Nancy L. Chick, ROLLINS COLLEGE, nchick@rollins.edu
Christopher Ostrowdun, UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY, chris.ostrowdun@ucalgary.ca
Sophia Abbot, GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY, sabbot@gmu.edu
Lucy Mercer-Mapstone, UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY, lucy.mercer-mapstone@sydney.edu.au
Krista Grensavitch, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MILWAUKEE, grensav2@uwm.edu

Naming Is Power: Citation Practices in SoTL

ABSTRACT

Citing is a political act. It is a practice that can work both sides of the same coin: it can give voice, and it can silence. Through this research, we call for those contributing to the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) to attend to this duality explicitly and intentionally. In this multidisciplinary field, SoTL knowledge-producers bring the citation norms of their home disciplines, a habit that calls for interrogation and negotiation of the citation practices used in this shared space. The aim of our study was to gather data about how citation is practiced within the SoTL community: who we cite, how we cite, and what values, priorities, and politics are conveyed in these practices. We were also interested in whether any self-selected categories of identity (e.g., gender, career stage) related to self-described citation practices and priorities. Findings suggest several statistically significant relationships did emerge, which we identify as important avenues for further research and writing. We conclude with 10 principles of citation practices in SoTL.

KEYWORDS

citation practices, inclusivity, diversity

"In SoTL, where there is the presumption that we are open, inclusive, and welcoming, our citational practices suggest otherwise."—Survey participant

In a "Guerrilla Leadership" workshop (Hamshire, Forsyth, Taylor, Riddell, and Smith, 2018) at the 2018 conference of the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (ISSOTL), Christopher Ostrowdun, Sophia Abbot, Krista Grensavitch, and Lucy Mercer-Mapstone were asked to reflect on our power in SoTL and our positions in universities. At our table, we began to talk about who has power in the SoTL community and how that power is visible. We were interested in the frequency with which some members of the scholarly community are cited, who's excluded in the process, and how we might use our individual power to read and cite more diversely. As the title of the workshop suggests, we were inspired by the belief that a small group of people can push back against a larger, more powerful body. Our group's discussion of our leadership potential focused on the idea of "guerilla citation," or how citation is a political act in which the citing author wields great power, *whether they realize it or not*. After the workshop, our conversation spilled into the hallway, where we ran into and

CC-BY-NC License 4.0 This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons – Attribution License 4.0 International (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly attributed.

immediately brought in Nancy Chick, who has talked elsewhere about the values and priorities embedded in different citation styles.

What *is* the citation process in SoTL? How do the "big names" become "big names"? Why do we read and cite one source and not another? What values and priorities are conveyed in our citation practices in SoTL? And ultimately, if (as our extended conversation and subsequent research suggests) citation signifies who's read, who's published, who's funded, who's tenured, who's employed, and who's heard, what do our citations say about the SoTL community—*no matter how unintentional*? As is often the case when a minoritized group pushes against a majority group, the latter may be initially unaware of the concern that deeply affects the former. Quite notably, as we've worked on this project and then prepared this article, we've realized how unaware we have been in certain areas and acknowledge that we remain so in ways that we do not yet know. Our conversations about citation have ultimately led us to existential questions about the field of SoTL, its community, and ourselves: who are we, and who do we want to be?

THOSE WE WANT TO REMEMBER

Citation is a dialogic act of situating one's work in relation to another's. It is a display of intertextuality, described by Norman Fairclough (building on philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin) as the process of responding to, weaving in, and borrowing "other 'voices' into a text" (2003, 41). Citations are thus the visible signposts of the writer's decision about which authors and texts are brought into discourse and which are left out.

Disciplines carry norms for citation practices that reflect their priorities and values. These norms inform the discipline's citation style to help writers "establish a persuasive epistemological and social framework for the acceptance of their arguments" (Hyland 2004, 22) by readers who share that framework. In this way, "big questions of disciplinarity, epistemology, and ways of knowing [are] funneled into the very specific and surprisingly mundane practice of citation styles" (Russell, Littler, and Chick 2020, 4). Given SoTL's multidisciplinary nature, its authors work across traditional disciplinary lines but tend to apply citation norms from their home disciplines, bringing unspoken, unintended, or unexamined assumptions with them. Helen Sword wisely recommends interrogating or disrupting "normative elements such as citation styles" to "send those unspoken assumptions scurrying out into the light" (Sword 2012, 135).

Ken Hyland explores some of these assumptions in *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing* (2004). He writes that physics and other sciences are often concerned with directly building on previous, well-defined, and specific knowledge domains (e.g., laws of physics). Citations in such disciplines "tend to be tightly bound to the particular research topic under discussion, which closely defines a specific context of knowledge and contributes to a sense of linear progression" (Hyland 2004, 32). This focus leads to narrow assumptions about the lineage of prior work and tends to result in fewer citations in these fields. For example, "a reader is unlikely to find Einstein, Oppenheimer or Planck cited in a [contemporary] physics paper" because the knowledge produced by such historic scholars "is assumed . . . [as] well known facts" (Hyland 2004, 32). In contrast, in the humanities and social sciences, "the fabric of established understandings has a wider weave," topics are more "diffuse and range over wider academic and historical territor[ies]," and scholarship often takes multiple or less defined paths. Historic works are often "re-crossed and reinterpreted," and citations help trace scholarly thinking that

may not be obvious otherwise (Hyland 2004, 32). In turn, this higher degree of intermixing and interweaving often leads to higher numbers of citations (Hyland 2004).

Several fields and disciplines have a history of critically examining the assumptions embedded in the act of citation. Feminist scholars, for instance, have taken up this interrogation in relation to ideas about power in scholarship. In "Citation Matters: Mobilizing the Politics of Citation Toward a Practice of 'Conscientious Engagement,'" Carrie Mott and Daniel Cockayne challenge traditional notions of citation as "just a passive representation of things we read" (Mott and Cockayne 2017, 968) and instead demonstrate its impact. Intentionally or not, citing a source imbues it and its author or authors with power: "Through the process of citation, we bring with us those bodies and ideas deemed legitimate and worthy of attention and dialogue—those who we want to remember" (964). Sara Ahmed's *Living a Feminist Life* (2017) describes citation as "feminist memory": it's "how we acknowledge our debt to those who came before; those who help us find our way when the way was obscured because we deviated from the paths we were told to follow" (15–16).

Literary Studies speaks to these issues as well, though from a broader entry point. Discussions of the literary canon—the writings of specific fields considered the most important, influential, and worth reading—are discussions of citation, for to be included in a canon is to be attributed, remembered, and cited. Toni Morrison (1988) illustrates in "Unspeakable Things Unspoken: The Afro-American Presence in American Literature," where she challenges the Western literary canon as a site of inclusion and exclusion. For example, about the canonical literature of her own country, she writes, "There is something called American literature that, according to conventional wisdom, is certainly not Chicano literature, or Afro-American literature, or Asian American, or Native American…. It is somehow separate from them and they from it" (Morrison 1988, 1). In debates about who is included in the canon and who is not, Morrison acknowledges, feminist scholars before her have been arguing for greater gender diversity, and now "no one believes the body of literature and its criticism will ever again be what it was in 1965: the protected preserve of the thoughts and works and analytical strategies of whitemen" (1988, 2). So Morrison launches a critique of the apparent absence of race in the canon, and what this absence means. Canon debates are not arguments about high culture or book sales, she argues; they're about power and language and who gets to represent what it means to be human. Indeed, the political implications of the canon mirror those of citation. Adapting Mott and Cockayne's (2017, 964) description above, "Through the process of *canonization*, we bring with us those bodies and ideas *and words and stories* deemed legitimate and worthy of attention and dialogue—those who we want to remember." In the canon and in citation, naming is indeed power.

