

Oleksandr KAPRANOV

NLA University College
oleksandr.kapranov@nla.no

CITATION AND REFERENCING PRACTICES IN ARGUMENTATIVE ESSAY WRITING BY UPPER-INTERMEDIATE EFL STUDENTS

Abstract: One of the critical skills that undergraduate students of English as a Foreign language (EFL) should master involves their ability to write an argumentative essay, which is adequately supported by credible sources, such as scientific articles, books, and online materials. Arguably, a successful argumentative essay reflects EFL students' genre-appropriate citation practices that, according to Swales (1990), involve several discursive realisations of citation (for instance, integral, non-integral, etc.) in the text. The article presents a study whose aim is to learn about citation and referencing practices in a corpus of argumentative essays written by a group of undergraduate EFL students on the upper-intermediate level of proficiency (henceforth – participants). Anchored in the theoretical framework developed by Swales (1986, 1990), the participants' citation and referencing practices in the corpus were identified and quantified. The results of the quantitative analysis revealed that the participants preferred the non-integral type of citation, in which the author/authors cited are mentioned at the end of the citation in the parentheses. The participants' referencing practices were found to be dominated by books and book chapters published by a number of reputable domestic publishing houses.

Key words: argumentative essay, citation practices, English as a Foreign Language (EFL), referencing, upper-intermediate level of EFL proficiency

1. Introduction

In Europe, and more specifically in Northern Europe, argumentative essay writing is taught at a variety of undergraduate courses in English as a Foreign Language (EFL), in which this form of written composition is typically subsumed under the aegis of academic writing (Kapranov, 2020a, 2019; Tasker, 2022; Thomson, 2022). The rationale behind offering argumentative writing to

undergraduate EFL students rests with the linguo-didactic tenets that are aimed at fostering an EFL student's awareness of argumentative and, more broadly, rhetorical thinking that is coupled with the ability to produce a clearly written, cohesive and coherent argumentative piece of writing in the academic register of English (Kapranov, 2020b; Paquot et al., 2013). Importantly, the linguo-didactic premises of the teaching and learning of argumentative essay writing involve a substantial focus on argumentation that is supported by credible sources, which, in turn, are appropriately referenced in accordance with referencing conventions, such as the American Psychological Association (APA) or Harvard referencing style (Alexander et al., 2023; Sato, 2022; Tabari & Johnson, 2023). However, the literature routinely points out that undergraduate EFL students encounter multiple challenges in their learning trajectory that is associated with the mastering of a range of skills that encompass the rhetorical underpinnings of argumentative essays writing, academic writing in general, and citation and referencing skills in particular (Kapranov, 2021a; Awada et al., 2020; Kamimura, 2014; Van Weijen et al., 2019).

Taking into consideration a perennial problem with citation and referencing experienced by undergraduate EFL students (Borg, 2000; Harwood & Petrić, 2012; Hyland, 2009; Lee et al., 2018; McCulloch, 2012; Pecorari, 2006; Petrić & Harwood, 2013), the article introduces a study on citation and referencing practices in argumentative essays written by a group of EFL students on the upper-intermediated level of EFL proficiency, whose first language (L1) is Norwegian (henceforth – “participants”). The study is informed by the research focus on an EFL student's ability to produce an argumentative essay that is characterised by genre-conforming and relevant citation practices, as well as references to reliable sources (Casal & Lee, 2019; Heron & Corradini, 2023; Howard et al., 2010; Shaw & Weir, 2007; Swales 1990; Thompson et al., 2013). The theoretical and linguo-didactic premises of the study resonate with the literature (Alramadan, 2023; Howard et al., 2010; Kamimura, 2014; Kapranov, 2021b; Liu & Wu, 2020; McCulloch, 2012; McKinley, 2015; Pecorari, 2006; Sun et al., 2022; Thompson & Tribble, 2001), which indicates that EFL students should be made aware of the current academic conventions of quoting and referencing in argumentative essay writing, so that they could be cognisant and observant of the best practices of the genre.

The theoretical underpinnings of the study involve an approach to citation practices in academic written discourse developed by Swales (1986, 1990), which has been further elaborated in applied linguistics by Kamimura (2014), Petrić (2007, 2012), and Thompson and Tribble (2001). In applied linguistics, the Swalesian (1990) approach to citation practices is treated as a way of facilitating the teaching and learning of academic writing by means of illustrating and applying the types of citation that are usually employed by advanced academic writers (White, 2004, p. 89). Swales (1990) posits that experienced academic writers typically use two

major types of citation, namely (i) integral and (ii) non-integral. The integral type of citation forms an organic part of the clause (Borg, 2000; Kamimura, 2014; Thompson & Tribble, 2001), as illustrated by the following excerpt:

(1) There is a further question of whether shared goals are necessary to define a discourse community. Although Swales (1990) felt shared goals were definitive, a ‘public discourse community’ cannot have shared goals, and more crucially, a generalized ‘academic discourse community’ may not have shared goals or genres in any meaningful sense. (Borg, 2003, p. 399)

We can observe in (1) that “Swales (1990)” functions as a subject, which is interwoven with the rest of the clause grammatically, as well as semantically and pragmatically. In contrast to the integral type of citation that is shown in (1), the non-integral type of citation is referred to, when an academic writer cites the author/authors of the quotation at the end of the sentence, usually in the brackets, as seen in (2) below:

(2) It now appears that such letters of reference, at least in the US Business School context, can generate a short official note of acknowledgement and thanks what we might call a ‘response letter’ (Swales et al., 2000). (Askehave & Swales, 2001, p. 202)

In (2), the non-integral type of citation is represented by the parenthetical reference “(Swales et al., 2000)”, which does not appear to be integrated in the syntactic structure of the clause. In addition to the aforementioned citation types, Swales (1990) and his followers have developed a taxonomy of citation, which is further given in the article.

