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Using a case study approach, this research investigated the intersection between citation use and identity construction by examining, as examples of advanced academic literacy practices, referencing in the Discussion sections of 5 completed Masters’ theses. To understand how the authors of the theses constructed their identities as educators and researchers, I analysed semi-structured interviews, identity questionnaires, and the Discussion sections of their Masters’ theses. I interpreted the data using Ivanič’s (1998) framework for the discoursal construction of identity to examine how citation choices contributed to identity formation in graduate students’ thesis writing. Analyses revealed connections between citation practices and identity construction. Participants’ responses were most frequent for the citation functions of support and alignment. These findings promote an understanding of the processes involved in using others’ words and ideas to legitimize knowledge. Consequently, I call for the demystification of academic integrity and pedagogies that recognize the complexities of citation practices.
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Chapter One

Introduction

*Education may well be, as of right, the instrument whereby every individual, in a society like our own, can gain access to any kind of discourse. But we well know that in its distribution, in what it permits and in what it prevents, it follows the well-trodden battle-lines of social conflict. Every educational system is a political means of maintaining or of modifying the appropriation of discourse, with the knowledge and the powers it carries with it.*

*Foucault (1971, p.227)*

*When people enter what is for them a new social context such as higher education, they are likely to find that its discourses and practices support identities and practices which differ from those that they bring with them.*

*Ivanič (1998, p.33)*

This study examines the use of citations, also called scholarly referencing — a key rhetorical function in advanced academic literacy practices — as both the co-construction of knowledge and the negotiation of identity. Using a case study approach, the research fills an existing gap in the published discourse on citation use in advanced academic literacy practices, in this instance, the Discussion of the Results in the Master of Arts (MA) thesis. In general, the focus of prior research and academic discussions on citation use has centred on what is considered inappropriate use of sources in academic texts, particularly plagiarism. To expand the discussion on citation practices I investigated the following questions in respect to a sample of 5 authors about their MA theses:

1. How and why did the writers use citations?
2. What does their use of citations reveal about their emerging identities as language and literacy educators and/or researchers?

The present chapter introduces the topic of the study, gives a short explanation of the research, and outlines the organisation of the thesis. My stance as a researcher is also described
Chapter 2 discusses the importance of the acquisition of academic literacies as well as some of the challenges associated with it, specifically the use of citations. In that chapter, the relevant literature, theoretical framework, and my assumptions about identity construction through citation practices are also summarised. The approach to the research and the methods used to conduct the study are described in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 profiles the participants. In Chapters 5 and 6, in response to the research questions, I present the findings from the cases of five participants, who were MA students between 2002 and 2012, who were considered writers with advanced academic literacy. The MA students, at the time of writing their Masters’ theses, were beginning experts in the field of Applied Linguistics. Chapter 7 offers a summary of the findings presented in the previous two chapters and interprets the significance of the findings as they relate to existing theories of the development of academic literacies, specifically Ivanič’s (1998) framework of identity construction and its link to Goffman’s theory of performance. I also discuss the contributions to new knowledge about the acquisition of academic literacies, offer advice to students engaged in writing Masters’ theses as well as to educators, and suggest implications for further research. I should observe here for readers of the thesis that I took exceptional steps to preserve the confidentiality of the participants and the institution they studied at, including obscuring exact references to people, policy documents, names, and locations and specific references to the institution.

**Overview of the Topic**

A rooted perception in academia is that discourse appropriation, indicated by citation use specifically (Abasi, Akbari & Graves, 2006; D. Duff, 2010; Shi 2010), is a central issue in scholarly and professional writing and that the concept of inappropriate “textual borrowing” (Shi,
2012) is a serious concern in higher education. These perceptions flank a lack of consensus among faculty in various disciplines and regions of the world on what exactly constitutes good and acceptable citation practices in student writing. Further, for student writers, knowing about the acceptable use of sources remains shrouded in the specialized discourse constraints of academic writing as a genre. Existing research on student writing with English as the first language (L1) and second language (L2) in relation to referencing has had a tendency to focus on challenges and issues surrounding transgressive behaviours, or plagiarism (Abasi & Graves, 2008; Amsberry, 2010; Flowerdew & Li, 2007; Pecorari & Shaw, 2010; Shi, 2012). Some studies have offered perspectives on citation use as knowledge construction and knowledge sharing, performance (Petrić, 2007, 2012; Yu, 2010), and identity construction (Abasi, Akbari, & Graves, 2006; Michaud, 2013). However, such studies have typically addressed problems encountered by inexperienced undergraduate student writers, L2 English writers only, L1 English writers only, or combinations of these populations. Few studies have looked into writing and citation practices by accomplished student writers who write in English either as their L1 or L2 from diverse backgrounds. This gap forms the starting point for my investigation in the present thesis research. I argue that trying to understand how advanced writers use citations, and thereby implicitly conceptualize the construction of their identities as experts in advanced academic literacy practices in a particular field of study, can inform and enhance instruction as well as the professional development of graduate students and open new pathways for further research and educational policies.

In general, there are three types of text which represent advanced academic literary practices: Doctoral dissertations, Masters’ theses, and published works written by academics (Basturkmen, 2009; Thompson, 2005). Though the use of the words “thesis” (not to be confused with a thesis
statement) and “dissertation” vary internationally, both refer to a lengthy manuscript submitted by candidates for Doctoral or Master’s degrees, usually for an academic qualification. While some publications offer perspectives on the differences in requirements and expectations between the types of texts and assignments in university courses (Shi, 2012), others discuss how student writers, seeking to become accepted as peers by senior academics and professors into a knowledge community (Basturkmen, 2009), make the shift, through their writing practices, to being accepted as contemporaries. For graduate student writers and for other members of the academic community, the thesis represents a major institutional and career milestone. It is in this genre that students develop, display, and are authorized by the university accepting the thesis to have accomplished the knowledge that gives them acceptance into the academic community, thereby making the transition from a student identity to a professional identity.

**Researcher Stance**

My interest in this topic of study, discourse appropriation and identity construction, began with a reflection on Foucault’s (1971) idea that while the pursuit of education is agentive in increasing what Bourdieu (1989, 1991) referred to as symbolic capital, it can also produce and result from both internal and external conflicts. Although I find this idea easy enough to accept, I am struck by Foucault’s concept that “Every educational system is a political means of maintaining or of modifying the appropriation of discourse, with the knowledge and the powers it carries with it” (p.227). Foucault’s idea is essentially post-structuralist, focused on the notion of power relations, and pits instinct against institution. In discussing education and language, both Bourdieu and Foucault saw a political relationship between institutional structures of power and the individual pursuit of acquiring knowledge. Macro-structural politics are inevitably
embedded in educational pursuits, so on an individual level, the tangible expression of this pursuit, the expression of knowledge through writing, brings with it complex issues of identity negotiation. As someone who was an academic writing instructor for almost a decade, I observed that the acquisition of academic literacy through writing compositions as academic discourse inevitably produced anxiety for students. One of the main reasons, which many students highlighted, was the challenge of using citations, that is, to perform a key rhetorical function of academic writing. Some of my former students described academic writing and citing as negotiating a minefield with their insides exposed. I perceived this as an internal conflict, possibly inflicted by external expectations. Such descriptions of an activity fraught with decision-making about when, what, and how to cite led me to question not only the way in which students are instructed about citation practices, but also the possibility of other issues, beyond apprehensions about plagiarism, underlying the anxiety that accompanies writing and citing.

Apart from the fear of transgressive citation behaviour, it seems that students associate high-stakes writing and the requirement of performing knowledge by integrating established expert knowledge as a primary mechanism by which they gain legitimacy and authority. As I reflected on Foucault’s words, the notion of identity construction as a dynamic process seemed embedded in “maintaining or…modifying the appropriation of discourse” (1971, p.222), and so I thought it important to investigate this relationship in the context of advanced academic literacy practices from a social constructionist perspective. My own journey as a graduate student, in the process of writing an MA thesis, has provided the unique opportunity to interact with other graduate students about their views on their citing behaviours and examine their identity construction through writing and citing. This thesis is a way of sharing knowledge with other beginning and accomplished expert writers alike.
Purpose of the Study

The process of writing the MA thesis allows students to gain, demonstrate, and share valued scholarly knowledge in written academic discourse through the use of citations. Essentially, it is through the appropriation of others’ words and ideas that students show how they differentiate between existing, new, and worthy knowledge at the dual levels of personal viewpoint and formal written discourse. As Pavlenko (2004) has argued, the complex relationship between linguistic practices and identity has been under-theorised. The purpose of my study is two-fold:

1. To examine citation practices as knowledge construction and performance by student writers in English-medium tertiary level institutions;
2. To investigate how the use of citations can be understood as identity construction for language and literacy educators and researchers.

I base my examination on the following assumptions:

- The use of citations is necessary and inevitable in legitimizing one’s voice in a new discourse community.
- The use of citations is one of the fundamental means available for making valued knowledge visible.
- In academic writing, writers often create an impression and try to project an expert identity through the citation choices that they make in order to align themselves with, or position themselves against ideas within specific knowledge communities.

In terms of potential significance, the findings of my study are expected to inform, stimulate, and expand discussions about citation practices in academia. Additionally, given
current interests in research integrity and surrounding controversies, language educators nationally, regionally, and internationally will be interested in new insights into the discoursal construction of identity in advanced academic literacy practices. This analysis should also be of interest to students, allowing them to expand their views of a previously narrowly or poorly defined concept.
Chapter Two

Developing Advanced Academic Literacy

In this chapter, I review the importance of the acquisition of advanced academic literacy and related issues in publications relevant to the topic of discourse appropriation. Also, I describe the theoretical positions adopted in the research to help justify the research questions that this thesis has addressed.

Academic Literacy

Academic literacy is a term commonly used for writing in institutions of higher education. Beyond simply composing written texts, academic literacy involves understanding and performing appropriately in conformity with institutional culture and disciplinary requirements, showing critical thinking and engagement, knowledge of citation styles, academic values, specific terms and genres, and awareness of ethical concerns within academia. In short, academic literacy and its acquisition require the display of a specific set of competencies. Extant research has defined the parameters of acquiring academic literacy by producing studies that have demonstrated its importance for students of diverse backgrounds and have underscored the need for more assistance for students from different cultures and educational backgrounds (Angelova & Riazantseva, 1999; Snow & Uccelli, 2009; Spack, 1997). However, these competencies are not acquired or developed in isolation. They require and arise from processes of thinking about, with, around, and against other thinkers in academic culture (Bartholomae, 2004; Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates, 2002). For this reason, many professors and scholars view
the use of citations as a mainstay of academic literacy (Hyland, 1999). The general reasons given (e.g., as stated here by MIT Guidelines, 2014) to university students for referencing include:

- showing your reader that you have done extensive and relevant research by listing sources you used to get your information;
- being a responsible scholar by giving credit to other researchers and acknowledging their ideas;
- avoiding plagiarism by quoting words and ideas used by other authors;
- allowing your reader to track down the sources you used by citing them accurately in your paper by way of footnotes, a bibliography or reference list, based on the citation style required or recommended by your disciplinary field of study.

The *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA, 2010, p. 169) described referencing as “crediting sources” and “acknowledging how others contributed to your work” and emphasized that writers should always cite the ideas, theories, and research that have influenced their work:

Cite the work of those individuals whose ideas, theories, or research have directly influenced your work. They may provide key background information, support or dispute your thesis, or offer critical definitions and data. Citation of an article implies that you have personally read the cited work.

Chapter 6 of the APA manual and its sub-sections described plagiarism and self-plagiarism and prescribed with ample, explicit examples, the exact formats to use in citing various kinds of
publications and how to produce parenthetical referencing correctly. These guidelines are conventionally used in the field of Applied Linguistics, which is the focus of my research.

The published discourse on the development of academic literacy shows a preoccupation with the development of basic writing for both L1 and L2 English writers upon entering an academic field of study, assuming these practices form a basis for the use of citations during students’ entire academic studies. As such, there is a noticeable focus on citation practices. For example, Lillis, Hewings, Vladimirov, and Curry (2010) evaluated the problem of the global status of English and how variations in citation practices follow geopolitical lines and influence knowledge production. Referring to a “tension between the politics of ‘knowledge building and knowledge measuring’” (p.111), they stated the importance of bringing to the forefront of academic discussions the tension about English as an academic lingua franca and in Anglophone-centred institutional gatekeeping practices.

**Defining Discourse Appropriation**

Defining the terms associated with citation practices can be problematic because definitions of discourse appropriation that exist in policy and research articles are often misaligned. Sometimes called textual appropriation or textual borrowing, discourse appropriation can be considered the incorporation and re-contextualization of others’ texts and others’ words and ideas into one’s own writing (Shi, 2004). Several studies have investigated issues around source integration in academic writing (Howard, Serviss & Rodríguez, 2010; Weigle & Parker, 2012). These vary in terms of their sub-thematic foci, methods of analysis, data collection, populations, and findings. Existing research has studied problems such as plagiarism, over-citing, and weak paraphrasing for both English L1 and L2 student writers (Abasi, Akbari & Graves,
2006; Borg, 2000; Ho, 2010; Pecorari, 2003; Shi, 2004). While some studies investigated issues surrounding the citation behaviours of undergraduate student writers (Amsberry, 2010; Li & Casanave, 2012; Shi, 2010), relatively few studies have examined the citation practices of successful students engaged in advanced academic writing (Abasi & Graves, 2008; Basturkmen, 2009; Petrič, 2007; Petrič & Harwood, 2013; Thompson, 2005). For the most part, studies revealed confusion over the identification of a plagiarized text. Some even discussed the different beliefs and perceptions by students as well as instructors (Chandrasegrnan, 2000; Pennycook, 1994; Thompson 2002) about what exactly constitutes transgressive textual borrowing, what leads to producing institutionally unacceptable texts, and the lack of clear guidelines for plagiarism thresholds.

Within the fields of Applied Linguistics (AL) and English for Academic Purposes (EAP) research has investigated topics such as (a) cross-cultural issues exploring cultural, educational and linguistic factors that may influence the citation practices and behaviours of international students (Amsberry, 2010; Shi, 2004); (b) writers’ performance and students’ and teachers’ perceptions (Borg, 2007; Li & Casanave, 2012; Liao & Tseng, 2010; Pecorari & Shaw, 2012; Petrič, 2012; Shi, 2012); (c) originality and intertextuality (Hu, 2001); and (d) identity-related issues (Abasi, Akbari & Graves, 2006). Overall, studies have focused on the main reasons for transgressive and non-transgressive borrowing from multiple perspectives and include calls for policy changes and pedagogical shifts and reorientations. In the following subsections, I review some important studies on discourse appropriation.

Textual borrowing can be perceived as transgressive or non-transgressive (Abasi, & Akbari, 2008; Chandrasoma, Thompson, & Pennycook, 2004). Arguably, for students, there is not much clarity about the main and specific issues associated with transgressive and non-transgressive
borrowing which are required to preserve academic integrity. This problem may be due to unclear expectations about disciplinary conventions and discourse constraints surrounding specific genres or simply unclear instruction. Transgressive textual appropriation is commonly considered plagiarism. Among teachers, instructors, lecturers and others who participate in the evaluation of writing in different disciplines there are divergent views on what plagiarized material entails (Flowerdew & Li, 2007; Pecorari, 2008; Shi, 2004). Problems arise when the lines between transgressive and non-transgressive borrowing become blurred. Copying whole sections of others’ texts into writing may be obviously recognized as offensive, whereas including or patching together strings of words and phrases while preparing a text may not be. The latter can be considered as plagiarism, which is arguably based on perception.

In theory, plagiarism itself is easily defined. According to the policy statement from the institution where I conducted my research, “Plagiarism is the academic offense of representing another person’s work as one’s own.” The transgressions associated with plagiarism can range from the (mis)appropriation in the form of over-citing – which is sometimes unavoidable with inexperienced academic writers – to outright misrepresentation such as purchasing and submitting a paper as a course assignment, which is a transparent form of cheating. Plagiarism may also involve non-attribution, which is the inclusion of passages borrowed from another source without acknowledgement. In general, plagiarism involves the misappropriation of texts and ideas, including copying another’s words verbatim, an entire work, or even a small part of a source text, as well as inappropriate paraphrasing, including paraphrasing material from other texts without proper documentation. In fact, any form of textual misrepresentation is often considered a contravention of good academic conduct. Consequently, much of the research on
the topic shows that for both teachers and students there are negative perceptions of textual borrowing, which create confusion in academic policies and educational practices.

The literature on citation practices is varied in dealing with different issues within diverse student populations across different institutions and disciplines. Four main themes appeared as the main topics addressed in the studies I have reviewed: (a) cross-cultural factors, which explained different approaches and views to referencing based on lines of social and institutional cultures; (b) issues encircling performance and perception on the part of both students and teachers; (c) views of referencing as intertextuality, and (d) analyses of identity construction as intertwined with the acquisition of advanced academic literacy. These four themes serve as a bridge to, and provide a rationale for, my analysis of identity construction in academic writing.

**Cross-cultural Factors**

Cross-cultural factors have been presented as an overarching reason for transgressive borrowing in academic writing. In a review of previous studies from various disciplines, Amsberry (2010) discussed motivations for transgressive borrowing behaviours by international students and categorized these reasons as cultural, educational, and linguistic. The cultural influences arise from differing ideas about text ownership and understanding what constitutes common knowledge. Educational differences include lack of prior writing instruction and perceiving copying as a means for learning. Linguistic influences involve language hurdles with terminology, register, and genre conventions, which English Language Learners (ELLs) take time to develop and which are linked to pressures to write in new forms of discourse. Amsberry’s review of previous studies may weaken the claim that there is insufficient support
from academic libraries to help international students understand and contend with the multiple and complex factors involved in academic writing and textual borrowing.

The theme of cross-cultural differences has emerged strongly from some studies indicating that the impact of these differences revolve around the idea of lack of contestability of ideas in certain cultures (Amsberry, 2010; Hu, 2001; Pennycook, 1996). This theme has been linked to notions of identity construction, presupposing that students’ educational backgrounds (autobiographical identities) played a major role in how student writers represented themselves (Abasi, Akbari, & Graves, 2006). In many societies and academic contexts outside of North America and Europe the approach to text ownership is collectivist, and students (and others) may have difficulty accepting that anyone can “own” an idea. Li (1996) reasoned that the collectivist belief rested on the concept that information was shared and belonged in the public domain. Further, for cultures that accepted copying text material, appropriation may have been viewed as a sign of respect to such a degree that there may not even be a lexical equivalent for plagiarism in their languages (Amsberry, 2010).

