TRACING CHANGES IN THE CITING PRACTICES OF A MASTER'S STUDENT: A LONGITUDINAL CASE STUDY

Bojana Petrić and Nigel Harwood

Introduction

Students' difficulties mastering source use and citation when learning to write in academic settings are now well documented (see Cumming et al 2016, and Liu et al 2016 for reviews). While most research on L2 students' problems with source use has focused on plagiarism (see Pecorari & Petrić, 2014 for a review), other types of problematic source use practices or misunderstandings of source use conventions, such as ineffective paraphrasing (e.g., Hirvela & Du 2013), over-reliance on quoting directly from sources (e.g., Petrić, 2012), over-citing (e.g., Harwood & Petrić, 2012) and difficulty conveying a stance on sources (Wette, 2018) have also been identified and explored. These and other difficulties are caused by the complexity of source-based writing, whose mastery requires both linguistic sophistication and a '*conceptual* understanding of knowledge construction and conventions in the dominant academic community, rather than [merely] practice of mechanical aspects of citing and referencing' (Gu & Brookes, 2008, p. 338, emphasis in the original). The challenging nature of source-based writing is also shown by studies of citation in published writing (see White 2004 for an overview), which reveal sophisticated and subtle ways in which experienced academic writers skillfully use sources for a range of rhetorical functions, from giving credit to other authors to expressing disagreement with them (e.g., Harwood, 2009).

Effective source use and citing can therefore be considered as instances of what Ortega and Byrnes (2008) call advanced capacities, which they define as 'sophisticated language use in

context' (p.4), listing literacy and non-linguistic dimensions, such as socio-pragmatic competence, as examples. By viewing effective source-based writing as an advanced capacity, i.e., as sophisticated language use in the context of a specific academic discipline, we emphasize its complex nature, requiring not only a high level of language proficiency but also various other types of knowledge, such as subject matter and genre knowledge among others. As Ortega and Byrnes (2008) further argue, phenomena that take a long time to develop can only be fully understood if investigated 'through time' (p.4). In light of this, it is surprising that, despite general agreement that mastering source use requires a long time and a great deal of practice, studies investigating *how* source use develops over time are still rare. And while there are valuable longitudinal case studies of L1 and L2 student writers, providing rich developmental accounts (e.g., Harwood & Petrić, 2017; Beaufort, 2004; Leki, 2007; Prior, 1998; Spack, 1997), they focus on the development of student writers' overall academic literacy, rather than specifically on source use and citing. Further, most of these studies focus on undergraduate writers. Our study fills this gap by using the longitudinal case study approach to obtain a rich account of a postgraduate L2 student's development of source use and rhetorical awareness of citing over the course of an academic year.

Despite their broader focus, the case studies above provide fascinating insights into some aspects of development of source-based writing of individual students, which we explore further. For instance, Prior (1998), who followed the disciplinary writing development of two MA TESOL students over a year, found that mastering source use was closely related to the students' disciplinary enculturation, with the higher-achieving student showing more progress in learning to write from sources effectively than the lower-achieving student who continued to rely on incorporating large chunks of source material into her writing, failing to understand how effective source use could benefit her as a developing author, and remaining disengaged

from the disciplinary community in her field. That there is a great deal of individual variation in the rate and eventual success of mastering source-based writing is also shown when the findings of these case studies are compared and contrasted; for instance, the source-based writing of Tim, a history undergraduate in Beaufort's (2004) study, showed no discernible pattern of development as he progressed in his program, in contrast to Yuko, an L2 undergraduate student in Spack's (1997) study, who gradually developed an awareness of citation as a tool for knowledge creation during her three-year study. Students' developmental trajectories can be quite dramatic, as shown by the case of Ian, an undergraduate L2 student in Leki's (2007) study, who initially exhibited a cynical attitude to source-based writing and engaging in transgressive, pragmatically motivated citing practices before developing a genuine interest in his subject and appropriate citing practices. This case points to a clear link between students' citing practices and their awareness of and attitudes to citing as a rhetorical practice, an issue we will investigate in our study.

Studies focusing specifically on source use and citing that take the temporal dimension into account, such as those using pre-post test designs and longitudinal case studies, mostly agree that acquiring an advanced level of source use and citing is a slow and gradual process, requiring extended practice. For instance, an intervention-based study by Wette (2010) investigated the effect of an eight-hour instructional unit on source use and citing on the declarative ('knowing that') and procedural knowledge ('knowing how') about source use of 78 undergraduates at a New Zealand university. Despite the intensive and varied instruction over a semester, the pre-post test analysis showed that while there were gains in both types of knowledge on the post-test, the students' source use did not become fully effective: while unacknowledged copying from sources decreased considerably, other source-use problems emerged in the post-task, such as partial and/or inaccurate paraphrase, failing to distinguish