Philosophers have been exploring issues of inclusion and exclusion in who is deemed credible enough to be recognized as someone with knowledge worth knowing. Miranda Fricker's *Epistemic Injustice: Power and Ethics of Knowing* (2007) introduces this titular term for "the wrong done to someone specifically in their capacity as a knower," which is "a capacity essential to human value" (Fricker 2007, 1). When someone is speaking (or writing), hearers (or readers) evaluate their credibility, sometimes based on "an identity prejudice . . . on the hearer's part" (McKinnon 2016, 438). An epistemic injustice occurs when hearers "attribute less [or more] credibility than the speaker deserves" (McKinnon 2016, 438). These judgments can be based on whether the reader perceives a shared identity with the author (e.g., shared gender, race, academic discipline), as has been explored in social identity literature (for example, see Haslam, Oakes, and Turner 1996, and Greenaway, Wright,

Willingham, Reynolds, and Haslam 2015). Epistemic injustice also occurs when an identity prejudice excludes part of someone's experience from the "'social imagination,'" limiting "marginalized persons" from "understand[ing] their own experiences or oppression" and ensuring "persons in dominant groups . . . remain ignorant of the oppression of marginalized groups" (McKinnon 2016, 441). Seen through the lens of epistemic injustice, this evaluation of people and groups of people as knowers or not is implied when we choose—within larger social structures and pressures—whom to cite. Credible knowers are worthy of citation. Others are not, and thus they remain unknown.

This work on epistemic injustice is heavily informed by the prior work of black feminists (e.g., Davis 1981; Hull, Scott, and Smith 1982; Carby 1987; Collins 2000) and others who have long been exploring issues of being unheard, silenced, unknown, unattributed, uncited, and thus dehumanized and symbolically annihilated in literature, history, and contemporary society. Scholars of color still chronicle battles in being recognized for contributing valuable knowledge: "The real issue is that the knowledge 'created' by, for, and about women and people of color is considered by the academy as biased or illegitimate" (Delgado Bernal and Villalpando 2002, 175). This epistemic gatekeeping affects their ability to get funding to begin their research and to get published in "prestigious" or "'mainstream'" journals as recognition of their research. Even further, scholars of color describe then being "penalized for publishing . . . in ethnic and women's related journals" (Delgado Bernal and Villalpando 2002, 175) because such journals are perceived as inferior. These systematic barriers surrounding what is considered knowledge worthy of remembering prevent such scholars from being read, cited, and valued in academic discourses and knowledge building.

We have intentionally taken the time and space above to include these conversations from across disciplines for a variety of reasons. First, we tried to model the use of citation—both the parenthetical nod and the inclusion of voice through quoted material—beyond "the bare minimum of perfunctory academic practice, that seeks only to avoid accusations of plagiarism" (Mott and Cockayne 2017, 970). We also wished to signal that this query about the power of citations is not new, nor is it tied to a single perspective, discipline, or field. It has been explored across disciplines, and notably by women of color, so we are eager both to invoke our "guerilla leadership" to explicitly bring it into SoTL and to invite this kind of critical reflection on citation here as well.

WHAT WE WANTED TO KNOW

As we were finishing our article, Alicia Cappello and Janice Miller-Young (2020) published a SoTL citation analysis usefully focusing on the types of texts, the locations of the citations, and the function of the surrounding text in one year of articles published in *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* (*TLI*). Our project is complementary as we step back to question how SoTL authors think about citation and what their intentions are when making citation decisions—before they write those citations into the text. To collect this information, we developed a 10-minute questionnaire in Qualtrics and, after receiving ethics approval from the Institutional Research Board at Rollins College (Florida, United States), distributed it throughout our networks using individual email, SoTL-related listservs, and Twitter. Participants (aged 18 years or older) self-identified as engaging in SoTL research, reading, and writing, and consented to completing the questionnaire. The questionnaire used multiple choice, rank, and open-response questions to collect data about participants' professional and personal demographics; their SoTL reading and publishing preferences; and their SoTL citation preferences including, for

example, preferred citation styles, choices of reference articles, and information sought about the authors cited. See our appendix for the full questionnaire.

The inclusion criteria for our final data set included respondents who progressed all the way through the survey according to Qualtrics metrics. We thus excluded respondents who abandoned the survey part-way, progressed all the way but did not answer most questions, or did not complete the ranking question (Q15). (The last group was excluded to allow for statistical analysis.) We coded open-response questions that were left blank as "not-specified." In total, 121 people completed the questionnaire.

We also collected all demographic information (except career stage) using open-response questions to avoid limiting the ways respondents might identify. Open responses allowed participants to describe their own gender, for example, so we retained participants' own language rather than filtering genders into predefined categories. We authors understand the terms "female," "male," and "intersex" to indicate assigned sex at birth, while "non-binary," "woman," "cis-woman," "man," and "cis-man" indicate gender identity. Whether respondents also understand and used this subtle yet significant difference as they self-identified their gender is unknown. Where a response did not answer the question specifically (e.g., the response was a comment on the necessity of collecting such demographic information), we categorized it as "other response" rather than providing the information itself. Therefore, in using "other response," we are noting the respondent provided unforeseen information, *not* that the response indicated an identity or minoritized perspective that we wished to lump together.

WHAT WE'VE LEARNED

First, our 121 respondents span a range of identities but, in retrospect, not the range we should have included. For a breakdown of their country, race, sexual orientation, gender, career stage, and pronoun, see table 1. A limitation of our sample and thus the findings we base on this sample is that the survey participants' profiles are heavily weighted towards the English-speaking countries that currently dominate the SoTL sphere, an unfortunate irony produced by our positions within the very systems we seek to critique. Our snowball sampling approach of recruiting through our networks resulted in a sample that reflects the demographics of these networks as being predominantly "like" us: scholars from Western, white-dominated institutions and knowledge domains. This limitation means our recruitment did not reach out to voices from a diversity of global communities as we had hoped, so our results do not represent voices from those places and spaces our findings suggest are most often excluded in citation practices.

For example, 64 percent of our sample is Canadian or North American, while only six percent came from Germany, Norway, Hong Kong, Switzerland, and Malaysia *combined*. This demographic breakdown *may* mirror the international SoTL landscape, but our sample bias does create pause for critical reflection. As one of our wise reviewers pointed out, "scholars of Critical Race Theory would argue that a survey like this cannot result in statistically significant findings related to race because the respondents are overwhelmingly white." As a result, our data cannot speak to certain important questions, such as citation priorities of those beyond our sample.

Our findings as presented below should be read within that frame—that the voices re-presented in our data are those of specific demographics and lived experiences. What have we learned? In addition to our survey findings, we've learned in hindsight that our best efforts to examine systems of power and

privilege in citation practices have been to some extent stymied by our own privilege and worldview, indeed so much so that it took the feedback from our peer reviewers to point this out. We remain humbled by the omission and acknowledge that we could and should have worked harder to include more diverse voices in our survey. It is a message we will carry with us as we continue to move torward a SoTL community that aspires to be more inclusive, recognizing there is a long way to go.