Another example of the influential role of cultural and linguistic factors is given by Shi (2004) who evaluated the role of the L1 and the type of writing task in uses of words from source reading by undergraduates. Shi (2004) found that Chinese students at a Canadian university habitually did not cite references for either summary or opinion essays they wrote in English. Taking a more radical approach, Pennycook (1996) argued for attention to the complexities of textual borrowing and the need for understanding the relationship between textual ownership and plagiarism. He examined this relationship historically and culturally, drawing on examples from previous studies. However, Pennycook refuted the dichotomy of West versus East by examining the discourse appropriation techniques of Chinese students in Hong Kong in order to identify and
defend differences in how “language, texts and memorization may be understood” (p.222).
Pennycook concluded that there is a dominant, modernist influence in concepts about textual appropriation – a Westernized notion – that is ambiguous and may be misleading to L2 writers.

Performance and Perception

Other studies have shown that teachers’ perceptions, while important, were not a major issue in views of textual borrowing. In fact, most scholars and instructors appeared to agree on the basic interpretation of non-attribution and the ways in which they could be considered misappropriation in assessing L2 students’ academic writing. The problem may reside in the definition of transgressive borrowing itself and the way in which it may have been explained or communicated to students. While most institutional requirements and disciplinary norms have clearly marked plagiarism as an offense (Amsberry, 2010), there may be varying perceptions across and within disciplines about the precise examples – but not the nature – of transgressive borrowing. For example, what some disciplines accepted as “good paraphrasing” was considered patchwriting in another. Patchwriting was described as a failure at successful paraphrasing, usually manifesting as rearranging phrases and changing tenses while still relying on the vocabulary and syntax of the original source material (Abasi & Graves, 2008b; Howard, 1995).

Studies that looked at students’ writing performance revealed several barriers to transferability, specifically for L2 writers. Most of these barriers were both cultural and linguistic. Struggles and pressures experienced by ELLs with writing in a new discourse were described as mostly due to their limited fluency in English as their L2. Some scholars (e.g., Bizzell, 1982; Pennycook, 1996) who studied textual borrowing and copying words have analyzed borrowing as a developmental learning strategy, while others questioned the potency of
views of cultural conditioning (Liu, 2005). Such strategies ranged from students combining their words with words from the source text (patchwriting or the digital mash-up) to stringing phrases together from the text (the remix). Faculty have also reported that encouraging students to write in their own voices is advice that is either unheeded or impeded by the plethora of linchpin phrases found in academic writing (Pecorari & Shaw, 2012). Even when student writers may have tried to express their voices by emulating model texts, they may have inadvertently reverted to using stock phrases that litter journal publications, leading to a high frequency of copied words. Pennycook (1996) referred to the reliance on others’ words and voice “ventriloquy” (p. 210). In fact, many students – whether from different countries, institutions or disciplines – have been exposed to different pedagogical practices and can often be unfamiliar with the wide variety of specific academic writing conventions.

Liao and Tseng’s (2010) comparison of skilful and less-skillful ESL writers’ performance and perception of plagiarism makes an important contribution to understanding the issue of misappropriation from the students’ perspective. Their findings revealed that while students claimed not to have plagiarized, an analysis of their writing task showed that they did, seemingly because of underdeveloped paraphrasing skills. Moreover, undergraduates borrowed more strings of words than graduates did. The researchers concluded that practice in paraphrasing is essential in raising awareness and improving both writing proficiency and metacognition.

Similarly, Petrić (2012) looked at the skill levels of L2 writers in using direct quotations from other sources. She examined direct quotation instead of paraphrasing to substantiate the claim that more attention should be given to skills for the integration of sources as part of university students’ writing development. Using textual analysis and interviews with student writers, Petrić (2012) investigated the uses of direct quotations by L2 students in their MA theses.
Interestingly, when interviewed about their motives for using direct quotations from sources, students often gave reasons such as pressure, time constraint, and lack of confidence among others.

Like Liao and Tseng (2010), Shi (2012) also researched paraphrasing as a source integration strategy but she considered the perspective of disciplinary requirements. The findings from her interviews with students and instructors at a North American university revealed that differences existed among and between disciplines and that, further, many students were unsure how to paraphrase to avoid plagiarism. Participants’ comments showed that differences in perceptions about paraphrasing and citations tended to arise from disciplinary orientations rather than differences between students and teachers. Shi’s study illustrated that concepts of plagiarism depend largely on knowledge of content as well as disciplinary conventions, and that students experience difficulties with balancing these constraints.

Yet another example of how perception and disciplinary requirements affected the use of citations appeared in Borg’s (2007) examination of issues surrounding plagiarism and collusion from the perspective of lecturers. He demonstrated that the lecturers’ experiences shaped the way they addressed plagiarism in student writing. Borg also contended that there was variation in the way different disciplines dealt with transgressive intertextuality. Findings indicated that assessment procedures were influenced by factors such as personal experience (where, when and how they, the teachers, learned and were taught about intertextuality) and personal emotions over the act of transgression (e.g., anger or empathy for a student’s financial situation) (p.419).

Further, Pecorari and Shaw’s (2012) study underscored the need for policy change that takes into account differences in interdisciplinary requirements and guidelines as well as to reinforce the need for transparency in teaching. They recognized that intertextuality, in the form of
including and responding to others’ ideas and words, is a complex writing skill, especially for persons who are L2 learners and unfamiliar with writing in an academic register (p.149). While differences in cultural background can and do explain the overuse of stringing language forms together inappropriately, the need for guidance for students navigating between intertextuality and plagiarism cannot be underestimated.

**Intertextuality**

Kristeva (1986), who coined the term intertextuality, defined it as “the insertion of history into a text” (p.39) and vice versa. Inherent in this basic conception is the idea of a text as “an interception of textual surfaces,” “a mosaic of quotations” and the “absorption and transformation of another text” (p. 37). Other views of writing and citing as intertextuality (e.g., as language socialization, P. Duff, 2002) have been espoused since Kristeva (1986), but recent explorations of this matter have raised questions about intertextuality and plagiarism (Bazerman, 2004; Hu, 2001; Pecorari & Shaw, 2012), underscoring its relevance to citation practices. Differentiations between “private words” and “public words” can be found in Hu’s (2001, p.52) critique of the various definitions of plagiarism provided by Howard (1995) and Bazerman (2004). According to Hu, these definitions did not take into consideration the L2 learner who needs to appropriate words and ideas in order to learn and develop their abilities in the second language. This claim supports the call for provisions to be made for ELLs who are new to academic environments to facilitate their transition from writing cultures that rely heavily on words from expert authored texts to create and support arguments for their own writing. As mentioned previously, Pecorari and Shaw (2012) also concluded that the complexity of borrowing others’ words and ideas as particularly challenging for ELLs.
Identity

The concept of identity in writing is discussed at length below in reference to Ivanič’s (1998) framework that I adopted for the present research, but the term is worth defining in a general sense now because it has been integral to prior studies of discourse appropriation. LaBelle (1999, p.174) referred to the concept of identity as “the way people present themselves to the world, and the way in which they are perceived and evaluated by others.” Further, Ochs (1993) examined the relationship between language and identity by looking at identity as socially constructed through interaction; she explained that identity is dynamic rather than stagnant, stating: “in any given actual situation, at any given actual moment, people...are actively constructing their social identities, rather than passively living out some cultural prescription for social identity”(p.296). The idea of identity negotiation as a problematic perception has been investigated by Cummins (1996, p.261), who observed that “Identities are not static or fixed but rather are constantly being shaped through experiences and interactions.” According to Cummins, while some facets of identity are unlikely (though not always impossible) to change (e.g., gender, ethnicity), others facets are more malleable or subject to modification as a result of our experiences.

The past decade has witnessed the emergence of a focus on the complexity of identity and how it intersects with writing (Abasi, Akbari & Graves, 2006; Michaud, 2013; Ouellette, 2008). Scholars have investigated hypotheses that students’ appropriation of words and ideas in their writing is a form of identity construction. Findings support conclusions that students’ awareness of the link between their writing and their identities can be improved through writing instruction (Abasi, Akbari & Graves, 2006). Analyses have shown that identities are constructed
and revealed through discoursal choices in writing, leading researchers to call for a developmental approach in pedagogical practices with ELLs (Ouellette, 2008).

Michaud (2013) examined how the experience of learning to write in a new genre and a new social situation was encapsulated in the negotiation of identity for an adult student. His case study concluded that adult learners who have re-entered academic institutions after an absence need to negotiate personally and discoursally between their workplace and academic identities. Further, Michaud extrapolated that all writers confront identity negotiation, calling for this challenge to be addressed in teaching and research.

**Summary of Factors Related to Perceptions of Transgressive Borrowing**

There are several reasons offered in the publications reviewed above for textual (mis)appropriation of source material, seen as plagiarism (an academic offence). These reasons are poor developmental writing and citing skills, demonstrated by weak paraphrasing performance and immature summary skills; cultural and identity (re)construction; (mis)perceptions by students and between students and teachers about what are observable and demonstrable examples of transgressive borrowing versus direct evidence of non-attribution. The consensus from these studies seems to warrant a pedagogical response to a learning issue rather than judgments about morally reprehensible behaviour. This response may be preferable when textual borrowing is perceived to have contravened institutional regulations and disciplinary conventions.

The studies reviewed above also reflect a preoccupation with learners’, teachers’, and researchers’ perceptions of textual borrowing, focused on issues that are cross-cultural, perception- and performance-related, identity-oriented, and revolving around originality and intertextuality. What has not been adequately explored goes beyond the acceptance that
authorship or ownership of a text is, in itself, a contentious notion in the context of post-modern society. Foucault (1977, p.114) problematized the emergence of the individualization of the author:

Once a system of ownership for texts came into being, once strict rules concerning author's rights, author-publisher relations, rights of reproduction, and related matters were enacted . . . the possibility of transgression attached to the act of writing took on, more and more, the form of an imperative peculiar to literature. It is as if the author, beginning with the moment at which he was placed in the system of property that characterizes our society, compensated for the status that he thus acquired by rediscovering the old bipolar field of discourse, systematically practicing transgression and thereby restoring danger to a writing that was now guaranteed the benefits of ownership.

Research shows that one of the main factors in textual borrowing is enculturation into the specialized discourse of a discipline (Canagarajah, 2004; Ivanič, 1998); moreover, when it comes to identity options in the social contexts of writing, there is variation in the levels of awareness students have regarding the discourse choices that are available to them. For these reasons, there has been an increasing shift in research towards re-examining students’ textual appropriation as an issue of discoursal identity construction. This means that, through their writing, writers construct and project an identity which they believe will please the audience or gatekeepers. Further examination is needed into the idea that students’ production of institutionally acceptable or unacceptable texts may be due to their own interpretation of how knowledge is constructed, their views of the authority of source texts, and their attempts to negotiate their identities as (future) experts. It is through writing that student writers have the opportunity to display
knowledge. Until their knowledge is included in the collective knowledge of the academic community, they are still student writers, novices in the field or beginning experts. By citing the works of experts in the field, they seize the opportunity to demonstrate valued knowledge, and it is through this display or performance that they negotiate an emerging identity.

Notwithstanding the apparent preoccupation with plagiarism, or related ideas in the research on citation use, the purpose of my thesis study is to evaluate the relationship between citation practices and identity construction (Gu & Brooks, 2008). I analyze this relationship from a neutral and positive perspective as scholarly development and entry into an academic discourse community, rejecting labels such as “transgressive borrowing” and “plagiarism,” concomitant with the claims made by Sutherland-Smith (2004) that this labeling calls to mind a “Pandora’s box” of unresolvable issues. Such negative terms hamper an understanding of the complex functions of key rhetorical functions in advanced academic writing. Instead, I refer to neutral terms such as “discourse appropriation,” “citation use,” “referencing”, and “source integration” to guide the present investigation into graduate students’ citation practices and the underlying reasons for their citation choices. I embrace Canagarajah’s (2004, p. 281) definition of appropriation as “taking over dominant discourses and using them for one’s own agendas.”

Further, student writers who want to project an identity as contributors to a field of knowledge and not be perceived just as receptacles for previously accepted valued knowledge, even while showing allegiance to experts in the field, assume what Bartholomae (1985) referred to an “insider identity.” This “insider identity” as a negotiation between student role and the role of contributor can emerge in several ways. For example, the use of discipline-specific terms (possibly jargon) used by other experts, while making no attempt to define those terms, signals shared knowledge. Also, there can be a demonstrated understanding that knowledge construction
is valued. Student writers want to display respect for authority by citing and modelling experts in their fields. They can also demonstrate that experts are held in high esteem while at the same time showing that they, as students, are well-read, a trait that is valued in the academic community. Students may tend to show allegiance with theories but sometimes try to challenge and debunk myths, wanting to make new contributions to the field of knowledge. The use of the subjective “I,” for example, by student writers shows a commitment towards taking responsibility as a sign of seeking entry into the community of practice.

To this end, in the following section I introduce Ivanič’s (1998) framework for identity construction and Goffman’s (1981, 2002) theory of performance as a conceptual bridge based on social constructionism between ideas of discourse appropriation and the negotiation of identity in writing.

**Theoretical Framework and Assumptions**

This thesis investigates how discourse appropriation and citation use are manifest as a performance of visibly constructed knowledge and intersect with identity. Consequently, I examine the relationship between academic writing and identity construction from two theoretical perspectives. Based on theoretical assumptions that knowledge is socially constructed (Vygotsky, 1978) and contains aspects of performance (Goffman, 1981), my analysis is mainly underpinned by the four aspects of Ivanič’s (1998) discussion of “the discoursal construction of identity in academic writing” (her book subtitle) to interrogate how postgraduate students, engaged in an advanced academic literary practice, namely the writing of the Master’s thesis and specifically the Discussion of the Results section, negotiate their identities as language and literacy educators and researchers.
Constructing an Identity Framework

In this section, I explain the theoretical framework as a conduit which I used to analyse the writers’ retrospective responses about citation use and I discuss the relevant literature which has emerged to unpack the complexity of the relationship between writing and identity construction.

A growing body of research recognizes the link between discourse appropriation and identity construction. Abasi, Akbari and Graves (2006) investigated the negotiation of identities, constructed through the appropriation of others’ words and ideas in texts, assuming that there is concord between teacher expectations, institutional regulations, and disciplinary norms. They also stated that students understand and accept that plagiarism is an academic offence but offered other reasons why students produce institutionally unacceptable texts, such as their epistemological orientations and ideas that published source texts are authoritative rather than contestable.

Underpinning discussions about textual borrowing are ideas such as dialogism (Bakhtin, 1981) and intertextuality (Bazerman, 2004; Kristeva, 1986), which suggest writers textually construct social identities while appropriating and representing established discourse. They do so by showing either alignment or dissonance or affiliation or disaffiliation (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, 2005). Likewise, Abasi, Akbari and Graves (2006) argued that writer identity is constructed not only through appropriation itself but also by the manner in which prior discourse is appropriated. They proposed that students’ (re)production of texts is either institutionally acceptable or unacceptable due to their own interpretation of how knowledge is constructed, as well as their views of the authority of source texts, and that perhaps the best interpretation of referencing by students is as an issue of authorial identity construction.
While some researchers (Ouellette, 2008) have examined the ways in which different aspects of identity shape linguistic choices, conversely, Canagarajah (2004) examined how the linguistic choices made by multiliterate writers revealed aspects of their identities. For instance, Ouellette’s study (2008) recognized both legitimate referencing and plagiarism as part of the literacy practices governing identity construction and findings. Ouellette’s research concluded that the participant’s writing demonstrated conflicts between the demands of what Ivanič (1998) has identified as strands of identity: autobiographical self, discoursal self, and self as author, which were essential to that participant’s development as a writer. Different aspects of identity shape linguistic choices, and citation choices expose conflicts between the demands of the four strands of identity: autobiographical self, discoursal self, self as author, and possibilities for selfhood (Ivanič, 1998). This process is essential to the development of an academic writer, the acquisition of advanced academic literacies, and the demonstration of competence in a knowledge community.

**Ivanič’s Theory of Academic Writing and Identity Construction**

Ivanič’s (1998) theory of writing and identity is a useful framework for analysing identity construction in advanced academic writing. Ivanič’s (1998) discussion of writer identity, while specific to a population of mature adults returning to study at a British university, can be extrapolated to other student age groups as well as other student writer profiles. Consisting of four main aspects, the framework addresses the identities that the person writing a text brings to it or develops while writing it as well as other underlying identities present within “the socio-cultural context of writing” (p.23). The four aspects of identity include: (a) the autobiographical self, (b) the discoursal self, (c) the authoritative self, and (d) the possibilities for selfhood.
Within the context of the Discussion of the Results section of the MA thesis as an advanced academic literacy practice, I interpreted the data from my research using Ivanič’s framework:

a. Autobiographical self: this can refer to writers’ cultural, linguistic and educational background as well as exposure to other disciplines and fields of study. Exploring a writer’s construction of their autobiographical self helps answer questions such as: What is their backstory? How do certain aspects of their backgrounds shape their writing? Do these aspects have an impact on an emergent identity?

b. Discoursal self: this idea is connected to Goffman’s (1981, 2002) distinction between the “writer-as-performer” and the “writer-as-character” in his social interactionist theory of self-representation. Discoursal identity is similar to a character or an impression that the writer-as-performer constructs in written text within a certain (academic) context. In other words, what are the specific rhetorical acts in writing that show an attempt to become initiated as language and literacy educators, and what ideologies do these acts reinforce or betray?

c. Self-as-author: if discoursal identity is akin to a process or an attempt to achieve a particular self-portrayal, then the authorial identity is the sense of self that actually emerges. In adopting this category for my analysis, I discuss the extent to which the new and emerging identity of authorial self of language and literacy educators is established and the extent to which this authorial presence or “voice” is evident. In this aspect of identity, “voice” involves the writer’s ideology (opinions, beliefs, and values) and how forcefully writers establish authority over the content they re-present. I investigate referencing as the mainstay of the establishment of authority for the content of writing,
and how writers attempt to present themselves or others as the authority, through the various appropriation choices that they make.

d. **Possibilities for selfhood:** This aspect refers to the “abstract, prototypical identities available in the socio-cultural context of writing” (Ivanič, 1998, p.23). In this sense, writing is scarcely individual but more institutionally and socially determined. In the context of universities and academic writing, the institution itself, represented by different disciplines, attaches more value and higher status to certain genres and types of writing as different ways of doing and knowing. As such, writers may position themselves through writing, access the different resources that are available, and validate the identities that are supported by and valued within the academic context.

Ivanič (1998) viewed the discoursal construction of identity and knowledge making and sharing as interwoven. These concepts are expressed in advanced academic writing as an activity through which writers try to demonstrate that they belong to a particular knowledge and discourse community (p.5). Forms of discourse appropriation show that there are connections between the discoursal and authorial aspects (Fairclough, 1992). Some aspects of this self-representation are both conscious and unconscious as well authoritative and non-authoritative, as writers try to “forge allegiances” (p.3) in order to access and display full membership by creating an impression for the audience of a valuable identity. However, there are potential conflicts between the autobiographical self and the identities which are supported by disciplines and institutions. Student writers can feel constrained by disciplinary writing conventions and find themselves caught between the proverbial “rock and a hard place.”