between an author's opinion and research results, failing to signal the use of secondary sources, citing general knowledge, and omission of page numbers. Also focusing on undergraduates, Thompson, Morton and Storch (2013) investigated thirteen L2 students' perceptions of their source use and authoring practices over a period of two semesters at an Australian university. Drawing mostly on data from repeated interviewing, they report that although students made progress to varying degrees, they did not become fully confident in source use by the end of the study. Similar findings were reported by Davis (2013), who examined four features of source use (citation, paraphrasing, reporting verbs, and attribution) in samples of three L2 students' writing at four points during a pre-master's and a Master's programme over two years at a UK university. Although based on limited amounts of textual data (four 50-100 word excerpts per participant), the study showed that all three students made progress in source use, but differed in starting points and development trajectories, with only one achieving competence in source use by the end of the study. Also relevant here is the eight-year long case study of a bilingual student ('Fabiola') in the US context by Kibler and Hardigree (2016), which investigated the development of the student's argumentative writing from high school to university. Based on analysis of 36 writing samples and 16 interviews with Fabiola during this period, the authors examined her use of evidence to support arguments, more specifically evidential type (e.g., paraphrase vs. quote), evidential function (elsewhere referred to as citation functions, such as to support an argument or express agreement), and reporting verbs. While there was a moderate increase in citation frequencies in Fabiola's writing at university in comparison to high school, changes were more visible in the ways sources were incorporated. For instance, Fabiola tended to use unincorporated quotations (i.e., quotations inserted as full sentences into her text) during the early stages of data collection, whereas the later stages were marked by greater use of paraphrase and incorporated quotations (i.e., by providing a sentence frame to incorporate the quoted

material). Fabiola also used a greater range of reporting verbs in her university assignments and employed a greater number of citation functions than in her high school papers. Another longitudinal study (Sun, Kuzborska & Soden, 2022) investigated the rhetorical functions of citations in the writing of ten L2 master's students at a UK university and their self-reported reasons for citing in their two assignments (one in term 1, another in term 2) and in the dissertation literature review chapter. Students consistently used more sources and citations as the academic year progressed; they also used a greater range of rhetorical functions of citations in their dissertation chapters in comparison to their assignments, with particularly noticeable increase in generalisations from multiple sources and citations used for comparison/contrast of sources. However, the use of citations for evaluation remained low, as the participants continued to adopt a neutral stance towards sources. Lack of development was also noted in the students' self-reported reasons to cite, with citing to support their ideas remaining the main reason to cite throughout the year.

These studies show the incremental nature of citing development over time; however, they tend to examine the development of a narrow set of citing features determined in advance. In line with our understanding of citing as an advanced capacity and a complex practice, in this study of a master's student's citing practices we adopt a more wide-angled approach, providing a fine-grained account of the participant's changes in her citing practices, both in her textual practices and in her conceptualization of citing, in the course of her master's program as they emerge and interact with the educational context. To this end, we adopt a bottom-up, data-driven approach. The study is guided by the following research question:

> To what extent did the student's citing practices change over the course of the master's program?

Methodology

This study draws on a larger, ethnographically-oriented, multiple case study (Harwood & Petrić, 2017), which investigated the dissertation writing trajectories of master's students at a UK university. Here we focus on one of the participants, Janet (a pseudonym)[i], whose academic writing trajectory we followed for a full year, from her enrolment in the presessional academic English course to the completion of her master's degree in an area of business studies. A mature student with five-years' work experience in her country in East Asia, Janet decided to obtain a master's degree in the UK to enhance her career prospects upon return to her country. With no previous experience of English-medium study, and with little experience of source-based writing in either her L1 or in English from her previous education in her home country, Janet's profile was particularly suited to our study of citing development, given that she needed to master citing in order to succeed in an education system where source-based writing plays a key role in assessment.

Data collection

The longitudinal, multiple-method study design enabled us to collect rich data on the participant's source use and citing during her study in the UK in multiple data collection 'waves' (Ortega & Byrnes, 2008). As shown in Table 1, the timing of our data collection took into account the key features of the participant's study program, which we divide into three periods: the presessional academic English program (hereafter: P1), the taught part of the master's program (P2), and the supervised dissertation (P3). In each period, students were required to produce pieces of source-based writing; however, the amount and complexity of the writing tasks required varied, as did the focus and nature of writing support students received. Briefly, P1 was an intensive 5-week course aiming to prepare students for the

demands of academic study in English at the master's level. The course covered a range of topics related to citing (e.g., paraphrasing, summarizing, quoting, reporting verbs, plagiarism) and provided students with ample opportunities for guided practice supported by individual tutorials and tutors' written feedback on the final assignment, a 2,000-word source-based essay on a topic of students' choice within their discipline. P2 consisted of two ten-week terms of taught modules in the participant's disciplinary area, during which she completed eleven assignments, all of which were source-based essays. Guidance consisting of recommended readings, assignment instructions and lecture slides was provided (although to varying degrees); however, students were required to work on their assignments independently, with minimal lecturer support during the writing process. P3 was the final 10-week term during which students were required to work independently on their master's dissertations, with support from an assigned supervisor.

Drawing on a larger dataset on Janet's case study (see Harwood & Petrić, 2017), here we use data relevant to our research question, focusing on changes in Janet's citing practices. We selected four comparable samples of Janet's writing from the three periods: the first draft of her assignment written as part of the presessional course, hereafter S1, two assignments written for modules during the taught part of the master's program, receiving her lowest (S2) and top mark (S3) respectively, and the literature review chapter of her dissertation (S4). All samples required source use and represented genres typical for the period of the academic year in which they were set, i.e., S1-3 were literature-based essays; S4 was a dissertation chapter. All but S1 were final, submitted texts rather than drafts. The reason we sampled a draft rather than a final product from P1 was that Janet's final text incorporated the tutor's corrections of her citing in her initial draft of S1; therefore, the final draft did not provide a valid picture of her citing practices at the time. In contrast to P1 where the tutor commented

on drafts, her lecturers in P2 neither read nor commented on her assignment drafts, while her dissertation supervisor in P3 did not provide feedback on dissertation drafts, making S2-4 appropriate for exploring Janet's citing practices in P2 and P3 respectively. Finally, S2 and S3, both sampled from P2, were selected to represent the range of Janet's performance, with S2 receiving Janet's lowest mark (56%), the only pass-band (50-59%) mark she received and S3 her highest mark (71%), one of her two distinction marks (70%+).

