



A Comparison of Turkish and English L1 Writers' Citation Practices in Doctoral and Master's Theses

Fatma Şeyma DOĞAN*, Oktay YAĞIZ**, Işıl Günseli KAÇAR***

Received date: 06.08.2018

Accepted date: 21.11.2018

Abstract

Citation is one of the important components of academic writing to provide justification for writers' arguments and demonstrate the novelty of the writers' position in the academia. This study investigates the citation practices of Turkish and English L1 writers in M.A. and PhD theses. This corpus-based study employed a qualitative approach. A corpus of 34 theses, 17 Turkish L1 writers' theses (10 M.A. and 7 PhD theses) and 17 English L1 writers' theses including 10 M.A. theses and 7 PhD theses, was selected. A rubric was prepared to analyse the 34 theses in the corpus via qualitative content analysis. Even though Turkish and English L1 writers' citing tendencies appear to be parallel with writing norms and conventions in the field of ELT, Turkish L1 writers have more challenges regarding integrating citations with their own voices and positions more than English L1 writers, which may stem from a lack of instruction, insufficient awareness of citation norms and conventions, cultural factors and linguistic background.

Keywords: Citation practices, academic writing, Turkish writers.

* Harran University, Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Teaching, Şanlıurfa, Turkey;fsdogan@harran.edu.tr

** Atatürk University, Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Teaching, Erzurum, Turkey;yoktay@atauni.edu.tr

*** Middle East Technical University (METU), Department of English Language Teaching, Ankara, Turkey;isil@metu.edu.tr

Türkçe ve İngilizceyi Anadili Olarak Kullanan Yazarların Doktora ve Yüksek Lisans Tezlerindeki Alıntı Yapma Uygulamalarının Karşılaştırılması

Fatma Şeyma DOĞAN*, Oktay YAĞIZ**, Işıl Günseli KAÇAR***

Geliş tarihi: 06.08.2018

Kabul tarihi: 21.11.2018

Öz

Alıntı yapma, yazarların fikir ve iddialarına gerekçe sağlamak ve onların akademik sahada fikirlerinin orijinalliğini göstermek açısından akademik yazmanın önemli bileşenlerinden biridir. Bu çalışma, İngilizce eğitimi alanındaki anadili Türkçe ve İngilizce olan yazarların yüksek lisans ve doktora tezlerindeki alıntı yapma uygulamalarını araştırmaktadır. Bu çalışmada derlemi içeren nitel yöntem uygulanmıştır. Anadili Türkçe olan yazarlar tarafından yazılmış 10 yüksek lisans ve 7 doktora tezi ile anadili İngilizce olan yazarlar tarafından yazılmış 10 yüksek lisans ve 7 doktora tezi, toplamda 34 lisansüstü tez araştırmanın derlemi için seçilmiştir. Derlemdaki 34 lisansüstü tezi içerik analizi yöntemiyle analiz etmek için bir yönerge oluşturulmuştur. Anadili Türkçe ve İngilizce olan yazarların alıntı yapma eğilimleri, akademik yazım normları ve kurallarıyla paralellik göstermesine rağmen, anadili Türkçe olan yazarlar, anadili İngilizce olan yazarlara göre kendi düşüncelerini ifade etmede daha fazla problem yaşamaktadır. Bu durum; öğretim eksikliği, kültürel faktörler, alıntı yapma normları ve kuralları ile ilgili farkındalık eksikliği ve dil geçmişleri gibi etkenlerden kaynaklanıyor olabilir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Alıntı yapma, akademik yazma, Türk yazarlar.

*  Harran Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümü, Şanlıurfa, Türkiye;fsdogan@harran.edu.tr

**  Atatürk Üniversitesi, Kazım Karabekir Eğitim Fakültesi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümü, Erzurum, Türkiye;yoktay@atauni.edu.tr

***  Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi (ODTÜ), İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümü, Ankara, Türkiye;isil@metu.edu.tr

1. Introduction

Citation lies at the heart of the writing process to fulfil the senses and is a constitutive element of academic writing. It plays a key role in establishing the credibility and novelty of writers' claims by positioning themselves. Thus, learning what, when, where, why, and how to cite is crucial for writers for an acceptable academic text. Citation as a key distinctive feature of academic writing is obligatory in scholarly writing as a means of meeting preliminary requirements and creating an authorial stance. There have been cross-genre and intra genre studies on citations in scholarly published writing such as journals (Harwood, 2009; Hu & Wang, 2014; Hyland, 1999, 2000; Kafes, 2017), students' academic writing such as BA theses (Schembri, 2009), MA theses (Azlan, 2013; Jallifar & Dabbi, 2012; Rabab'ah & Al-Marshadi, 2013) and PhD theses (Dong, 1996; Maroko, 2013; Monreal & Salom, 2011; Thompson, 2000; Thompson & Tribble, 2001) and focusing on both genres concurrently (Jalilifar, 2012). However, rare studies comparing citation practices of native and non-native speakers of English have been conducted (e.g. Kafes, 2017; Monreal & Salom, 2011; Rabab'ah & Al-Marshadi, 2013). In the studies in Turkey concerning citation practices (Işık-Taş, 2008; Kafes, 2017; Kan, 2016; Yağız, Ötügen, Kaya, & Aydın, 2014), it can be said that there is an inadequate number of studies on this issue. There seem almost no studies in the Turkish context to compare the source use of Turkish speakers of English with that of native speakers (NS) of English in M.A. and PhD theses. This study can be a preliminary one exploring the citation practices of non-native speakers of English (Turkish writers) and NS of English in their academic works including M.A. and PhD theses, and it provides some insights about Turkish writers' citation practices and compares their control of the source material with native writers' citation practices.