Table 1. Demographic details of questionnaire participants

Demographic	n	Percent	Demographic	n	Percent
Country			Race		
Canada	49	40	White	75	62
United States	29	24	Not specified	20	17
Australia	14	12	Other response	7	6
United Kingdom	12	10	Multiple race	3	2
Singapore	11	9	Asian	3	2
Germany	2	2	Chinese	3	2
Norway	1	1	Caucasian	3	2
Hong Kong	1	1	Mixed-race	2	2
Switzerland	1	1	Punjabi	1	1
Malaysia	1	1	Indian	1	1
			Black	1	1
			Metis	1	1
			South Asian	1	1
Sexual orientation			Gender		
Heterosexual	73	60	Ciswoman	38	31
Not specified	33	27	Woman	18	15
Other response	7	6	Male	17	14
Gay	3	2	Not specified	17	14
Lesbian	2	2	Female	15	12
Bisexual	2	2	Cisman	11	9
Asexual	1	1	Man	2	2
			Other response	2	2
			Non-binary	1	1
Career stage			Pronoun		
Mid-career	60	50	She/her/hers	70	58
Early career	31	26	He/him/his	28	23
Late career	29	24	Not specified	13	11
Not specified	1	1	They/them/theirs	6	5
			Other response	4	3

Our participants came from 51 different disciplines. Of these, those most represented were education (n = 21, 19 percent), science (including biology, chemistry, and physics, n = 12, 10 percent), psychology (n = 8, 7 percent), and a combination of educational development with another discipline (n = 9, 7 percent). Were we to repeat our survey, we would also work harder to encourage participation from more disciplines to ensure greater diversity among our respondents but also to reflect the diversity of fields in SoTL. When it came to citation styles, which are often tied to discipline, 81 (66.9 percent) respondents preferred APA (American Psychological Association), 11 (9.1 percent) preferred Chicago, three (2.5 percent) preferred MLA (Modern Language Association), three (2.5 percent) were unspecified, and 23 (19 percent) preferred styles such as Vancouver, Harvard, or journal-specific styles. When asked the reasons for their preferences, respondents could select multiple provided reasons or none: 65 (53.7 percent) indicated "It is required by my discipline," 84 (69.4 percent) indicated "I am most familiar with it," 29 (23.9 percent) indicated "It privileges information that I value," and 10 (8.26 percent) were unspecified.

As we thought about our data, we wondered if the survey revealed any connections between respondents' identity and the principles guiding their decisions about citation. To identify any patterns in how different people assign significance to citation principles, we cross-referenced the ranking data with participant demographics and considerations for diversity. On the advice of a colleague with expertise in statistical analysis, we also performed an Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis test to determine statistical significance between pairs of ranking data and demographics and considerations for diversity data. We recognize the irony that these tests, and much of statistical methods generally, were developed by white, male, and Western scholars, but we are unaware of alternative statistical tests suitable for our dataset derived by scholars with more diverse backgrounds. As a non-parametric method, the Kruskal-Wallis test does not assume a normal distribution and allows us to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the medians of independent groups by comparing the ranking data with other data groupings (e.g., gender, considerations of diversity). In the following sections, we focus on data where the analysis revealed a statistically significant relationship among the data along with supporting qualitative data.

Why we cite: Common principles guiding citation choices

We wanted to know why SoTL practitioners cite, or more precisely what principles guide their decisions to cite—or not. Our questionnaire thus asked, "When you cite published literature, what principles guide which articles you reference? (Please rank in order of significance.)" Given the multidisciplinarity of SoTL, we expected a range of responses, so we first offered nine common principles for academic citation, as well as a tenth option of an open-text "other" for participants to identify additional principles guiding their decisions. We then calculated the mean (average) ranking for each principle and ordered them from most to least significant (see table 2).

Table 2. Participant average rankings of principles which guide their citation practices where 1 = most important and 10 = least important

Rank	Principles guiding citation choices	Mean
1	Reputation of the source	3.81
2	The work is considered "canon"	4.40
3	To engage in specific conversations/discourses	4.49
4	To engage in conversation/discourse with other individuals	5.45
5	It is published in my target journal for publication	5.55
6	Citation count of the article (widely cited)	5.71
7	To strategically engage with particular scholar(s)/writer(s)	5.94
8	Other	6.21
9	Rank or impact factor of the journal in which an article is published	6.51
10	It is written by someone I know	6.91

Note: Respondents had to rank "other" even if the open-text box was left blank.

Based on the mean rank values, "reputation of the source" and "the work is considered 'canon'"—two fairly common criteria in evaluating research sources—were the top ranked principles guiding which articles respondents choose to cite. The next highest ranked (3, 4) foreground the conversation metaphor in conducting research, and most of the remaining principles (5, 6, 7, 9) suggest a more strategic approach.

Who prioritizes a source's reputation

Given our initial conversations that led to this project, the above trend troubled us. The relative popularity of "reputation of the source" and "the work is considered 'canon'" may suggest a SoTL echo chamber that amplifies the voices of authors who are already well known and thus already have a strong reputation in the community. Admittedly, SoTL is a young field—by name, merely 30 years old after Ernest Boyer's 1990 coining of the term—but we use the term "canon" here intentionally and in quotes. Like "the big names," we hear the two phrases in conversations with SoTL colleagues and have read them in peer reviews,[1] so they are meaningful (if not problematic) in the SoTL community. We also choose to avoid the term "seminal" here because of its explicitly gendered denotation. The language of "echo chamber," "canon," "seminal works," and "big names" are all imbued with power and problems we wish to surface here, even in our own choices within this project.

In response to these highly ranked guiding principles, we undertook statistical analyses to further explore whether patterns existed in *who* ranked which citation principles the highest. Using a Kruskal-Wallis test, we found prominent relationships with two groups. Namely, there was a significant difference (chi-square = 9.22, $p < .05$, $df = 3$) in median scores between the respondents' career stage and their ranking of "reputation of the source." Participants who identified as "late career" ($n = 29$, mean rank = 5.07) ranked the "reputation of the source" as a guiding principle significantly higher than those who identified as "mid-career" ($n = 60$, mean rank = 6.3), according to post hoc tests of pairwise comparisons. Late career respondents similarly ranked reputation higher than "early career" ($n = 31$, mean rank = 5.94) respondents, but the difference was not statistically significant. One respondent did not specify their career stage ($n = 1$).

This preference by late career respondents may suggest the reputation of a source matters more as scholars enter later career stages. Alternatively, perhaps there are generational differences in how much scholars have been trained to value a source's reputation, with other priorities emerging or taking precedence more recently. Late-career scholars may also have had the advantage of time to build a larger reading list from which to draw and to form judgements about the reputations of those authors. On one hand, this approach to citation makes great sense in demonstrating to "reviewers and readers that you know the topography of the field and who's who and what's what" (Thomson 2019). However, citing for these reasons also results in "referencing the same old bunch of people, those who already have loads of citations" (Thomson 2019). While this approach helps a young field build and sustain itself, if used as the primary principle guiding citation, it can also result in the same voices speaking to and about each other all of the time, excluding newer voices that may challenge, extend, or deepen the field in meaningful ways. Citation also contributes to an author's professional capital, so if we cite someone because we prioritize their reputation, we risk creating a hegemonic ouroboros where the rich get richer. In other words, overreliance on this principle can limit both who may join in the conversation and who is heard.