We also screened the tutors' and the supervisor's feedback and markers' reports on these samples to identify any comments specifically related to Janet's source use and citing. To gain an emic perspective (Mason, 2002) on her citing, we conducted repeated semi-structured interviews with Janet, covering a range of topics related to academic writing and citing. We also used the discourse-based interview (Odell et al, 1983) to elicit Janet's account of specific instances of her citing in the selected pieces of her writing (see Harwood & Petrić, 2012; Petrić & Harwood, 2013). The collected documents allowed for data triangulation and helped us to understand the contextual factors surrounding Janet's citing practices, such as the instruction, advice and feedback on source use and source-use related requirements and assessment criteria.

Type of data	Description	Period
Writing samples	First draft of the main assignment for the presessional course (S1) (2,099 words)	P1
	Assignment awarded Janet's lowest mark of 56%[ii] (S2)(2,844 words) Assignment awarded Janet's highest mark of 71% (S3) (2,225 words)	P2
	The literature review chapter in the dissertation (S4) (3,943 words)	P3
Interview accounts	Interview 1 (October) 36 mins	P1

	Interview 2 (February) 103 mins Interview 3 (March) 97 mins	P2
	Interview 4 (June) 46 mins Interview 5 (July) 72 mins Interview 6 (August) 109 mins Interview 7 (October) 102 mins	P3
Feedback and markers' reports	Academic English tutor's feedback on S1	P1
	Lecturers' feedback and markers' reports on S2 and S3	P2
	Dissertation supervisor's advice[iii] and feedback on S4	P3
Teaching materials and departmental/university documents	Booklet for the presessional course	P1
	Module booklets (including instructions for assignment writing), Lecturers' slides explaining assignment requirements and assessment criteria, Departmental handbook (including guidelines for assignment and dissertation writing, assessment criteria, supervision guidelines)	P2 and P3

Table X.1   Dataset used in the study

Data analysis

Writing samples were analyzed manually in order to capture citing patterns of interest in the data. Citations, defined as explicit references to the work of another author, were counted, and their density (i.e., the number of citations per 100/1000 words) calculated for each piece of writing to enable comparison, following established procedures in the literature (e.g., Thompson, 2005). Citations were classified using Swales' (1986) distinction between integral and non-integral citations, depending on whether the citation is part of the citing sentence or not, and reporting and non-reporting citations, depending on whether a reporting verb is employed (as in 'Walker argues') or not (as in 'Linstead's point'). Direct quotations, i.e., instances where source material is reproduced verbatim and signaled by quotation marks and

an accompanying citation, were classified into unincorporated, i.e. quotations inserted as full sentences into one's text, and incorporated, i.e., quotations made part of the writer's sentence by providing a sentence frame to incorporate the quoted material, following Kibler and Hardigree (2016). Incorporated quotations were further divided following Borg (2007) and Petrić (2012) into fragments (quotations shorter than a T-unit, i.e., the main clause with any dependent clauses), brief quotations (quotations consisting of one or more T-units but shorter than 40 words) and block quotations (quotations consisting of more than 40 words). Other features of citing behavior such as citing multiple sources and secondary citations were also recorded.

Interviews were transcribed and analyzed through an iterative process: we started by reading and summarizing the transcripts independently, and then discussed our notes through face-to-face 'collaborative coding' (Smagorinsky, 2008) and developed a 'start list' of codes (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The list was refined through several cycles of independent coding followed by comparison and discussion. The final code list was applied to a segment of our dataset to check the inter-reliability of coding, which showed that the coding agreement rate was high (k=0.97, p<0.0001). Coding was done in NVivo. The codes relevant to this study were:

(i)   Writing further divided into sub-codes: Previous experiences of academic writing, Types of writing done, Beliefs about academic writing, Writing process (e.g., outlining), Citing (including instruction on source use and citing, plagiarism), Literature (e.g., literature searching, selecting material from sources), Proof-reading;

(ii)   Learning (e.g., about citing, about topic; from feedback on past papers);

(iii)   Departmental help (a sub-code of the MA programme code, which referred

to departmental preparation for dissertation writing, writing support);

(iv)   Difficulties, further divided into subcodes: Academic (including difficulties

citing, understanding assignment requirements or lecturers' feedback),

Procedural (e.g., lack of understanding of how dissertation supervision

works), and Life;

(v)   Peers (including citation-related advice sought and received);

(vi)   Self-evaluation (e.g. writing skills, ability to find literature, quality of

drafts);

(vii)   Dissertation, further divided into sub-codes: Development, Work patterns,

Overall Evaluation,

(viii)   Departmental Requirements. further divided into sub-codes: Assessment

Criteria, Writing Standards, Student Knowledge of)

(ix)   Supervision, further divided into sub-codes: Supervisor Role, Format of

supervision.[iv]

Discourse-based interviews were coded for citation functions, i.e., rhetorical purposes for

which citations are used in the text. We identified categories emerging from the data, using

the categories from previous research on citation functions in master's student writing as

reference (Petrić & Harwood, 2013). Based on previous research, we expected to find

categories such as supporting citations, where writers cite the work of other authors to

support their own claims, and defining citations, where the work of others is used to define a

term or a concept.