'Citation' is generally defined as "a reference to a source" (Szypszak, 2011, p.315). There have been different definitions of the concept 'citation' made by various researchers, considering the function of citation practices in texts. Harwood (2009) brought the role of citation in texts as the justification of writers' claims into the front in his article. On the other hand, Statsky (2009) highlighted the signposting function of citation, claiming that citation refers to an address that leads people interested in cited texts to find the related texts.

Citation practices have been investigated in term of citation types grounded in linguistic criteria and syntactic position (Swales, 1990), the density of citation practices (Coffin, 2009; Hyland, 1999, 2002; Thompson & Tribble, 2001), the use of reporting verbs (Hyland, 2002; Thompson & Ye, 1991), the reporting structure (Jalilifar & Dabbi, 2012), and tense (Davidse & Vandelanotte, 2011). Other studies have examined citation types based on Swales' (1986) categorization of citation types (Coffin, 2009; Hyland, 2000; Rabab'ah & Al-Marshadi, 2013; Thompson & Tribble, 2001), the rhetorical function of citations (Harwood, 2009; Lee, Hitchcock & Casal, 2018; Petric, 2007), the writers' citation motivations (Harwood, 2009; Mansourizadeh & Ahmad; 2011), and the nature of cited sources (Coffin, 2009).

Jalilifar (2012) carried out a study on 65 research articles (RAs) and 65 M.A. theses in applied linguistics. The preference of citation types showed a difference between these two genres. M.A. writers heavily relied on integral citations since the writers preferred to emphasize the researcher rather than the research in order to provide a strong support for their claims in their theses. Jallifar (2012) claimed that even though M.A. writers were aware of formal features of citation, they ignored functional features as a result of their limited familiarity with the latter stemming from lack of explicit instruction.

Jalilifar and Dabbi (2012) expressed their concerns regarding citation practices in 65 Iranian M.A. theses published between 2005 and 2009 in applied linguistics. The results showed that integral citations were preferred more than non-integral citations in M.A. theses, putting an emphasis on the researcher rather than on the information. Among integral-citation types, verb-controlling

citations were found out to be the most frequent integral citation type. Reference was the least preferred type of non-integral citation by Iranian MA students. Jalilifar and Dabbi (2012) emphasized that M.A. students tend to report previous work rather than make a critical evaluation of it, highlighting the descriptive nature of these theses instead of being argumentative.

In a similar study on the citation density and citation types, Kafes (2017) revealed that novice Turkish academic writers preferred more verb-controlling integral citations than English speaking expert American writers in their research articles, attributable to its popularity and syntactic simplicity. Kafes (2017) claimed that the differences between citation practices of both groups of writers outweighed the similarities, which may be due to their knowledge and experiences.

The main categorization of citation types is grounded in Swales' (1990) categorization and Thompson and Tribble's (2001) framework, based on the position of the citation in the sentence. According to these sources, there are two main categories of citation types: integral citation and non-integral citation.

1.1 Integral citation

Integral citation refers to the citation type with an explicit grammatical role in the sentence and puts an emphasis on the researcher of the cited work. According to Thompson and Tribble (2001), integral citation is categorized under three main groups including verb-controlling citation, naming-integral citation, and non-citation.

1.1.1 Verb-controlling citation

The verb-controlling citation is a sub-category of integral citation where the citation acts as agent and it is controlled by a verb either in the active or passive voice. The following extract illustrates the verb controlling citation.

As **Pinkman (2005) points out**, when learners take responsibility for their learning, they will be more able to capitalize on learning environments both in and out of the classroom, hopefully making them life-long and efficient learners (Çiftçi, 2011, p. 28)

Each citation is followed by a reporting verb. Thompson and Ye (1991) categorized these reporting verbs used with verb-controlling citations based on three factors: author's stance, writer's stance and writer's interpretation. Among these three factors, author's stance is the most easily detectable. There are three categories including positive, negative and neutral verbs under the factor of "author's stance", showing the attitude of the author. As to the factor "writer's stance", Thompson and Ye (1991) categorized the verbs into three groups: factive, counter-factive and non-factive. The writer's interpretation deals with different perspectives of the proposition status, with four sub-categories including the author's discourse and behaviour interpretation, status interpretation and non-interpretation.