Guided by the Swalesian (1990) approach to citation in academic writing, the study, which is introduced and discussed in the article, seeks to discover new knowledge concerning the participants’ citation and referencing practices. Specifically, the novelty of the study is twofold. First, the study involves a cohort of participants at the B2 level of EFL proficiency according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (The Council of Europe, 2011), which is underrepresented in the literature. Second, the study aims at contrasting the participants’ citation and referencing practices in their argumentative essays written over the span of two semesters, that is one essay round, or Round 1, written in the autumn semester, whereas another round of the participants’ essays (i.e., Round 2) is executed in the spring semester, which makes it two semesters in total. In line with these considerations, the following research question (RQ) is formulated:

RQ: What is the preferred type of the participants’ citation and referencing practices and is it liable to change over time during two semesters of study?

Further, the article is organised in the following manner. First, a review of the literature is provided. It should be emphasised that there is a plethora of meta-

analyses, as well as systematic reviews of the literature on citation and referencing (see, for instance, Arsyad et al. (2018), Borg (2000), and White (2004)). Hence, the aim of the review is to outline the relevant literature in undergraduate EFL contexts. Thereafter, the present study is introduced in conjunction with its aims, research methodology, results of the study and their discussion. The article concludes with the summary of the major findings, the limitations of the study, and suggestions for future research.

2. Citation and Referencing Practices in Undergraduate EFL Contexts: Literature Review

In applied linguistics and EFL studies, there is a substantial bulk of literature on citation and referencing practices in undergraduate EFL contexts. As mentioned in the introduction, citation and referencing practices are regarded as a crucial element of academic writing in English (Kamimura, 2014; Kunnath et al., 2021; White, 2004). They are deemed critical indicators of an EFL student's awareness of the genre requirements of academic writing and, more specifically, of argumentative essay writing, where citations point to evidentiality, background sources of the argumentation, and serve as credible sources of the formulation of the argument and, correspondingly, the counter-argument (Cumming et al., 2018; Kapranov, 2017a, 2012; Lee et al., 2018; Van Weijen et al., 2019).

The literature demonstrates that the credibility of sources represents a variable that, to an extent, determines the success of an argumentative essay that is written by an EFL undergraduate student (Kaminura, 2014). The literature, however, does not provide a clear baseline for the use of credible sources in argumentative essay writing (Kongpetch, 2021; Liu & Wu, 2020). Obviously, the prior studies emphasise the importance of distinguishing between credible and non-credible sources with the latter being represented, mainly, by online sources (e.g., Wikipedia) and online social networking sites (e.g., Facebook), the credibility of which cannot be verified (Harwood & Petrić, 2012; Howard et al., 2010). However, the literature does not specify whether or not there would be substantial differences between an argumentative essay that relies on such sources as online books and online scientific articles on the one hand and an essay whose writing is facilitated by published books and/or articles on the other hand (McKinley, 2015; Yoshimura, 2015).

As far as the genre-appropriate citation and referencing practices in argumentative essay writing are concerned, the literature suggests that explicit instruction is required in order to foster these practices, especially in undergraduate EFL contexts (Kamimura, 2014; Kapranov, 2019, 2013; Wette, 2010). In particular, research indicates that undergraduate EFL students respond positively to explicit instructional settings that focus on “technical and rule-governed aspects of writing using sources” (Wette, 2010, p.168). Such an indication is further supported by

the linguo-didactic suggestion of the necessity to integrate reading and writing activities in EFL students' argumentative writing, so that the students have a chance to familiarise themselves with the best practices of citation and referencing, which, at a later stage, should be integrated into their argumentative essays (Kamimura, 2014, p. 96).

It should be noted, however, that whilst there is a positive impact of pedagogical interventions on undergraduate EFL students' argumentative writing, research indicates that citation practices are associated with multiple challenges that persist over the undergraduate students' learning trajectory of becoming proficient writers (Kapranov, 2015, 2017b; Kirsner et al., 2007; Kongpetch, 2021; Lee et al., 2018; McCulloch, 2012; Wette, 2010). One of the challenges involves the lack of awareness of the role of citations in creating a shared discursive space with the readership by means of projecting their unique authorial voice (Wette, 2010). More specifically, Wette (2010) has discovered that undergraduate EFL writers underutilise the discursive potential of citations, thus disguising their authorial voices behind a neutral façade of non-committal authorial stance. In other words, instead of commenting, arguing, or supporting the cited material, undergraduate EFL writers employ a rather common citation practice of acknowledging the quote without undertaking any further rhetorical moves (Wette, 2010; Lee et al., 2018). The aforementioned challenge is expanded upon by Lee, Hitchcock, and Casal (2018), who posit that undergraduate EFL writers do not seem to offer their own evaluation of the cited literature. The absence of the authorial stance vis-à-vis the materials cited is, presumably, reflective of undergraduate EFL writers' unawareness of the dialogic nature of argumentative writing (Kongpetch, 2021; Lee et al., 2018).