Findings

This section first reports on the main trends in Janet's citing during the academic year, followed by a contextualized exploration of key changes in her citing practices and understanding of citing in each of the three periods.

An overview of Janet's citing throughout the academic year

Table 2 provides an overview of a range of features of Janet's citing in the selected four pieces of writing she wrote during the academic year, including source and citation frequencies, frequencies of integral/non-integral and reporting/non-reporting citations and direct quotations. The data show an overall pattern of increase in the numbers of sources and citations Janet used in her writing over the year albeit with some fluctuation, as S3 displays slightly higher source and citation density than S4. In terms of the proportions of integral/non-integral and reporting/non-reporting citations, the pattern is less clear: while none of the citations Janet used at the start of the academic year (S1) were reporting and only one was integral, her module assignments (S2, S3) show high percentages of both integral (42.5% in S2 and 50% in S3) and reporting (27.5% in S2 and 50% in S3) citations; however, in her final piece of writing at university (S4) she reverts to her earlier tendency to rely on non-integral and non-reporting citations. In contrast, there is a clear trend in Janet's writing throughout the year towards using fewer direct quotations, from almost two-thirds (63.3%) of her citations in S1 containing a direct quotation to less than a fifth (19.5%) of such citations in S4.

Feature of citing / Writing sample	S1	S2	S3	S4

Length (in words), excluding the reference list	2,099	2,844	2,225	3,943
Number of sources	4	15	17	24
Sources per 1000 words	1.9	5.3	7.6	6.01
Number of citations	11	40	48	82
Citation density per 100 words	0.52	1.41	2.16	2.08
Integral citations (% of all citations)	1 (9%)	17 (42.5%)	24 (50%)	13 (16%)
Non-integral citations (% of all citations)	10 (91%)	23 (57.5%)	24 (50%)	69 (84%)
Reporting citations (% of all citations)	0 (0%)	11 (27.5%)	24 (50%)	20 (24%)
Non-reporting citations (% of all citations)	11 (100%)	29 (72.5%)	24 (50%)	62 (75.6%)
Direct quotations (% of all citations containing a quotation)	7 (63.6%)	20 (50%)	22 (45.8%)	16 (19.5%)
Types of direct quotations	3 fragments 3 complete sentences (3 unincorporated) 1 table	13 fragments 7 complete sentences (6 incorporated, 1 unincorporated)	15 fragments 7 complete sentences (6 incorporated, 1 unincorporated)	14 fragments 2 complete sentences (2 incorporated)

Table X.2   Features of citing in the selected samples of Janet's writing

To gain a better understanding of Janet's citing trajectory, we now turn to the qualitative data.

Citing practices in context

Citing during the presessional course

As Janet explained in our first interview at the end of the presessional course, she had

received no instruction in and had only limited experience of source-based writing in her L1,

and none in English before coming to the UK to study. Her response to our question about what she learnt in the presessional course that she did not know before was therefore unsurprising: 'The bibliography. I didn't do it before'. And although, as shown in Table 2, she used only four sources and 11 citations (0.52 per 100 words) in S1, by the end of P1 she had understood the basic rationale for citing, as shown by her comment on the need to cite scholarly literature to support her observations based on her work experience:

> I know it [from] before, but I cannot just write it down; I should find some evidence to support. (…) I cannot talk my own experience because I'm not a professional here [in academia], so I should use the experience from the book, because they are professionals. (Janet, interview 1)

Her awareness of the value of including the views of 'professionals' in her writing is evident in S1, as shown in Example 1, where she included the cited author's university affiliation and title in order to, as she explains, indicate the credibility of his views:

An excerpt from S1	Janet's comment (interview 1)
According to Albert Mehrabian, Professor of Psychology, UCLA, there are basically three elements…	Because how can you prove this is correct? So the professor in psychology area, people will believe it (…) . So it's more convinc[ing].

Example X.1   An excerpt from S1 and Janet's accompanying comment

Her explanation that a claim is 'more convincing' if supported by a citation also shows her understanding that citing is a persuasion device.

Janet also learnt about plagiarism and was surprised by the emphasis placed on it in the course: 'in UK teachers are more concentrate on plagiarism and they use everything to avoid

[it]'. However, she was not concerned about committing inadvertent plagiarism, confident that the presessional course had prepared her to cite appropriately in her future assignments: 'If I forgot, I can check the previous essay, how to do that'.

Despite the above illustration of how Janet is beginning to perceive some key citation functions, analysis of her presessional essay shows that there are various aspects of citation she has not yet fully mastered. For instance, her inclusion of a reference to a search engine ('according to google.com') reveals a lack of awareness of what constitutes acceptable academic sources, while her citation patterns, as shown in Table 2, show limited variation: all but one citation are non-integral, no reporting verbs are used, and most citations (63.6%) include a direct quotation. She also tended to use unincorporated direct quotations, i.e., complete sentences taken from sources are inserted into her text as stand-alone textual elements, as in Example 2, showing no attempt at textually and/or conceptually integrating them into her own text:

An excerpt from S1	Janet's comment (interview 1)
Good communication skills: the substance of CSRs' work is the process of a conversation, communicative skills certainly are the crucial criteria in CSR's recruitment. 'While some levels of product and systems knowledge are prerequisites for the job, personality and communication skills are seen by management as the crucial differentiating qualities' (Deery & Kinnie, 2004:133)	…if you quote a lot of information the reader cannot catch the main point. So I just quote the most important part.

