained skills; got started or kept going; got connected to others; got support/reassurance; got rest/relaxation; got happiness/pleasure; and reached goal.

Several small-scale applications of the approach have involved system design. One is the use of the "neutral questioning" procedures drawn from the SITUATION-GAP-USE model for conducting reference interviews. Sense-making posits that neutral questioning procedures can increase both efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery in reference interviews. This proposition is being tested empirically (DERVIN & DEWDNEY). The procedures have also been tested in use as a result of training workshops. It is estimated that the techniques have been taught to about 1,000 librarians and they are being systematically used in five libraries.

Also implied in the sense-making approach is the idea, similar to that in the values approach, that systematically describable dimensions of sense-making can be incorporated into information bases to make retrieval more effective and efficient. DERVIN (1983b) has suggested, for example, that records could be altered to supplement existing techniques with sense-making categories by requiring authors to address them and/or by having users assess them.

The sense-making studies have their earliest roots in a genre that deserves brief mention. They can be called the "everyday citizen information need studies." The first was completed in 1973 (WARNER ET AL.) and described the kinds of everyday need situations of citizens (e.g., housing, family, employment, welfare), the sources used by the citizens, and success in situation-facing. Recent examples are the studies by Chen and her colleagues (CHEN; CHEN & BURGER; CHEN & HERNON, 1980). In these studies, the information need is the topically defined situation (e.g., housing), and the remaining emphasis is placed on source use, library use in particular. The primary contribution of these studies is that they go outside the bounds of system intersection to assess need situations.

The Anomalous States-of-Knowledge Approach

The final example of an approach to information needs that incorporates most of the elements of the paradigm shift described earlier comes from the work of Belkin and his colleagues (BELKIN, 1978, 1980, 1984; BELKIN & ODDY; BELKIN ET AL., 1982a, 1982b, 1983). The approach starts with a situation in which someone with a problem needs help from some kind of information system. Belkin emphasizes that the approach doesn’t focus on information needs but on people in problematic situations with views of the situations that are incomplete or limited in some way. In this context, users are viewed as being in anomalous states of knowledge (abbreviated to ASK), in which it is difficult to speak of or even recognize what is wrong. Because they face gaps, lacks, uncertainties, and incoherences, they are seen as being unable to specify what is needed to resolve the anomalies.
CONCLUSION

The intent here has been to offer three alternative information needs assessment approaches as examples that have resulted from the call for a significant paradigm shift in information needs and uses research. While there are substantial and important differences among the three approaches, their similarities are more important here. Each approach is driven by alternative paradigmatic assumptions. Each is focused on a holistic process situationality and cognition. Each has moved toward nonobjective information assumptions by not demanding that a best match be made by the system to user needs. Each assumes that there are systematic fundamental underlying dimensions to what former studies considered chaotic individuality. Each posits human beings as actively constructing rather than passively processing information. Each is focused on application to practice, to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of information delivery. Each points to different ways for assessing user needs and to different ways for describing and/or retrieving databases, collections, or records.

If one uses the ARIST reviews on information needs and uses (1966-1978) as a baseline, a quantum and revolutionary conceptual leap in this area has been made since 1978, and a few scholars have taken tentative steps down some promising roads. Yet the leap would not have been possible without the tension created by the continuing quest to understand the elusive user. The struggle to break out of world views that constrain professional observations of users has been forged on many fronts, with each small step enriching the next. It appears that since 1978 the small steps have reached critical mass.

New mandates for information needs and uses research have been charted. At their core is the demand for inventing new ways of looking at users and linking systems to them.
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