Much research investigated reporting verbs from different dimensions: the presence or absence of reporting verbs (e.g. Swales, 1990), the types of reporting verbs (e.g. Hyland, 2000; Petric, 2006; Thompson, 2001), the choice of reporting verbs (e.g. Hyland, 2000; Thompson & Ye, 1991), and the features of reporting verbs consisting of tense, aspect and voice (e.g. Hyland, 2000; Thompson & Ye, 1991). It can be said that the kinds of verbs used in citations in scholarly academic papers give clues regarding how to interpret or convey evaluation in academic papers, which is also verified by Hunston (1993), highlighting the relationship between the verb selection and its evaluative status. However, choosing a reporting verb, which meets the syntactic requirements of writers' sentences and the requirements of taking an appropriate stance towards a claim, appears

to be a difficult process for both NS and NNS of English writers. It can even be a more complicated process for NNS of English writers, which may stem from NNS of English writers' unawareness of how to use reporting verbs appropriately and a lack of instructors' emphasis on utilizing reporting verbs in academic writing (Hyland, 2002; Pecorari, 2008). Swales and Feak (2004) highlighted the importance of making conscious decisions regarding the use of reporting verbs in the development of NNS of English writers' academic writing skills, which also provides the "maximum interpersonal and persuasive effect" (Hyland & Milton, 1999, p.147).

1.1.2 Naming-integral citation

The naming-integral citation is the second subcategory of integral citation where the citation is a noun phrase or a part of a noun phrase. An example is as follows:

According to Ellis (1986), there is a critical period when individuals learn languages more effectively than other periods (Çiftçi, 2011, p.35).

1.1.3 Non-citation

Non-citation is the third subcategory of integral citation in which a reference to the name of the writer of the cited source exists without a year reference or a page number. This type of integral citation is mostly made use of when the reference is mentioned before in the text, as in the following example:

As **Clément** conceptualized it, self-confidence was composed of both psychological-affective and social-environmental elements (Blumenthal, 2014, p.8).

1.2 Non-integral citation

The non-integral citation refers to citations that are used outside of the text either in the brackets or in footnotes/endnotes. These citations usually do not have an explicit grammatical role in the sentence and foreground the research and information given in the cited work. Thompson and Tribble (2001) classify the non-integral citation under four categories such as source, identification, reference and origin, considering the formal linguistic criteria including the sentence position and content.

1.2.1 Source

The source is the first sub-category of the non-integral citation showing where the idea or the information is taken from, as shown in the following example:

Self-efficacy beliefs provide foundation for human motivation, well-being and personal accomplishment (**Pajares, 2002**) (Çiftçi, 2011, p.45).

1.2.2 Identification

The identification is the second sub-category of the non-integral citation which identifies an agent in the sentence it refers to.

There has been a lot of research done on learner autonomy over the past three decades (**Benson, 2001; Cotterall, 1995; Littlewood, 1996; Ushioda, 1996**) (Tilfarlioglu & Ciftci, 2011, p.1286).

1.2.3 Reference

The reference is the third subcategory of non-integral citation that is generally signalled by inserting directives "see" or "e.g.". It can be considered as a shorthand device (Thompson & Tribble, 2001). In other words, instead of giving the information in the text, the writer leads the readers to other sources. The following is a representative example:

Silva's (1993) important synthesis of early SL writing research allocated a subsection to argumentation and shows that in 1980's, there was some momentum for argumentatively-oriented scholarship, especially through the lens of contrastive rhetoric (e.g. Connor, 1984,1987,1990; Connor &Lauer, 1985, 1988; Kobayashi, 1984) (Hirvela, 2017, p.70).

1.2.4.Origin

The origin is the fourth sub-category of non-integral citation, showing the originator of a concept, a technique or a product.

The ROWPVT-SBE (Brownell, 2001) provides a measure of an individual's bilingual receptive vocabulary.

This study focuses on both Turkish and English L1 writers' citation practices on the pathway of growing as a professional writer. The use of citations is considered as "an important skill" (Harwood, 2010, p.302) for a writer development. Thus, the present study aims to address the following research question:

Are there any differences between the native and non-native English speakers' citation practices in terms of citation types in M.A. and PhD theses?

2. Methodology

The qualitative research design, which involved a corpus, was adopted in this study. The corpus was grounded in Swales' (1990) categorization of citations and Thompson's (2001) classification of citations. Swales (1990) classified citations under two groups: Integral citation and non-integral citation. Thompson (2001) further classified integral citation under three groups: Verb-controlling, naming and non-citation whereas he subdivided non-integral citation under five groups: Source, identification, reference, origin and example.