Example X.2   An excerpt from S1 and Janet's comment

Janet's comment in Example 2 on the drawbacks of quoting directly seems to be in contrast with her actual citing here; however, the fact that she did not use block quotations or

quotations consisting of more than one sentence suggests that she interpreted the tutor's guidance on using direct quotation sparingly as a warning against overly long quotations rather than against quoting too frequently.

In terms of citing conventions, she had learnt the basics, such as how to signal direct quotations, as shown in Example 3:

An excerpt from S1	Janet's comment (interview 1)
HR department may not know every aspect of all positions, as a result, 'written material, job holders' reports, colleagues' reports and direct observation' (Arnold &Randall et al. 2010:144) become the most frequently used sources for them to understand the requirement of different positions.	the half-sentence is the same as the book, so I have to cite it

Example X.3   An excerpt from S1 and Janet's accompanying comment

However, Example 3 also shows that she had not mastered referencing joint authors' work or the use of scholarly abbreviations such as 'et al'. Nor had she learnt how to signal cited-in sources, although she acknowledged her use of secondary materials:

Actually, the first [citation] is the book cited from another book. So I write the first book here, but I didn't read it. I just read another book, and that book cited it.

Her reference list also showed inaccuracies and omissions (e.g., including a work that was not cited in the paper, wrong order of bibliographic information in reference list entries). The tutor corrected some of these errors, using arrows and symbols to indicate missing or wrongly placed elements in reference list entries, and commented on the direct quotation fragment in Example 3 above ('How does this quotation relate to the rest of the sentence?'), also

providing a suggested rewrite (starting a new sentence with 'As a result'), which Janet duly incorporated into her final draft. The final feedback listed Janet's in-text referencing ('good') and reference list ('well-formatted and accurate') among the strengths of her essay, reinforcing Janet's confidence, shown above, that her citing was effective.

Citing in assignments for the taught part of the program

During P2, Janet reported being 'under huge pressure' to read and write for the six modules she was taking in her program, which required a total of eleven source-based assignments. The samples from P2 selected for analysis, S2 and S3, achieving Janet's lowest and top marks, were both written for compulsory modules. As shown in Table 2, in comparison to S1, both essays feature a larger number of sources and higher citation density. The difference however is not only quantitative. Examples 4a-c illustrate the difference well: while in P1 Janet cited 'a professor of psychology' at a famous university, her growing disciplinary knowledge enabled her to make discipline-specific (4a) and topic related (4b) evaluations of the importance of selected authors' work, or select a suitable definition from several definitions of a term (4c):

Excerpts from Janet's assignments	Janet's comments (interviews 2 and 3)
4a: It is not '*automatically accepted by individuals'* but it has to be '*earned and legitimated in order for system to domination to exist*'. (Weber 1964, in Linstead, 2009) (S2)	Weber, it's a very famous scholar so I think his opinion is very credible here.
4b: Stories have a particular meaning and purpose which is 'self-deconstructing, flowing, emerging and networking, not at all static'. (Boje, 2001:1) (S3)	Boje is one [of the main] professionals or masters of this area. Everyone cited from him.
4c: Secondly, Jackson and Carter (2007) define that 'power is the ability to get someone to do something they do not particularly want to do '. (S2)	Not all of [the authors] have a very good definition but I think this definition is very simple and clear so I use this one.

Examples X.4a, X.4b and X.4c   Excerpts from S2 and S3 and Janet's comments on

reasons for source selection

In P2 Janet also developed an awareness of a range of functions citations can perform beyond

citing to support one's claim, which in P1 was the only purpose of citations she had

recognized. In both S2 and S3 she cited for multiple purposes, such as to define a concept

(5a), to identify the originators of terms/concepts (5b), to present a viewpoint (5c) and to

express disagreement (5d), as shown in these examples, respectively:

Excerpts from assignments	Janet's comment	Citation function
5a: Gabriel (2000) made a definition that 'stories are narratives with plots and characters', it is a 'delicate weaving product that generate the experience and emotions of the storyteller'. (S3)	First of all we should know what is it about the conception… I think at the beginning of every [section] I should have a clear definition about the idea.	To define a concept
5b: In Knights and Willmott, it mentions a concept of psychological contract in aspects of organizational culture. (S2)	It's a professional term I think, so I should mention who mentioned this concept.	To identify the originators of terms/concepts
5c: Nevertheless, according to Linstead.S at el, power does not only exit in elite group, people of lower ranks could also have it. (S2)	It's his opinion and I think it's useful for my coursework.	To present a viewpoint
5d: Knights and Willmott argue that a strong culture may cause employee "lack of creativity, inflexibility, and groupthink", and	both [sources] mention about strong cultures disadvantages but I don't think so (…) they didn't give a definition of strong culture,	To express disagreement

even harm performance. On the contrary, <u>Linstead's point</u> about "strong culture" is more positive, who claims that [citation follows]. However, all of them do not mention what is "strong culture", and in what extent that a culture can be "strong". (S3)	what is strong culture.	