Participants' self-described gender also shows a statistically significant difference (chi-square = 15.97, $p < .05$, df = 8) in medians such that participants who identified as "woman" (n = 18, mean rank = 3.33), "female" (n = 15, mean rank = 3.27), "cis-woman" (n = 38, mean rank = 3.5), or "not-specified" (n = 17, mean rank = 3.59) (combined n = 88) ranked "reputation of the source" as a guiding principle significantly higher than those who identified as "male" (n = 17, mean rank = 5.12), "man" (n = 2, mean rank = 2.5), or "cis-man" (n = 11, mean rank = 4.64) (combined n = 30) according to post hoc tests of pairwise comparisons. One respondent also identified as "non-binary" (n = 1). As with the career stage connection, the results here suggest a gendered difference in the importance of a source's reputation in deciding what to cite: reputation may matter more for women, females, or cis-women than men, males, or cis-men. We are eager to investigate this ranking in the future, but here we draw from the literature for a possible explanation. This preference could signal a response to ongoing gender inequities in academia (van der Lee and Ellemers 2015; Stewart and Valian 2018) that contribute to women, females, or cis-women experiencing greater scrutiny about their research. This specific inequity is echoed in the lead finding in the most recent survey of the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI), a prominent barometer of faculty experiences in the US: "faculty of color and female faculty disproportionately experience stress due to discrimination and feel they have to work harder than their colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar" (Bara Stolzenberg, Eagan, Zimmerman, Lozano, Cesar-Davis, Aragon, and Rios-Aguilar 2019, 2). Perhaps part of "working harder" includes feeling pressured to draw on what are considered reputable, canonical sources to gain credibility and strengthen their own reputations as scholars. Further, the dominance of men in peer review processes, editorial boards, and positions of power in publishing may also signal a gendering of "reputation" (Lundine, Bourgeault, Clark, Heidari, and Balabanova 2018). Of course, these experiences and patterns are about academia more generally and perhaps scholars' home disciplines, not necessarily SoTL. But none of us leave our experiences at the SoTL door (as if there is a door). SoTL is made up largely of disciplinary experts who bring their whole selves with them. As the disciplinary boundaries of SoTL are permeable, so too are the boundaries that separate our prejudices, assumptions, and anxieties and our work. It is our responsibility, then, to examine how our lives, identities, and experiences come to bear on what we do and how we do it.

Also why we cite: Relevance, quality, and politics

The qualitative responses to the open-ended option for the question "When you cite published literature, what principles guide which articles you reference? (Please rank in order of significance.)" give us some complementary insight into the rankings in table 2, and more. Notably, 45 respondents (37 percent) ranked "other" as 1 (most significant), and 67 respondents (55 percent) ranked "other" as 10 (least significant); blank responses (n = 60) for "other" were counted as 10 (least significant). The "other" category was the only one that skewed so heavily as either the *most* or *least* significant factor compared to the other principles. In analyzing and interpreting these explanations, we identified three overarching principles respondents added to their reasons for why they cite in SoTL: relevance, quality, and politics. Certainly, there are other reasons why citations may not end up in published work (e.g., word count limits, the difficulty of finding some sources), but here we focus on what our respondents told us about why they cite.

Relevance

Among these "other" responses, the majority of respondents wrote that "relevance/relevant" (a word appearing 26 times among the 61 "other" text responses) was most important to their citation decision. If something is seen as relevant, it is related, connected, or appropriate. This makes sense as a simple, common reason for citation. However, respondents frequently wrote more than the single word, and the verbs they used to describe "relevance" in these open-ended responses reveal a nuanced distinction in what they consider "relevant": another text is relevant because it ultimately supports their own work, or another text is relevant because the respondents want "to acknowledge [their] debt to previous scholarship."

Participants frequently used verbs that suggested they cite material that serves the purposes of or benefits their own work, placing the cited texts in a secondary role. Language like it "addresses my research question" and it is "connected to" or is "most germane" to one's own work points to a relevance based on a neutral similarity in subject matter, signaling credibility by indicating the author has done due diligence in referencing related scholarship. Stronger verbs such as "it support[s] my argument" suggest a connection in the form of confirmation, demonstrating one's credibility because others agree. Some participants used phrases like it "adds something of value to," "contribute[s] to," or "is useful or helpful to me," which connote a more active connection or contribution from the cited material, as it enhances one's own work. All of these responses—whether the obligatory citation, seeking like-minded work, or strengthening one's work—foreground the author's work and place the cited material in a supporting role.

Some participants described another type of relevance that reframes this relationship between the author's work and another's. The comments "My work . . . is derived from that" work, "To acknowledge my debt to previous scholarship," and "has influenced my thinking" indicate a sense of gratitude for the earlier work, repositioned here as literally a source or an origin, rather than secondary or supporting material. This kind of relevance acknowledges a direct causal relationship between someone else's ideas and one's own, the kind of relationship that ultimately builds a tradition, a field, or a discipline.

Quality

Many of the "other" responses were more value-laden, focusing on the apparent quality of the cited material. Some participants simply list this principle as self-evident, as in "My evaluation of the article quality," "My critical appraisal of the quality," or "my assessed quality of the research or content." Others, however, highlight specific criteria, such as "credibility," "conceptually important," "the best source," "insightful," "interesting," "current," "the most recent reference," "the research methods are strong," "the methodologies are clear and the conclusions are logically drawn from the results," and "well written and designed." On the surface, these comments read like textbook measures of high-quality research. At the same time, they come with largely unspoken assumptions: What are the *best* sources or *strong* methods? What makes an author *credible*? What makes an article *well written* or *insightful*?

These comments reinforce the ranking of "reputation of the source" and "the work is considered 'canon'" as the top two in the questionnaire's prepared list of principles. These implied decisions about quality and the explicit decisions about reputation and canon invoke notions of meritocracy, or rankings by quality, talent, and other subjective characteristics. Although academics are trained to value indicators of quality and reputation, many are inherently imbued with mechanisms of power and privilege. Some SoTL scholars have challenged such judgments made through narrow lenses, particularly in a diverse landscape like SoTL. Disciplinary prejudices have been called into question (Chick 2013; Poole 2013; Potter and Wuetherick 2015; Bernstein 2018; Sword 2019), as have geographical and cultural biases (Chng and Looker 2013; Chng and Mårtensson 2020).

Feminist theories offer an additional critique of the politics of meritocracy, shining a light on the ways in which the well-known, "reputable" canon is populated by those from privileged backgrounds—scholars who faced fewer barriers to establishing their reputation than those from marginalized groups (Mercer-Mapstone and Mercer 2018). The meritocracies of academia are rife with unspoken assumptions hidden beneath purportedly "objective" processes for determining effectiveness, success, "fit," hireability, tenurability, merit pay, and much more (Stewart and Valian 2018). These problems emerge even in academic publishing more generally, where metrics such as impact factors guide whose work gets read, circulated, cited, legitimized, and ultimately rewarded (e.g., through career progression based on research "impact"). In these situations, those with the power to define quality are often those who have been rewarded for their identity and place in society (their positionality); merit, then, becomes linked with power and privilege. It is worth repeating, though, that these selection criteria are often unspoken and not malicious.

Politics

Three of the 61 explanations for "other" can be described as "political" because they suggest specific intentions in choosing what to cite (or not) to make a statement about inclusion. Two of the comments highlight a range of identity factors that the respondents seek in authors they cite: "attempting to diversify scholars cited (e.g., highlight women, people of colour, Indigenous author, etc.)" and "citational rebellion! Citing marginalized people (people of colour, women, queer people, trans people)." There is no ambiguity in these respondents' intentions to expand their own and subsequently their readers' conceptions of who contributes to SoTL. The third response that seems to be making a statement about the politics of citation reads simply "Canadian/Open Access." Unlike the parenthetical insertions within the two responses above, this respondent is singular in the specific

identity to foreground. This previews their later comments about the need for SoTL to include more "scholars of other nationalities/backgrounds," alluding to what some describe as the disproportionate citation of US authors (as in the response quoted below). The deliberate choice to cite open access sources may suggest a rejection of the exclusivity of publishing costs associated with conventional publication in favor of freely available research, or it may indicate the respondent functions outside of a well-resourced context and thus does not have access to pay-walled journals. Either way, the purposeful selection of open access resources can be interpreted as a statement about the role of inclusion and exclusion in citation choices.

