ABSTRACT
        Citation practice in scholarly writing is the
enactment of a set of beliefs shared by the academic community, and
it is these rituals which enact and thereby confirm adherence to
certain values. The citation practices of a whole discourse community
can be viewed as a representative anecdote of collaborative effort to
establish the collective knowledge of that community. Students'
failure to observe citation rituals will prohibit their acceptance
into the scholarly community. Writing teachers should consider
designing exercises and assignments which require students to attend
consciously to citation practice in the writing they read. Students
may become interested in citation practice once they realize that it
is a chance to exercise the power to participate in shaping the
knowledge and belief of their community. (Thirty-five references are
attached.) (RS)

Shirley Rose
San Diego State University
CCCC 1989

Citation Rituals in Academic Cultures

A year ago at this conference, I discussed the individual
scholarly writer's citation practice in Burkean terms of
identification and division. I considered citation at the
microcosmic level as a representative anecdote of a scholar's
attempts to identify with certain writers and divide herself
from others. Thus I focused on citation as courtship of or
collaboration with other writers and readers.

My focus today is on citation practice at the macrocosmic
level, viewing the citation practices of a whole discourse
community as a representative anecdote of collaborative effort to
establish the collective knowledge of that community.

Only a Derridean can effectively--however neatly or messily-
-dismiss citation rituals altogether by discoursing on the
iterability or un-iterability of discourse, as Derrida does in
his exchange with John Searle carried on in the pages of Glyph 1
and Glyph 2 on the subject of John Austin's speech act theory.

The rest of us are as constrained by the academic culture's
rituals of citation as E.D. Hirsch, Jr. has proven to be in the
seemingly endless response/counter-response/counter-counter-
response sequence initiated by Hirsch's publication of Cultural
Literacy and carried on by Hirsch, James Sledd and Andrew Sledd,
and Robert Scholes in College English, the MLA's Profession '88,
and the MLA Newsletter. Like Hirsch, we are expected to
represent another writer's work accurately.

So, in an effort to better understand the basis of these
expectations, I want to look at scholarly citation practice from
the religious perspective. If my earlier work considered
citation as an act of love, today I am considering it as an act
of faith.

Clifford Geertz describes the religious perspective as
moving "beyond the realities of everyday life to wider ones which
correct and complete them, and its defining concern is not action
upon these wider realities, but acceptance of them, faith in them
. . ." (112). For Geertz, religious beliefs "do not merely
interpret social and psychological processes in cosmic terms--in
which case they would be philosophical, not religious--but they
shape them." I suggest then that we consider citation practice in
scholarly writing to be the enactment of a set of beliefs shared
by the academic community. That is, members of the academic
community participate in citation rituals in order to enact and
thereby confirm their adherence to certain values.

What are the values confirmed by ritual enactment each time
a scholarly writer cites another scholarly writer? We might hope
to find answers in the documents which describe or prescribe how
the citation rituals are to be carried out--but the style manuals
are not very helpful as far as explaining why scholars cite ther
scholars in the way they do or even why they do so at all.
Beyond a few introductory remarks about the need to acknowledge

intellectual debts by "giving credit" to sources and the need to
provide readers with leads to relevant materials, the manuals
offer few clues for interpreting the ritual practices of
citation.

A close reading of the Chicago Manual of Style, for example,
suggests that the stylistic rules for punctuation, abbreviation,
and placement of documentation information are governed by the
need for clarity, economy, and the "reader's ease"--pretty much
in that order. These controlling values are embedded in
explanations of variant rules, such as how to punctuate a
quotation from a source, and are usually cast in the form of
"should" and "must" statements about the responsibilities of the
citing author.

Here are a few examples:

15.40 Whenever possible, a note number should come at
the end of a sentence, or at least at the end of
a clause.   Numbers set between subject and verb or
between other related words in a sentence are
distracting to the reader.
15.4 The system of documentation generally most
economical in space, in time (for author, editor, and
typesetter), and in cost (to publisher and public)--in
short, the most practical--is the author-date system.
Authors' names and dates of publication are given in
the text, usually in parenthesis, and keyed to a list
of works cited, which is placed at the end of the book
or article.

The MLA Style Manual doesn't provide even these embedded
explanations, because it presents style rules in the form of "is"
and "are" statements.

While the style manuals prescribe, much of the research in
citation studies describes. Much of this work on citation
practices has been done in the disciplines of library science and
social studies of science. When computerized citation indexing
became possible, scholars in these disciplines used citation
counts to inform document retrieval and evaluate the
contributions of individual scholars.