Examples X.5a-d   Citation functions in Janet's assignment writing

Further, she started to synthesize material from different sources to construct a coherent thread in her paper, as shown in the following extract, where she first explained the importance of her chosen topic by citing one source (Denning), then illustrated and supported this author's view with findings from another source (Prusak):

Textual extract	Interview excerpt
Denning(2005) point out that "storytelling already plays a huge role…", people just need to glance at the business section in newspaper or listen to on lecture in business school, who will realize the massive impact of stories upon the Global economy. Prusak(in Brown.J et al. 2005) makes an example to prove the impact: 28% of gross national product … (S3)	Janet: It's related to the practice, the real world, so I begin with Denning, it's… it's what is the significance [of storytelling]. It plays a huge role. Interviewer: He talks about the significance and you want to show the significance of storytelling? Janet: Yes, and then Prusak gives an example, use the number to prove why it's important

Example X.6 Source synthesis in Janet's writing

The growing diversification of Janet's citation practices is also evident at the formal level: as shown in Table 2, she started using integral and reporting citations in P2. Using integral citations, where the cited author's name is part of the citing sentence, she employed a range

of syntactic structures: with citation as the subject of the citing clause ('Denning (2005) mentioned the strategies…'), as part of the subject noun phrase ('Linstead's point about…'), as part of the object noun phrase ('… which proves some of Kanter (1977)'s four key empowering strategies') and as part of the adjunct ('As Schein (2004) argues…'). Her 35 reporting citations featured a total of 14 different reporting verbs, the most frequent being *argue* (6 instances), *point out* (5), *mention* (3), *cite* (3) and *claim* (3), in line with some of the most common reporting verbs in social sciences (Hyland, 1999). However, there were also instances of collocation errors ('bring up a conception') and awkward reporting structures ('Jackson and Carter (2007) define that').

She used fewer direct quotations, and when she did, they tended to be citation fragments, which require a higher level of rhetorical and linguistic skill to be incorporated into one's sentence (see Petrić, 2012), rather than unincorporated clauses:

> Film is fictitious and unreal; however it reveals the **'**embodied, personal and emotional nature**'** of organizational life. (Bell, E. 2008) (S2)

Example X.7   Janet's use of a direct quotation fragment

This example also shows that Janet's citation practices were in flux in P2: she did not consistently provide page numbers when quoting directly; and, as shown in 4a above, she sometimes used italics in addition to the quotation marks to signal the quoted material.

Another new citing pattern was the signaling of secondary sources; however, this practice was also inconsistent, as seen from the following examples from S2 and S3. Janet's comment on this lack of consistency suggests that while she realized the importance of signalling secondary citations, she was not overly concerned about the consistency of her citing.

Secondary sources	Janet's comment (interview 3)
(Prusak.L, in Brown.J et al. 2005) - Collins (2005) cited from Boje (Collins,D 2005 cited from Gabriel) - Gabriel cited from Bettelheim (1976) (Weber 1964, in Linstead, 2009) - Kanter (1977)'s four key empowering strategies (in Linstead ,S. 2007:289) (Simon, 1958, in Knights & Willmott)	I don't know which way is the best. I just want that it is secondary.

Example X.8   Janet's use of secondary sources in S2 and S3

Indeed, her citing was still marred by numerous inconsistencies and errors such as using authors' initials (as in Example 7), or missing the publication date in the reference list. In contrast to P1, Janet was by this time aware of these shortcomings, but believed she was improving: 'Actually my bibliography is not perfect. It always has mistakes, but now I think that it's better'. This awareness of the weaknesses in her citing likely resulted from the markers' comments on S2 and S3, such as 'please reference carefully' next to one of the citations from Example 8 (S2), 'page?' next to a direct quotation where Janet failed to provide page numbers (S3) as well as guidance such as 'you need to work on referencing' (S2) and 'titles of books and journals need to be in <u>T</u>itle <u>C</u>ase' next to the reference list in S2. However, overall, the markers assessed Janet's referencing as 'good' (S2) and 'adequate' (S3) on the marking sheet, giving marks of 4 and 3 out of 5 respectively; both S2 and S3 markers also ticked the assessment box for 'good use of additional sources and required reading' (4 out of 5).

Citing in the master's dissertation

Janet's citation practices in her dissertation literature review chapter (S4), the final piece of writing in her master's program, were similar to her assignment citing practices in terms of normalized source and citation frequency, as shown in Table 2. There was a continued trend from P2 towards using fewer direct quotations, the majority of which were now quotation fragments rather than complete sentences, allowing her greater control over the cited material. However, in contrast to the diversification of citing patterns in P2, Janet's citing in P3 was characterized by a narrower range of citing patterns, with a considerable drop in both integral and reporting citations, making non-integral (84%) and non-reporting (75.6%) citations the main citation type in S4.

We identified only two new citing patterns in Janet's writing in P3 that were not present earlier: citing from multiple sources (Example 9a) and using abbreviations such as 'ibid', 'cf' and 'see' with non-integral citations (Example 9b). Citing multiple sources, also referred to as generalization from multiple sources (Hyland, 1999), is a relatively common citation practice in S4 with 27 instances, i.e., 32.9% of her citations, referring to multiple sources. Her preference for this citing pattern may explain the prevalence of non-integral citations. As seen from Janet's comments, she learnt about this citing practice from reading journal articles. Apart from wishing to adopt this 'more academic' practice, as she described it, her rationale for using generalizations from multiple sources was to indicate what she believed was the most important point in the literature and to provide a fuller account of the material, but also to show that she had read extensively (see Harwood & Petrić, 2012, on students' use of citations to indicate the extent of their reading). The use of abbreviations with non-reporting citations was a less common new practice, with S4 containing 10 instances of 'ibid' and two of 'cf' and 'see' each.