**Goffman’s Theory of Performance**
Closely related to Ivanič’s theory of writing and identity construction is Goffman’s theory of performance. Following Ivanič’s model (1998, pp.19-23), I have also chosen to present the different aspects of identity that she proposed as linked to Goffman’s idea of performance, modelling Harwood and Petrič’s (2012) presentation of their findings. To extrapolate, Goffman’s (1981) framework involves an acceptance of any cultural space, such as a university, as a social establishment, where the performers, by observing certain rules, look for positive judgement. Goffman described a two-dimensional “performance,” consisting of a “front region” and a “back region” with controlled access. Preparation takes place in the “back region” while performance occupies the “front region.” To achieve a good performance, there is a requisite amount of “staging” which has to occur. Putting this conceptualization into the context of academic writing, I have shadowed Ivanič (1998) and Harwood & Petrič (2012) to discuss the idea that through writing and citing writers as performers strive to live up to the standards by which they believe their work will be judged. However, there are other elements which play an important part in this process: the conception of the self and the projection of the self. It is this interactional space that deserves attention for exploring the construction of identity.

**Research and Analysis**

In analyzing students’ perceptions of discourse appropriation as well as identity construction, I adopt a social constructionist approach. Social constructionism refers to jointly created understandings of the world and assumes that language is the most important system through which we perceive reality. Social constructionists theorize that identity is negotiated through language. Further, Ivanič (1998, p.12) described the social constructionist view of identity as one which:
reject[s] the idea that any type of identity – political, social, emotional – is solely the product of individuals’ minds and intentions, [constructionists believe that] it is the result of affiliation to particular beliefs and possibilities which are available to them in their social context.

My research questions are informed by these ideas, and I adopted a qualitative method of inquiry that is based on participants’ perspectives, meanings, and subjectivity (Creswell, 2007). The notion of the researcher as one who pieces together information from the natural setting in order to better understand it is one of the mainstays of qualitative inquiry (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Since it was not my intention to generalise findings universally, I used a case study approach with a small sample of five participants to delve into the different motivations related to writing and citing in the context of a mainstream English-medium academic environment for both L1 and L2 students. In the field of qualitative inquiry, a case study refers to the collection of data and presentation of findings about a participant or a defined small group (Creswell, 2007). The use of a small sample in qualitative inquiry promotes the framing of human behaviour through a (multi-) cultural lens. It also allowed me to examine closely the various contentions surrounding citation practices through textual analysis of MA theses and semi-structured interviews, data sources that I considered as most suitable to understand the complex issues surrounding the perceptions of discourse appropriation.

Social Constructionism, Knowledge Sharing, and the Academic Community

Berger and Luckman (1966) and Burr (2003, p.3) explain social constructionism as a term describing the idea that we construct, share, and understand our knowledge of the world through our daily interactions with each other. Other constructivists supported the idea that people co-construct knowledge through shared experiences. They believed that within the
microcosm of universities as social institutions, knowledge is constructed, sustained, and shared through the various interactions and expectations of members of certain discourse communities. Educational debates about constructivism have taken many forms. While some constructivists focused on the individual learner (Vygotsky, 1978), others attached more importance to learning in a general sense, such as the construction of knowledge taking place in various disciplines, allowing the formation of habitus — cultural or professional field of interest (Bourdieu, 1989). For Schwandt (2000) knowledge was both contextually bound and intersubjective. Phillips (1995) provided an evaluative summary of different views and directions of constructivism which attest to its complexity. Phillips (1995, pp.7-9) discussed three main elements into which he compressed the different views:

1. “Individual psychology versus public discipline,”
2. “define[s] the thinker as being constructivist,”
3. “the construction of knowledge [as] an active process.”

The goal of the present thesis study was to understand the process of identity construction through citation use in writing. A social constructionist approach proved useful in examining the issues that accompany knowledge making and display as a way of accessing and confirming membership within a specific community of practice. An area of common ground among constructivists was that active participation from the learner is a primary requirement of learning. In the context of my study, I assumed that active participation was essential for the co-construction of knowledge evident through citation use in the Discussion of the Results sections of theses. For this reason I relied as much as possible on data from the retrospective views of the participants, whose perspectives were likely informed by their experiences in educational institutions. The constructivist world view prompted me to focus on the participants’ perceptions
of their interactions with the academic institution in order to understand the institution as a cultural setting and, by extension, the disciplinary field or habitus as a community where knowledge was co-constructed and identity was negotiated through performance. Giroux (1983) claimed that “academic discourse communities were more concerned with excluding new members than with ways of admitting them” (p.219), a view which generated controversial discussions among writing theorists (e.g. Faigley, 1986; Pennycook, 1996; Raimes, 1991).

Defining the Problem and Justifying the Research

The preceding narrative has outlined the context for writing as an advanced academic literary practice and connects that context to identity construction. The MA thesis is one such example, in which the writer attempts to negotiate acceptance and acceptability into an established knowledge community. As a genre, the MA thesis is an empirical study or a report of original research. It should include analyses of hypotheses or assumptions, examined within established theoretical frameworks while presenting analyses that have not been previously addressed. The study reported in an MA thesis generally reflects a research process which is presented in chapters or sections of introduction, method, results, and discussion of the topic or research (IMRD), (APA, 2010, p.10; Thompson, 2005) and in a conventional format conforming to prescribed length, style, and conventions of source use as well as conditions for preparation such as timeframe, steps to conduct states of inquiry, and expected levels of support (Petrić, 2012, pp.105-106). The MA thesis is crucially important to students and faculty as an institutional gatekeeping mechanism. The policy guidelines for a thesis from my research site state: “The thesis must constitute a significant contribution to the knowledge of the field of study” and “must conform to the tenets of scholarly writing in a rigorous style of presentation.” (The average
length of the MA thesis at the research site has generally been between 120 and 150 pages, I surmised from the research reported in the next chapters).

The Discussion of the Results section has been recognized in policy guidelines as the part of the thesis where the student is expected to make knowledge claims and to support them by reference to the findings as well as to previously researched literature. The Discussion of the Results section is often densely populated with citations, indicating the writer’s intention to meet the requirement of linking the findings with established research literature (Thompson, 2005). According to the APA (2010, p. 10), the Discussion section is a “summary, interpretation and implications of the results” which follow from a student’s or researcher’s obligation to “examine, interpret, and qualify the results and draw inferences and conclusions from them” (p.35). APA (p. 36) also encourages writers to state in this section the limitations of their research and include a commentary about the importance of their findings.

A major rhetorical function in this type of writing is the use of citations, which is simultaneously necessary and problematic in showing an awareness of the link between collective knowledge and valued knowledge. A writer’s performance of knowledge construction and knowledge sharing takes place primarily through writing and citing. What overshadows this function of writing as a communicative event, and the acceptance of the idea of identity construction, is the friction between transgressive and non-transgressive borrowing. The stigmatizing act of plagiarism is closely linked to the required rhetorical function of scholarly referencing, involving strict conventions in academic writing, so it is surprising that so few prior studies have investigated deeply the underlying issues about and functions of citation use beyond the intent to deceive. I hope that my study contributes to appreciation of the complexity of
discourse appropriation within the framework of identity construction among language and literacy educators.

Additionally, I hope that this study broadens the scope of how university educators and administrators view citation practices and helps in negotiating new pathways for more culturally responsive pedagogical practices. To reiterate, the main questions that guided my investigation were as follows:

In composing the Discussion of the Results section of their MA theses,

1. How and why did the writers use citations?

2. Retrospectively, what did the writers’ use of citations reveal about their identities as language and literacy educators and/or researchers?
Chapter Three

Approach to the Research

This chapter describes the research design of this study and the approach to collect and analyse data in order to answer the research questions and to analyze the findings. I outline the key data sources and procedures for the research. I give examples of the citation categories which I adapted and used for selecting and organising the citation examples. After describing the data collection procedures, I outline the process and categories for coding and analysing the data.

To interpret the findings and answer my research questions I have used Ivanič’s (1998) framework of identity construction in writing. As documented in greater detail in the remainder of this chapter, I examined Masters’ theses submitted by students at a major university in Canada. North American universities typically attach a high level of importance to citations in both graduate and undergraduate programmes. I obtained copies of five MA theses for analysis. The theses were written in English by students of diverse language backgrounds. These former students were invited to participate in discourse-based, semi-structured interviews about their writing and citing behaviours as well as their attitudes and perceptions of academic writing and disciplinary writing conventions. Through the interview process and critical analysis of interview transcripts, I analyzed the participants’ retrospective reasons for making specific decisions about citation use. I also considered whether or not awareness of their linguistic and socio-cultural backgrounds influenced those choices and what those choices revealed about aspects of their identity construction which emerged through writing and citing.
Data

The Masters’ theses were randomly selected based on certain criteria. The theses were written and examined from 2002 to 2012. I decided that the participants had to be graduates of the same major university in Canada with a thesis topic or interest in the field of Applied Linguistics. Masters’ theses are public documents available for consultation in either shelved or electronic formats through the university’s library, so I did not require permission to identify or obtain copies of the theses. Samples of data containing citations were chosen from the Discussion of the Results sections or chapters of the selected theses. In order to study the construction of expert identity and avoid the complications which accompany differences in interdisciplinary requirements, I focused on a single discipline, what I call here Applied Linguistics (though the real name of the programme was slightly different). Numerous studies have shown that the expectations and requirements of academic writing conventions vary across disciplines (Pecorari & Shaw, 2012; Shi, 2012).

Key data points were:

- Participants’ backgrounds,
- Participants’ perceptions of citation use,
- Discussion of the Results section as advanced academic literacy practice,
- Citation density and use,
- Construction of identity:
  a. Autobiographical identity,
  b. Discoursal identity,
  c. Authorial identity,
  d. Possibilities for selfhood.
Through (a) a text analysis of the Discussion sections of the Masters’ theses and (b) discourse-based semi-structured interviews with student writers, I examined citation use. Citation use in this context consists mainly of non-integral references, which are information-prominent rather than author-prominent. Typically, non-integral citations are parenthetical references which privilege the research instead of the researcher and do not affect sentence syntax (Thompson 2005; Weissberg & Buker, 1990). In APA citation style, non-integral citations rely on direct quotations, paraphrasing, or summarizing, flanked by parenthetical references to the author and the date. The decision for a writer to use a non-integral citation is essentially a conscious decision to share information.

Text analysis

For the text analysis and to prepare for the semi-structured interview, I identified the uses of summarizing, paraphrasing, and direct quotations in the Discussion of the Results sections of each of the five Masters’ theses. To classify the types of citations, and interpret the motivations which the writers expressed for using them, I adapted Petrić and Harwood’s (2013, pp. 114-115) categories of citation use, whose functions were defined as follows:

- Defining: to help define or explain a concept or approach,
- Position and alignment: to present an author’s viewpoints and/or findings and to show alignment with same,
- Supporting: to help justify the writer’s claim or idea,
- Application: to apply a concept, framework, approach or theory to writer’s own analysis,
- Topic relevance: to help justify the writer’s choice of topic,
Disagreement: to express the writer’s disagreement with an idea,

Acknowledgement: to acknowledge the author of an idea or term,

Agreement: to express the writer’s agreement with an idea.

For this classification, I used monotonic coding (i.e. assuming a single function for each citation examined, meaning that each function of citations was only coded once for the main function evident, even in instances where some of these functions overlapped). After I had categorised the examples of citation use, I interpreted these citation functions in relation to the four strands of identity developed by Ivanič (1998), as presented in Chapter 6. To classify the categories and motivations for citing, another coder who was an MA student with experience in the field of language acquisition and I evaluated each citation from two randomly selected samples of the data as well as the reasons given, during interviews, by the participants for the citations in order to arrive at a logical consensus among the two of us for the use of each reference. Together, we obtained 90% inter-coder agreement. In the instances of disagreement, the other coder and I discussed and subsequently agreed on the classification for the citations. For the examples where a different label or categorisation emerged from those proposed by Petrić and Harwood (2013), we discussed each example within the context and situation for each writer and arrived at a mutual consensus. I decided to add several more categories which I saw emerging naturally from the data, beyond those described by Harwood and Petrić (2013), namely: To show the extent of one’s reading, to show that the expert is a well-known authority in the field, to comply with instruction from respective supervisors and to avoid plagiarism. These categories emerged both from the textual analyses of the theses and from the participants’ responses to questions about why and how they integrated sources into the Discussion section. Samples of the coded data can be found in Chapter 5.
Participants

I recruited and interviewed five participants with completed and examined Master’s theses from 2002 to 2012. I decided to focus on a recent time period of one decade for ease of access to electronic copies and for ease of contacting the participants. Using such a small number of theses and people helped to account for some diversity in a sample likely to be characterized by heterogeneity. The participants consisted of one male and four females between the ages of 32 and 40 at the time of data collection. The population included both English L1 and L2 speakers. The rationale for sampling was to have enough participants to look at trends and to compare and contrast their respective experiences to account for the diversity existing within and among the participants. Assuming that diverse cultural, linguistic and educational backgrounds might contribute to perceptions of discourse appropriation within the same discipline, I did not limit the selection criteria in terms of language background. However, in interpreting the findings I gave consideration to whether or not language background could provide an explanation for certain observations where appropriate.

Selection was done by simple random sampling (as described below). All five participants agreed to participate in the study from the first point of contact, though four other potential participants did not respond to my initial request for involvement, and I was unable to find contact information for another five people (described below). Some of the participants were currently in doctoral programmes subsequent to completing their MAs. One participant was working as a practitioner in the same field. Participants were required to be willing to talk about their theses and citation choices. Each participant was contacted directly by me, and informed consent was obtained using the appended letter of information and consent form (see Appendix A). Each participant signed the consent form prior to being interviewed. I took several steps to
protect the participants’ confidentiality including: using only their self-selected pseudonyms; obscuring their personal details and generalizing about the names of the institution and programme where they studied and the languages they speak as well as in referring to their specific thesis topics. I also tried to obscure specifically revealing information by omitting or using “XXX” in lieu of the actual information.

**Sampling and Recruitment**

First, to identify all theses that met the eligibility criteria, I searched the university’s electronic archives of completed theses using search parameters and terms which included Masters’ theses submitted between 2002 and 2012 in the subject areas of “language study,” “literacies,” and “language and literacies education.” My initial search yielded 34 results, of which 20 students met the criteria for being potential participants. Of the 34 initial results, 14 participants did not meet the criteria, mainly because their theses did not fall within the date range. An advanced search in the catalogue system of theses in print rather than electronic form yielded an additional five potential participants. I also consulted annual reports from a department at the university to verify that the potential participants were in fact former students in the appropriate discipline. To begin the sampling process, I assigned a random code number, from a table of random numbers, to all the theses that I was able to locate electronically.

Next, I used a table of random digits to select randomly a first set of 10 potential participants from among the 25 possible theses. I was able to obtain contact information for six of those participants by using Google, Google+, social and professional networking sites such as Facebook and LinkedIn, or the contact information provided in the appendices to the Masters’ theses. I sent letters of information and consent forms to these six people via electronic mail (see Appendix A). My first attempt to recruit participants yielded only two positive responses, so I
repeated the process by creating another simple random sample of five participants, of whom only four were contactable. I was unable to obtain contact information through electronic searches for one of these five potential participants. The five participants who finally agreed were then asked to sign and return a copy of the consent forms, forming the final sample of five participants.

**Selecting Samples of Citations**

Once I had obtained a sample of five participants for my study, I then selected the relevant Discussion of the Results section from the archived electronic copies of their theses. From the Discussion of the Results sections or chapters in some cases, I used 13 to 43 examples of citation use that appeared in the Discussion sections as parenthetical APA references. I examined each reference which appeared in parentheses and counted the reference to a single author or group of authors or work as one citation. This process was not problematic, and I was able to verify the citations by cross-checking with the appended list of references at the end of the thesis. The Discussion sections either appeared separately as labelled chapters, or as a section of a chapter. I also asked each participant to verify that this was the Discussion of the Results both by email and at the start of each interview. I highlighted each citation or set of references which appeared in parentheses throughout the entire Discussion section. Once the process of selecting the citations was complete, I sent electronic copies of the relevant sections to the participants via email to give them time to review the information before the interviews began. The participants were simply told that they were being given a copy of their Discussion sections with highlighted citations to help refresh their memories prior to interviews.
Interview Process

I then made arrangements to have face-to-face interviews with the participants at a time and location convenient to each of them. Four of the interviews took place in either a university seminar room or a private study room at the university’s library. To ensure privacy and to preserve the anonymity of the participants, the doors remained closed and/or locked for the duration of the interview. One interview was conducted via Skype from the privacy of my home with a participant who no longer resided in Canada. That interview was audio recorded only and not video recorded.

The interview process unfolded in two stages. First, I went through the steps for the interview process (see Appendix B), informing the participants about the study and reminding them of their right to withdraw at any time. Through 45 to 60 minute, discourse-based, semi-structured interviews, I collected information about the participants’ perceptions of discourse appropriation by asking questions about their cultural and linguistic backgrounds and educational and professional trajectories; experiences with writing and citing; and their reasons for integrating the specific sources that I had previously highlighted. The participants were provided with copies of the Discussion sections of their theses and were asked to describe and explain their reasons for each identified citation in their writing. From this retrospective perspective, they were invited to talk about their reasons for citing a particular source, for including it in the way that they did, and whether or not they saw the decision to cite as related to their identities as language and literacy educators or researchers.

After the interviews, each participant was asked to complete the identity profile (see Appendix C). The identity questionnaire was useful in helping me to examine each participant’s
autobiographical identity and also helped to ensure consistency with what participants revealed in their interviews.