Another major challenge that is involved in undergraduate EFL writing is concomitant with the current attention to plagiarism in academia (Howard et al., 2010; Liu & Wu, 2020; McCulloch, 2012; Yoshimura, 2015). Applied to the context of argumentative essay writing by undergraduate EFL students, intolerance to plagiarism means that all the external sources and ideas in argumentative essays must be acknowledged and properly referenced (Kongpetch, 2021; Lee et al., 2018; McCulloch, 2012). Furthermore, the literature demonstrates that it is paramount to teach genre-appropriate citation practices in order to avoid instances when an undergraduate EFL student provides a very close, almost verbatim, paraphrase that can be qualified as plagiarism (Liu & Wu, 2020; McCulloch, 2012; Petrić, 2007, 2012; Yoshimura, 2015). The argument seems to reinforce the previously mentioned linguo-didactic emphasis on the explicit teaching of citation and referencing to undergraduate EFL students (Kamimura, 2014; Kapranov, 2023; Wette, 2010).

Based upon the literature, it appears feasible to summarise that once explicit and genre-appropriate input associated with citation and referencing has been provided, undergraduate EFL students would be able to incorporate it into their argumentative essay writing (Kamimura, 2014; McCulloch, 2012; Petrić, 2007, 2012; Wette, 2010). However, the literature does not indicate whether or not undergraduate

EFL students can exhibit sustainable citation and referencing behaviour over time. The study, which is presented in the subsequent section of the article, sets out to learn about possible changes in a group of undergraduate EFL students' (i.e., the participants') citation and referencing practices in the course of two semesters.

3. The Present Study: Settings, Participants, and Corpus

The settings of the present study involve a course in academic writing that is offered to pre-service EFL teachers (i.e., future teachers of English) at a university in Norway. The course, which is comprised of two semesters of full-time study, is accompanied by the course book *English Teaching Strategies* (Drew & Sørheim, 2016) that involves a series of topics in EFL didactics (for instance, Vygotsky's theory of proximal development, types of assessment, typical and atypical processes of EFL acquisition, etc.). The topics that are given in the course book are first discussed in class as pre-writing activities and, subsequently, are expected to be used as themes in argumentative essay writing. In total, two argumentative essays on the topics of EFL didactics are to be written within the course. Each argumentative essay, which should be between 1,200 and 1,400 words, is requested to be written in academic English on a topic in EFL didactics that is found in the course book by Drew and Sørheim (2016). Furthermore, each essay should involve a clearly formulated argument and its respective counter-argument that are appropriately supported by means of quoting credible sources, which are referenced in accordance with the APA format.

As mentioned, the obligatory course requirements involve the submission of two argumentative essays. The first essay is written during the autumn semester in the so-called Round 1 of essay writing, whereas the second essay (i.e., Round 2 of essay writing) is carried out in the spring semester. Importantly, it should be explained that in Round 1 the participants' argumentative essay writing is facilitated by the course instructor's explicit teaching of (i) the rhetorical steps involved in an argumentative essay, (ii) academic vocabulary, (iii) style-appropriate metadiscursive means, and (iv) citation and referencing conventions. Additionally, in Round 1 the participants are offered feedback by the course instructor, whilst Round 2 is characterised by the absence of the course instructor's direct involvement. The rationale behind the course set up is based upon a contention that the participants should master the conventions of argumentative essay writing in explicit instructional settings in Round 1, which they would be able to transfer to their argumentative essay writing in Round 2 without the course instructor's direct participation and feedback.

Set within the aforementioned context, the present study investigates whether or not there would be quantitative differences in the participants' citation and referencing in their argumentative essays contrasted between the two rounds of argumentative essay writing. Conceivably, the novelty of the study, as previously mentioned in the

introduction, is associated with the contention that the participants would be able to sustain their citation and referencing skills in Round 2 of argumentative essay writing with minimal facilitation of the course instructor. Theoretically, the study builds upon the literature (Kamimura, 2014; McCulloch, 2012; Petrić, 2007, 2012; Swales, 1986, 1990; Wette, 2010; Yoshimura, 2015) that demonstrates the importance of citation and referencing practices in argumentative essay writing by undergraduate EFL students. Following the literature and, in particular, the seminal publications by Petrić (2007), Swales (1990), and Thompson and Tribble (2001), the study utilises the types of citation that are summarised in Table 1 below.

Table 1. The Types of Citation According to Petrić (2007), Swales (1990), and Thompson and Tribble (2001)

#	Types of Citation	Subtypes of Citation
1	Integral citations	Verb controlling. The citation controls a lexical verb. Naming. The citation is a noun phrase (alternatively, a part of noun phrase). Non-citations. The author's/authors' name/names are not followed by the year of publication.
2	Non-integral citations	Source citations. The citation indicates the source of data, idea, or information. Identification citations. The citation identifies an actor in the sentence. Origin citations. The citation indicates the originator of technique, research methodology or a product. Reference citations. The citation refers to work containing further information. Example. The citation illustrates what is given in the sentence.
3	Short citations	The citation is represented by a clause or its part that is surrounded by quotation marks (typically less than 40 words in length).
4	Extensive citations	The citation is represented by several clauses that are set off from the main text by spaces and are not surrounded by quotation marks.