Although there were only three such overtly political responses in the "other" section, they prefigured questions and responses to come. Subsequent questions in the survey interrogated political aims and asked if respondents "consider diversity or representation in [their] citation practices." Overall, 71 responded "yes" (33) or "sometimes" (38), with 50 stating they did not consider diversity or representation in their citation practices. The two most sought elements of diversity were geographic (or "national," 35 responses) and gender diversity (36). Geographic diversity makes sense, since we reached out to respondents via the listserv of an international society where people may be more primed to consider international perspectives. As one respondent wrote:

> *I frequently reject articles for IJSOTL and TLI for their exclusive North American citations. These are meant to be international journals . . . I particularly look for non-Western material and get very annoyed with articles from the US (where this mostly happens) that only cite US sources when I know that most of the interesting work is outside the US.*

While we agree with this concern, and while some of us have been guilty of such limited work, the outright rejection of an article solely for this reason—which could then presumably not be published or cited—is worth exploring. It is less clear to us why gender diversity was so highly sought, especially compared to identity categories like race (14), ethnicity (4), sexuality (5), ability (2), or socio-economic status (3). Perhaps the larger number of women-identified scholars in SoTL both broadly and as respondents to this study (around twice as many) contributes to this trend. Or perhaps conversations about the value of different gendered perspectives have a particular zeitgeist in scholarly conversations in the wake of the ongoing #MeToo movement. Had our survey gone out more recently, we wonder whether more scholars would have noted race in light of the ongoing #BlackLivesMatter movement, which resurged to international recognition in May of 2020. Finally, in addition to social identities, respondents seek information about their cited authors' academic identities. In particular, these respondents cared about disciplinary diversity (17) and new or contrasting academic perspectives (19). Two were intentional about looking outside the "SOTL canon."

When asked, "Why is this important to you?" some respondents suggested a wider range of perspectives would strengthen not only their own work, but also the academy. For instance, one described an effort "to decolonize my bibliography and cite research from marginalised groups." In this view, seeking greater diversity in the research process is the first step an individual might take toward academic equity. Respondents also reported they actively seek diversity in their citation practices "[to] change the way academia continues to reify particular types of power structures," to "bear responsibility for change," "to help amplify newer voices," to "challeng[e] my own blind spots," and "to stop

perpetuating exclusionary citation practices." Mott and Cockayne describe citation as "a technology of power" and a potential "model of resistance" to traditional "'successful' citational performances that demure to sameness, whiteness, maleness, and cisnormativity" (964–65). The responses above recognize the need for intentionality in wielding the power of citation toward resistance to develop socially just scholarship. Naming and magnifying attention to scholars from frequently overlooked groups becomes a way to start righting historical wrongs.

We found a significant difference (Kruskal-Wallis test: chi-square = 14.65, p <.001, df = 2) of medians between responses to the question "Do you consider diversity or representation in your citation practices?" and the rank of citing "to strategically engage with particular scholar(s)." Participants who responded "yes" (n = 33, mean rank = 5.12) or "sometimes" (n = 38, mean rank = 5.61) (combined n = 71) about whether they considered diversity or representation in their citation practices ranked "to strategically engage with particular scholar(s)/writer(s)" as a guiding principle of their citation practices significantly higher than those who responded "no" (n = 50, mean rank = 6.74). In other words, scholars who care about engaging with diverse scholars likely also care about using their citation to strategically engage with others.

We also detected a relationship between this question regarding consideration of diversity and how people ranked the citation-guiding principle of "the work is considered 'canon.'" A Kruskal-Wallis test shows a significant difference of medians (chi-square = 6.61, p < .05, df = 2), which speaks to the politics of citation in terms of whose voices are most powerful. Participants who responded "no" (n = 50, mean rank = 3.66) about whether they considered diversity or representation as a guiding principle of their citation practices ranked "the work is considered 'canon'" significantly higher than those who responded "yes" (n = 33, mean rank = 5.36) or "sometimes" (n = 38, mean rank = 4.55) (combined n = 71). This result suggests people who prioritize what they consider canonical citations are less concerned with diversity in their citation decisions. The result reinforces the notion that much of what is considered canonical is not considered diverse. Some respondents expressed concern "about who/what isn't represented when scholars (including me) repeatedly turn to a canon of scholarship or only to specific journals," as well as an active effort to go "beyond SoTL canon."

What "extra information" matters in why we cite

In addition to our specific question about the diversity of cited authors, we wanted to know what authorial details matter when making citation decisions. We asked if respondents "know/seek details about the author" when they're citing: 98 responded "yes" (n = 16) or "sometimes" (n = 83), while 22 said "no." We then offered an open-text response box for the "yes" and "sometimes" responders to describe "what extra information [they] seek on authors." In the items listed in these responses, the most frequent explanation was the authors' other publications (n = 59). After that, respondents looked for authors' disciplinary and/or educational backgrounds (n = 23), the institutional contexts of the authors (n = 22), and their research activities (n = 22). Several (n = 9) were interested in the authors' role or position on their campus, but only one specified looking to see whether the author was a student or staff. Additionally, only two respondents mentioned seeking particular content understanding about the person's writing: one mentioned looking to see whether the author took a critical perspective in their writing, and another mentioned wondering whether "they tend to be more creative/forward-thinking or

reinforce the traditional canon." It seems, then, that respondents who want to know more than what is already presented about the authors they cite want to know about their professional positions.

We also asked participants "how [they] go about finding this information." We recognize some information about authors (e.g., about their gender identity) cannot be assumed based on the abbreviated details shared in their biographical blurbs, and we were curious how actively respondents sought further clarification about those they cited. Unsurprisingly, web searches of various forms (i.e., Google, Google Scholar, institutional website, library database searches, online profiles on social media or ResearchGate/LinkedIn, CVs) dominated responses, but two reported reaching out directly: one asks peers, and another emails the authors. The predominance of simple web searches makes sense for learning about authors' other works or institutional affiliations, but they may be inadequate for understanding authors' social identities and locations, as we will discuss in our "Implications" section.

Because seeking extra information about authors means extra work for the researcher, we were also curious about *why* these respondents are willing to take the extra time. The responses reveal four broad themes, three of which point to building one's own knowledge, while the fourth is more outward- or field-facing.

Knowledge-building

Some of the respondents described seeking extra information to help them grow their knowledge of the field, in line with the 59 respondents who specifically seek out an author's other publications. A few noted taking the extra effort simply "in case there are additional works that I can cite and add to my literature review etc. that are key parts of the conversation." Others have more specific field-mapping perspectives. They, for instance, want to learn more about their topic by "mak[ing] sure that the author is the best representative of an idea or concept," in recognizing "how the conversation about a particular topic is flowing and building off one another," and by "see[ing] if I've missed out relevant articles in this domain." Some describe a goal of breadth in their search as they try to "tease out perspectives for balance, often for an unexpected or unfamiliar or contrary view," to "update my knowledge of who publishes on what topics in SoTL," or "to familiarize myself with people in the community." Others strive for depth by "going down the rabbit hole of deep-diving into the literature; seeking the saturation point and/or looking for redundancies in the literature."