**Transcribing and Verifying the Data**

After the interview session, I transcribed the interview session for each of the five participants. I also asked another transcriber with some transcription experience in business writing to verify the information I had transcribed. I then compared the two transcriptions for accuracy. I sent a copy of the summary of my main interpretations of their identity profiles to each participant via email for information and verification. This was also done to give participants the opportunity to make changes, add information, or respond to inaccuracies. At the time of completion of my research, four out of the five participants had responded. Out of the four who responded, three stated that they were completely satisfied with my interpretations and representations of their identities and citation use. One participant corrected the accuracy of their age and also made vocabulary suggestions to make their experiences with writing and citing seem more positive. I have complied with the participant’s request for changes, since this did not affect the analysis or findings. These steps helped to ensure the validity of the research. The transcription methods which I used were orthographic transcriptions of speech utterances based on Standard English spelling. The transcripts are punctuated with time stamps so I could track how long the participants had been speaking (e.g., 30:05). These conventions were based on precedents from previous work which I had done as a research assistant as well as a course which I took in Discourse Analysis (Johnstone, 2008).
Data Analysis

Analysis of the data was impressionistic and focused on a holistic analysis of each case and an embedded analysis of Ivanič’s (1998) four aspects of identity. To construct the interpretations of the negotiation of identity, I undertook cross-case analyses by establishing themes and comparing responses across the cases. Data analysis was carried out through three main steps. First, I did a text analysis of the Discussion of the Results sections written by the participants; second, I did an analysis of the semi-structured interview; and third, I examined the four strands of identity construction. I also made a decision to combine Ivanič’s categories of Discoursal Self and Authorial Self because of the constraints imposed by the focus of the research on just Discussion sections of theses. There were two reasons for this decision. Firstly, the Discussion sections in some theses were short such that some did not contain enough examples for analysis. Secondly, in this genre of writing the citations have been previously referred to in the Review of the Literature Section, limiting the participants’ presentation of their discoursal identities. This means that in the chapter where I interpret the data using the four strands of identity, the analysis of the Discoursal and Authorial aspects are collapsed into one analytic category.

Semi-structured interviews

To analyze the transcribed interview data, I used a general inductive approach involving data reduction by organizing and formatting the data. A close reading of the data helped to identify the themes before creating or assigning categories from Harwood and Petrić (2013). I then organized the raw data first through initial coding — what was happening in the data. Initial
codes described the data but no analysis was attempted at that stage. After I had compiled initial codes and/or themes I used focused coding to categorize them, as presented in Chapters 5 and 6. To answer both research questions, I used the information in the Discussion section, the identity questionnaire, as well as the participants’ responses to the questions they were asked about selected highlighted examples of source use and integration throughout the Discussion section.

The Discoursal Construction of Identity

For the examination of the construction of identity as language and literacy educators, I looked at examples of source integration and linguistic choices for instances of affiliation/allegiance and dissonance with the disciplinary content or institutional culture and conformity or resistance to writing as applied linguists. I then analysed the transcripts to look at emerging themes and patterns and compared them to conflicting demands between four strands of identity: autobiographical self, discoursal self, self as author and possibilities for selfhood (Ivanič, 1998).

Given the nature and expectations of the Discussion of the Results section, I focused the analysis on the extent to which the participants used parenthetical references to legitimize their own knowledge claims (Discoursal Self) and how they (said they) established expertise in the literary domain (Self-as-Author). I examined how their identities were shaped by writing instead of how their identity (Autobiographical Self) shaped writing and the relationship surrounding the existing conventions for establishing authorial presence in writing (Possibilities for Self-hood). For the purpose of presenting a more cohesive analysis, and reasons stated above, I have combined the discussion of the Discoursal Self and the Authorial self. I believe that the data that I collected, focused just on the Discussion sections of theses, provided few opportunities for the
participants to express or consider themselves as authors within the context of source integration.

**Participants’ Identity Construction through Writing and Citing**

While Ivanič’s (1998) research focused on writing full compositions and course assignments as a discursive practice in university courses, I specifically analysed citations within the limited context of Discussion of Results sections of theses. Subsumed within my second research question, I also wanted to understand the following:

- What aspect of identity were the participants performing through their citation behaviours?
- How did they juxtapose or intertwine ideas vis-à-vis the ideas that they encountered in published works?
- How did they position themselves in relation to these ideas?

For the analysis, I used the entire Discussion section for each participant. My research questions did not require me to read the whole section, but only the sections containing parenthetical references. However, as a researcher, I felt that I needed to review the entire Discussion of the Results section for each thesis in order to understand each participant’s negotiation of identity through instances of citation use. Further, I decided to use my own knowledge as an educator, researcher, and MA student to understand how the writers positioned themselves to perform their identities.
Chapter Four

Profiles of the Participants

This chapter profiles the participants as well as their experiences with writing during the Master of Arts programme. I present a description of each individual using their self-chosen pseudonyms — Anna, Charlotte, Ervand, Sophie, and Grace — based on the information they shared in the identity questionnaires as well as responses they gave to questions asked during the semi-structured interview. Table 1 provides a summary of each person’s characteristics that are relevant to my investigation.

Table 1

Description of the Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Dominant Language or L1</th>
<th>Other Languages</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>European language</td>
<td>English, other European languages</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian language</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ervand</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>English and French</td>
<td>European languages</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anna

Anna, a female, in her thirties at the time of the research, was born outside Canada and has been living in Toronto for almost a decade. In addition to English and French, she is fully bilingual in two European languages, and she has high proficiency in both written and oral English and is also fairly competent in oral and written French. Anna had two Masters’ degrees, the first completed in a different field in Europe prior to her starting the Master’s degree that was the focus of the present thesis study.

In terms of her national and cultural identity, Anna identifies with her motherland “inside,” but stated that she has no intention of ever returning to her homeland although she is “family-oriented” and misses her family there. Her dual national and cultural identities are emphasized by her statement that during the Olympics she cheers for both Canada and her homeland. She also identified a separation between her linguistic identity not only by the dominant languages that she knows, but also in terms of when and how she uses each language: “My professional life is English; my personal one is XXX.” She uses her knowledge of other European languages in personal email communication with her family, but in her professional studies, research, and employment, she uses English: “So all the emails that I write to you guys, to my professors, to my colleagues at work, they would all be in English. So my life is pretty much between two major languages for writing.”

Anna admitted to still feeling insecure about her English proficiency, especially when required to converse with native speakers. However, in her role as an educational professional she emphasised that her students are her priority and she is always prepared for classes. Her major challenge with writing in English was the acquisition of academic literacy: “When I started my Masters, I was a newcomer to Canada and though my English was not bad at that time,
that’s what I thought, apparently, my writing was much worse.” Anna explained this difficulty with the acquisition of academic literacy in English as rooted in the fact that her previous degrees were all done in her first language (L1). Anna’s academic writing in her mother tongue, which she described as very different from English, especially in terms of technical terminology, gave her a feeble foundation on which to build her acquisition of academic literacy in English in Canada. Another major challenge for Anna was her personal writing style. She stated that her professors had difficulty following her ideas and reasoning because of her lack of sentence variety or writing style and structure. Another problem she discussed was not having received sufficient feedback on her writing throughout the stages of the process of writing her thesis, which impeded her progress with both her writing and the timely completion of her Master’s thesis: “Unfortunately, it wasn’t the thesis that much, it was a huge suffering for me emotionally, morally, I mean everything… Yeah, it was that bad.” However, she did not have the same difficulty with her course papers.

Interestingly, Anna believed that cultural differences were an integral part of the challenges she faced with academic writing in English as well as her relationship with her professors. For example, when Anna did not get timely feedback from a professor or a response to an email after several weeks, she said that in her homeland this would have been perceived as normal because of an accepted distance and formality between students and professors. In an effort to avoid confrontation, she did not make any inquiries about the lack of feedback or communication in one particular case: “But XXX [the institution] was on my [Anna’s] side.” It seems that in resolving the conflict, the institutional policy regarding communication protected Anna and the administration acted on her behalf.
Anna ascribed her main achievements to the constant redrafting of her Master’s thesis, which eventually led to her having more confidence in writing. At the time of data collection, Anna had co-authored several manuscripts which have been published and has other publications going through editorial review. As a teacher and researcher, she has re-written and published sections of her MA thesis.

Anna, an animated and open individual, was willing to share her experiences with writing and citing, working on her thesis, and doing her other courses in general. She has a self-described strong command of English and uses it as her dominant language in the academic sphere. Her Masters’ thesis dealt with one aspect of second language acquisition, but Anna later shifted her research focus to other topics. Her arrival story as a newcomer to Canada is typical of those who come thinking that their English “was not bad at the time,” but she recalled having a rude awakening when it came to academic writing as a genre: “So my first steps here actually felt like I was starting from zero and my English had a lot to do with it because that was a different academic jargon that I had to use.” The findings of Anna’s thesis study affirmed her hypothesis that educators needed to pay attention to specific aspects of language acquisition.

**Charlotte**

A female, in her early forties at the time of my research, Charlotte was the only participant who was no longer living in Toronto. She had come to Canada as an international student to pursue her Master’s degree after completing her Bachelor’s degree in her home country. She had been teaching English to high school students for over a decade when I talked with her.
Charlotte described her national and cultural identity as Asian and added that while she was proud of her heritage, others did not perceive her as “very XXX” [Asian origin]. She also commented that while she was comfortable with her identity as “female,” she was not perceived by others in her society as what she described as “lady-like.” She appeared to be accepting of the differences between her self-perception and the way others saw her. Bilingual, bi-literate, and an educational researcher were some of the words that Charlotte used to describe her linguistic identity, not so much in terms of the languages she has mastered or is proficient in, but rather the complexity which they brought to her identity.

In terms of her English proficiency, Charlotte stated that she “is comfortable using it.” Born and raised in her homeland, she usually writes in her dominant Asian language. However, Charlotte attended high school in a different English-dominant country (from Canada), where she was first introduced to academic writing in preparation for that programme and its final exam. Charlotte explained that previously she did not have much writing experience, even in her mother tongue, so her academic writing identity is grounded in English.

Charlotte described her L2 writing proficiency as needing improvement, but she felt that the support she received from the many resources available to her as an ESL student during her university studies in Canada (e.g., through writing workshops and writing courses) helped to boost her confidence and further fuel her interest in writing. For Charlotte, her greatest achievement as a Master’s student was the improvement she saw when writing her thesis. Initially, she said she felt unsettled because she was getting lower grades than she had expected, but due to the cultural diversity in the student population at the university she never felt “out of place,” and that gave her a certain level of comfort and confidence.
Charlotte was also eager to share her experiences with writing and citing during her MA programme in Canada. She was a pleasant and jovial interviewee, whose recorded interview was frequently punctuated with laughter. She clearly recalled her challenges with academic writing, but she had difficulty remembering her specific citation choices in the Discussion section of her thesis. A fluent speaker of both her L1 and English, Charlotte was in the unique position of being the only L2 English speaker that I interviewed who had acquired academic literacy in English and not in her L1. Charlotte was acutely aware of her multi-layered identity as a teacher and language learner. She admitted that she loves writing, but she is not as confident in her L2 proficiency as she would like to be, and she recalled participating in the writing support workshops provided by the university to help her improve in that area. Describing her greatest achievement as the improvement she saw in her writing while working on her Master’s thesis, she remembered it as challenging but enjoyable. Charlotte said her greatest challenge was synthesising ideas to compose a literature review, and she described the expert models written by one of her professors as the best she had seen, leading her to make consistent efforts to try to achieve that level of expertise. What she found particularly encouraging was that many of the best models of published expert writing had come from ELLs like herself. For her, this trend dispelled the myth that “the greatest researchers would be native speakers of English.”

**Ervand**

Ervand, a male in his thirties born outside Canada, had at the time of my interview with him been living in Canada for about a decade. Fluent in three languages including English, for which he described his proficiency as high, he also stated that he had basic competence in at least one other language, in addition to the three in which he was fluent. Ervand had completed B.A.
and B.Ed. degrees before his Master of Arts degree. He had been a language instructor for over 20 years and worked extensively as well in a different professional field.

In stating his national and cultural identity, Ervand described himself as a transnational multilingual European, intent on learning languages, and whose personal identity is not fixed, but “in flux.” Ervand narrated that his relationship with writing was a struggle, particularly because the MA thesis represented the longest piece of writing he had ever been required to produce. He also believed that writing a document as long as a Master’s thesis was not only his greatest challenge, but also his most significant accomplishment. Specifically, Ervand described writing the literature review chapter as the easiest, as a process which came to him naturally, but the Discussion section was the most difficult. He recalled having had to rewrite the Discussion section over a period of about four months. The reasons he reported for the rewrite revolved not only around the quality of his writing, but also the quality of his analysis, described by Ervand as “thinker’s block.”

In terms of his linguistic choices for writing, Ervand viewed this as geographically determined as well as by the discourse constraints of a particular genre and society. For example, he uses English mainly when he is in Toronto, French when in Quebec and France. Interestingly, Ervand talked about experiencing difficulty in choosing whether to use or think in another language or English when writing for academic purposes:

Before I started my Master’s I think I was divided between English and XXX, which is another language I can speak and um, I’ve noticed that uh, the graduate school has sort of shaped my writing towards English more and it’s much easier for me to write in English especially if I know that the other person I’m writing to, if it’s like an email, knows at
least two of my languages, I would write in English. So it’s just because it’s faster and easier. Thoughts come in English faster.

Another participant of multicultural and multilingual heritage, Ervand was forthcoming with information about his writing and referencing experiences while writing his Masters’ thesis. He showed a particularly deep insight into challenging what he considered to be certain myths and misinterpretations about specific experts in his chosen topic of inquiry about L2 development. Similarly to some of the other participants, Ervand clearly recalled his writing process, but he did not seem to have a complete recollection of the citation choices which became part of the MA thesis. Ervand discussed several influences on his citation choices, including but not limited to a perceived alignment with certain authors’ ideas and other disciplines as a complement to his analysis and a strong influence from the works of a professor whose course he took during the final stages of writing and revising his thesis.

Ervand said that he predominantly uses and identifies strongly with written academic English but uses vernacular forms of several European languages when warranted by the situation. He also used the words “major frustration” to describe the experience of writing the MA thesis. He attributed this difficulty to a decline in not only the quality of his writing, but “more even the quality of my thought and my analysis which was very superficial and I just didn’t know where to go with that.” Ervand’s qualitative study focused on the relationship between pragmatics and L2 acquisition.

Sophie

Sophie was a female and one of two participants born in Canada. Her L1 is English, but she has also a strong conversational competence in an Asian language as well as in French. Her
educational and employment trajectories included obtaining a Bachelor’s degree; a certificate in teaching English; and a Master’s in Applied Linguistics. She had worked, at the time of my data collection, as an English instructor for seven years and was currently employed as an administrator at a college in Canada.

Sophie, a self-described non-academic, reported that she conducts her professional writing exclusively in English. Her writing now revolves around business and administrative communications in the form of instructional emails and course materials that she creates for the language classes that she sometimes teaches. Her most significant achievements during her Master’s programme were her high level of competence in writing grammatically correct English, editing her own work, and her analysis of her research. However, she said she felt severely challenged by writing the abstract for her thesis, plagued by an inability to express the essence of her thesis in a succinct manner: “I needed a lot of help with that and I surprised myself because I teach summary writing and I just couldn’t really succinctly and concisely get out exactly what was necessary.” She also described the process of transcribing her interviews as “tedious.”

Sophie described her cultural and national identity as “Canadian urbanite” and her linguistic identity as monolingual English with good writing skills: “so for three years I was a composition instructor, is what I’m trying to say and so I felt I did have a really good handle on writing, writing grammatically correctly and writing fairly accurately.”

There appeared to be a link between her self-described professional and personal identities when she included the word “professional” in her description of her personal identity. Interestingly, Sophie also added the description of “word nerd” to her identity profile.

During her interview, Sophie was cooperative, forthcoming, and candid, not only about her experiences with writing and citing, but also about her self-perceived academic abilities.
Sophie reported that the writing process came easily to her and she did not have many challenges writing her thesis. She particularly enjoyed the analytical aspect of writing. The main aim of Sophie’s study was to examine certain challenges students faced when writing.

Grace

Grace was another female participant also born in the Toronto area, where she has lived and worked all her life with the exception of travelling overseas for extended periods for research work. She described both her L1 English competence and her oral and written competence in French as high, but she clarified that she is dominant in English and an “accidental/intentional Anglophone.” This, she explained, is due to her immigrant parents who spoke five languages collectively and were advised to communicate with and educate their Canadian children in English in order to secure their chances at having a successful life in Canada. Grace had a Bachelor of Arts as well as a Bachelor of Education prior to her MA in Applied Linguistics. At the time of my data collection, she had worked as a teacher for several years and had worked as a researcher since the completion of her MA degree.

Grace reported that she writes primarily in her L1, English, but that she also writes in French because of her increasing exposure to French contexts. She explained that she makes decisions about the language she writes based on the conceptualization that she is using. Her choice of language, she explained, was also determined by whether or not her audience was French-dominant or English-dominant. Her greatest achievement was that she achieved mastery of academic writing by constantly availing herself of the opportunities offered by the university to support students with their writing, persistently seeking feedback on her writing to achieve critical distance. She approached her engagement with writing strategies by treating it as a
discipline. Another significant achievement for Grace was that through her approach to exploring inclusive literacy practices she was able to demonstrate this theory in the production and presentation of her thesis. Grace’s main challenge occurred when she was unwell and did not enjoy writing much.

Grace described her cultural and national identity as a Canadian/Asian hybrid and her linguistic identity as “plurilingual.” She described herself as an “emerging academic educator,” and there appeared to be some overlap between her professional and personal self-perception when she used the word “educator” as a descriptor for her personal identity, which was otherwise strongly characterised by familial ties, her creativity, and efforts at activism.

My interview with Grace revealed a participant who was articulate, intelligent, and creative. Grace identified not only as Asian, but also as Canadian. She is fluent in English, but considered her competence in French to be limited. Grace’s view of her experience with writing her Masters’ thesis is positive overall for several reasons. She admitted that she saw the MA as a stepping stone for future scholarship:

I knew when I was writing my Master’s thesis that I was going to go on [for further research]. And so I often said, you know, this is like kindergarten for graduate school, where you’re developing the skills or the literacy practices that help you through elementary school or learning how to read.

Deeply connected to both the content and form of her thesis, Grace’s research demonstrated a strong investment in Applied Linguistics and her role in re-shaping pedagogical approaches in that field: “I was really challenged by myself to put into practice what I was theorizing, so I was looking at inclusive practices and began reflecting that, in graduate school
and academia, we are not very inclusive.” Grace’s thesis study examined and recommended reorientations to existing policies for bilingualism and language teaching.

**Summary**

The summaries provided in Table 2 as well as the individual profile descriptions above exemplify that the participants, at the time of their interviews, were in the same general age range and at similar points in their careers. Only two out of the five participants were born in Canada and they all knew more than one language. Their multilingual backgrounds appeared to align with their chosen field of Applied Linguistics, and they all had continued to work or be engaged in pedagogical practices or research areas that were consistent with that choice. In short, the five participants all acknowledged that their professional and scholarly interests in Applied Linguistics conformed to their life experiences and were also shaped by their graduate studies, writing an MA thesis, and work in Applied Linguistics.