In addition to the types of citation presented in Table 1, the study examines the types of referencing practices, which are represented by the following categories: (i) books, (ii) journal articles, and (iii) other web-based sources. It should be noted that electronic and printed books and journal articles are treated in the study as belonging to the same category of references. Subsequently, the category “other web-based sources” is regarded as non-academic sources, such as blogs, government websites, social networking sites, and similar sites (Kapranov, 2020c).

In total, the study involved 20 participants (7 males and 13 females, mean (M) age = 22.4, standard deviation (SD) = 7.4). The participants were native speakers of Norwegian and English was a foreign language to all of them. The participants were at the B2 level of EFL proficiency (The Council of Europe, 2011). At the time of the study, the participants were enrolled in an EFL programme for pre-service EFL teachers at a university in Norway. The participants signed the consent form that allowed the author of the article, who was the instructor in their EFL course, to

collect, process and analyse their argumentative essays for research purposes. The participants' real names and other personal data were coded to ensure confidentiality.

The corpus of the study was comprised of 40 argumentative essays produced by the participants in Round 1 (total number (N) of essays = 20, total N of words = 26,196, M = 1,309.8, SD = 115.1) and Round 2 (total N of essays = 20, total N of words = 26,082, M = 1,304.1, SD = 315.7).

4. Procedure and Methodology

The study formed part of a research project that sought to shed light on metadiscursive practices of argumentative essay writing that were acquired and sustained over time by the participants (Kapranov, 2023). Within the project, explicit instruction associated with rhetorical, metadiscursive, and citation and referencing practices of argumentative essay writing was offered in the autumn semester of study. Specifically, the participants were taught about citation practices and referencing conventions in the APA style at a two-hour lecture at the start of the autumn semester, which was followed by a seminar that offered possibilities to discuss them and have a questions-and-answers session. Thereafter, the participants were instructed to write their argumentative essay drafts and submit them to the course instructor for written feedback. Each participant was allowed multiple feedback sessions with the instructor. By the end of the autumn semester the participants were instructed to submit the final version of their argumentative essays (i.e., Round 1 of the essays). In contrast to the autumn semester, however, the course instructor's interventions were minimal in the spring semester. During the spring semester the participants were expected to work on their own and in small peer-review groups that were organised as dyads in order to provide peer feedback. The participants were requested to submit their final argumentative essays in Round 2 by the end of the spring semester.

In terms of the methodology, the following should be specified. The participants' argumentative essays in Round 1 and Round 2, respectively, were analysed manually in order to identify and classify the types of citations and referencing. Each essay was read several times to identify the participant's citations and references. Thereafter, the manually identified citations and references were entered into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 20.0 (IBM, 2011) and converted to numerical representations. The descriptive statistics of Round 1 and Round 2 essays were computed in SPSS. They included the total number of citations and references, their means, and standard deviations per essay round. Also, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and a paired-sample t-test were calculated in SPSS (IBM, 2011) in order to establish whether or not there were statistically significant differences in terms of the participants' citation practices between the essay rounds. Additionally, the percentage of types of referencing in both Round 1 and Round 2 was counted in SPSS. The descriptive statistics were summarised and presented in the subsequent section of the article. It should

be specified that the methodology in the study took into consideration the so-called surface representations of citations and referencing, thus leaving out their rhetorical functions in the text.

5. Results and Discussion

The results of the quantitative analysis have yielded the descriptive statistics that are summarised in Tables 2 – 5. Let us scrutinise them in more detail.

Table 2. The Descriptive Statistics of the Participants' Citations in Round 1 and Round 2

#	Citations	Round 1	Round 2
1	Total N	209	234
2	M	10.5	11.7
3	SD	5.8	5.6
4	Maximum	24	25
5	Minimum	1	3

In Table 2 above, we can observe that the total number of citations increases from Round 1 to Round 2. This finding is interpreted as a growing tendency on the part of the participants to pay more attention to citation practices in Round 2, even though the t-test indicates that the result is not significant at $p < .05$ [$t(2) = -0.086$, $p = .468$]. Interpreted within the parameters of the RQ, which addresses the issue of whether or not the participants' citation practices are liable to change over time in the course of two semesters of study, the results show that the participants are able to sustain their citation skills in Round 2. To reiterate, the settings in Round 2 are characterised by the absence of explicit instruction associated with citation, metadiscursive, and rhetorical peculiarities of argumentative essay writing. Given the absence of linguo-pedagogical interventions on the part of the course instructor in Round 2, a substantial decline in all types of citation and referencing could have been expected. Such a decline would be in line with the literature, which indicates that undergraduate EFL students experience persistent problems with citation and referencing (Kamimura, 2014; Kongpetch, 2021; Lee et al., 2018; McCulloch, 2012; Yoshimura, 2015). However, the data indicates that this is not the case. The present findings suggest that a lecture (N of hours = 2) at the start of the autumn semester and the ensuing questions-and-answers seminar would be considered sufficient for the maintenance of the participants' citation skills in the spring semester during Round 2 of argumentative essay writing, which took place with no direct involvement of the course instructor and, consequently, no explicit teaching of citation and referencing conventions. This finding aligns with Wette (2010), who demonstrates that the genre-appropriate use of citation practices on the undergraduate EFL level can be attained within a relatively short period (under eight hours of contact teaching) of explicit instruction.