Understanding context

Twelve respondents explicitly described seeking extra information as an effort to fill out a broader "context" for the author, such as "institution type, student demographics, or theoretical/disciplinarity perspectives of the author." A few pursue extra information through an evaluative lens "to determine level of experience in the field (e.g., seasoned researcher vs. student engaging in graduate work)" and "to assess author's area or expertise." Most of these comments and others point to the role these details play in helping readers reconcile the differences between the article's contexts and their own. As one respondent observed, "understand[ing] the contexts in which the author is positioned . . . helps me grapple with their conclusions and think about how to apply them to my context." In this way, this information about an author—the extra information about their professional positions—is also a proxy for information about the teaching and learning contexts affecting their SoTL work. Another acknowledges how an author's perspective is situated in their

experiences, noting that additional context might also prevent overgeneralization: "It's important to understand the cultural and other contexts that inform the writing of a person. A Maori woman in New Zealand will have a different take on a topic than a white man from America." Erik Blair's "The Challenge of Contextualising SoTL" argues for greater explicitness of this information because "all teaching and learning takes place within a space that is more than just physical; therefore, the teaching and learning context—the wider societal context, and the cultural, ethical, and philosophical climate—are inseparable from our lived experiences" (2013, 28). Including this contextual information in SoTL publications would eliminate the need for the extra work because it's no longer "extra information."

Getting to know fellow scholars

Other respondents are motivated by "curiosity" (mentioned six times) in an attempt to become better informed about the author and the author's opus, because "if I am interested in one piece, I might be interested in others by the same person." Such respondents are following breadcrumbs in pursuit of "additional citations that may be of interest to my research work," "to know if he/she has written anything on the topic earlier; has there been any development in his/her ideas etc.," or to "get a sense of their body of work." A few expressed even broader interest in authors, information that goes well beyond their CV. One describes trying "to understand what grounds an author—influences, theoretical and ideological background, and the intertextual dimensions of their work." Another goes even further, seeking a more individual and human connection:

> *I want to understand where they are coming from, I want to make sure I have their freshest ideas (especially if they may have changed their mind about something in their most recent writing[)], I want to know if there is a chance we might meet to talk one day, I want to know if I can learn something about being a scholar from the way that they work.*

These responses illustrate how "extra information" about authors helps readers assess both the relevance of their work by finding common ground across different experiences and the potential for broader relationships with their scholarship or with them as fellow scholars.

Including for impact

In addition to foundational and scholarly motives for seeking extra information about an author, respondents spoke to a commitment to inclusion, equity, and diversity, or—as one put it—"I want to consider the politics of my citation practices." One response carefully unpacks this philosophy:

> *I believe it matters who we cite and what kind of work we cite as it directs our field in particular ways. Either it leads us towards more narrow, less critical work that presumes a neutrality in categories like teacher/student that are dangerous. Who we cite also impacts who is presumed to be a leader in the field. If we consistently cite only men, or only white women, we centre them as experts in the field and bring considerable prestige to their work. We also contribute to long established patterns in the academy that have left people of colour (especially black and indigenous scholars) at the margins.*

As this respondent suggests, the politics of citation are clearly present in status quo citation practices, in the choices that lead to "consistently citing only" a narrow set of identities. Several respondents describe their own responses to these political implications. For example, one identifies the importance of including scholars of identity groups relevant to certain topics: "When I am writing about issues involving Indigenous/non-Indigenous peoples, I want to make sure I include Indigenous perspectives." In this view, the notion of impact factor—normally an article's average number of citations per year as a (problematic) proxy for its importance—takes on new meaning as some scholars change their practices with the knowledge of the ultimate "impact" of their citation choices.

WHAT WE DO NOW

We began this project asking questions about whose voices have most often been included in SoTL. We then sought to learn what informs citation practices in SoTL, and to reflect on the values and priorities implied in these practices. As the survey respondent in our epigraph noted, "In SoTL, where there is the presumption that we are open, inclusive, and welcoming, our citational practices suggest otherwise." Indeed, our survey results (and our own work throughout this project) suggest some misalignment between these ideals and SoTL's on-the-ground practices. We infer a range of possible reasons—again, none of which are intentionally malicious. For example, SoTL is not the primary discipline for most SoTL scholars, so the time devoted to learning a field deeply is necessarily devoted to home disciplines, leaving little time for reading and citing widely in SoTL. Also, publication word limits require authors to cut where possible, and often an easy place to do so is through quoted material and references. At the same time, publication often rests in part on the ability to demonstrate familiarity with the field, reinforcing the potential overreliance on some core references. Faced with this double bind, authors may have to choose between citing relevant canon and diversifying the voices they want to include.

This project thus challenges us—the authors of this article, and SoTL scholars more broadly—to critically reflect on the purposes of citation in SoTL and the principles we *want* to apply to our practices. If the SoTL community aspires to be open, inclusive, and welcoming,[2] what practices would align with these values? To begin mapping a way forward, we offer 10 principles for guiding a more intentional, values-driven approach to citation practices in SoTL. While primarily aimed at authors, we see these principles as also useful for reviewers, editors, and others involved in the writing-publishing process. Some of these principles come out of our own self-reflections as SoTL scholars who continue to identify our own blind spots, privileges, and corrective actions. We begin with recommendations for reflection, then offer some possible actions to expand our own practices, and end with a few ways to effect change beyond ourselves.

Principle one: Be wakeful

We argue for less citing from reflex (i.e., perceived obligatory referencing) and more citing from a place of reflexivity (i.e., intentional practices that align with our values). Morrison, in her work re-envisioning a more inclusive literary canon, names this intentionality "wakefulness" (1988, 11). Mott and Cockayne argue for "paying attention to [citation] as an echoic *doing* rather than uncritically reproducing it as something natural and incontestable" (2017, 964). We should be wakeful by paying attention to the power embedded in the act of citing, as well as the effects of this power. As we

discovered in our own process of writing this article, we cannot assume consensus on how we want to wield this power, but we do hope it's done from a place of reflexivity.

The following questions can guide this process for each of us: What's the relationship between our work and others? What does it mean for a work to—in the language of some of our respondents—"support," "add something of value to," "contribute to," or "be useful to" our own work? What does it mean to "acknowledge debt to" or be "influenced by" another author? How are these relationships expressions of power, and what do we want to express through the "doing" of our citations?

Principle two: Self-assess

We can then apply this wakefulness to our current and future bibliographies. We can ensure we cite texts because of meaningful relationships between their ideas and ours, rather than a knee-jerk sense of duty to canon or even just a duty to have citations. We can also research the authors present and know more fully the people cite. We can identify "how many women, people of color, early career scholars, graduate students, and non-academics are cited" (Mott and Cockayne 2017, 966). We can ask what countries or countries of origin are represented, and why. This self-assessment will help us identify, and then address, the gaps in our current practices.[3]

Principle three: Read widely and curiously

Reading comes before citation, or at least meaningful citation. Continuing with principle one, we can ask ourselves why we read some sources and not others. We can be curious about lesser-known perspectives and seek to learn from them. This process isn't meant to be a formulaic or mechanical exercise in satisfying a quota of diversity. Instead, we envision a critical self-reflection about which ideas and perspectives we reach for, and where we reach—and thus whose texts we privilege over another. One of our reviewers wisely linked the breadth of our reading with the breadth of our networks, pointing out that our intellectual community is often limited to those in closest geographical or social proximity to us. Maha Bali (2020), in calling for "inclusive citation," encourages us to start small by following the work of one scholar who isn't frequently cited. Even further, since "peer review itself is a gatekeeper and space of social reproduction," she recommends we look to those who publish primarily in blogs or social media. As a useful starting point in diversifying how we read, the crowdsourced document "Expanding Our Bibliographies" includes a section on SoTL written by Black, Indigenous, and People of Color.