**Table 2**

**Details of the Participants’ Self-reported Identities, Accomplishments, and Challenges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Self-Reported Layers of Identity</th>
<th>Main Accomplishments</th>
<th>Main Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>-Fully bilingual&lt;br&gt;-ESL instructor&lt;br&gt;-Strong work ethic&lt;br&gt;-Family oriented&lt;br&gt;-Empathetic&lt;br&gt;-Responsible&lt;br&gt;-Insecure about English proficiency when surrounded by native speakers</td>
<td>Improved writing came later after MA</td>
<td>Writing in English/academic genre and supervisor relations. Stress because of lack of support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Charlotte** | - High school teacher  
- Asian bilingual female  
- Bi-literate  
- Second language learner  
- Educational researcher  
- Optimistic | Improved academic literacy through writing MA thesis | Synthesis in writing a literature review |
| **Ervand** | - High level of competence  
- Professional in a field other than language education  
- ESL/EFL/TESL Instructor  
- Transnational European  
- Multilingual lifelong learner  
- Educator | Amount of writing and ability to decode raw data | Re-drafting the Discussion chapter |
| **Sophie** | - Native English speaker  
- English instructor  
- Programme coordinator  
- Caucasian urbanite  
- Monolingual “word nerd”  
- Teacher/educator  
- Administrator  
- Colleague  
- Woman/wife/daughter/friend/sister | Strengthening of writing skills | Writing the thesis abstract |
| **Grace** | **-Teacher** | **-Researcher** | **-Canadian/Asian hybrid** | **-Accidental/intentional Anglophone** | **-Plurilingual** | **-Emerging academic educator** | **-Mother/daughter/wife** | **-Engaged activist** | **Gaining more confidence as a writer; breaking outside the box to write a thesis to produce a text which fit academic criteria but was also creative and authentic** | **Health; staying committed to her identity as a language/literacy teacher** |
Chapter Five
Citation Practices

This chapter outlines the findings and interpretations of the data collected and analysed to answer the first research question: How and why did the writers use citations? The chapter includes: (a) a summary of the content of the Discussion of the Results section for each participant and their self-reported reasons for citing and (b) comparison of the findings across the five cases.

Findings are organised and presented according to the themes that emerged from the interviews and the questions which the participants were asked. In addition, I present cross-case analyses to highlight the differences and similarities between the participants’ motivations and perceptions and the impact of their choices on various aspects of their identities as language and literacy educators.

Participants’ Citation Use in the Discussion Sections of Their Theses

Table 3 presents the mean frequencies of citation use as well as other summary information about the Discussion sections of each thesis. The types of investigations undertaken in the five theses ranged from qualitative case studies to mixed methods pedagogical experiments. The length of the Discussion sections that I examined ranged from four pages (approximately 2,000 words) to 20 pages (approximately 10,000 words). The length of the Discussion sections seemed to correlate with the number of extracts that contained citations, with the exception of Anna’s thesis, so there was little variation among the participants’ theses in terms of the number of references cited per extract and the overall citation ratio or citation density. Nonetheless, there was considerable variation in the number of words each person used
in this section of their theses, the number of times they referred to outside sources, and the length of the Discussion sections of their theses. Viewing the standard deviation from the mean frequency of words per citation, Charlotte and Ervand tended to have a wider range in the number of words they used per citation, whereas the other three participants were more consistent in the number of words used to refer to sources. In Anna’s case, she used the most sources per parenthetical reference when compared with the other participants.

The number of extracts containing parenthetical references which I selected ranged from five to 18, and they contained between 13 and 43 citations. Some citations contained multiple sources within parentheses referring to different publications. This variation had an impact on the citation density and the overall ratio of citations per words. For example, Grace’s thesis, which had the fewest number of pages and extracts in the Discussion section, did not have the lowest number of sources cited.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics for Citations in Discussion Sections for Five MA Theses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Number of Words in the Discussion section</th>
<th>Number of References Cited</th>
<th>Average Number of Words Per Extract: Median and Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Overall Ratio of Citations Per Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>4,331 words</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$Md = 28$ $M = 33.61$</td>
<td>$SD = 13.61$</td>
<td>1 citation per 100 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>11,704 words</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$Md = 39$ $M = 48.47$</td>
<td>$SD = 28.02$</td>
<td>1 citation per 1000 words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As documented below, the majority of the participants said they used referencing for support and application of theories, with a smaller number using referencing to show disagreement or specifically with the stated intention of avoiding plagiarism. For the most part, the participants reported similar reasons for citing sources such as “support,” but in certain cases there was some interpretation required on my part to arrive at an accurate categorization of their intentions in the data. The coding categories were mainly adapted from Petrić and Harwood (2013, pp. 113-115). However, to do justice to the range of reasons given by the participants, I added six coding categories to adequately describe the present data and, particularly, the five participants’ personal trajectories for the acquisition of academic literacy. These expanded categories are included under the heading “others” in Tables 4 to 8 below, but they did not occur frequently in or across the participants’ Discussion sections. These additions included:

- Showing the extent of one’s reading,
- Aligning one’s findings with other studies,
- Including core reading in the field,
- Mentioning a famous, authoritative expert or one who is well-known by or to the participant,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Citations per 1000 words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ervand</td>
<td>5,032</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23.27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>3,038</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>2,028</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Relevance of the source to the topic,

• Instruction from supervisor.

The findings in Tables 4 to 8 (adapted from Petrić & Harwood, 2013, pp 113-115) show both concord and variation between the participants’ responses in different categories. For example, some participants, such as Anna and Charlotte, favoured quantity in the numbers of citations they used in each reference. While many participants used citations for what they referred to as support for their findings, they (e.g., Ervand) did not shy away from citing studies which showed disagreement with their claims or accounted for limitations in their studies. While Ervand was not the only participant who demonstrated disagreement with the application of a theory, he did so more directly than others. Most participants said that they rarely felt the need in the Discussion of the Results section to clarify or define certain terms specific to their disciplinary fields, nor did they clarify the use of terminology in the field of Applied Linguistics with me. One possible reason could be that they had already done so earlier in other sections of the theses or perhaps they were aware that they were writing for an expert audience already familiar with the theories, frameworks, and jargon of Applied Linguistics.

Anna

As shown in Table 4, Anna mostly cited references to support her claims. In general during the interview, however, Anna reported having difficulty with reconciling some of the choices she made with (a) overuse of citations and (b) unnecessary references to specific experts and studies. In the first instance, she felt that she had so many choices that her decisions to include citations were skewed toward quantity. Secondly, she observed that using multiple references for the same claim now seemed superfluous. In some cases, Anna was comfortable
with the alignment between her discussion and existing published literature in the sense that the previous studies confirmed her own ideas, but overall she noted retrospectively that some citations seemed out of place or misaligned with the point she was trying to make in her thesis. Anna recalled feeling anxious when framing ideas in her Discussion section within the context of expert ideas and reinforcing her own knowledge with expert knowledge. While she believed that the ideas cited affirmed the claims in her Discussion, she felt that she had relied too heavily on others’ words, which may have caused her to sacrifice her own voice and at times her intentions. In a few instances, Anna pointed to the subsection called “learner’s attention” to demonstrate the contrast between her expressions of ownership of her own ideas compared to other areas where she deferred to other studies even while being aware that the view expressed by the expert writer had been heavily critiqued since publication. As her Discussion section continued she noted a shift to finding ideas from published sources to support her own ideas rather than the converse, and she said that she felt that this approach added a stronger sense of coherence to her Discussion.

Anna attributed the high citation density in her 4,331 word Discussion section not only to her eagerness to show knowledge and alignment with expert views, but also as a result of decisions made by her supervisor about when, where, and how much she should cite, a fact which she had resisted at the time and still felt conflicted about at the time of the interview.

Table 4
Frequencies and Examples of Anna’s Self-Reported Reasons for Citing
(Adapted from Petrić & Harwood, 2013, pp. 113-115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation Function</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples From Anna’s</th>
<th>Interview Excerpt</th>
<th>Number of Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


### Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>To present an author’s viewpoints and/or findings and to show alignment with same</th>
<th>No examples occurred</th>
<th>None found</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining</th>
<th>To help define or explain a concept or approach</th>
<th>No examples occurred</th>
<th>None found</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting</th>
<th>To help justify the writer’s claim or idea</th>
<th>As Bialystok (1991), Cummins (1984), Swain (1997), and Zobl (1992) point out…</th>
<th>And I for some reason thought that it is important again to back up my words …So I thought, Oh my gosh I need big names again so Cummins … Swain, sounded like very big names in the field and whatever they said confirms what I found.</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>To apply a concept, framework, approach or theory to writer’s own analysis</th>
<th>No examples occurred</th>
<th>None found</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic relevance</th>
<th>To help justify the writer’s choice of topic</th>
<th>(e.g. Horst et al. 1998; Huckin &amp; Coady, 1999; Pigada &amp; Schmitt, 2006; Zahar et al. 2001),</th>
<th>So this big citation here just simply says that there has to be a pick up rate and that’s where my hypothesis came from initially, right? Based on Horst…..and so many other names that extensive reading had produced some results and so after that I do have some citations but again most of the things that happened here are</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagreement</strong></td>
<td>To express the writer’s disagreement with an idea</td>
<td>Hopefully here marked most of it is my own but again, I try to, for some reason I tried to support it somehow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>… (Day, et al. 1991; Horst, et al. 1998; Pitts, et al. 1989; Zahar, et al. 2001).</td>
<td>That’s what I thought it was supposed to be, because that was my …... at that time I thought, oh my gosh, it does not agree with my hypothesis – at that time I did not understand that whatever did not agree, did not mean it was wrong it just meant that there must be an explanation to it so I did find an explanation… it’s just both of them are counter-arguments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Acknowledgement</strong></th>
<th>To acknowledge the author of an idea or term</th>
<th>… in the first part I relied a lot on citations on what big people in the field have to say and then I would try to accommodate my own writing to reflect these big ideas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Coady et al. 1993; Hirsh &amp; Nation, 1992; Laufer, 1997),</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agreement</strong></th>
<th>To express the writer’s agreement with an idea</th>
<th>No examples occurred None found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Others:</strong></th>
<th>Instruction from supervisor</th>
<th>… in my Discussion section, you see it’s overloaded with citations, however, if you look at …... nothing there – my supervisor felt that I needed a few citations there and instead of putting them here and there, I decided to put them all in one paragraph but I guess the only thing is that I did not understand why I needed citations in conclusions and pedagogical applications – from what I read these have to seem to be my words and my opinions that come out from the results, however, because I was told to do so that’s what I did.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Charlotte

The findings in Table 5 reveal that most of Charlotte’s references were mainly used as support and to show relevance to her topic. Many of Charlotte’s references to experts were repeated throughout the discussion, which she explained was a conscious decision based mainly on her using particular analytic frameworks by specific experts. Because the methods of her study paralleled her thematic interests and was also a unique study, Charlotte said she felt a need to demonstrate the similarities between a study she was following closely and her own. We discussed one study in particular that she referenced several times. Although it was considered outdated, it was a seminal work on the topic that Charlotte had researched.

Table 5
Frequencies and Examples of Charlotte’s Self-Reported Reasons for Citing
(Adapted from Petrić & Harwood, 2013, pp. 113-115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation Function</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples from Charlotte’s Writing</th>
<th>Interview Excerpt</th>
<th>Number of Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position and alignment</td>
<td>To present an author’s viewpoints and/or findings and to show alignment with same</td>
<td>Canagarajah (2004)…argues. (p.270).</td>
<td>Canagarajah is one of the uh researchers that inspired me to be interested in writing development in the first place, And uh I think uh let me see. This part might be slightly related to what you’re interested in as well. But I was trying to uh find a way, um how bilingual writers express their identity in their writing and yeah. I can’t remember sorry. Canagarajah inspired</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defining</strong></td>
<td>To help define or explain a concept or approach</td>
<td>No examples occurred</td>
<td>None found</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting</strong></td>
<td>To help justify the writer’s claim or idea</td>
<td>Motobayashi (2009) reports …</td>
<td>I think I mentioned something like that to her, that I wonder if bilingual writers tend to produce longer and more detailed texts when they’re writing in the same language of the experience that they’re writing about and she said, yeah, that’s exactly what she found and she’s actually just published the uh, article based on that kind of stuff and she introduced me to, you know, to that article that she wrote and so I thought, yeah, that would be perfect to back up my uh data, it just happened that way, yeah.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application</strong></td>
<td>To apply a concept, framework, approach or theory or framework to writer’s own analysis</td>
<td>Also, it seems to account for Cummins’ (1981) and Cummins and Nakajima’s (1987) …</td>
<td>So, Cummins and Nakajima’s research is the one I just talked about, they did similar research at the same site, but they did the research on oral proficiency rather than writing proficiency. So it had a great relevance to my study.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic relevance</strong></td>
<td>To help justify the writer’s choice of topic</td>
<td>These findings are mostly consonant with Ikuta’s (2001b) findings in her study.</td>
<td>Ikuta’s study was very unique in the sense that not many people have done research in the literacy development of</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
bilinguals and uh, Ikuta’s research was very similar to my interests and I really felt I need to refer to her study because uh, the participants that she was dealing with was half Japanese bilingual right? It was like Japanese-Portuguese bilinguals, very relevant to my study. So I think I’ve cited Ikuta quite a few times, …Yeah, because, she’s in a very close research area, uh I need to keep going back to her study to compare and contrast my study with her study kind of, to uh consolidate my argument I guess.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagreement</th>
<th>To express the writer’s disagreement with an idea</th>
<th>No examples occurred</th>
<th>None found</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement</td>
<td>To acknowledge the author of an idea or term</td>
<td>…what Cummins has called <em>Common Underlying Proficiency</em> but rather belong to the surface features of L1 and L2.</td>
<td>One example was found but not explained by the participant.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>To express the writer’s agreement with an idea</td>
<td>(Cummins, 1982/2001).</td>
<td>It was only a tendency that I was seeing but I needed to support my argument by some authority I guess…</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ervand

Table 6 indicates that Ervand used many of the same references to show that he was applying a well-known theory and discussions about that theory. These same references were also used to show points of convergence and divergence, not only with the findings in his study, but between the studies he reviewed. Ervand expressed a keen intent in showing the relevance of his topic in an updated setting through a sociocultural lens and using a particular theoretical framework. His Discussion section showed the widest range of citation use among the five participants, including alignment with ideas, defining terms used by experts, and explaining ideas that he had investigated in order to articulate his agreement or disagreement.

Table 6
Frequencies and Examples of Ervand’s Self-Reported Reasons for Citing
(Adapted from Petrić & Harwood, 2013, pp. 113-115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation Function</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples from Ervand’s Writing</th>
<th>Interview Excerpt</th>
<th>Number of Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position and alignment</td>
<td>To present an author’s viewpoints and/or findings and to show alignment with same</td>
<td>Mimesis as bodily imitation-transformation is interpreted by McCafferty first and foremost as imitation of gesture…</td>
<td>But it was coherent, clear, interesting and solid and that was what I actually was missing in a lot of research on drama and second language education. And the good part that</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Defining**

To help define or explain a concept or approach

Following Donald (2001), McCafferty understands mimesis as “an analogue style of communication that employs the whole body as an expressive device. It manifests itself in pantomime, imitation, gesturing, sharing attention, ritualized behaviours, and many games” (p. 240)

**Supporting**

To help justify the writer’s claim or idea

Mimesis is also essential to L2 learning and can be defined as a creative/transformative representation of the target linguaculture. Mimetic behaviour is predetermined in human beings and is often linked to mirror neurons (Gallese and Goldman, 1998).

…and that was just a perfect fit, and it was also exciting because there was this reference to uh, um neuroscientists and I quote it later, Gallese and Goldman.

**Application**

To apply a concept, framework, approach or theory to writer’s own analysis

To understand this process better it may be useful to see it through the idea of *mimesis*. Steven McCafferty, in his recent article on mimesis, identifies two prominent roles mimesis plays in L2 education: one is linked to gestural expression, the other

So you’re like oh wait that’s great I wish that theoretical framework had been known to me when I was writing my first, when I was designing my study but he gave me this concept of mimesis and he kind of proposed a theoretical
to the formation of L2 identity (McCafferty, 2008).

**Topic relevance**

To help justify the writer’s choice of topic


…that’s the only one where Vygotsky talks about XXX and because my thesis was about XXX and second language pragmatics and the framework I was using was socio-cultural theory, I felt that I needed to corroborate, my uh, my vision of the data through the Vygotskian lens but I was very excited when I found that short essay.

**Disagreement**

To express the writer’s disagreement with an idea

Nonetheless, as my experience with XXX [names of participants] has shown, substitution does not necessarily help learners to achieve natural intonation and the appropriate forms of linguistic expression.

I felt that a lot of stuff that people do in that area is very different from my own experiments in the field and I also felt that a lot of stuff is very superficial and people throw in buzz words, one of them is XXX and the XXX system and people throw in things but they have no coherent understanding of what the system was about of what XXX wrote about and so I think it was just an example of taking somebody’s thought
on XXX and then deconstructing it through my own perspective and through my own, the analysis of my own practice, my own pedagogical practice but it all comes from this annoyance with the fact that people keep quoting XXX but there is no proof that his system works in second language education.

**Acknowledgement**

To acknowledge the author of an idea or term

XXX requires work, experimentation, determination, and creativity. In the end, I would not be able to say it better than XXX himself...

I think it’s partly a stylistic device here because I’m quoting the master himself here. Somebody whose system I learned when I was a child …So I think that was partly expressing my own identity and re-enforcing my links – my personal affiliation here – but it is also as I said a stylistic device because I wanted to have a nice poetic ending which would keep my thesis open.

**Agreement**

To express the writer’s agreement with an idea

No examples occurred

None found

0

**Others:**

1. On the other hand, pronunciation is linked to emotion and on a larger scale to identity (Morgan, 1997; Pavlenko, 1. ...I think the reason I don’t remember it is that I myself had a very, um, general awareness of Pavlenko’s work at
2. Instructions from supervisor/course taken

2. My second concern is my interpretations of the footage coming from a very particular ‘angle’ prompted by the positioning, perhaps, not a very useful one, of the camera in the corner of the rehearsal room. “The camera lens works to ‘enframe’ the field into compositions” (Dicks et al., 2005, p. 82) and by that creating inequalities and inconsistencies of representation. In certain cases, a research participant could be inadvertently facing the camera and saying something that would indicate “correct pragmatic choices.”

that time. I’m much more aware…… Morgan I don’t even remember what that was about but Pavlenko’s work I think I’d read it but it was like a very superficial kind of reading and I’m not surprised that I am not quoting them directly here, I just mention them like – yeah people talked about that but I don’t really know what they said.