Some of this research is quite interesting. Here is a sample
of its findings: researchers in communications disciplines cite
social science scholarship more often than researchers in social
science disciplines use communication scholarship (Kreps); books
are cited most often in monographic literature in the humanities,
while manuscripts and journal articles are cited about equally
(Cullvers); in works listed under American Literature in the MLA
Bibliography for 1981, there were more citations of books than of
journal articles (Budd); in economics, women scholars tend to
cite more women while men tend to cite more men, thus women are
at a disadvantage because they will be cited less often (Ferber).

Other scholars have used citation index data bases to
compile information and attempt to identify core journals in a
field and relationships between those journals by counting the
number of citations made (Summers). Similar studies have even

counted the number of citations a particular author's work
receives in order to identify major contributors to particular
disciplines or even to predict future Nobel prize winners
(Griffith) While the usefulness of the information and the
wisdom of the conclusions drawn in many of these studies has been
questioned (Cronin), they do reflect assumptions about the role
of citations in scholarly writing.

Recently, the interests of citation scholars have turned to
identifying citer motivations and analyzing citation contexts.
Much of this work, as John Swales has suggested, will interest
writing teachers--especially those who teach the research paper
in writing across the curriculum programs--for several models of
citer motivations have been developed which distinguish between
types of citations and their relative frequency in different
disciplines. But, as Henry Small has observed, these citer
motivation models fail to provide a theoretical framework for
fully explaining citation practices--the motives of the citing
writers, the way readers respond to the kind, number, and style
of citation, or readers' expectations about whom should be cited
for which work in reference to what subject.

Some citation scholars, Gilbert for example, have considered
the practice of scholarly citation as persuasion, describing the
scholar's practice as an effort to present the best argument or
case to his/her reader and the citation as persuasive tool.
Indeed, as Louis Gottschalk has pointed out, the several
denotations of the term "citation" suggest the nature of the
footnote as a summons to a witness in a court of law.

Thus far, I've been developing the point that citation is a
collaborative ritual faithfully, strictly adhered to, but not
fully understood. In what follows, I will argue that citation
can be better understood as a ritual of collaboration.

RITUAL OF COLLABORATION
Henry Small has suggested that scholars cite works which are
symbolic of ideas and concepts they are discussing. Citation of
these works is a shorthand way of including large sets of
information and complex ideas previously discussed in the body of
the new work. Small views citations as symbol usage; cited
documents serve as symbols for concepts or ideas the citing
author wishes to express or discuss. Frequently cited documents
in the literature of a discipline are "standard symbols" of an
idea or concept for the whole community. Within a single citing
document, a cited document may serve as a "private" symbol of an
idea or concept for the citing author.

Conceiving "the social determination" of scientific
knowledge "as a dialogue among citing authors on the "meaning" of
earlier texts, Small considers the importance of citation
practices to the creation of scientific community and notes that
the "cognitive function" (citations as symbols of concepts or
ideas) "arises from the formal requirement imposed on the
scientist author of embedding his references to earlier
literature in a written text. This leads to citing of works

which embody ideas the author is discussing" (328).

Building upon Small's ideas, then, we might look at the ways in which citing authors participate in a discipline's collective process of creating knowledge. One of the most important elements of this process appears to be identification/division-- identification of what counts as shared knowledge and division from what has been refuted or rejected as knowledge. Identification/Division takes place in the ritual practices of citation in scholarly writing. Every time a scholar presents a review of the literature in her area of inquiry, or writes a bibliographical essay, or incorporates another writer's words or ideas to advance her own thesis, she maps the field of her discipline. She draws the boundaries, circumscribes the territory of her field of discourse, and determines who else is within and who is without.

This makes citation practices critical to a scholarly discipline. And though we may not share much explicit, formal knowledge of it, it is very important to us. For example, consider some anecdotal evidence I've collected recently:

In a bibliography circulated at a preconvention workshop here at this year's CCCC, titled "Feminist Studies/Composition Studies Bibliography," Lisa Albrecht characterizes two works as "overquoted"; of Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule's Women's Ways of Knowing, Albrecht writes "over-rated and overquoted." Carol Gilligan's In a Different Voice "gets cited too much." This is an excellent illustration of my point. In this brief, only minimally annotated bibliography, Albrecht has mapped the territory and drawn the lines that identify work related to "intersections of race/class/gender" from a feminist perspective and divided it from other work in areas that might otherwise be considered related. The two notes I've pointed out are especially interesting because they call attention to citation practice explicitly.