2.1. The Corpus of the Study

The study corpus was composed of 34 theses: 17 English L1 writers' theses (10 M.A. theses and 7 PhD theses) and 17 Turkish writers' theses (10 M.A. theses and 7 PhD theses) between the years 2010 and 2014. There were two parallel sub-corpora in the corpus of PhD theses: 7 theses by NS of English and 7 theses by Turkish speakers of English. The data collection procedure had two phases. The first phase involved the selection of PhD and M.A. theses by English L1 writers concerning English language teaching and learning while the second phase consisted of the selection of PhD and M.A. theses by Turkish L1 writers regarding English language teaching and learning. Simple random sampling was used during the process of selection. For the selection of 10 M.A. theses written by English L1 writers, 40 theses were downloaded. Each of these downloaded theses was given an ID number. Among these theses, 10 out of 40 theses were randomly chosen. The same procedure was followed for the selection process of 10 M.A. theses conducted by Turkish writers. As for the selection of 7 PhD theses carried out by English L1 writers, 20 theses were downloaded and each of them was given an ID number. 7 out of 20 were randomly chosen. The same procedure was followed for choosing 7 PhD theses written by Turkish writers.

A pool of theses with the keywords 'English language teaching', and 'English language learning' was formed using two different databases. One of the databases was the "ProQuest Dissertation and Theses" database that has the world's most comprehensive collection of dissertations and theses. The other data base was the "EThOS" (Electronic Theses Online Service), the UK's national thesis service, with access to only PhD theses conducted in the UK. 7 PhD theses of English L1

writers were randomly chosen from this pool, based on several criteria such as the writers' first and last names and the university where the B.A. or M.A. degrees were obtained. Also, to verify the origin of the thesis writers, a verification e-mail was sent to the writers of theses whose contact addresses were available online. Among the theses whose writers sent an answer to our e-mails, 7 PhD theses were randomly chosen. These PhD theses were conducted between 2010 and 2014, at seven different universities around the world.

The corpus of Turkish writers consists of 7 PhD theses written at English Language Teaching (ELT) department at different Turkish universities between 2010 and 2014. Turkish writers' theses carried out at the department of English language teaching (ELT) were randomly downloaded from the official website of the Council of Higher Education (YÖK). An equal selection of the PhD theses over the universities and the years was provided, which strengthens the validity of the data obtained from the corpus.

The corpus of M.A. theses comprises two parallel subcorpora: 10 theses conducted by English L1 writers and 10 theses conducted by Turkish L1 writers. The corpus of M.A. theses of English L1 writers includes 10 theses written between 2010 and 2014. All of the theses were randomly selected among the accessible ones from the international theses database (ProQuest Dissertation and Theses). The corpus of M.A. theses of Turkish L1 writers constitutes 10 theses written at the ELT departments Turkey between 2010 and 2014. 10 M.A. theses by NNS of English were randomly selected from open access theses conducted at ELT departments through the theses database of YÖK. In order to ensure the validity of the data from the M.A. thesis corpus in the study, the equal distribution of M.A. theses by Turkish writers over the universities and the years was provided.

2.2. Data Analysis

Prior to the commencement of the study, a pilot study was conducted. 5 English L1 writers' and 5 Turkish writers' theses were compiled and saved as separate files named as the corpus of NS of English and the corpus of NNS of English (Turkish Writers) electronically. Then, for each thesis in each group, a new file was created to download the reference list of each thesis. Each reference that could be reached was downloaded and saved electronically. The references that could not be accessed by the researcher were excluded from the list. Content analysis was employed to analyse the corpus. The analysis was carried out through a rubric prepared by the first researcher, based on the relevant literature (Swales, 1990; Thompson, 2001). Two expert academics' views in the field of ELT were taken. Grounded in Swales' (1990) classification of citations and Thompson's (2001) classification of citation types for the categorization of citation types in the present study corpus, the rubric consists of seven sections: the source text, the target text, the location of target text, the location of source text, the types of citation, the types of integral citation, and the types of non-integral citation.

For each citation in the theses, a rubric was filled. Software programmes such as I-thenticate and Turnitin, were utilized to fill the rubric. After creating the rubric for all the citations in M.A. and PhD theses by English L1 and Turkish writers in a Microsoft word file, the titles and subtitles in the rubric were given the codes. The data with these codes were recorded in an excel file. Then, the data were transferred to SPSS 23.0 and analysed by using descriptive statistics. In order to provide inter-rater reliability, two independent raters with a background in citation practices coded and analysed the citations in each thesis in the pilot study simultaneously with the researcher. There was over 90% agreement between the categorizations of citations in all the theses in the pilot study done by three researchers. When the researchers disagreed on the category of a citation or had two options for a citation, three of the researchers reached a consensus related to the category of the citation by discussing the most appropriate option. The same procedure was followed for 9.161 citations in 34 theses in the corpus.

3. Results

Table 1. below shows the frequencies and percentages of citation types employed in theses written by English L1 and Turkish writers.