2. Right. It speaks about the mediational function of camera and how the camera lens reshapes our gaze on the research participants something I learnt from a course I took with [a professor]… So this particular citation was partly prompted by the fact that I knew that [the professor] would be reading my thesis and after I had taken the course with [the professor] so I felt the need to put things that would please [the professor] in the first place – I want to be very open here –.
Sophie

The data in Table 7 shows that Sophie used citations mainly to apply theory to her findings and to avoid plagiarism. Accordingly, there was not much variation in the ways in which Sophie used citations. Her main intent as she described it was to show support for her claims especially as they related to the author of a study which she followed closely. Sophie explained that the reason she repeated the reference to the one particular author was not only to apply and acknowledge his theory and framework, but also to avoid plagiarism. Sophie was also one of two participants who referred to an idea with which she disagreed.

Table 7
Frequencies and Examples of Sophie’s Self-Reported Reasons for Citing
(Adapted from Petrić & Harwood, 2013, pp. 113-115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation Function</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples from Sophie’s Writing</th>
<th>Interview Excerpt</th>
<th>Number of Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position and alignment</td>
<td>To present an author’s viewpoints and/or findings and to show alignment with same</td>
<td>No examples occurred</td>
<td>None found</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining</td>
<td>To help define or explain a concept or approach</td>
<td>No examples occurred</td>
<td>None found</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>To help justify the writer’s claim or idea</td>
<td>No examples occurred</td>
<td>None found</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>To apply a concept, framework, approach or</td>
<td>In doing so I was able to explain the textual choices students made (Shi, … Keck as well as Campbell come back quite often because I actually used Keck’s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
theory to writer’s own analysis 2004, p. 190), an approach that Keck (2006) and Shi (2004) both called for in their related, previous studies. analytical methods and coding style basically and terminology for analysis so that type of approach I think was not my own

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic relevance</th>
<th>To help justify the writer’s choice of topic</th>
<th>No examples occurred</th>
<th>None found</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Disagreement | To express the writer’s disagreement with an idea | Many researchers (e.g., Shi, 2004; Keck, 2006) have found that some L2 participants’ lower proficiencies in English might contribute to their frequency of direct copying from source texts. This was not always the case in my study, notably for Nozomi, who contributed the highest number of substantially revised paraphrases, but who also required more time to complete the task than most of the L1 participants did. | Yes, so I looked specifically at again the two studies – yeah this was specifically in their findings and I put it in my own words but they specifically found that there was a correlation between an L2 speaker’s lower proficiency and that their reliance on others’ voices and others text | 1 |

| Acknowledgement | To acknowledge the author of an idea or term | Secondly, the controlled task conditions and verbal reports may have influenced people’s performance of the task, leading to reactivity (see Ericsson & Simon, 1984, 1993) and influencing the overall quality and appropriateness of | Ok so reactivity is a term that Ericson and Simon came up with I can’t even say I really remember too specifically about reactivity but it certainly was not my term so I had to relate back to them. | 1 |
Agreement  

To express the writer’s agreement with an idea

Many researchers (Currie, 1998; Keck, 2006; Pennycook, 1996; Thompson & Pennycook, 2008; Shi, 2004) have commented on the inconsistent definitions of plagiarism within the academic community, which might lead to inconsistent punishments and rewards in L2 writing classrooms. So what I’m referring to here is not about paraphrasing specifically – it was more about the notion of appropriation of others’ ideas and the notion that plagiarism is actually a culturally specific understanding and so anybody who had brought that up in the past, mainly Pennycook, who challenged that notion of saying what appropriateness really means is actually up to interpretation, up to possibly a cultural interpretation. I really felt obliged to bring that in.

Others:

Avoiding plagiarism

This may have interfered with their ability to consider the excerpt as a single thought unit, leading them to interpret it instead word by word, or sentence by sentence. These findings are consistent with those summarized by Campbell (1987, p. 6). I wanted to continue to refer back to Campbell whenever it was possible – basically it meant saying – you know what – this isn’t an original thought of mine.

Grace

Table 8 shows that Grace, like some of the other participants, used citations mostly to apply theory to her findings. Although Grace’s thesis was the longest and her Discussion section
the shortest in terms of word length, there was not much variation between her use of citations and the other participants. The main ways in which she reported and recalled using citations was to present other expert viewpoints and express alignment with them. She attributed this to knowing the authors as well as their works and this gave her the confidence that comes from extensive reading and feedback. Not only did she acknowledge these authors, but also, she applied their ideas and concepts to her findings to show the relevance of her topic and contribution to the field on literacies. These account for the strength of her consistent agreement with the authors she chose to cite.

Table 8
Frequencies and Examples of Grace’s Self-Reported Reasons for Citing (Adapted from Petrić & Harwood, 2013, pp. 113-115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation Function</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples from Grace’s Writing</th>
<th>Interview Excerpt</th>
<th>Number Of Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position and alignment</td>
<td>To present an author’s viewpoints and/or findings and to show alignment with same</td>
<td>(Cummins, 2001; Cummins, June, 2009; Feuerverger, 1994; Herrera &amp; Murry, 2005; Heydon &amp; Iannacci, 2008; Purcell-Gates, 2007; Schecter &amp; Cummins, 2003; Smythe &amp; Toohey, 2009; Toohey, June, 2009).</td>
<td>I had been following their work but I aligned myself with these people – this is the type of research around cultural linguistic diversity that I was interested in doing so I wanted to position myself in alignment with these people</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining</td>
<td>To help define or explain a concept or approach</td>
<td>No examples occurred</td>
<td>None found</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>To help justify the writer’s</td>
<td>No examples</td>
<td>None found</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>To apply a concept, framework, approach or theory to writer’s own analysis</td>
<td>occurred (Albanese, 2009; Christensen &amp; James, 2008; Clark, 2004; Freeman &amp; Mathison, 2009; Heydon &amp; Iannacci, 2008; Soto &amp; Swadener, 2005)</td>
<td>…this notion of children as researchers is something that is in education research and even in sociological research is relatively new you know we’re on a similar trajectory of,… that we saw with women doing or marginalized groups doing research about, to research with, and then having them do research for themselves and so that’s where that fell in it’s also Albanese is Canadian, Freeman and Madison are Canadian, Heydon &amp; Iannacci are also Canadian so I was interested in the Canadian contexts about what was going on here. But you can’t write about children, doing research with children, without recognizing the contributions of Richardson James Clark.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic relevance</td>
<td>To help justify the writer’s choice of topic</td>
<td>bhabha’s (1994) theoretical framework of Third Space identities….</td>
<td>So the next one is bhabha again and then we get into childhood studies and again it was my literature review where I didn’t know any of this literature before coming in and so I had done a pretty extensive review, um, and I selected these people because they were recognized as… in the field, as very much working with children as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement</td>
<td>To express the writer’s disagreement with an idea</td>
<td>No examples occurred</td>
<td>None found</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement</td>
<td>To acknowledge the author of an idea or term</td>
<td>I draw on bhabha’s (1994) notion of Third Space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So I started with bhabha and his notion of third space, I think I also talk about my naming of the school as an ecole cosmopolite because bhabha also has a term that was not yet published on vernacular cosmopolitanism which is also like a non-traditional view of cosmopolitism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>To express the writer’s agreement with an idea</td>
<td>As policies such as Ontario’s Equity and Inclusive Education strategy (2009) and Admissions to French-language schools (2009…</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And so this policy, the 2009 French Language Policy 148, was a new admissions policy that was opening French Language schools to the inclusion of Allophone students and those students were the students that I was looking at in my study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Others:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No examples occurred</td>
<td>None found</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Challenges**
The participants discussed several hurdles related to the acquisition of academic writing and, specifically, their decisions about scholarly referencing as beginning experts. Some of these challenges included having acquired academic literacy in a language other than English (e.g., Anna); not receiving enough feedback on different aspects of academic writing (e.g., Anna and Grace); receiving feedback that was not timely, proving inadequate in helping them to improve (e.g., Anna); institutional and cultural differences (e.g., Anna); lack of prior experience in writing academic texts (e.g., Charlotte); lack of experience in writing longer texts such as those required in graduate courses (e.g., Ervand); and lack of exposure to different genres in academic writing, such as writing a synthesis and a cogent abstract (e.g., Charlotte and Sophie).

Additionally, the participants discussed the main ways in which they sought to overcome these challenges. While some reported having to be persistent in seeking feedback from professors and getting help through more formal channels (English language support centres and writing centres), others relied on modelling expert writing in journal publications. I also observed that high citation density seemed consistent with lack of confidence in writing, wanting to please professors and feeling the need to show knowledge and expertise by relying on a higher quantity of citations than they felt was necessary (e.g., Charlotte and Anna). For some (e.g., Anna, Charlotte, Sophie, Ervand), sacrificing their own voice to give prominence to expert voices showed a keenness for knowledge display and a strong desire to align with expert ideas. Using citations because the professor “said so” showed strict adherence to the requirements of the gatekeepers/experts, as Charlotte and Ervand observed. Another important observation was that referencing experts in the field was consistent with a desire to show alignment and extensive reading, as Charlotte and Grace demonstrated. In the cases of Charlotte, Sophie, and Ervand, for example, acknowledging use of a specific analytic framework was a common strategy to
legitimize their ideas. Challenging ideas, though infrequently done, could have been a means by which participants such as Ervand and Grace distinguished between their perceptions of worthy knowledge and worthier knowledge.

Overcoming a lack of confidence by either using several parenthetical references or several citations within one parenthetical reference to acknowledge the same idea not only contributed to a high citation density, but it also showed a strong desire to do what the writers thought the professors wanted, as Anna and Charlotte indicated. Writers who followed closely other studies also showed these same tendencies. Grace was the only student writer who broke with this tendency to the extent that she deliberately wanted to give prominence to her own ideas.

Interestingly, some participants acknowledged referencing famous authors or seminal works to show their familiarity with expert works. This to me was the strongest evidence for the desire for legitimacy and being recognized by and within the knowledge community. For example, Grace talked about using works of people she knew personally and who were famous in the field. Ervand gave a similar example by constantly referring to one theorist who he frequently quoted directly. Anna felt strongly that she needed “big names” to strengthen claims that she already knew were legitimate. She felt that citing famous authors and many authors was a beneficial way to make her knowledge visible and have her claims legitimized. As Charlotte likewise observed:

Um, this one, umm, this one is like so seminal you know, I just couldn’t neglect it, you know what I mean. I just had to mention it somewhere …yeah when you are talking about XXX [topic], you know, you just couldn’t go without this.

However, Ervand made a conscious decision to go against the grain and did not conform just to please the audience of assessors by using experts who were aligned with his ideas, or whose
ideas supported his findings. In the interview session he challenged the idea of one expert on the theory he was using as the basis for his study, to express his “annoyance” with what he saw as a superficial use of theory.
Chapter Six

Identities Revealed through Citation Practices

This chapter responds to my second research question: Retrospectively, what did the participants’ responses about their use of citations reveal about their identities as language and literacy educators and researchers? To discuss this second question, I used Ivanič’s (1998) framework to interpret the findings in respect to the negotiation of four strands of identity for the five writers as they appeared in their interviews and specifically their justifications for the use of citations in their theses. I begin with a description of the four strands and then present the findings for each strand. To support the findings, I give examples from interviews and identity profiles of the five participants.

Performing Autobiographical Identity

Generally, the autobiographical self emerges in a written text as an expression of past interests, experiences, commitments, allegiances, ideas, newly formed opinions and commitments, and a sense of self and one’s own literary practices within a particular sociocultural context (Ivanič, 1998, p. 183). The effect of experiences is important, and there can be a possible conflict between multiple experiences and writing and citing in a new context. Writers tend to give expression to what has interested them in the past.

In Ivanič’s (1998, p.25) discussion of the discoursal self as “voice” she linked this to the emergence of the autobiographical self. This relates to the Vygotskyian idea of how knowledge is co-constructed. Voice has also been described as “the manifestation of one’s agency in discourse through the means of language” (Canagarajah, 2004, p.267). The expression of one’s
own voice can complicate adhering to the use of source material written by experts. It is rooted in experiences because whatever a person cites was already expressed in someone else’s voice. This fact has implications not only for the social construction of the autobiographical self, but it is also the reason for the examination of intertextuality (Fairclough, 1992). In each participant’s interview, responses showed that the expression of the autobiographical self was multifaceted and manifested as a struggle between experience and a new context.

In this aspect of identity construction, the citation choices made by the participants were revealed first and foremost by their decision to study in the field of Applied Linguistics, which was largely influenced by their own cultural, educational and linguistic backgrounds. Second, all the participants spoke more than one language and viewed that ability as an important aspect of their decisions about what to study and why and who to cite.

For example, Grace revealed that she felt it was important to prove to her colleagues that she was doing something important about literacy education, not just because of her hybrid Canadian-Asian identity, but also due to her desire to effect meaningful change in education through her research. Her reliance on experts who had had similar research trajectories coincided with her goal to build on their work. However, in my interpretation, this tendency emerged not only as a decisive path, but also as a way for Grace to actively engage with a past struggle. In her interview, she spoke about having been deprived of opportunities to learn other languages besides English during her childhood, because her parents, who spoke many languages, were told that she would have better opportunities in Canada if she only learned English. This seemed to be the basis for Grace’s decision to write part of her thesis in French. It seemed as if it was her way of taking advantage of an opportunity which she previously had been denied. Also, she needed to reconcile that aspect of her identity which she called “plurilingual.”
Similarly, Ervand’s background as a multilingual language teacher and active professional in another domain underpinned his decision to investigate possible pedagogical links between the two areas. Additionally, his entire investigation rested on a popular tenet of teaching that seemed to have emerged from both his translingual and professional abilities; these were skills which he possessed before writing his MA thesis. His citation choices revolved mostly around one main theory and theorist, juxtaposed with the responses of other experts to the ideas of that theorist.

In Anna’s case, familiar practices, entrenched in her autobiographical identity, encroached on or even dominated her writing and citing decisions. In Anna’s previous social and institutional culture, the professor was the ultimate authority:

And because I was a newcomer, pretty much a newcomer to Canada and because the relationship I had previously had with my professors in [XXX] was very much different, there is a lot of distance between the student and the professor and if the professor does not respond it’s okay.

Consequently, that aspect of her past experience caused Anna to make decisions to include citations in places where she did not want to, or disagreed with the professor, simply because this was what was institutionally acceptable in her homeland. She appeared to have carried those beliefs with her. Although modelling the professor as expert is accepted as part of the acquisition of academic literacy, Anna’s citing behaviours demonstrated a clash in sociocultural contexts, conflicts in values and a conflict in her sense of self-worth. This friction was also observed in Charlotte’s description of her autobiographical identity. Anna skilfully negotiated the space between her autobiographical identity and her citation choices by doing what she described as writing her own ideas first and then going back to see which authors
showed alignment or agreement with her findings. In her interview, Anna reported that she later inserted these as parenthetical references simply as a way to meet the supervisory professor’s requirements.

As a committed writing teacher, Sophie expressed the most concern with avoiding plagiarism as part of her citation practices. Sophie said she wanted to demonstrate that the format of her citation practices could mimic the topic of her thesis. In direct quotations, the original voice of an author is reproduced, and I observed this technique being heavily used by Ervand. However, Sophie’s Discussion showed more evidence of paraphrasing techniques. In paraphrasing, the original voice may dominate but the ideas are balanced by the writer’s own interpretation (Ivanič, 1998). Perhaps for this reason Sophie negotiated her identity by choosing to paraphrase instead of quoting, and so aligned her writing style with the topical focus of her thesis, which presumably was selected because of her experience as a writing teacher.

In defining autobiographical identity, Ivanič (1998, p. 213) distinguished between “intermental” and “intramental” encounters. I observed that the participants’ justifications for their uses of citations sometimes intersected with autobiographical identity as an issue of ownership, which could mean that the writers used others’ words to legitimize their own intentions and purposes. For example, Charlotte’s discovery that many good published academic writers were ELLs like her seemed to lead to her citing more ELL writers in her Discussion section. These behaviours involved an appropriation of others’ words and ideas that the participants had tailored to suit their own experiences and opinions.

Performing Discoursal and Authorial Identities
Because the present data collected came from the Discussion sections of the participants’ theses, there were limitations for them to present their authorial identities through citation. For a more balanced analysis, the interpretations of the negotiation of discoursal and authorial identities are presented together here, as I had observed in Chapter 3.

The discoursal negotiation of identity in writing is accompanied by a focus on and influences from the social or institutional context. In other words, whereas autobiographical identity represents the past self, discoursal identity is the self that writers want to portray and enter into in the present through their writing. This identity option imposes the need to accommodate the conventions and expectations of a particular discourse community. Moreover, in the academic context of an MA thesis the initial, intended audience is also the assessor(s) of the written text. In this sense, the presentation of the discoursal self is both negotiated and constrained by the expectations of others.

Many insights into the identity of the discoursal self appeared in the retrospectives of Anna, Charlotte, Grace and Ervand, who were the most concerned with how their backstage preparation (research and writing processes) would be received in the front region (final textual product) of their writing. They wanted to identify with prominent voices in the field and wanted the audience to see this clearly. In this way, the participants in this study engaged in interdiscursive practices in the form of the parenthetical references to show identification with expert voices, thereby legitimizing their own opinions and research findings.

Among the five participants, none more than Anna seemed to have experienced audience constraints in terms of how and when to cite. Anna reported the experience of including citations in her Discussion of the Results as a source of conflict:

In the first part, I actually relied a lot and you can probably feel that more in the first part
I relied a lot on citations on what big people in the field have to say and then I would try to accommodate my own writing to reflect these big ideas. In the second one I went the other way around because in the second one I wrote the whole thing first and then I tried to find the support in the work that I used in my lit review so I went back and I actually tried to find some of the things to prove my point …

So I thought, oh my gosh I need big names again so XXX and XXX, sounded like very big names in the field and whatever they said confirms what I found (19.17). And that’s so obvious. I know now that it probably really is not needed here. I see now, looking at my Discussion section, that it has way too many citations and it refers too much to these big names.

The preceding excerpts demonstrate that Anna’s acquisition of academic literacy was developmental. In terms of Anna’s negotiations she made adjustments to the way she presented her ideas to suit what she thought her audience would accept and value. She seemed not to trust herself enough at that point in her development as an advanced writer to make knowledge claims without alignment with several “big names.” Her words strongly express this lack of confidence and deference to the audience to portray the identity she thought they wanted to see:

   But to me, I probably thought as a beginning scholar or something, nobody would trust whatever, and I knew that I had to support, so I had that in the back of my head (26.45) saying that everything, all the conclusions that I make, they have to go in line with the previous research, somehow. I guess.

Anna frequently disowned some ideas during her retrospective by repeating in reference to some of her citation choices: “why did I do that,” “I shouldn’t have,” and “next time I won’t.” It also
became clear that for Anna academic literacy was part of a professional identity.