How could a work be "cited too much," "overquoted"? What are the consequences of this inappropriate citation practice? Albrecht is suggesting that these two works do not merit the stature they receive as a result of being frequently and repeatedly cited. With so very few words, Albrecht has exercised great power. I know I'll think twice before I cite Gilligan's work again or mention Belenky et. al, however important I might consider them to be in terms of their introductions of new research methodologies. I know that out there somewhere is at least one person who may dismiss my work not because I've failed to include a reference but because I have included it. It is not enough to demonstrate familiarity with relevant related work; it is not enough to acknowledge other related literature; it is not enough to accurately represent that work with stylistic clarity and grace. One must also know when not to know, when not to acknowledge another's work.

My second illustrative anecdote also comes from this convention: Thursday morning, Sue Carter Simmons presented a paper titled "Men with Teeth: Male Historians of 19th Century

American Rhetoric" in which she quoted six or seven male
historians' narratives of 19th century rhetoric. Simmons' focus
was on these historians' use of war metaphors to narrate their
versions of rhetorical history. When she read these quotations,
she did so <u>without</u> attributing them to their respective authors
because she did not want to "point a finger." Of course she
didn't need to attribute them--many of us in the audience knew
whom she was quoting anyway, but I want to call your attention to
Simmons' desire to avoid proscribing these writers by giving them
a negational citation--it's the thought that counts here. By
quoting, but not attributing words, Simmons attempted to
criticize these writers without banishing them from the community
she defines and embraces in writing the paper. It is probably
not irrelevant that this strategy is used in a feminist critique.

Stephen North's critique of Stephen Witte's essay "Topical
Structure and Revision: An Exploratory Study" further
illustrates my point that citation is a ritual of collaboration
wherein a writer attempts to create community by affirming or
denying community membership and by defining shared beliefs.
North chose Witte's essay as an exemplar of the way "knowledge is
made in the field of composition." Noting--parenthetically--that
Witte's essay is "almost certainly the most heavily documented
article in the history of [CCC]" North analyzes the way Witte
presented or misrepresented the works he cited in his opening
paragraphs in order to "establish the context within which he
wants his exploratory study to acquire its meaning" (339).

There is no need to go into detail on this--I want merely to
call your attention to the significance North assigns to Witte's
citation practice:

> Witte is r.t obliged to offer a comprehensive review of
> the literature or revision, nor, despite the heavy
> documentation, does he pretend to. I suppose it is
> even possible to argue that the whole passage could be
> deemed strictly ceremonial, and that he includes these
> titles simply by way of ritual salutation . . . But the
> seriousness of his tone, the careful documentation, and
> the essay's reception indicate otherwise. They may be,
> as his qualifiers suggest, exemplars and
> representatives, but they are deliberately and
> carefully chosen. (340-341)

As North's critique of Witte's essay illustrates, each act
of citation both identifies new work with some old work and
<u>divides</u> the new work from other old work, it draws boundaries.
The text defines the space which will become its context: a
writer like Witte creates a community in which he may
participate. Another writer, North, passes judgment on that
created community, on its resemblance to his own community sand
its rituals. Readers of North, in turn, pass judgment on North's
faithfulness. Thus, collaboratively, through their collective
citation practices, members of a scholarly discourse community
define true faith.

Citation rituals help construct the social reality of

academic culture in general and specific disciplines or areas of
inquiry in particular--and so is an essentially collaborative
action. Thus, aberrant or unconventional citation practices, new
and different rituals, may be understood as attempts to establish
separation from the community, attempts to disrupt the community
by attacking the rituals that enact the community's values, or
attempts to change those values. That's why editors and
reviewers take such pains--or why we think they should take such
pains--about the citation practice of essays or books submitted
to consideration for publication. If these texts are to deserve
the community status with which publication officially endorses
them, they must observe the community's rituals.

I turn now to an examination of some examples of
unconventional citation practices which have somehow gotten past
the citation police. I want to focus on two works in particular:
Luce Irigary's "On the Index to Plato's Works: Women," which is
part of her book, Speculum, and Rachel Blau Du Plessis' essay
"For the Etruscans."

"On the Index to Plato's Works: Women" is a string of
quotations from Plato's writings mentioning women. Irigary has
not contributed one single word to this twenty-or-so page section
of her book. But, of course, her presence is palpable as one
reads through these snippets from Plato. After having read
Irigary's thorough going word for word commentary, critique, and
deconstruction of passages from Freud's writing in the preceding
section of her book, one can write Irigary's response to Plato
oneself--and one does. As I read this section, I have the
strange sensation of hearing myself talk back to Plato in the
same fashion as Irigary had talked back to Freud.   Indeed,
Irigary does go on to "talk back" to Plato in the book section
which follows, "Plato's Hystera," in which she paraphrases
Plato's description of the cave and gives an elaborate, sentence
by sentence explication.