Table 1. The Distribution of Citations in English L1 and Turkish Writers' Analysed Theses in regard to Citation Types

Citation Types	English L1 Writers' Theses		Turkish Writers' Theses	
	f	%	f	%
Integral Citation	1783	40.9	2378	49.5
Non-integral Citation	2466	56.6	2146	44.7
Total	4250	97.5	4524	94.2
Incorrect Citation Use	109	2.5	278	5.8
Total	4359		4802	

*Note: f= Frequency, %= Percentage

While the English L1 writers' theses have more non-integral citations, accounting for 56.6% of total citations, Turkish writers' theses prioritized integral citation, accounting for 49.5% of total citations. Table 2. and Table 3. below present the frequencies and percentages of each subtype of integral citations and non-integral citations in both groups of theses.

Table 2. The Distribution of Citations in English L1 and Turkish Writers' Analysed Theses in regard to Integral Citation Types

Integral Citation Types	English L1 Writers' Theses		Turkish Writers' Theses	
	f	%	f	%
Verb-controlling Citation	989	55.4	1738	73
Naming-integral Citation	431	24.1	482	20.2
Non-citation	363	20.3	158	6.6
Total	1783	100	2378	100

*Note: f= Frequency, %= Percentage

As can be seen from Table 2., both groups of writers favoured the verb-controlling type of the integral citation but Turkish L1 writers relied on this type to a greater extent. Naming-integral citation was on the second most common integral citation type in the theses by English L1 writers and Turkish writers; respectively, 24.1% and 20.2%. Non-citation was on the last rank among other types of integral citation in both groups of writers' theses. Nonetheless, English L1 writers' theses relied on non-citation almost three times more (20.3%) than Turkish writers' theses (6.6%). Even though both groups of writers benefitted from stylistic variation of citations in their theses, there was an equal distribution of sub-categories of integral citation in English L1 writers' theses.

Table 3. The Distribution of Citations in English L1 and Turkish Writers' Analysed Theses in regard to Non-integral Citation Types

Non-integral Citation Types	English L1 Writers' Theses		Turkish Writers' Theses	
	f	%	f	%
Source	1720	69.7	1413	65.8
Identification	596	24.1	531	24.7
Reference	98	3.9	193	8.9
Origin	52	2.1	8	0.3
Total	2466	100	2146	100

*Note: f= Frequency, %= Percentage

As shown in Table 3., English L1 and Turkish writers made use of four sub-categories of non-integral citation type in their theses. Both groups of writers predominantly used source citations (69.7% in English L1 writers' theses and 65.8 % in Turkish writers' theses). Identification was the second most common type of non-integral citations in both groups of writers' theses; respectively, 24.1% and 24.7%. The third most common type belonged to reference. However, Turkish writers relied on reference twice more than English L1 writers in their theses. Origin was the least preferred type of non-integral citation by both groups of writers but the English L1 writers' theses used almost seven times as many such type of citation as the Turkish writers' theses. Table 4. below presents the frequencies and percentages of citation types in both types of theses.

Table 4. The Distribution of Citations in Analysed M.A. and PhD Theses in regard to Citation Types

Citation Types	M.A. Theses		PhD Theses	
	f	%	f	%
Integral Citation	1903	51.5	2258	41.3
Non-integral Citation	1605	43.4	3007	55.0
Total	3508	94.9	5266	96.4
Incorrect Citation Use	189	5.1	198	3.6
Total	3697		5464	

*Note: f= Frequency, %= Percentage

As regards the portions of integral and non-integral citations, there seemed a difference in the preference of citation types in both types of theses. MA theses displayed a higher percentage of integral citations whereas PhD theses used a higher number of non-integral citations. The following two tables (Table 5. and Table 6.) give the frequencies and percentages of sub-types of integral and non-integral citations.

Table 5. The Distribution of Citations in Analysed M.A. and PhD Theses in regard to Integral Citation Types

Integral Citation Types	M.A. Theses		PhD Theses	
	f	%	f	%
Verb-controlling Citation	1229	64.5	1498	66.3
Naming-integral Citation	433	22.7	480	21.2
Non-citation	241	12.6	280	12.4
Total	1903	100	2258	100

*Note: f= Frequency, %= Percentage

As shown in Table 5., there is a nearly equal distribution over integral citation types in M.A. and PhD theses. Verb-controlling citation was the most common integral citation type in M.A. theses, accounting for 64.5% and in PhD theses, accounting for 66.3%. Following verb-controlling citation, naming-integral citation was on the second rank among three types of integral citation. The last rank belonged to non-citation, having a nearly equal percentage in two sets of theses.

Table 6. The Distribution of Citations in Analysed M.A. and PhD Theses in regard to Non-integral Citation Types

Non-integral Citation Types	M.A. Theses		PhD Theses	
	f	%	f	%
Source	1112	69.2	2021	67.2
Identification	445	27.7	682	22.6
Reference	28	1.7	263	8.7
Origin	20	1.2	41	1.3
Total	1605	100	3007	100

*Note: f= Frequency, %= Percentage

As presented in the Table 6., no difference was found in the preference of non-integral citation types in MA and PhD theses. However, there was a minimal difference in the use of one sub-category of non-integral citation: reference. Source and identification were the two most frequently used type of non-integral citation in both groups of theses. Regarding the use of in M.A. and PhD theses, the latter used it almost four times more than the former. Origin was on the least preferred type among four types of non-integral citation, having an equal distribution over the theses.