As far as the participants' preferred types of citation are concerned, the quantitative analysis in SPSS (IBM, 2011) has revealed the findings that are given in Table 3 below.

Table 3. The Types of Citation Practices in Round 1 and Round 2

#	Types of Citation	Round 1	Round 2
1	Non-integral (all types) N	117	158
2	Non-integral (all types) M	6.9	7.9
3	Non-integral (all types) SD	3.3	6.3
4	Non-integral source citation N	95	110
5	Non-integral source citation M	5.6	5.5
6	Non-integral source citation SD	2.9	4.8
7	Non-integral identification N	11	22
8	Non-integral identification M	1.1	1.6
9	Non-integral identification SD	0.3	0.7
10	Non-integral origin N	8	19
11	Non-integral origin M	1.0	1.7
12	Non-integral origin SD	0	1.2
13	Non-integral reference N	3	8
14	Non-integral reference M	1.0	1.0
15	Non-integral reference SD	0	0
16	Non-integral example N	0	0
17	Non-integral example M	0	0
18	Non-integral example SD	0	0
19	Integral (all types) N	92	76
20	Integral (all types) M	5.1	4.8
21	Integral (all types) SD	2.9	3.7
22	Integral verb controlling N	43	51
23	Integral verb controlling M	3.6	3.6
24	Integral verb controlling SD	2.5	2.8
25	Integral naming N	19	17
26	Integral naming M	1.7	2.4
27	Integral naming SD	1.1	1.3
28	Integral non-citations N	30	8
29	Integral non-citations M	2.5	2.0
30	Integral non-citations SD	1.6	1.7
31	Short citations (all types) N	201	230
32	Short citations (all types) M	10.1	11.5
33	Short citations (all types) SD	5.6	5.8
34	Extensive citations (all types) N	8	4
35	Extensive citations (all types) M	1.3	1.3
36	Extensive citations (all types) SD	0.5	0.5

As seen in Table 3, the participants' preferred type of citation both in Round 1 and Round 2 is represented by non-integral citations. Whilst the participants

show that they employ citations in both Round 1 and Round 2, the prevalence of non-integral citations in the corpus is interpreted as the participants' insufficient awareness of the discursive role of citations. This finding resonates with Wette (2010) and Lee, Hitchcock, and Casal (2018), who demonstrate that undergraduate EFL students typically seem to acknowledge the source of the citation, but fail to incorporate the citation into the discursive fabrics of their argumentation, thus demoting their authorial voices to a bland background narration.

It follows from Table 3 that there is an increase in non-integral citations in Round 2 and a decrease in integral types of citation in the same round. However, the application of a one-way ANOVA indicates that these changes are not statistically significant at $p < .05$. [$F(1, 58) = 1.247, p = .273$]. Referring back to the RQ in the study, we can argue that the occurrence of integral and non-integral citations of all types is fairly similarly distributed between the rounds. Subsequently, this finding suggests that the participants sustain their citation skills in Round 2 without linguo-didactic interventions by the course instructor. The findings are further supported by two paired-sample t-tests, which reveal that extensive and short citations, respectively, do not differ significantly between the essay rounds at $p < .05$, namely [$t(2) = -0.104, p = .461$] in short citations and [$t(2) = 0.512, p = .318$] in extensive citations.

As far as the participants' referencing practices in the rounds of argumentative essay writing are concerned, the quantitative analysis indicates that the participants prefer books (both electronic and printed) as sources, as seen in Table 4 below.

Table 4. The Types of Referencing Practices in Rounds 1 and 2

#	Types of Referencing	Round 1	Round 2
1	Books N	56	68
2	Books M	3.1	3.4
3	Books SD	1.05	2.5
4	Journal articles N	10	11
5	Journal articles M	1.4	1.8
6	Journal articles SD	1.1	1.1
7	Web sources N	17	9
8	Web sources M	2.4	1.8
9	Web sources SD	1.6	0.7
10	All types of reference N	83	88
11	All types of reference M	4.2	4.4
12	All types of reference SD	1.3	2.8

The findings presented in Table 4 are indicative of the participants' referencing practices that are reasonably similar in the rounds (see mean values of all three types of referencing). In this fashion, we can argue that the participants' referencing practices that involve journal articles appear to be stable in the rounds of essay writing (see Table 4). Whilst the participants' references to books exhibit an increase

Table 5. The Participants' Referencing Practices in Rounds 1 and 2: Publishing Houses, Journals, and Websites