But my focus is Irigary's unconventional citation practice
in "On the Index of Plato's Works: Women." This is extensive
quoting without commentary to an extreme--the conventional
scholar would have embedded the quotations from Plato in
commentary of her own--that's what the style manuals and the
handbooks teach us. That Irigary has chosen not to enact this
citation ritual is emblematic of her rejection of scholarly
discourse conventions. But this is more than rejection; it is
subversion.

My second example of unconventional citation practice is
Rachel Blau Du Plessis' essay "For the Etruscans," reprinted in
Showalter's The New Feminist Criticism. Du Plessis' essay
employs the collage design she has used in her poetry.
Quotations from other writers are inserted, unintegrated, without
commentary in the middle of Du Plessis' own sentences,
interrupting her syntax, yet somehow elaborating her meaning;
relevant work by four different feminist researchers and
theorists is referenced in a one to six sentence summary (it's
hard to tell, unless one already knows, where Du Plessis' ideas

end and her summary of others' ideas begins) and documented in an
endnote which does not explicitly indicate whose contribution was
whose; quotations from other writers are laced with Du Plessis'
own parenthetical commentary or gloss--in a sense, her words are
given footnote status, much like scholia. Some of these
quotations are surrounded by quotation marks, others are not; the
governing principle seems to be the degree to which Du Plessis
has either assimilated/integrated the content into her own
exploration of an idea and thus engaged the cited writer in
conversation or provided quoted words without comment, thus
choosing, it would seem, to merely listen.

If we hear her essay as talk, the quoted material can be
heard as voices interrupting Du Plessis, speaking over her,
engaging her in conversation, being listened to (deferred to),
or, in the case of borrowed phrases, actually speaking through
DuPlessis. In these terms, Du Plessis' citation practice is
rule-governed, though the rules are her own. She signals the
status of each of these voices by her use of punctuation,
boldface, italics, and indentation. Thus, while the essay has
the appearance of unpredictable collage or juxtapositional form,
it also follows progressive form insofar as it resembles turn
taking in spoken discourse.

I think it is significant that these two exemplary writers
are feminists attempting to inscribe a feminine discourse. Their
unconventional citation practices are not merely alternative
ways, but disruptions and subversions of standard practice--or
customary ritual--and therefore are re-mappings of the field of
discourse insofar as they reform the discourse of the field.

LEARNING THE RITUALS/ ACCEPTING THE FAITH
So, I come to the question of how, why, and whether writing
teachers address citation conventions in teaching the research
paper, scholarly discourse forms, or any writing that
incorporates the writing of others.

The rules of citation--whatever they are, whyever they are,
however tacitly they may be acquired--cannot be dismissed.
practice cannot be ignored. Failure to observe these
ritualizations will prohibit the student from acceptance (however
lowly the status) into the scholarly community. If he does not
honor the values of the community by observing its rituals he
will not be recognized. If he is not recognized, he is silenced.
Unheard, he is eventually excluded completely.

What might be appropriate ways to help our students learn
these rituals of citation? Instead of handing our students a
copy of the MLA Style Manual--or an abbreviated handbook version
of it--we might consider designing exercises and assignments
which require students to consciously attend to citation practice
in the writing they read. We might, for example, encourage them
to identify and articulate the rules themselves--as John Swales
suggests--by having them analyze scholarly discourse using
already developed citer motivation schema or categorizing and
classifying types of citations, citer motivations, and reader

responses to citation on their own.