Similarly, Charlotte seemed to feel that she would not be taken seriously if she did not mention a well-known author in her field of study:

Um, this one, umm, this one is like so seminal you know, I just couldn’t neglect it, you know what I mean. I just had to mention it somewhere and uh Ikuta actually mentions that, uh in her study as well and uh, yeah when you are talking about second language writing, you know, you just couldn’t go without this…

Further, she expressed a strong desire to please her supervisor/audience. When Charlotte used “I guess,” this may have signalled a sense of ambivalence about her own commitment to cite these sources, but she seemed secure in the knowledge that this display was necessary to please her audience.

Grace’s writing and citation choices showed a desire to simultaneously accommodate as well as resist the readers’ expectations as a critical act. In terms of the format of her writing, she clearly disassociated her work from the norm:

I positioned it as an inter-chapter rather than as a chapter so already I wasn’t at a place where I was going to push as hard to say, you know, this is legitimate as a chapter – I just said that it was an in-between chapter – it was in that in-between space that XXX talks about and so I was like – that’s fine – I was OK with just pushing it there and I think that my dissertation was completely outside of the box now.

However, in her citation choices, Grace did not go against the grain and showed a strong desire to accommodate her intended reader’s expectations:

I aligned myself with these people – this is the type of research around cultural linguistic diversity that I was interested in doing so I wanted to position myself in alignment with these people.
Grace’s alignment with these experts was long-term (before and during her MA thesis), contrary to the temporary nature of some of the choices made by other participants such as Anna and Charlotte, who admitted to just using “big names” for the sake of the thesis itself. Likewise, Ervand remarked how he had only just discovered, but was enthusiastic to align himself with, certain critics toward the end of writing the Discussion section of his thesis:

Oh this one I remember really well and that’s when I got very excited because this particular article by XXX XXX took me to a different level of thinking and that all happened after I completed my data collection and after I wrote my first version of Chapter 5. I don’t think XXX was there and I read XXX work after and realized, partly because it’s XXX [year], so I just discovered it too late. So you’re like oh wait that’s great I wish that theoretical framework had been known to me when I was writing my first, when I was designing my study.

Ervand’s retrospective discussion also showed a combination of accommodation and resistance to the reader’s expectations. In at least one citation, Ervand set up an expert opinion, only to challenge and critique it later on in the Discussion section:

I do remember being annoyed by a lot of literature I had read on XXX (topic of thesis) and um, I felt that a lot of stuff that people do in that area is very different from my own experience in the field and I also felt that a lot of stuff is very superficial and people throw in buzz words, one of them is XXX and the XXX system and people throw in things but they have no coherent understanding of what the system was about of what XXX wrote about and so I think it was just an example of taking somebody’s thought on XXX [name of author] and then deconstructing it through my own perspective and through my own, the analysis of my own practice, my own pedagogical practice but it all
comes from this annoyance with the fact that people keep quoting XXX but there is no proof that his system works and I don’t think all researchers agree upon what that system means so the superficiality of, uh the way how people quote XXX mention his work probably led me to quoting this particular author.

This perspective of Ervand’s was almost the converse of Sophie’s “cookie cutter” approach to accommodate, rather than resist, existing expert views:

I actually used XXX’s analytical methods and coding style basically and terminology for analysis so that type of approach I think was not my own and so XXX I always have to refer to XXX, XXX, XXX [repeats the author’s name].

In considering how the writers described their real selves in their identity profiles in comparison to their projected selves in their citation choices in their written texts and interviews, Anna appears to have sacrificed her sense of her real self, whereas Ervand wavered between owning and disowning the ideas of his main theorist and other critics. The participants all believed that they were making a contribution not just to research for the sake of it but for a wider pedagogical and scholarly purpose. They adopted different positions on the expert ideas they chose to include, ranging from Charlotte’s showing reverence by quoting and repeating the names of experts to Sophie’s paraphrasing to reduce authority. It is important to note that the use of a direct quotation can also signal distance rather than close association. Sometimes, the participant used direct quotations to make it clear that they were not seeking ownership of the words or ideas. In other cases, they wanted to show close association by using the author’s words directly. Ervand did this towards the end of his thesis, both as a way of paying homage to the author of the theory he was addressing, but also a way of distinguishing between his original thought and someone else’s.
With the exception of Grace, the participants did not seem to consistently and directly take ownership of their discoursal identity in reflecting on the Discussion sections of their theses. While they all seemed to want to associate themselves with the relevant academic community, they sometimes seemed ambivalent about their citation choices. Specific mention must be made of Ervand who described his identity as a person as being in a state of flux, perhaps meaning that he no longer identified with the experts he chose to cite at the time of his MA thesis, perhaps because he had now acquired more critical distance. He also admitted to disliking the word identity since his identity at the time of writing the MA thesis was temporary, and since that time it had become different. This seems consistent with Ervand’s tendency to challenge and critique ideas. Similarly, Anna, upon reflection stated that she was not, at the time of my interview, the same person or writer who did the MA and who had made certain citation choices for the reasons that she did back then. While Sophie appeared to have established the most secure alignment with experts in order to please her audience and fulfil her own research purposes, she used paraphrasing in a way that could indicate reducing the ownership of experts over ideas and thereby attempting to appropriate them.

As Ivanič (1998, p. 242) observed, the power relationships between students and professors and assessors mediates the influence of the wider social context, putting pressure on student writers to conform to these reader’s expectations and anticipated responses. Out of the five participants, Anna, Charlotte, and Sophie showed a greater tendency to accommodate expectations, whereas Ervand most consistently performed resistance. Power relations between reader and writer had an impact on how participants such as Anna and Charlotte positioned themselves in their citation choices Participants like Anna and Ervand felt constrained by this relationship, and only Grace consciously took a risk with her “inter-chapter,” but still “played it
safe” with her conventional citation practices. Clashes between writers’ beliefs and their readers’ anticipated values or instructions can lead to discoursal identity emerging in an ambivalent way.

The authorial self as an aspect of identity construction seemed to be foregrounded in this context by the ways in which the participants conformed to the style guide of the APA. One participant, Sophie, expressed a strong desire to ensure that her use of the APA style was correct: “so I took the APA workshop and this individual taught me so much.” She was also keen on showing that her citation practices exemplified paraphrasing. Grace wanted her writing to be “beautiful” although she reported that she did not feel any pressure or expectation from the academic institution for her writing to be that way. She demonstrated her keen pursuit of the principles of academic writing, but her style of writing and the reasons she expressed for her citation choices showed that she was willing to go “against the grain.” To exemplify, Grace revealed her intention to craft a unique and personally satisfying style in her thesis:

We have a very strict definition of what a thesis is supposed to look like and you have to adhere to those criteria. And so I wanted to suggest and demonstrate that it’s possible to use other literacy practices and still produce an academic document…

Anna referred to multiple sources within parentheses to show that she understood what was required of her as a scholarly author. This approach to citation use, of citing on average more than three authors at a time in several parenthetical references, was unique to Anna’s writing and citing behaviour compared to the other participants. She explained that this was due to a lack of confidence in herself. Anna in this way seemed to be performing the role of the industrious student (Harwood & Petrić, 2012).

**Possibilities for Selfhood**
This section analyses how the writers tried to construct their identities as beginning experts within the disciplinary field chosen for this research. I focused on the third interview prompt about whether or not and how the participants thought that writing the Discussion section had an impact on their identities as applied linguists (see Appendix B). Specifically, I examined their responses regarding the opportunities afforded to them by undertaking the research and citing specific authors. In sum, as observed already, there was a strong tendency to show allegiance with expert writers. However, there was a distinction between how the participants expressed a student role versus the role of a beginning expert or contributor of knowledge to applied linguistics.

Additionally, I observed a proclivity amongst the participants to position themselves as people who have read books and articles and studies on topics within the discipline. This proclivity manifested itself as identifying with the interests of applied linguists by citing authors who were relevant to their thesis topic. In cases where the participants’ approaches to research were following closely published studies, there was a tendency to show subjectivity in the interpretation of expert sources rather than to challenge the ideas. On the other hand, where the thesis studies were more of the participants’ own original design the participants expressed freedom to challenge expert or established ideas.

The participants saw and wanted to project an identity as contributors to a field of knowledge and not be perceived just as receptacles for previously accepted knowledge, even while showing allegiance to experts in the field. This “insider identity” (Bartholomae, 1985) is the image of the self as a researcher contributing to a field of knowledge and by extension pedagogical change, as exemplified by Anna who said:
And when I was finished writing I think that was a great relief of course and it did change me in the way that I felt that I can create something that may promote some change maybe not in Canada but in my home country – it did – it helps students – and that was important -at that point it was not so much of the research or some innovation or whatever – it was the thing that it was practical and it was needed somewhere and it made me happy – it made me very happy that it all worked out.

Only one participant, Charlotte, attributed an idea to a fellow student. On the one hand, this could be construed as Charlotte’s acknowledgement of her mixed and emerging identities. However, this was also further evidence of establishing credibility, since the appeal to ethos demonstrates that there is shared knowledge and common ground with other members the community:

Right, yeah, this one was actually, she was uh, well she still is an XXX student …and I’ve known her quite well, because and she’s done some research related to my area, I’ve had quite a few discussions with her and stuff, you know, while we were having coffee together, kind of. I think I mentioned something like that to her, that I wonder if bilingual writers tend to produce longer and more detailed texts when they’re writing in the same language of the experience that they’re writing about and she said, yeah, that’s exactly what she found and she’s actually just published the uh, article [23:15] based on that kind of stuff and she introduced me to, you know, to that article that she wrote and so I thought, yeah, that would be perfect to back up my uh data, it just happened that way, yeah.
I also observed that the participants expressed the possibility of acquiring an expert identity. Ervand expressed such shifts in his identity clearly:

I’m just brainstorming right now I think I’m not sure I have thought about that before, because my research made me look at my participants from a perspective of an expert cause I was a teacher teaching them so that was the perspective I was taking – and it was sort of artificial, a little bit – and it was like me being Canadian looking at ESL speakers learning to perform in English and writing from that position – I don’t know why I did that but I wrote from that position – um, reinforced my teacher-identity or educator identity and my Canadian identity.

In particular, the participants’ writing and citing behaviours demonstrated features which were linked to negotiating the possibilities for selfhood. First, the resources that they drew on were socially constructed by the life and experiences of other (expert) writers. Charlotte included other graduate students in this knowledge community, demonstrating the intertextual nature of citing as a response or conversation with other experts in the field:

I think I mentioned something like that to her that I wonder if bilingual writers tend to produce longer and more detailed texts when they’re writing in the same language of the experience that they’re writing about and she said, yeah, that’s exactly what she found and she’s actually just published the uh, article [23:15] based on that kind of stuff and she introduced me to, you know, to that article that she wrote and so I thought, yeah, that would be perfect to back up my uh data, it just happened that way, yeah.

Further, there was a demonstration of a strong commitment to knowledge construction as a collaborative experience at university. Grace, for example talked about seeking valued feedback although she seemed comfortable to write independently and took risks with writing and citing by including her inter-chapter. Second, the act of showing allegiance to other expert writers
revealed the self/identity that participants wanted to convey through the thesis writing itself. This process was evident when Grace said:

And I think that there are lots of um, researchers that are using the notion of XXX and it’s conceptualized differently like you can think of XXX [author’s name] and now I would include them all in here but at the time, this was what I knew and so this was what I drew on.

Third, the participants all displayed knowledge of the institutional requirements for writing the Discussion section of a thesis or research report. For example, Sophie’s ambivalence did not deter her from positioning through citation for her readers. She was very cognizant of the values of the institution: “I truly believe it was an ethical thing to do and [name of institution] supported it.” Fourth, there was the balancing act of distancing one’s autobiographical identity from the discoursal self. For example, Ervand did not buy in to all the interpretations of the theoretical system he followed in his thesis, and so he cited some of the responses of other authors to the system, only to challenge them.

In sum, the findings about the possibilities for selfhood show that the participants positioned themselves within the academic community by identifying with the field of study, leaning more toward the role of contributor rather than student, and taking a stance on knowledge construction by establishing their contributions to the field and making them visible and legitimate. Whereas Anna, Charlotte, Ervand and Grace displayed identities that were academically focused, Sophie identified more with a professional identity and seemed to resist a scholarly identity:

So for me, in terms of my identity, I see a difference – you mention voice a couple of times and I’m really fascinated by that concept and I talk to my students a lot about voice
but in terms of identity ..... I think in certain, certain in discourse communities, I feel a little more comfortable talking about the work I've done and I think it’s added to my confidence as a practitioner of teaching a second language because the actual work of the interviewing, the recording, the transcribing all of that gave me a nice first-hand exposure to what goes on in second language learners’ minds so it certainly informed my professional identity and allowed me to kind of look at the students differently and really question what’s going on in their minds and question their real intentions.

Further, all participants used expressions and cited expert writers that correspond to and characterise traditional academic discourse. They all used formal academic prose, observed the stylistic conventions of academic writing, and used APA format and style, including the IMRD rhetorical moves in their theses. Their efforts showed a sense of wanting to belong to the academic discourse community.

I think it was important in my identity construction as a graduate student and becoming academic or a scholar in process, simply because, it was…, I hadn’t published anything prior to this and so this was my introduction into the world of academic publishing.
Chapter Seven

Discussion

This chapter discusses the findings presented in the two preceding chapters, highlighting the themes in the participants’ explanations about their citation use. I also interpret and evaluate these themes in reference to the theoretical framework as well as prior research. First, I summarize the findings in reference to my two research questions. Then, I compare the participants’ explanations of their citation use. This helps to examine the intersection with the construction or negotiation of identity as it emerged from the writers’ retrospectives and their identity profiles (Basturkmen, 2009; Ivanič, 1998; Michaud, 2013). Finally, I draw some conclusions about citation use and identity and outline the major implications for further research and pedagogical practice. The limitations of this research are also observed.

Summary of Findings

In relation to my first research question, the participants in the present study gave a variety of reasons, each of which were specific to their own experiences and purposes, for referencing in the Discussion sections of their MA theses. Collectively, the reasons they gave for citing were mainly to show support for their claims, show parallels between their study and a prior study whose research design they had followed closely, show alignment between their ideas and expert ideas, impress their professors with the breadth of the reading which they had done, show agreement or disagreement with others’ ideas, challenge existing hypotheses or policies through pedagogical innovations, and interrogate or integrate ideas from other disciplines. These findings are consistent with similar research by Harwood and Petrić (2012). What surfaced as interesting and different, however, was the way in which some participants in the present
research used citations not only to align themselves with expert ideas but also to build on existing knowledge, sometimes even challenging ideas they considered to be outdated and refuting claims that they considered inapplicable to certain contexts.

The present study showed that the construction of the Discussion of the Results section was not arbitrary, but rather a demonstration of deliberate decisions, bound by the discourse conventions of (a) academic writing, (b) APA style, and (c) institutional demands and disciplinary practices. The participants engaged with specific sources and gave justifiable reasons for using those sources. Their choices were shaped by their experiences, ideas, knowledge, and opinions. These student writers were already positioned in a specific way based on their “backstories,” which had an impact on how they engaged with citation choices of expert voices in discussing the results in their MA theses as well as their desire for acceptance into the relevant academic community.

In the Discussion of the Results sections of their MA theses, the writers showed how they integrated expert knowledge with their original ideas. The discussion of their findings seemed to be performance of co-constructed knowledge, intertwined with the negotiation of different parts of their identities (Goffman, 2002; Ivanič, 1998). This echoes Elbow’s (1995) explanation of the discomfort in reconciling the roles of being a writer and being an academic. Sometimes it seemed that participants lacked confidence in expressing their own ideas causing them give prominence to expert voices. This process forms part of Goffman’s notion of the “staging” which takes place in the back region (in the case, the writing process) in order to produce an institutionally acceptable text, or a performance in the front region (the product of an MA thesis and specifically a Discussion section).
In terms of my second research question about the intersection between citation choices and the construction of the four strands of identity developed by Ivanič (1998), the findings in Chapter 6 indicate that the writers brought to the process of writing an autobiographical identity which they applied to citation practices and which framed other aspects of their identities. Peoples’ words and phrases, ideas, opinions and values come from experience and interactions with other texts. The present participants seemed almost unable to extricate this aspect of their identity from their citation choices and topic of interest in their theses. Spack (1997) emphasised that the importance of acquiring academic literacy is underscored by the way in which different educational backgrounds shape the way we respond to academic discourses. In this particular context, I found that the MA students did as expected by aspiring scholars, which was to deploy familiar, previously read sources.

Consequently, although the autobiographical self seemed to be the strongest aspect of identity evident in the participants’ citation choices, it was the emergence of the possibilities for selfhood that seemed to be the most potent. Citations used for attribution connected expert sources and the participants’ own ideas and identities. This process is referred to as intertextuality by Fairclough (1992) and as dialogism by Bahktin (1986). Viewing citation practices in this way may remove plagiarism “from the province of moral outrage, cheating, regulations and penalties” (Ivanič, 1998, p.197). Importantly, this perspective helps to understand that the intersection between citation practices and identity construction has fundamentally to do with a strong impetus to belong to a community of practice (CoP) (Lave & Wenger 1991; Wenger, 1998). This impetus is what Ivanič (1998) expressed as possibilities for selfhood. It is what the present participants were doing in their enculturation into the disciplinary community of applied linguistics.
The examination of citation practices, interpreted using Ivanič’s (1998) four strands of identity, also confirmed the uses of citing as symbolic capital, social control, markers of identity, sites of resistance, empowerment, and solidarity. Moreover, “there is always room to negotiate, modify and reconfigure” (Canagarajah, 2004, p.268) when past and present identities collide in academic literacy. The five participants experienced conflicts in their citation practices about who to cite and when and why, as they were very concerned that their discoursal identities might be constrained by discourse requirements and by the expectations of their audience of assessors. However, this process did not obscure the emergence of their multi-layered identities which were demonstrated by how and why they used citations.

The emergence of different strands of identity also surfaced as an issue of ownership of voice, which was expressed by Anna and Charlotte as a love/hate relationship with writing, but which led to a strong desire to please the gatekeepers in the community of practice. Evidence of this tendency was the repeated reference by Anna and Ervand to considering the readers’ ideological stance and expectations by pleasing the professor. Hyland (2002b, p. 351) expressed this tendency as a sort of muffling of students’ voices:

Students often see academic writing as an alien form of literacy designed to disguise the author and deal directly with facts. Style guides and textbooks commonly portray scholarly writing as a kind of impersonal, faceless discourse, and EAP teachers direct students to remove themselves from their texts.