#	Types of References	Round 1	Round 2
1	Publishing Houses	Det Norske Samlaget 30.4% Cappelen 8.9% Longman 8.9% Routledge 7.1% Universitetsforlaget 7.1% Gyldendal 5.4% Lawrence Erlbaum 5.4% Oxford University Press 5.4% Pearson 5.4% Pergamon 3.6% Bloomsbery Academic 1.8% Fagbokforlaget 1.8% Harvard University Press 1.8% Pedlex 1.8% Prentice Hall 1.8% Scientific American Books 1.8% Springer 1.8%	Det Norske Samlaget 23.5% Fagbokforlaget 13.2% Routledge 13.3% Gyldendal 10.3% Pearson 10.3% Cambridge University Press 8.8% Longman 5.9% Oxford University Press 4.4% Blackwell 2.9% Pergamon 2.9% Universitetsforlaget 2.9% Gleerups 1.5%
2	Journals Titles	The Canadian Modern Language Review 30% Education Policy Analysis Archives 10% English Language Teaching 10% Hispania 10% Journal of Technology Studies 10% Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods 10% System 10% The Modern Language Journal 10%	TESOL Quarterly 27.3% Applied Linguistics 9.1% Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology 9.1% Journal of Education 9.1% Language Arts 9.1% Language Learning 9.1% Procedia 9.1% Studies in Second Language Acquisition 18.2%
3	Websites	www.shmoop.com 17.6% www.onwardsstate.com 11.8% blog.droptask.com 5.9% www.cambridge.org 5.9% www.cmu.edu 5.9% www.educationaltechniques.com 5.9% www.hivolda.no 5.9% www.onestopenenglish.com 5.9% www.rigjenigen.no 5.9% skottberkum.com 5.9% www.sydney.edu.au 5.9% www.teachingenglish.org.uk 5.9% www.teamweek.com 5.9% www.thoughtco.com 5.9%	www.teachingenglish.org.uk 22.2% blogs.mtroyal.ca 11.1% www.academic.oup.com 11.1% ec.europa.eu 11.1% www.forskning.no 11.1% www.lovdato.no 11.1% www.udir.no 11.1% www.utdanningsforskning.no 11.1%

in Round 2, it is not statistically significant at $p < .05$ [$t(2) = -0.163, p = .439$]. In contrast to the increase in the references to books in Round 2, there is an observable decrease in the referencing of web sources, especially blogs, in Round 2, which is not statistically significant at $p < .05$ [$t(2) = 0.561, p = .302$]. These findings are indicative of the following contention: unlike in Round 1, which can be described

as the participants' initiation to the conventions of argumentative essay writing in English, the participants' referencing strategy in Round 2 is characterised by the preference for more reliable sources (e.g., books) and a more cautious use of web-based sources of referencing. This contention is further corroborated by the findings presented in Table 5, which illustrates the participants' referencing practices that are associated with the sources available on websites, in scientific journals, and in books by publishing houses.

It is seen in Table 5 that the scope of websites referred to by the participants in Round 1 encompasses mostly blogs (64.8% of all websites), whilst the references to official websites of universities and government agencies are less numerous (35.2% of all websites). In Round 2, however, referencing to web-based blogs is epiphenomenal (22.2%) in contrast to the university-affiliated blogs (e.g., blogs.mtroyal.ca), as well as university and government-administered (e.g., www.udir.no) webpages (77.7% of all websites). Another rather remarkable finding that is evident from Table 5 consists in the participants' reference exclusively to international English-mediated scientific journals (e.g., *TESOL Quarterly*) and the absence of domestic (i.e., Norwegian) journal titles both in Round 1 and Round 2, whereas Norwegian publishing houses seem to be preferred by them in the essay rounds (55.4% in Round 1 and 49.9% in Round 2). It should be noted that in Round 1, 91.6% of all the references are English-medium articles, books and web sources, whilst references in Norwegian comprise 8.4%. In Round 2, however, there is a decrease in Norwegian-medium sources of reference (6.8%), whilst English-medium sources account for 92%. Additionally, in Round 2, one participant refers to a book that is written in Swedish (1.1%). Hence, we can summarise that the participants typically use English-medium sources in their argumentative essay writing. This finding is in contrast with the literature (Kamimura, 2014; Yoshimura, 2015), which postulates that undergraduate EFL students are more likely to use sources that are written in their L1 rather than in English.

6. Conclusions

The aim of the study was to learn about the preferred type of the participants' citation and referencing practices and whether or not the practices were likely to change in the course of two semesters of study. By means of applying an intra-group design, the study examined the participants' citation and referencing practices in the set of two conditions, namely in the contexts of (i) explicit instruction that was associated with the teaching of metadiscursive, rhetorical, and citation and referencing practices during the autumn semester (i.e., in Round 1 of argumentative essay writing) and (ii) the minimal instruction thereof during the spring semester (i.e., in Round 2). By means of focusing on the final results of argumentative essay writing (i.e., the essay drafts were factored out from the study corpus), it would be feasible to summarise the following findings.

First, the participants managed to exhibit sustainable citation and referencing practices in the spring semester that was characterised by the minimal involvement of the course instructor. Second, the participants sustained their citation and referencing skills that they had developed during the autumn semester, so that they continued to use a range of citation techniques, mainly, non-integral types of citation in Round 2 of argumentative essay writing. Moreover, they increased the use of citations in their argumentative essays, even though the increase was not found to be statistically significant. Third, the participants sustained their referencing skills in Round 2. Furthermore, they paid more attention to credible sources, such as books (in electronic and printed form) and official web-based sources. The aforementioned findings supported the literature (Wette, 2010), which posited that a short-term period of explicit instruction of citation and referencing conventions could be considered sufficient for the successful execution of argumentative essays by undergraduate EFL students on the B2 level of EFL proficiency.

Concurrently with the findings, the following limitation should be acknowledged. Specifically, the participants in the study were at the upper-intermediate level of EFL proficiency. Presumably, the results of the study would be substantially different in case the participants would be on a less proficient level. In this regard, it would be desirable to contrast the corpus of the participants' essays with that of a lower EFL proficiency level. In addition, a possible avenue of future research should be mentioned, where it would be desirable to compile a parallel English/Norwegian corpus of argumentative essays and contrast them in terms of the undergraduate students' citation and referencing practices.