4. Discussion

This study investigated English L1 and Turkish L1 writers' citation practices in M.A. and PhD theses in terms of citation types. In the study corpora, English L1 writers of M.A. and PhD theses tended to employ more non-integral citations, accounting for 56.6% of total citations compared to Turkish writers' M.A. and PhD theses. On the other hand, Turkish writers favoured integral citations, accounting for 49.5% of total citations more than English L1 writers in their M.A. and PhD theses. This finding shows similarities with the results of Jallifar and Dabbi's (2012), Jallifar's (2012) and Rabab'ah and Al-Marshadi's (2013) studies, showing that M.A. non-native writers of English preferred more integral citations than non-integral citations in their theses. Contradictory to the findings of the studies mentioned above (Jallifar, 2012; Jallifar & Dabbi, 2012; Rabab'ah & Al-Marshadi, 2013), Monreal and Salmon (2011) found out that NNS of English (Spanish writers) preferred non-integral citations in the LR sections of their theses but English writers predominantly employed integral citations in the LR sections of their theses. Even though Turkish writers relied on integral citations more than non-integral ones in their theses, the distribution of two types of citations was nearly equal: integral citations accounting for 49.5% and non-integral citations accounting for 44.7% of total citations. Expert writers have a tendency towards the usage of non-integral citations or equal tendency towards two types of citations in their scholarly academic writing (Jallifar & Dabbi, 2012; Jogthong, 2001; Okamura, 2008). It can be said that both English L1 and Turkish writers seemed to make use of two types of citations seamlessly in their theses.

As to the sub-categories of integral citation, both groups of writers employed verb-controlling citations more than the other two subcategories but Turkish writers relied on verb-controlling citation to a greater extent. This tendency of both English L1 and Turkish writers to employ verb-controlling citations more than the other two subgroups of integral citations can be attributed to the consideration of the verb-controlling citations as the easiest and most obvious way of integrating citations into a text (Jallifar, 2012), but NS of English writers used a wider range of linguistic options while employing verb-controlling citation. However, in this study, Turkish writers used verbs in a more variety in their MA and PhD theses, compared to English L1 writers. This finding accords with the results of Jallifar and Dabbi's (2012) and Jallifar's (2012) studies. The results of the study showed that among integral-citation types, verb-controlling citation was the most commonly used. Following verb-controlling citation, naming-integral was the second most commonly used one while non-citation was used much less frequently. English L1 and Turkish writers seemed to create a stylistic variation regarding integral citation types in their M.A. and PhD theses; however, there is a more similar distribution of these three sub-groups of integral citations in the English L1 writers' theses than Turkish writers' theses. Given the proportions of verb-controlling and naming citations in Mansourizadeh and Ahmad's (2011) study, expert writers used two types of integral citations while novice writers preferred to employ verb-control citations five times more than naming citations. This could be attributed to novice writers' lack of competence in constructing nominalization and complex noun phrases (ElMalik & Nasi, 2008; Mansourizadeh & Ahmad, 2011).

Both groups of writers seemed to have approximate disciplinary tendencies in the use of non-integral citation subcategories. They tended to employ source as the most common type of non-

integral citation in their M.A. and PhD theses; accounting for 69.7% and 65.8% of total citations respectively. Identification was the second most predominantly used non-integral citation type used in the two sets of the theses written by English L1 and Turkish writers; respectively, 24.1% and 24.7%. As can be seen, no differences were found out in the aspects of two subcategories of non-integral citation in two corpora. However, Turkish writers made use of reference which is defined as shorthand device by Thompson (2001) twice more than English L1 writers. According to Hyland (2002), reference, constructed by means of directives, can be a good indicator of the writer's ability for collecting information from different sources and of his/her ability to lead the reader. Origin was the least preferred type of non-integral citation by two groups of the writers but English L1 writers employed it almost as seven times as Turkish writers. This finding complies with the results of Jallifar and Dabbi's (2012) study in terms of the distribution of non-integral citation sub-groups across Iranian graduate students' M.A. theses in the field of applied linguistics. However, this study is in contradiction with Jallifar's (2012) study, where reference was found to be the least preferred type in M.A. Iranian writers' theses.

5. Conclusion

The process of writing cannot be considered a separate process of writers' skills of understanding and integrating others' work into their own studies. Thus, teaching how to make use of sources effectively and appropriately, as one of the most challenging aspects of academic writing, has a key role in helping graduate students to meet the demands of 21st century academic writing world.

Given the importance of effectively learning what, when, how, and why to cite in the academic discourse community, relatively few systematic attempts have been made to describe Turkish speakers' tendencies regarding the source use (Işık-Taş, 2008; Kafes, 2017; Yağiz et al., 2014). Even though some studies have been conducted on disciplinary variation in the usage of citation and citation forms (e.g. Hyland, 2000), researchers have paid relatively little attention to investigating the variations as a results of the writers' origins.