Principle four: Now, cite with intention

The previous principles build up to an intentional and informed citation practice. Our choices can now be driven by thoughtful attention to our relationship to another author and text, our awareness of our prior blind spots, and our commitment to listening to new and new-to-us voices as part of SoTL's conversations. Ahmed (2017), for instance, developed her own citation policy, a set of rules or boundaries that dictate who she cites, and why. At the same time, as one of our reviewers cautioned, we also should "avoid over-exercising the noble wish to be inclusive" that might lead us to "include works superficially or in passing just to 'enrich' and extend our list of references." Here again, the goal is an avoidance of unthinking extremes of inclusion or exclusion, and we acknowledge this isn't easy work. Our team of authors, for instance, experienced the tension between acknowledging those who laid groundwork for our own project here and seeming unreflexive by including citations of some frequently

cited names (potentially adding professional capital where none is needed). Ultimately, we do not mean to imply that expanding our bibliographies means we should stop citing the voices of conversations we're intentionally building on just because they've been frequently cited. Instead, we're encouraging greater thought about the depth of the relationship with frequently cited works, combined with an intentional expansion of whom we acknowledge as contributing or potentially contributing to these conversations.

Principle five: Name them

Some shortcuts in citation practices have problematic consequences. For example, eliding authors' first names in favor of just an initial in effect hides part of their identity. Even worse, the "et al." shortcut for multiple authors removes recognition of their authorship, as does listing a series of citations and then adding "and others." These space- and time-savers are literally acts of erasure and othering. We can instead use full names and all names, and avoid the separation of scholars into the named and unnamed. Again, this is easier said than done, especially when navigating citation styles of different journals and publishers. We argue that it's worth a conversation with the editors, as we had to do to reinstitute all authors' names in this article after a copyeditor "et al"-ed many of them.

Principle six: Identify with care

In addition to fully naming authors, we can be careful about how far we go in identifying authors we cite. The goal of inclusive citation begs the question: do we matter-of-factly describe the diversity of the authors we cite, and if so, how? The seemingly simple solution of explicitly naming aspects of authors' identities is, in fact, not simple. For example, if writers want to demonstrate their commitment to the work of scholars of different races, would they reference a book by bell hooks by writing "the black, woman-identified scholar bell hooks (1997) argues . . . "? One could argue that writing just "bell hooks (1997) argues . . . " erases an important part of her identity and masks the writer's inclusive intention. On the other hand, naming hooks' identity can reinforce assumptions that scholars who aren't black or women-identified are the norm because they don't warrant descriptions, as seen in the common act of labelling women's gender (e.g., Marie Curie, the *woman* scientist) without doing the same for men (e.g., William Shakespeare, the white male author).

There are no simple solutions. Instead, we can look at how authors situate themselves in their own work. Since bell hooks foregrounds her identity as a black woman in much of her writing, we might infer that we should, too—just as we adopt her practice of writing her name without capital letters. This example is perhaps too easy, though, because hooks' writing is often *about* being a black woman. SoTL authors, on the other hand, rarely call attention to themselves and the identity categories they inhabit in similar ways. Whether they should is for another conversation related to context (Blair 2013), or subjectivity (Miller-Young and Yeo 2015; Berenson 2018), or pronouns in SoTL writing (Sword 2019). Here, though, we offer the guiding principle inspired by some of our survey respondents who took the time to learn something about the authors they cited. We can seek what is available about their identities (i.e., how they describe themselves professionally) and consider the relevance of those identities to the ideas we're citing.

Principle seven: Include their voices

We also recommend including the voices of those we cite. Unfortunately, some citation styles discourage direct quotations. Members of our authorship team remember learning during our undergraduate and graduate years that including direct quotes was seen as lazy writing so we should instead rephrase someone else's work using our own words. What does this practice say about the ownership of the ideas expressed by those words? Relegating acknowledgement of their work to parenthetical lists that readers may skip over is less impactful than calling attention to a scholar's ideas and actual words within the text. As we point out earlier in this essay, weaving a colleague's effective phrasing into our own honors their work as author, and most explicitly "demonstrates engagement with those authors and voices we want to carry forward" (Mott and Cockayne 2017, 954). Direct quotations carry forward their voices, as well as their names and ideas.

Principle eight: Cite beyond publication

In addition to being more intentional when acknowledging the sources of another's ideas through written citation, we can also be more intentional outside of our publications. How often do we say or hear the phrases "in previous work" and "as stated elsewhere" as a preface to the sharing of uncited ideas? We can cultivate an "ethos of attribution" (Chick 2017) in conversation, public talks, conferences, peer reviews, online posts, committee meetings, and other sites where we may allude to but not typically name those who have influenced us.

Similarly, we can also honor "the multiple ways that knowledge is produced" by acknowledging when we have been informed by someone's ideas from classes and interactions with students; from conferences, peer reviews, online posts, committee meetings, and interactions with colleagues; and from public outreach and other interactions with community members (Mott and Cockayne 2017, 968). Even if we're unable to cite the specific individuals, we can still recognize these venues as legitimate sites of intellectual influence.

Principle nine: Collaborate and co-author

Collaboration can become a mode of amplification and a way to welcome new voices. Mott and Cockayne recommend "collaboration and co-authorship" as a "strategic tool of solidarity" (2017, 967), especially between established and emerging scholars. Co-inquiring, co-researching, and co-authoring are bedrocks of the creative-academic process in some fields, and in SoTL, such partnered work seems more common than not. We can be proactive by initiating collaborations, and the subsequent research and publication can be sites for not only inclusion, but also expanding our own knowledge through the experiences and perspectives of new colleagues. Our research project and this resulting article, for example, are collaborative projects. It was because we felt empowered to ask ourselves, and then one another, the difficult questions we pose here, that we were able to offer an in-road to this conversation about power and voice to a larger audience.

Principle ten: Encourage peers

Finally, we can apply these principles in our capacities as peers in interactions with colleagues, as well as in our work as peer reviewers and editors. In these "behind-the-scenes" roles (Mott and Cockayne 2017, 967), we can give specific feedback about an author's apparent approach to citation and

the diversity (or lack thereof) in the works cited. We are certainly indebted to our three peer reviewers for challenging our thinking and contributing to this article. Additionally, editors can also establish relevant recommendations or policies within their submission guidelines, for example, as *TLI* had previously done with a policy against "et al"-ing authors' names.

CONCLUSION

We conclude this article exploring how and why SoTL practitioners cite with an invitation to join us. We envision initiating a "crowd-sourced quantitative project with multiple investigators" (Mott and Cockayne 2017, 968) to conduct a citation analysis of SoTL journals, including and beyond *TLI* to build on the exemplary work of Cappello and Miller-Young (2020) with a particular focus on aspects of diversity and voice. This could also intentionally address our limitations by seeking to include more exploration of citation practices in SoTL beyond Western contexts. This project would extend our initial survey to provide the details of actual citation practices and not just intentions. Through this collaboration, we could provide a concrete way towards enacting the 10 citation principles shared above.