Excerpts from S4	Janet's comments
9a. Training need analysis typically involves three levels: *organizational*, *occupational* and *individual* (Landy and Conte, 2010; Gold, et al, 2010; Arnold et al, 2010; Buckley and Caple).	[if you] use the opinion from different people the idea will be more complete I think quote from others a lot looks like more academic because other journals do and because I read a lot so that's why I have those opinions what I write is not from only one book and after I read three of them, I pick up the most important thing, what I think is the most important thing here
9b. Though, some factors should be considered when designing the training process (cf. Gold, et al, 2010; Evenson, 2005; Buckley & Caple, 2008): (…)	a lot of opinion is from my own experience and I read something so I just compare to it. Not all from that, partly from that, mixed with my own experience.

Examples X.9a-b   New citing patterns in S4

In the 20 reporting citations in S4, a total of 12 different reporting verbs are used, with the most frequent being *state* (3 instances), *suggest* (2), and *claim* (2); however, some of the reporting citations contain collocation errors (e.g. 'gives a high phrasal') or errors in the use of the reporting verbs (as in 'The *trainees' intellectual/cognitive ability*, claimed by Clark and Voogel (1985), is "one of the most common and supportable" factor that…')

In terms of accuracy, Janet's citing was still not error free in P3: missing page numbers, publication years, errors in citing joint authors (e.g. 'Arnold and Randall et al, 2010') were still evident. Unlike in P2, when she benefited from her markers' comments alerting her to problems in her citing, Janet did not benefit from detailed feedback on her citing and source use from her supervisor in P3, who mainly provided generic guidance by email (for a detailed

discussion of the supervision Janet received, see Harwood & Petrić, 2017). Janet's dissertation was awarded 64%, with the markers' report assessing her referencing as 'good' (4 out of 5).

Discussion

This study traced the changes in Janet's citing over the course of the year she spent at a UK university, starting from a presessional academic English course, through completion of modules in a business studies department, finishing with the completion of a master's dissertation. We identified considerable changes in different aspects of Janet's citing practices across the three periods, with new citation patterns emerging in each period.

Janet's citing during the presessional course is best described as emergent: she understood the basic rationale and purpose of citing but struggled to cite effectively and accurately. Her procedural knowledge of how to cite lagged behind her declarative knowledge of citing and its role in academic writing. Although it could reasonably be argued that the preparatory course could not have covered citing in depth, it is interesting that even some areas that were covered in the course, such as reporting verbs, did not result in immediate uptake, as Janet's essay did not feature a single reporting verb. Yet Janet was largely unaware of these shortcomings, pleased with her progress and her tutor's positive feedback, and confident that she had mastered citing and that she was adequately prepared for writing assignments in her department.

In P2 Janet's citing practices developed further. Her growing knowledge of her field of study enabled her to make decisions on what authors to cite; she also became aware of and able to

use citations for multiple rhetorical purposes, such as to support her claims and define concepts. Her writing displayed more sophisticated citing patterns, but was also marked by the emergence of new citing challenges (e.g., citing secondary sources) and inconsistency in applying citing conventions, which seemed a less important aspect of source use to Janet, although her lecturers indicated areas needing improvement in their comments on her citing when marking her assignments. In contrast to the multiple changes in her citing in P2, Janet's citation practices displayed fewer new patterns and a narrower range of citing structures in P3, to some extent reverting to an earlier stage. However, one of the two new citing patterns she adopted, generalizing from multiple sources, enabled her to show the extent of her reading and the knowledge of her dissertation topic she had acquired. Her citing practices at this stage can be characterized as functional, although not completely error free.

Although the writing samples we analyzed are exemplars of different genres, requiring different approaches to citing (e.g., a literature review dissertation chapter is expected to display higher citation density than an essay), our findings nevertheless provide an insight into the student's citing trajectory as she learnt to navigate increasingly complex writing tasks in a manner that satisfied the assessment criteria at each stage, as evidenced by her marks. However, Janet's citing did not develop evenly: as we have seen, in P3 she simultaneously adopted new, more complex citing practices, such as generalizing from multiple sources, while simultaneously reverting to an earlier stage of citing in other aspects, as evidenced by a slight decrease in source and citation frequency and in diversity of citing patterns. This fluctuation shows that citing development is not a linear process, and it cannot be assumed that, once mastered, citing practices will necessarily be transferred to new writing tasks without further support.

Practical implications

Overall, Janet's case confirms previous studies' findings (e.g., Wette, 2010) that citing skills develop slowly and gradually. The reason for this, as our wide-angle approach to analysis of citing has revealed, is the complex nature of citing, the mastery of which requires effective coordination of multiple domains: the conceptual domain (e.g., awareness of the different rhetorical functions of citations), the discursive domain (e.g., syntactic proficiency such as the ability to incorporate citation fragments into one's sentences effectively, lexical sophistication such as the knowledge of meanings of reporting verbs, and discipline-specific citation patterns such as the disciplinary preferences for particular reporting verbs), and the domain of technical accuracy in applying citation styles. Conceptualizing citing as an advanced literate capability therefore has the advantage of necessitating a holistic approach to both studying citing behavior and to the teaching of citing instead of limiting research or pedagogical intervention to one domain only. More specifically, we argue that methods for studying citation holistically should combine analysis of students' texts, discourse-based interviews with student writers, and analysis of relevant documentation such as their markers' comments and guidance on citation, while pedagogical approaches to teaching citation should target both students' discursive practices and their awareness of citing (for examples of awareness raising activities regarding citation functions, see Harwood, 2010).