Given the gap regarding citation practices in the relevant literature, this study primarily set out to uncover the similarities and differences between English and Turkish L1 writers in terms of citation types. Regarding citation types, the stylistic variation was found in English L1 and Turkish writers' theses. Nonetheless, English L1 writers favored non-integral citations whereas Turkish writers preferred integral citations more than non-integral citations. Regarding the theses written at two levels of graduate academic life, M.A. theses show a tendency towards integral citations while PhD theses use a higher number of non-integral citations.

Some new implementations regarding citation practices in the field of ELT in the Turkish context are regarded as necessary to equip Turkish L1 graduate students with necessary skills in writing scholarly papers. At this point, explicit instruction can be an effective solution for different aspects of citation practices in scholarly writing. Also, it has a facilitative role in the acquisition of necessary skills regarding citation practices. Thus, a new course named the "citation practice course" or the integration of explicit instructions related to citation practices into academic writing or research skills courses not only at the graduate level but also at the undergraduate level can be added to the curriculum. This study seems a beginning in the investigation of citation practices of graduate students in English language education majors in the Turkish context. Further research is needed to examine the citation practices in other disciplines too.

References

Azlan, N.M.N.I (2013). Citation typologies and rhetorical functions of citations in master dissertations. *Journal of Creative Practices in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(2), 61-74. Retrieved from <https://kedah.uitm.edu.my/CPLT/images/stories/v1n2/Article5.pdf>.

- Bloch, J., & Chi, L. (1995). A comparison of the use of citations in Chinese and English academic discourse, In D. Belcher, & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex,
- Blumenthal, L.F. (2014). *Self-efficacy in low-level English language learners*. (Unpublished MA thesis). Portland State University, Portland.
- Borg, E. (2000). Citation practices in academic writing. In Thompson, P. (ed.) *Patterns and perspectives: Insights into EAP writing practice* (27-45). Reading: The University of Reading.
- Campbell, C. (1990). Writing with others' words. Using background reading texts in academic compositions. In Kroll, B. (ed.) *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 211-230). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coffin, C. (2009). Incorporating and evaluating voices in a film studies thesis. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 1, 163-193. <http://doi.org/10.1558/wap.v1i2.163>.
- Çiftçi, F.S. (2011). *Supporting self-efficacy and learner autonomy in relation to academic success in EFL classrooms (A case study)*. (Unpublished MA thesis). Gaziantep University, Gaziantep.
- Davidse, K., & Vandelanotte, L. (2011). Tense use in direct and indirect speech in English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 236-250. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.022>
- Dong, Y.R. (1996). Learning how to use citations for knowledge transformation: Non-native doctoral students' dissertation writing in science. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 30(4), 428-457. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40171551>
- ElMalik, A. T., & Nesi, H. (2008). Publishing research in a second language: the case of Sudanese contributors to international medical journals. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7, 87-96. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.02.007>
- Harwood, N. (2004). Citation analysis: a multidisciplinary perspective on academic literacy. In M. Baynham, A. Deignan, & G. White (eds.), *Applied linguistics at the interface*. London: Equinox, pp.79-89.
- Harwood, N. (2009). An interview-based study of the functions of citations in academic writing across two disciplines. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41, 497-518. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.06.001>
- Harwood, N. (2010). Research-based materials to demystify academic citation for postgraduates. In N. Harwood (Ed.), *English language teaching materials: Theory and practice* (pp. 301-321). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hirvela, A. (2017). Argumentation & second language writing: Are we missing the boat?. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 36, 69-74. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.05.002>
- Hu, G. & Wang, G. (2014). Disciplinary and ethnolinguistic influences on citation in research articles. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 14, 14-28. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2013.11.001>
- Hunston, S. (1993). Evaluation and ideology in scientific writing. In M. Ghadessy, (Ed.), *Register analysis: Theory and practice*. (pp 57-73). London: Pinter.
- Hyland, K. (1990). A genre description of the argumentative essay. *RELC Journal*, 21 (1), 66-78. <http://doi.org/10.1177/003368829002100105>
- Hyland, K. (1999). Academic attribution: citation and the construction of disciplinary knowledge. *Applied Linguistics*, 20, 341-367. <http://doi.org/10.1093/applin/20.3.341>
- Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. London: Longman.
- Hyland, K. (2002). Activity and evaluation: reporting practices in academic writing. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), *Academic discourse* (115-130). London: Longman.