**Implications for Theory**

The participants’ citation choices and the relationships documented between their values, beliefs and cultural backgrounds link to Ivanič’s (1998) argument that academic writing is a
“multiple, complex and contested set of social practices which should be given more explicit attention by all members of the academic community” (p.109). Goffman’s notion of performance (2002) as the presentation of multiple selves figures centrally in Ivanič’s possibilities of selfhood. This strand of identity construction is where a writer ostensibly develops and projects an identity of wanting to belong to a discourse community.

Differences in the reasons, challenges, and attempts to overcome hurdles that the five participants reported attest to the complexity of citation use for advanced academic writers. This, I believe, is due to issues of performance, co-constructed knowledge, and identity construction. The writers approached writing and citing in various and sometimes ambivalent ways. This variability and uncertainty about citation practices lead me to question the consistency of approaches commonly used to teach citation use in advanced academic literacy. Indeed, can citation practices be taught as an isolated topic across the curriculum or through pedagogical prescriptions at higher levels of education, or must they be acquired in the process of specialized knowledge construction and advanced literacy practices such as writing an MA thesis, as Freedman (1993) has argued about the acquisition of all specialized genres? The complexity of the uses of referencing beyond the intent to avoid plagiarism may well camouflage the complexity of the discoursal construction of emerging scholarly identities and literacies.

The five participants identified with the theoretical positionings within their own research, which verified their negotiation of the four strands of identity in Ivanič’s theoretical framework. The lack of definition-oriented citations in their Discussion sections may well be because this function is normally fulfilled by citations in earlier sections of a thesis or research report, such as Introductions or Reviews of Relevant Literature. This lack, however, may also
demonstrate that the present participants took into account their intended readers’ expertise in the field while showing at the same time that they intended to belong to, and were exploring possibilities for selfhood within, the relevant academic community of practice. The participants also displayed creativity, disciplinary awareness, and possibilities for selfhood by writing their own ideas and then inserting citations of authors who were aligned with them. In terms of their authorial identities, Anna and Sophie seemed particularly concerned about portraying qualities which were valued by their intended audiences, showing combinations of creativity and sincerity.

Through this research I came to believe that the discoursal construction of identity was a useful lens through which to understand citation practices beyond examinations of plagiarism within the context of advanced academic literacy practices. There was a constant (re)negotiation of identity in progress with these five advanced literacy writers such that; the strands of their identities seemed so inextricably linked through citation uses that they were relatively easy for the participants to recall and even appeared difficult to suppress.

That several of the participants I interviewed were now pursuing PhD studies raises questions about whether or not, at the Masters’ level, they could have had the full awareness of citation practices that they expressed during my research. It may be that only in retrospect could they see certain things, and only after further advanced studies could they properly assess what they had written previously. Would the participants have been able to make better or more varied use of citations if they were aware of the issues illuminated in the present research? Could they have derived more benefit from feedback from professors, writing instructors, and student peers, not only to address adherence to APA style, but to appreciate the complex, analytical, and identity-oriented aspects of how and why to use citations to produce academically acceptable texts?
Implications for Pedagogical Practice

The challenges of acquiring advanced literacy observed above suggest that institutions of higher education consider more inclusive, empirically and theoretically informed pedagogical practices related to citation practices. Policies prohibiting plagiarism rarely touch on the complexities of citation uses in advanced scholarly writing, and they may event divert attention away from their fundamental characteristics. The five participants in the present research were not mere receivers (and certainly were not blatant copiers of source texts), but rather they distinguished themselves as contributors to research and creators of knowledge. Recognizing this position as central to advanced academic literacy implies engendering a natural, grounded, and unrestricted conversation between beginning experts and expert writers about their citation and other advanced literacy practices. Instructors in all disciplines need to develop and become involved with pedagogical practices which (a) help writers position their ideas among ideas expressed by experts in a critical manner; (b) help writers to deepen their understanding of the wide range of options available to them for the co-construction and display of valuable and valued knowledge; (c) help writers use citations to express close alignment with but also challenges to existing theories and ideas; (d) help writers to learn to access resources such as style manuals, exemplar models, and computer concordances available for shaping source integration; and (e) facilitate an acceptance that students’ views and identities evolve through writing and knowledge generation, for which citation practices are integral discourse strategies.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

There are myriad limitations to this research. First, the sample size only consisted of five participants within the same discipline. This meant that I could only draw conclusions about the
five participants who wrote during that single decade in the one institution. Also, although I was careful to use random sampling to identify the theses, the lack of response or impossibility of finding contact information for many possible participants selected from the sampling may have introduced a bias to my sample. For example, the participants were mostly those still located in the city where they had done the MA rather than people who had moved elsewhere. Second, the duration of the data collection was quite short. Although I selected and examined theses that were written within a ten-year period, the interviews were one-time interviews lasting about 45 minutes. My commitment to protecting the identities of the participants also limited me in divulging details and specifics about them and their work. For example, I withheld information about the languages they spoke and in addition I did not include the date of publication of their thesis which would have indicated the amount of time that had lapsed between the submission of the thesis and the interview. Variation in this amount of time elapsed between the present research and the writing of each MA thesis could account for some of the responses I received being “I don’t know” or “I don’t remember”. The entire process of selecting participants who met the criteria, performing a simple random sample, contacting participants and obtaining informed consent, selecting the citations for discussion and finally scheduling and conducting the interviews, took about eight weeks. Further research of the kind I have undertaken can make a contribution to understanding the full nature of citation practices and its development in higher education, for example, in different scholarly and scientific disciplines, in different types of research reports and other genres, and among Doctoral as well as Masters’ students and among established scholars or novice professors. Longitudinal research is definitely required to more fully appreciate the developmental aspects of citation practices and other dimensions of advanced academic literacy. Tardy’s (2009) study of four multilingual graduate students in
engineering and computer sciences is an exemplary analysis of how rhetorical, formal, process, and subject-matter converge and mix over several years to develop advanced scientific literacy practices.

Third, some readers may question the type of data which I collected, namely the Discussion of the Results section of theses, which was an assessed written product. Observing the process of preparing the Discussion section may have provided more opportunities for examining the negotiation of identity. Fourth, a thesis may have been heavily edited by a thesis supervisor, committee member, and even professional editor or writing support staff. Fifth, the nature of the retrospective interviews is that the participants’ current identities could colour their reports of the identities they had and were forming while writing their theses. These kinds of negotiations were not considered in my data or analyses. To counter this limitation, I provided the participants with the opportunity to reflect on their writing and citation practices by sending them electronic copies of their Discussions sections with highlighted sections that were going to be the topic of interviews. Sixth, I did not have the sample size or opportunity to examine class, gender, or race as part of the discussion of autobiographical identity.

Some challenges which I experienced in reading the Discussion sections and talking to the participants about them were that the scope and transparency of the citation functions were not always obvious to me. Sometimes there was considerable overlap in the functions of citations, so it would be advisable in future research to code citations for multiple functions rather than just one as I had decided to do. In this case, the overlap was resolved by another coder and myself to arrive at a single category for each example selected.
Concluding Thoughts

For many years, researchers in the field of academic literacies have focused on citation practices as transgressive behaviours among basic and L2 writers (Bartholomae, 1986; Flowerdew, & Li, 2007; Liao & Tseng, 2010; Pecorari, 2003; Shi, 2004; Yu, 2010). Some have advocated for a shift from conducting research about writing and citing in higher education by looking at other, related developmental processes such as the negotiation of identity (Abasi, Akbari, & Graves, 2006; Ivanič, 1998; Michaud, 2013; Ouellette, 2008). This opening up of discussions, which includes student voices as well as examples of their work, necessitates a similar openness to and inclusion of critically relevant pedagogical practices which form the basis of the argument in this thesis. There is a need to shift the discussion about source integration away from unacceptable practices and look instead at developmental processes at work, with a view to engaging in relevant and productive practices for helping students acquire effective citation behaviours. As I write, many universities limit the education about citation use and ethics in academia to a flyer in their orientation package which describes the penalties for plagiarism. The same flyer may sometimes contain a link to the university’s website, where, again, penalties are emphasised instead of clear guidelines, model exemplars, and thresholds. Evidence of the complex, knowledge-building processes that accompany citation use through the experiences of successful student writers shows new ways to focus on and approach the acquisition of abilities to integrate sources in writing effectively and for varied purposes. Educators may hopefully realise that “change is possible by the defenders of the status quo” (Bizzell, 1988, p.14).

The focus of institutional policies on plagiarised texts makes academic writing practices particularly challenging for students who navigate multiliterate spaces (Canagarajah, 2004).
Discussion needs to open up understanding of processes of knowledge construction, identity formation, and specialized discourse membership which are signalled by and underpin citation uses. This understanding should respond to the diversity in student populations, increase access to information, and build on communities of discursive practices. Research communities need to learn to engage with advanced academic writers not just as students but also as contributors and researchers themselves. Pedagogy for beginning experts should begin with sharing funds of knowledge in order to develop relevant strategies to reflect the complexity of writing and citing behaviours. As Hyland (2002a, p.351) expressed:

in fact there is considerable scope for the negotiation of identity in academic writing. …by treating academic discourse as uniformly impersonal we actually do a disservice to our students, and that as teachers, we might better assist them by raising their awareness of the options available to them as writers.

Through this research, I have provided an alternative way of conceptualizing citation practices as grounded in identity construction. By privileging the participants’ retrospective viewpoints rather than my own interpretations, I have represented the perspectives of the five writers in a way that I hope better helps (them and other MA students) understand what they were trying to achieve, how they projected various aspects of their identities, how they contributed to knowledge making, and how they performed the possibility of joining one academic community of practice. As a student who is in the process of writing a Masters’ thesis now myself, I am now less concerned about my discoursal identity and more so about the contribution that I want to make to the field of knowledge in which I find myself engaged. If I had not understood before the multilayered identities that emerge in citation practices, I have certainly gained new insights from interacting with the five participants. Thus, this thesis has
developed my own insights into my writing process as a graduate student, and that has enabled me to consider both practically and theoretically how to use citation practices to respond to disciplinary writing conventions, appreciating how they constrain the task of writing a discussion about one’s research while also providing opportunities to consider new possibilities for further research and knowledge.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A. Letter of Information

January 20, 2014

Dear XXXX:

My name is Alison Altidor-Brooks and I am pursuing an M.A. in Language and Literacies Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) of the University of Toronto. As part of the degree requirements for the M.A., I am required to write a thesis, based on my own original research. The title of this study is “Citation Use and Identity Construction: Discourse Appropriation in Advanced Academic Literacy Practices.” The purpose of my research is to examine how citation use intersects with the construction of expert identity in advanced academic literary practices. Assuming that all MA students used citations to show expert knowledge in writing their theses, I am interested in understanding the connections of these citations to their identities as language and literacy educators and researchers.

I am inviting you to participate in my study because you have recently graduated from XXX University and wrote an MA thesis in the field of Applied Linguistics. Your thesis was selected randomly from the archive in the university library. I would like to conduct a one-time interview with you to discuss your use of citations in your Master of Arts (MA) thesis. The interview will last approximately 45-60 minutes. At the end of the interview, I will also ask you to complete a questionnaire profiling your professional, cultural, educational, and scholarly identity and experiences. The goal of the research is to learn more about students’ citation choices and how these relate to the construction of their professional identities. In the interview, I will ask you questions about the disciplinary expectations for writing in your field: your knowledge and perception of citation practices; the choices you made when you cited sources in your study; why you made those choices and whether or not these choices and writing the thesis in general had an impact on your development as a language and literacy educator or researcher. I will interview you about your perceptions of citation use and your experience writing your MA thesis, specifically the Discussion of the Results section. After the interview, you will be provided with a draft case analysis. This will enable to you check the information
and make me aware of anything that I may have noted incorrectly or misinterpreted. It is also a way of providing an opportunity to inform and benefit you as a participant.

Participation in this study is voluntary. You may withdraw from participation for any reason at any time or decline to answer any questions that I pose. The nature of the information to be gathered will be to some extent personal, but should not cause you any discomfort. You should also be aware that it may be possible for persons reading my thesis to perform a web search using sections of your thesis that I cite, and from that could possibly identify you as a participant in the research. While this is unlikely, it is possible. Since your thesis is a public document available through the University’s archives, I cannot guarantee complete obfuscation of your identity. However, I will take several steps to keep your identity and the information that you share with me confidential. You will be asked to select a pseudonym that I will use in storing data and reporting on my thesis and in future publications and presentations about my research. I will obscure any information in my thesis that may identify you personally. There is a possibility, that despite all my efforts to protect your identity, due to the public nature of MA theses as source documents, it may be possible for someone reading my thesis to perform an electronic search of data that is directly quoted from your thesis, and so identify your thesis and you in this way. Additionally, there is a very small risk that my investigation may uncover instances of improper citation use which could be considered an academic offence. In the unlikely event that this happens, I will protect your privacy and confidentiality and not report this to anyone (including you and my faculty supervisor) or in the thesis.

I am distributing this letter now to a variety of people who have produced MA theses between 2002 and 2012, in the field of language and literacies education, hoping to seek the involvement of the first five people who indicate their willingness to participate. After five people have consented to participate, then I will have reached the intended sample size for this study, so it may be that I will not be able to accommodate you in this research for that reason, and if so, I will notify you immediately.

Any and all data that I collect from you will be stored on password-protected and encrypted computer files on my personal computer and printed documents in a locked filing cabinet in my home, using only pseudonyms rather than real names, for a period of five years.
after the thesis completed, and then systematically destroyed (by shredding and erasing electronic files). Only my thesis supervisor and I will have access to the raw data.

There is no compensation for your participation in this study. However, the benefits of being a participant are as follows: (1) By participating in this study, you will have the opportunity to reflect on your experiences with writing your thesis as well as your professional identity as a language and literacy educator or researcher (2) By detailing your experiences in this manner, you will be contributing to the growing body of literature on discourse appropriation and identity construction in academic writing.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me by telephone at 416-580-0548 or via email at alison.altidor.brooks@mail.utoronto.ca. You may also contact my thesis supervisor, Dr. Alister Cumming at alister.cumming@utoronto.ca. Additionally, if you have any questions related to your rights as a participant in this study, please contact the Ethics Review Office at ethics.review@utoronto.ca or 416-946-3273.

Thank you for your willingness to participate. To indicate your consent, please sign the consent form, and return it to me either by email attachment or by Canada Post, or arrange to meet with me if you are residing in or near Toronto. Also keep a copy of this form for your own records. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask them now. If you need more information before agreeing to participate, or if you wish to receive a summary of the study results later, please contact me by e-mail or telephone, as indicated below.

Thank you in advance for your consideration and, hopefully, your participation.

Yours sincerely,

Alison Altidor-Brooks
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
University of Toronto
Room 10-257
252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, ON
M5S 1V6
Email: alison.altidor.brooks@mail.utoronto.ca

Dr. Alister Cumming
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
University of Toronto
Room 10-246
252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, ON
M5S 1V6
Email: alister.cumming@utoronto.ca
Consent Form

I have been informed of the nature of the present study on “Citation Use and Identity Construction: Discourse Appropriation in Advanced Academic Literacy Practices” by Alison Altidor-Brooks, including the tasks to be undertaken, and agree to participate in an interview. I also agree to complete an identity profile. I have indicated my willingness to be audio-recorded. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may withdraw at any time without consequence.

Name (please print):

I agree to be interviewed (please initial)

I agree to be audio-recorded (please initial)

Signature:

Date:
Appendix B. Interview Guide

Overview: Discourse-based semi-structured interview sessions will be conducted with participants with completed and examined Master’s theses in the past 10+ years (2002-2012). The aim of the interviews is to obtain information about their identities by talking with them retrospectively about their citation choices when they wrote their theses. The interviews will follow the same format.

General procedure:

1. Test recording equipment to ensure that voices are clearly audible.
2. Thank participant for agreeing to be interviewed.
3. Review objectives of research and assure participant of confidentiality. (Letters of informed consent)
   - Objective of this study is to understand how discourse appropriation intersects with identity construction in advanced academic literary practices
   - Confidentiality: participants’ names will be changed in the reporting of findings
   - Recordings of interviews will be destroyed upon transcription and termination of research
   - Present list of themes for interview
     - Ask participants if they have any questions
4. Semi-structured interview around listed themes. (Approximately 45 - 60 minutes)
5. Finish interview by thanking participant and asking if s/he has any questions or additional information to add.
6. Completion of the identity profile

Introduction: Thank you for taking the time to meet with me today and to talk to me about your experiences with writing at the university. As we discussed earlier, my research is about discourse appropriation and identity construction; how postgraduates feel retrospectively about their writing experiences and the choices they made in integrating sources into their writing. I will ask questions about disciplinary expectations about writing in your field; choices you made for source integration in your study; why you made those choices and whether or not these
choices had an impact on your identity or development as a language and literacy educator or researcher.

Interview Questions

Questions about experiences with writing and citing

1. Writing strategies
   a. What language(s) do you usually write in? Under what circumstances?
   b. What were some distinct achievements you made in your writing during your Master’s degree? Can you provide examples?
   c. What were some challenges that you faced when writing for your Master’s degree? In courses? When writing the thesis? Can you provide examples?

Questions about the thesis

2. We will now go through the Discussion of the Results section of your thesis. I have selected some pages and highlighted some citations which will be the focus of this section of the interview. For this section, I would like you to look at the example and talk about why you (think you) cited it and why you did so in the way that you did. Are any of your choices related to your decision to study in your chosen field? If there are any experts that you did not cite, why did you decide to exclude them? Also, if there are any sections which are not highlighted please feel free to talk about those also.

3. Do you think that the knowledge you gained while doing research for your thesis and writing your thesis (re) shaped your identity? What sort of impact do you think writing the thesis had on you?

Thank you for participating in this interview. At this point, I would like to ask whether or not you have any questions, or anything to add. Thank you once again.

Finally, I would like you to take a few minutes to complete the identity profile. Please feel free to ask questions or seek clarification.

End of interview
Appendix C. Identity Questionnaire

Part I: Personal Information, Language and Educational Background

1. What is the pseudonym you have chosen for this study? _____________________________

2. In what year were you born? ________________________________

3. Where were you born? ________________________________

4. If you were born outside of Canada, please state how long you have been living in Canada. ____________

5. Please list all the languages that you know (speak, read, write, understand) and include your level of proficiency in each. Start with your mother tongue (L1) OR your dominant language and end with the language in which you are least proficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>PROFICIENCY: Fair, good or high (you can also write a short description of your proficiency here)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Please use the table below to give details of your educational and professional experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree programme</th>
<th>Year you obtained the degree</th>
<th>For your university degrees, give your major or specialty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Part II: National/Cultural, Linguistic, Professional and Personal Identity

7. Please use the table below to give information about your national/cultural, linguistic, professional and personal identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>ANSWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Please give 5 words that describe your national/cultural identity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Please give 5 words that sum up your linguistic identity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Which words best describe your professional identity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of Questionnaire