7. Acknowledgments

The author is thankful to the participants, the editor and two anonymous reviewers.

References

- Alexander, P. A., Fusenig, J., Schoute, E. C., Singh, A., Sun, Y., & van Meerten, J. E. (2023). Confronting the challenges of undergraduates' argumentation writing in a "Learning How to Learn" course. *Written Communication*, 40(2), 482-517. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07410883221148468>.
- Alramadan, M. M. (2023). Citation behavior, audience awareness, and identity construction in Arabic and EFL research. *Heliyon*, 9(2), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e13125>.
- Arsyad, S., Zaim, M., & Susyla, D. (2018). Review and citation style in research article introductions: a comparative study between national and international English-medium journals in medical sciences. *Discourse and Interaction*, 11(1), 28-51. <https://doi.org/10.5817/DI2018-1-28>.
- Askehave, I., & Swales, J. M. (2001). Genre identification and communicative purpose: A problem and a possible solution. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(2), 195-212. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/22.2.195>.

- Awada, G., Burston, J., & Ghannage, R. (2020). Effect of student team achievement division through WebQuest on EFL students' argumentative writing skills and their instructors' perceptions. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 33(3), 275-300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1558254>.
- Borg, E. (2000). Citation practices in academic writing. In P. Thompson (Ed.), *Patterns and Perspectives: Insights into EAP Writing Practice* (pp. 26-42). Reading, UK: Centre for Applied Language Studies.
- Borg, E. (2003). Discourse community. *ELT Journal*, 57(4), 398-400.
- Casal, J. E., & Lee, J. J. (2019). Syntactic complexity and writing quality in assessed first-year L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 44, 51-62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.03.005>.
- Cumming, A., Yang, L., Qiu, C., Zhang, L., Ji, X., Wang, J., Zhan, J., Zhang, F., Xu, C., Cao, R., Yu, L., Chu, M., Liu, M., Cao, M. & Lai, C. (2018). Students' practices and abilities for writing from sources in English at universities in China. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 39, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.11.001>.
- Drew, I., & Sorheim, B. (2016). *English Teaching Strategies: Methods for English Teachers of 10 to 16-Year Olds*. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget.
- Harwood, N., & Petrić, B. (2012). Performance in the citing behavior of two student writers. *Written Communication*, 29(1), 55-103. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088311424133>.
- Heron, M., & Corradini, E. (2023). A genre-based study of professional reflective writing in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 28(3), 504-516. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1824178>.
- Howard, R. M., Serviss, T., & Rodrigue, T. K. (2010). Writing from sources, writing from sentences. *Writing and Pedagogy*, 2(2), 177-192. <https://doi.org/10.1558/wap.v2i2.177>.
- Hyland, T. A. (2009). Drawing a line in the sand: Identifying the borderzone between self and other in EL1 and EL2 citation practices. *Assessing Writing*, 14(1), 62-74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2009.01.001>.
- IBM. (2011). IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, version 20.0. New York: IBM Corp.
- Kamimura, T. (2014). Citation behaviors observed in Japanese EFL students' argumentative writing. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 18(1), 85-101.
- Kapranov, O. (2023). Evidentiality in argumentative essays by upper-intermediate EFL students. *LANGUAGE: Codification, Competence, Communication*, 1(8), 66-82.
- Kapranov, O. (2021a). Discourse markers in peer reviews of academic essays by future teachers of English as a Foreign Language. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia: An International Review of English Studies*, 56(1), 55-84. <https://doi.org/10.2478/stap-2021-0020>.
- Kapranov, O. (2021b). Self-mention in academic writing by in-service teachers of English: Exploring Authorial Voices. In M. Burada, O. Tatu, & R. Sinu (eds.) *Exploring Language Variation, Diversity and Change* (pp. 76-100). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Kapranov, O. (2020a). Self-mention in argumentative essays written by pre-service teachers of English. *Beyond Philology. An International Journal of Linguistics, Literary Studies and English Language Teaching*, 17(2), 97-128. <https://doi.org/10.26881/bp.2020.2.05>.
- Kapranov, O. (2020b). The use of discourse markers in academic writing by in-service primary school teachers of English. *Prague Journal of English Studies*, 9(1), 197-229. <https://doi.org/10.2478/pjes-2020-0009>.
- Kapranov, O. (2020c). English goes digital: Framing pre-service teachers' perceptions of a learning management system in their EFL studies. *ExELL (Explorations in English Language and Linguistics)*, 8(1), 47-67.
- Kapranov, O. (2019). Discourse markers in argumentative essays in EFL by Norwegian preservice primary school teachers. In C. Haase & N. Orlova (eds.) *English Language Teaching through the Lens of Experience* (pp. 83-100). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