- Hyland, K. & Milton, J. (1999). Assertions in students' academic essays: A comparison of English NS and NNS student writers. In R. Berry, B. Asker, K. Hyland, & M. Lam (Eds.), *Language analysis, description, and pedagogy* (pp. 147-161). Hong Kong: Language Centre, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology
- Işık-Taş E. E. (2008). *A corpus-based analysis of genre-specific discourse of research: The research article and the PhD thesis in ELT*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Jalilifar, R.D. (2012). Academic attribution: citation analysis in master's theses and research articles in applied linguistics. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 23-41. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2011.00291.x>
- Jalilifar, A. & Dabbi, R. (2012). Citation in applied linguistics: Analysis of introduction sections of Iranian master's theses. *Linguistik Online*, 57 (7), 91-104. <http://dx.doi.org/10.13092/lo.57.252>
- Jogthong, C. (2001). *Research article introductions in Thai: Genre analysis of academic writing*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Morgantown, West Virginia, Department of Educational Theory and Practice.
- Kafes, H. (2017). Citation practices among novice and expert academic writers. *Education and Science*, 42:441-462. doi: 10.15390/EB.2017.6317.
- Kan, M.O. (2016). Atıf çözümlemesi: Türkçe eğitimi alanındaki lisansüstü tezlerin giriş bölümlerine atıf kullanımları. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 24(3), 1289-1300. Retrieved from <http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/210059>
- Lee, J.J., Hitchcock, C. & Casal, J.E. (2018). Citation practices of L2 university students in first year writing: Form, function and stance. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 33,1-11. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.01.001>
- Mansourizadeh, K. & Ahmad, U.K. (2011). Citation practices among non-native expert and novice scientific writers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 10, 152-161. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2011.03.004>
- Monreal, C.S. & Salom, L.G. (2011). A cross-language study on citation practices in PhD theses. *International Journal of English Studies*, 11(2), 53-75. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2011/2/149641>
- Okamura, A. (2008). Use of citation forms in academic texts by writers in L1 and L2 context. *The Economic Journal of Takasaki City University of Economics*, 51(1), 29-44. Retrieved from http://www1.tcue.ac.jp/home1/k-gakkai/ronsyuu/ronsyuukeisai/51_1/okamura.pdf
- Pecorari, D. (2008). *Academic writing and plagiarism: A linguistic analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(2), 201-230. doi:10.2307/3588141
- Petrić, B. (2005). Contrastive rhetoric in the writing classroom: A case study. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24, 213-228. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2004.09.001>
- Petric', B. (2006). *Citation practices in student academic writing*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Budapest, Hungary: Eötvös's Lora'nd University.
- Petric, B. (2007). Rhetorical functions of citations in high- and low-rated master's theses. *Journal or English for Academic Purposes*, 6, 238-253. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2007.09.002>
- Rabab'ah, G. & Al-Marshadi, A. (2013). Integrative vs. non-integrative citations among native and non-native English writers. *International Education Studies*, 6(7), 78-87. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v6n7p78>

- Salager-Meyer, F. (1999). Referential behavior in scientific writing: a diachronic study (1810–1995). *English for Specific Purposes*, 18, 279–305.
- Statsky, W. P. (2009). *Introduction to par legalism: Perspectives, problems and skills*. US: Library of Congress.
- Swales, J. M. (1986). Citation analysis and discourse analysis. *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 39-56. <http://doi.org/10.1093/applin/7.1.39>
- Swales, J.M. (1990). *Genre analysis. English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M. & Feak, C. B. (2004). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills (2nd ed.)*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Szypszak, C. (2011). *Understanding law for public administration*. Sudbury, Massachusetts: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.
- Thompson G. & Ye. Y. (1991). Evaluation in the reporting verbs used in academic papers. *Applied Linguistics*, 12(4), 365-382. <http://doi.org/10.1093/applin/12.4.365>
- Thompson P. (2000). Citation practices in PhD theses. In L. Burnard and T. McEnery (Eds.), *Rethinking language pedagogy from a corpus perspective*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Thompson, P. (2001). *A pedagogically-motivated corpus-based examination of PhD theses: Macrostructure, citation practices and uses of modal verbs*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Reading.
- Thompson, P. & Tribble, C. (2001). Looking at citations: Using corpora in English for academic purposes. *Language Learning and Technology*, 5(3), 91–105. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.615.1887&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.
- Thompson G. & Ye. Y. (1991). Evaluation in the reporting verbs used in academic papers. *Applied Linguistics*, 12(4), 365-382. <http://doi.org/10.1093/applin/12.4.365>
- Tilfarlioğlu, F. T., & Ciftci, F. S. (2011). Supporting self-efficacy and learner autonomy in relation to academic success in EFL classrooms (A Case Study). *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(10), 1284-1294. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4304/tpls.1.10.1284-1294>
- Yağız, O., Ötügen, R., Kaya, F & Aydın, B. (2014). A literature review analysis of the Turkish scholars' research articles in ELT and applied linguistics. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 158, 389-393 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.12.105>

Research article: Doğan, F. Ş., Yağız, O. & Kaçar, I. G. (2018). A comparison of Turkish and English L1 writers' citation practices in doctoral and master's theses. *Erzincan University Journal of Education Faculty*, 20 (3), 842-855.