In this way, they may see that writers' citation practices bear witness to their integration into the scholarly community and into their specific disciplines. Not every student will fully appreciate the privilege and opportunity to enter the scholarly community presented by the research paper assignment. Some will not be all that keen on attempting to place their discourse in a larger field. They may however, be interested if we suggest it is a chance to exercise power--power to participate in shaping what is knowledge and belief--just one of the powers of writing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Achtert, Walter S. and Joseph Gibaldi. The MLA Style Manual. New
    York: Modern Language Association, 1985.
Brooks, Terrence A. "Citer Motivations." Encyclopedia of
    Library Information Science 1988 Supplement. pp 48-59.
Belenky, Mary Field, et al. Women's Ways of Knowing: The
    Development of Self, Voice, and Mind. New York: Basic Books,
    1986.
Burke, Kenneth. Counterstatement. Berkeley: U California P,
    1968.
---. A Rhetoric of Motives. 1959 Berkeley: U of California
    Press, 1969.
Budd, John. "Characteristics of a Written Scholarship in
    American Literature: A Citation Study." Library and
    Information Science Research 8.2 (1986): 189-211.
The Chicago Manual of Style. 13th ed. Chicago: U of Chicago P,
    1982.
Cronin, Blaise. The Citation Process: The Role and Significance
    of Citations in Scientific Communication. London: Taylor
    Graham, 1984.
Cullars, John. "Characteristics of the Monographic Literature of
    British and American Literary Studies." College and
    Research Libraries 46.6 (1985): 511-522.
Derrida, Jacques. "Limited Inc abc . . ." Glyph: Johns Hopkins
    Textual Studies 2. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1977: 162-
    254.
---. "Signature Event Context." Glyph: Johns Hopkins Textual
    Studies 1. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1977. 172-198.
Du Plessis, Rachel Blau. "For the Etruscans." In The New
    Feminist Criticism: Essays on Women, Literature and Theory.
    Ed. Elaine Showalter. NY: Pantheum, 271-91.
Ferber, Marianne A. "Citations: Are They an Objective Measure of
    Scholarly Merit?" Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and
    Society. 11.2 (1986): 381-389.
Geertz, Clifford. The Interpretation of Cultures. New York:
    Basic Books, 1973.
Gilbert, G.N. "Referencing as Persuasion." Social Studies of
    Science 7.1 (Feb. 1972): 113-22.
Gilligan, Carol. In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and
    Women's Development. CAmbridge, MA: Harvard U P, 1982.
Gottschalk, Louis. Understanding History: A Primer of
    Historical Method. New York: Knopf, 1950.
Griffith. B. C., et al. "On the Use of Citation in Studying
    Scientific Achievement and Communication." Society for the
    Social Studies of Science Newsletter 2 (1977): 9-13.
Hirsch, E. D., Jr. "Comments on Profession '88". Profession
    (1988): 77-80.
---. Cultural Literacy. Boston: Houghton, 1987.
---. Letter replying to Scholes' reply to "Comments." MLA
    Newsletter 21.1 (Spring 1989): 26-28.
Irigary, Luce. Speculum of the Other Woman. Trans. Gillian C.
    Gill. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985.

Kreps, Gary L. "Analysis of the Interdisciplinary Credibility of
     Communication as a Social Science." Association of
     Communication Administration Bulletin 42 (Oct 1982): 40-43.
North, Stephen M. The Making of Knowledge in Composition:
     Portrait of an Emerging Field. Portsmouth: Boynton, 1987.
Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. 3rd
     ed. Washington, D.C.: APA, 1984.
Scholes, Robert. "Three Views of Education: Nostalgia, History,
     and Voodoo." Review of The Closing of the American Mind by
     Allan Bloom, Professing Literature: An Institutional History
     by Gerald Graff, and Cultural Literacy: What Every American
     Needs to Know by E. D. Hirsch, Jr. College English 50
     (1988): 323-32.
---. Reply to E. D. Hirsch, Jr.'s "Comment." Profession (1988):
     81-82.
---. Reply to E. D. Hirsch, Jr.'s letter in Spring '89
     Newsletter. MLA Newsletter 21.2 (Summer 1989): 21-22.
Searle, John. R. "Reiterating the Differences: A Reply to
     Derrida." Glyph: Johns Hopkins Textual Studies 1. Baltimore:
     Johns Hopkins UP, 1977. 199-208.
Sledd, Andrew and James Sledd. "Hirsch's Use of His Sources in
     Cultural Literacy: A Critique." Profession (1988):33-39.
---. Reply to E. D. Hirsch, Jr.'s "Comments." Profession (1988):
     80-81.
Sledd, James. Reply to E. D. Hirsch, Jr.'s letter in Spring '89
     Newsletter. MLA Newsletter 21.2 (Summer 1989): 22.
Small, Henry G. "Cited Documents as Concept Symbols." Social
     Studies of Science 8 (1978): 327-40.
Summers, Edward G. "A Review and Application of Citation
     Analysis Methodology to Reading Research Journal
     Literature." Journal of the American Society for
     Information Science. 35.6 (1984): 332-343.
Swales, John. "Utilizing the Literatures in Teaching the
     Research Paper." TESOL Quarterly 21.1 (March 1987): 41-
     68.

Citation is also, though Small does not develop this argument at
any length, a way of placing the new work into the context of
previous work.

15.44 If a note is added, or deleted, in the   typescript, the
following numbers throughout the chapter   must be changed and
any cross-references to notes adjusted.   Such evidence of
negligence as a note numbered 4a is   unprofessional . . .