- Kapranov, O. (2017a). Discourse markers in EFL academic essays written by primary school teacher candidates. *Konin Language Studies*, 5(4), 473-493.
- Kapranov, O. (2017b). Discourse markers in academic writing in EFL by Swedish preservice secondary school teachers of English. *Logos & Littera*, 4(1), 21-39.
- Kapranov, O. (2015). Self-construals of national identity in EFL reflective essays written by Swedish advanced EFL students. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 2(4), 579-590.
- Kapranov, A. (2013). English as a foreign language in Swedish self-construals. *Scientific Notes. Language and Philology*, 116, 18-22.
- Kapranov, A. (2012). Swedish university students' perception of English as a global language. *Kalbos, kultūra ir globalizacija* (pp. 8–14). Vilnius: Mykolas Romeris Univeristy Press.
- Kirsner, K., Bujalka, H., Kapranov, O., & Dunn, J. (2007). How long does it take to learn a second language?. *Forum on Public Policy: A Journal of the Oxford Round Table*, 3(2), 161-170.
- Kongpetch, S. (2021). Use of citation forms in academic writing of Thai undergraduates. *International Journal of Language and Literature*, 9(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.15640/ijll.v9n1a1>.
- Kunnath, S. N., Herrmannova, D., Pride, D., & Knoth, P. (2021). A meta-analysis of semantic classification of citations. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 2(4), 1170-1215. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00159.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.01.001>.
- Liu, M., & Wu, Y. (2020). Chinese undergraduate EFL learners' perceptions of Plagiarism and use of citations in course papers. *Cogent Education*, 7(1), 1855769. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1855769>.
- McCulloch, S. (2012). Citations in search of a purpose: Source use and authorial voice in L2 student writing. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 8(1), 55-68. <https://doi.org/10.21913/IJEI.v8i1.784>.
- McKinley, J. (2015). Critical argument and writer identity: Social constructivism as a theoretical framework for EFL academic writing. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 12(3), 184-207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2015.1060558>.
- Paquot, M., Hasselgård, H., & Ebeling, S. O. (2013). Writer/reader visibility in learner writing across genres: A comparison of the French and Norwegian components of the ICLE and VESPA learner corpora. In S. Granger, G. Gilquin, F. Meunier (eds.), *Twenty Years of Learner corpus Research: Looking Back, Moving Ahead* (pp. 277-288). Louvain-la-Neuve: Presses universitaires de Louvain.
- Pecorari, D. (2006). Visible and occluded citation features in postgraduate second-language writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25(1), 4-29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2005.04.004>.
- Petrić, B. (2007). Rhetorical functions of citations in high-and low-rated master's theses. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 6(3), 238-253. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2007.09.002>.
- Petrić, B. (2012). Legitimate textual borrowing: Direct quotation in L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(2), 102-117.
- Petrić, B., & Harwood, N. (2013). Task requirements, task representation, and self-reported citation functions: An exploratory study of a successful L2 student's writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12(2), 110-124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2013.01.002>.
- Sato, T. (2022). Assessing critical thinking through L2 argumentative essays: an investigation of relevant and salient criteria from raters' perspectives. *Language Testing in Asia*, 12(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00159-4>.
- Shaw, S. D., & Weir, C. J. (2007). *Examining writing: Research and practice in assessing second language writing* (Vol. 26). Cambridge University Press.

- Sun, Q., Kuzborska, I., & Soden, B. (2022). Learning to construct authorial voice through citations: A longitudinal case study of L2 postgraduate novice writers. *System*, 106, 102765. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102765>.
- Swales, J. M. (1986). Citation analysis and discourse analysis. *Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 39-56.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M., H. Jacobsen, C. Kejser, L. Koch, J. Lynch, and L. Mulbæk. (2000). A new link in a chain of genres? *Hermes*, 25, 133-141. <https://doi.org/10.7146/hjlc.v13i25.25589>.
- Tabari, M. A., & Johnson, M. D. (2023). Exploring new insights into the role of cohesive devices in written academic genres. *Assessing Writing*, 57, 100749. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100749>.
- Tasker, D. G. (2022). A case study of the variety of writing assignments in an undergraduate English department. *English for Specific Purposes*, 66, 33-62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.12.001>.
- The Council of Europe. (2011). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Retrieved from https://www.coe.int/en/web/language-policy/home?e1_en.asp.
- Thomson, J. J. (2022). Organisatorisk metadiskurs i videregående skriftlige oppgaver i ulike utdanningsfaglige kontekster og sjangrer: En undersøkelse av elevers bruk og læreres praksiser. *Acta Didactica Norden*, 16(1), 1-31. <https://doi.org/10.5617/adno.9112>.
- Thompson, C., Morton, J., & Storch, N. (2013). Where from, who, why and how? A study of the use of sources by first year L2 university students. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12(2), 99-109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2012.11.004>.
- Thompson, P., & Tribble, C. (2001). Looking at citations: Using corpora in English for academic purposes. *Language Learning and Technology*, 5(3), 91-105.
- Van Weijen, D., Rijlaarsdam, G., & van den Bergh, H. (2019). Source use and argumentation behavior in L1 and L2 writing: A within-writer comparison. *Reading and Writing*, 32, 1635-1655. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-018-9842-9>.
- Wette, R. (2010). Evaluating student learning in a university-level EAP unit on writing using sources. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(3), 158-177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2010.06.002>.
- White, H. D. (2004). Citation analysis and discourse analysis revisited. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(1), 89-116. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/25.1.89>.
- Yoshimura, F. (2015). Japanese University students' task representations of paraphrasing and their experience with it. *Tohoku Gakuin University Review: Essays and Studies in English Language and Literature*, 99, 1-21.