In terms of the kinds of instruction and guidance on source use and citation Janet was exposed to, we noted she received explicit instruction about citing and individual feedback on her draft in P1 and markers' feedback on her assignments in P2. However, not all aspects of this input resulted in immediate uptake, as in the case of reporting verbs in P1, which Janet only started using in P2, and in the case of her continued lack of accuracy in applying citing conventions despite her markers' comments on the weaknesses in this area of her citing

throughout the course of the program. Interestingly, as we have noted, Janet also used other sources of learning about citing, such as noticing the citing patterns in the readings for her assignments.

Issues for further research

An interesting direction for future research would be to compare the kinds of citing support available to students with those they actually avail themselves of when completing coursework and dissertations, including both formal instruction and informal sources of learning, such as peer networks. Such longitudinal studies of citing, as our study has shown, have the potential to reveal students' changing pedagogical needs as they encounter new writing challenges.

References

Beaufort, A. (2004). Developmental gains of a history major: A case for building a theory of disciplinary writing expertise. *Research in the Teaching of English, 39*, 136-185.

Cumming, A., Lai, C., & Cho, H. (2016). Students' writing from sources for academic purposes: A synthesis of recent research. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 23,* 47-58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2016.06.002

Davis, M. (2013). The development of source use by international postgraduate students. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 12*, 125-135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2012.11.008

Harwood, N. (2009). An interview-based study of the functions of citations in academic writing across two disciplines. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *41*, 497-518.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.06.001

Harwood, N. (2010). Research-based materials to demystify academic citation for postgraduates. In: Harwood N (Ed.), *English language teaching materials: Theory and practice* (pp. 301-321). Cambridge University Press.

Harwood, N., & Petrić, B. (2012). Performance in the citing behaviour of two student writers. *Written Communication, 29,* 55-103. *https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088311424133*

Harwood, N., & Petrić, B. (2017). *Experiencing Master's supervision: Perspectives of international students and their supervisors.* Routledge.

Hirvela, A., & Du, Q. (2013). "Why am I paraphrasing?": Undergraduate ESL writers' engagement with source-based academic writing and reading. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 12*, 87-98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2012.11.005

Kibler, A.K., & Hardigree, C. (2017). Using evidence in L2 argumentative writing: A longitudinal case study across high school and university. *Language Learning,* 67, 75-109. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12198

Leki, I. (2007). *Undergraduates in a second language: Challenges and complexities of academic literacy development*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Liu, G-Z., Lin, V., Kou, X., Wang, H-Y. (2016). Best practices in L2 English source use pedagogy: A thematic review and synthesis of empirical research. *Educational Research Review, 19,* 36-57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2016.06.002

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Odell, L. et al (1983). The discourse-based interview: a procedure for exploring the tacit knowledge of writers in nonacademic settings. In P. Mosenthal et al (Eds.), *Research on writing: Principles and methods* (pp.221-23). Longman.

Ortega, L., & Byrnes, H. (2008). *The longitudinal study of advanced L2 capacities.* Routledge.

Pecorari, D., & Petrić, B. (2014). Plagiarism in second-language writing. *Language Teaching, 47*, 269-302. *https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000056*

Petrić, B., & Harwood, N. (2013). Task requirements, task representation, and self-reported citation functions: An exploratory study of a successful L2 student's writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 12,* 110-124. *https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2013.01.002*

Petrić, B. (2012). Legitimate textual borrowing: Direct quotation in L2 students' writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*, 102-117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.005

Prior, P. (1998). *Writing/Disciplinarity: A sociohistoric account of literate activity in the academy*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Spack, R. (1997). The acquisition of academic literacy in a second language: a longitudinal case study. *Written Communication, 14*, 3-62.

Sun, Q., Kuzborska, I., & Soden, B., (2022). Learning to construct authorial voice through citations: A longitudinal case study of L2 postgraduate novice writers. *System, 106*, 102765. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102765

Thompson, C., Morton, J., Storch, N. (2013). Where from, who, why and how? A study of the use of sources by first year L2 university students. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 12*, 99-109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2012.11.004

Thompson, P. (2005). Points of focus and position: Intertextual reference in PhD theses. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 4*, 307-323. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2005.07.006

Wette, R. (2010). Evaluating student learning in a university-level EAP unit on writing using sources. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 19*, 158–177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2010.06.002

Wette, R. (2018). Source-based writing in a health sciences essay: Year 1 students' perceptions, abilities and strategies. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 36,* 61-75.

White, H. D. (2004). Citation analysis and discourse analysis revisited. *Applied Linguistics, 25*, 89-116. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.09.006

Notes

---

[i] Janet responded to our call for participants distributed to students attending the presessional course. Her informed written consent was obtained prior to data collection.

[ii] The marking system for postgraduate taught programs in the UK is as follows: fail (0-49%), pass (50-59%), merit (60-69%) and distinction (over 70%).

[iii] While we do not have permission to use the supervisor's feedback, we make use of the information provided to us by Janet, without reproducing the supervisor's actual words.

[iv] Other codes included the following: Student profile, Preparation (preparing to study in the UK), Adjustments (comparison and evaluation of previous education and the UK, e.g., differences in writing requirements, assessment, plagiarism), Lecturer expectations (student expectations of the lecturers, e.g., amount of help expected), Lecturer requirements (beliefs about what lecturers/markers prefer, e.g., in terms of paragraphing), Feedback and marks (student's expectations and reactions), Actions (further divided into actions taken in response

to lecturers' feedback and those taken independently when encountering difficulties), Time

management, Emotion, MA program (further divided into sub-codes such as Expectations

and Evaluation) and Advice to future students. For the complete codebook, see Harwood &

Petrić (2017).