Citations are small textual moments that carry a world of meaning. Sword claims that "at best," writers can use citations to "promote academic humility and generosity . . . acknowledge their intellectual debts . . . to affirm the contributions of their peers" (Sword 2012, 145). Shirley Rose goes further in describing citation as a "collaboration between the author and other authors and between author and reader," and ultimately as "a courtship ritual" and "an act of building community" (1996, 40–45). By applying the above principles, the SoTL community can more generously acknowledge the range of contributors, note connections more thoughtfully, and align our intentions with our actions so our values exist not just in words but also in practice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge and appreciate our conversations with Rachel Guitman, who also attended the workshop in Bergen and contributed to our initial brainstorming and discussions about these issues. We would also like to thank Dr. Man-Wai Chu for her insights and support in the statistical analysis. We are also profoundly grateful for the three peer reviewers who took the time to carefully read our article and offer substantive, critical, and generative feedback. We felt in conversation with these anonymous reviewers, and we learned a great deal.

Nancy L. Chick is the Director of the Endeavor Foundation Center for Faculty Development at Rollins College (USA).

Christopher Ostrowdun holds a PhD in learning sciences from the Werklund School of Education, University of Calgary (CAN).

Sophia Abbot is a second-year PhD student in higher education at George Mason University (USA) and holds a M.A. in higher education from Elon University (USA).

Lucy Mercer-Mapstone is a principal researcher focusing on understanding students' experiences of higher education through a feminist lens (AUS).

Krista Grensavitch holds a PhD in history and an MA in women's and gender studies, both from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (USA).

NOTES

1. Nancy Chick was the founding co-editor of *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* and thus read hundreds of peer reviews before she retired from that role in December 2020.
2. While there is internal diversity within any community, we believe the SoTL community aspires to be open, inclusive, and welcoming. We merely need to look at some of the public documents of the field's international professional organization, the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (ISSOTL). See, for example, the 2019 Strategic Plan (ISSOTL 2019a), the statements on conference pedagogy (ISSOTL 2017) and peer reviewers (ISSOTL 2019b), and the recent editorial commitment to greater internationalization of the Society's journal (Chick and Mårtensson 2020).
3. Our writing team is eager to apply this principle to our own work, including this article, but this piece is already well over the basic wordcount. In addition, the pandemic has diminished our ability to keep up with so many projects, so we've committed as a team to take up this analysis soon and write about it in a ISSOTL blog post to complement this article. Out of curiosity, though, we ran our bibliography through the Gender Balance Assessment Tool (Sumner 2020), which uses two algorithms that probabilistically codes authors' names according to gender and race (Sumner 2018). While the tool is limited by its use of binarial representations of gender and racial categories from the US Census, it's a start, and "a huge improvement over not assessing gender balance at all" (Sumner 2018, 397). According to the GBAT, our bibliography is "approximately 53.75 percent woman-authored" and "7 percent Asian, 10.63 percent Black, 10.53 percent Hispanic, 2.82 percent Other, 69.03 percent White." We look forward to hand-coding our bibliography and writing about the results and the process soon.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, Sara. 2017. *Living a Feminist Life*. Duke University Press.

Bali, Maha. 2020. "Inclusive Citation: How Diverse Are Your References?" *Reflecting Allowed*, (blog). May 8, 2020. https://blog.mahabali.me/writing/inclusive-citation-how-diverse-are-your-references/.

Bara Stolzenberg, Ellen, Kevin M. Eagan, Hilary B. Zimmerman, Jennifer Berdan Lozano, Natacha M. Cesar-Davis, Melissa C. Aragon, and Cecilia Rios-Aguilar. 2019. *Undergraduate Teaching Faculty: The HERI Faculty Survey 2016–2017*. Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA. Los Angeles, CA.

Berenson, Carol. 2018. "Identifying a Tradition of Inquiry: Articulating Research Assumptions." In *SoTL in Action: Illuminating Critical Moments of Practice*, edited by Nancy L. Chick, 42–52. Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing.

Bernstein, Jeffrey L. 2018. "Unifying SoTL Methodology: Internal and External Validity." *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* 6, no. 2: 115–26. http://dx.doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.6.2.9.

Blair, Erik. 2013. "The Challenge of Contextualising the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning." *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* 1, no. 1: 127–29. http://dx.doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.1.1.127.

Boyer, Ernest L. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: The Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Cappello, Alicia, and Janice Miller-Young. 2020. "Who Are We Citing and How? A SoTL Citation Analysis." *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* 8 no. 2, 3–16. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.8.2.2.

Carby, Hazel V. 1987. *Reconstructing Womanhood: The Emergence of the Afro-American Woman Novelist*. Oxford University Press on Demand.

Chick, Nancy L. 2013. "Difference, Privilege, and Power in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: The Value of Humanities SoTL." In *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in and Across the Disciplines*, edited by Kathleen McKinney,15–33. Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Chick, Nancy L. 2017. "Toward an Ethos of Attribution." *ChickChat* (blog). January 20, 2017. https://nancychick.wordpress.com/2017/01/20/toward-an-ethos-of-attribution.

Chick, Nancy, and Katarina Mårtensson. 2020. "What Does It Mean to Be an 'International' Journal?: What Is Submitted to TLI Is What Shapes TLI." *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* 8, no. 1: 1–3. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.8.1.1.

Chng, Huang Hoon, and Peter Looker. 2013. "On the Margins of SoTL Discourse: An Asian Perspective." *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* 1 no. 1: 131–45. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.1.1.131.

Chng, Huang Hoon, and Katarina Mårtensson. 2020. "Leading Change from Different Shores: The Challenges of Contextualizing the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning." *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* 8, no. 1: 24–41. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.8.1.3.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. "Gender, Black Feminism, and Black Political Economy." The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 568, no. 1: 41–53. https://doi.org/10.1177/000271620056800105.

Davis, Angela Y. 1981. *Race, Women, and Class*. New York: Random House.

Delgado Bernal, Dolores, and Octavio Villalpando. 2002. "An Apartheid of Knowledge in Academia: The Struggle Over the 'Legitimate' Knowledge of Faculty of Color." *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 35 no. 2: 169–80. https://doi.org/10.1080/713845282.

Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. Psychology Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203697078.

Fricker, Miranda. 2007. *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Greenaway, Katharine H., Ruth G. Wright, Joanne Willingham, Katherine J. Reynolds, and S. Alexander Haslam. 2015. "Shared Identity Is Key to Effective Communication." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 41, no. 2: 171–82. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167214559709.

Hamshire, Claire, Rachel Forsyth, Paul Taylor, Jessica Riddell, and Heather Smith. 2018. "Guerilla Leadership Revisited: Troubling Metaphors, Strategic Leadership, and Social Change." Workshop presented at the ISSOTL2018 Conference, Bergen, Norway.

Haslam, Alexander, Penelope J. Oakes, and John C. Turner. 1996. Social Identity, Self-Categorization, and the Perceived Homogeneity of Ingroups and Outgroups: The Interaction Between Social Motivation and Cognition. In *Handbook of Motivation and Cognition: The Interpersonal Context*, edited by R.M. Sorrentino and T. Higgins, 182–222. New York: Guilford Press.

hooks, bell. 1997. *Wounds of Passion: A Writing Life*. Holt.

Hull, Akasha Gloria, Patricia Bell-Scott, and Barbara Smith. 1982. *But Some of Us Are Brave: All the Women are White, All the Blacks are Men: Black Women's Studies.* Feminist Press.

Hyland, Ken. 2004. *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. University of Michigan Press.

ISSOTL. 2017. "ISSOTL Conference Pedagogy." https://issotl.com/issotl-conference-pedagogy/.

ISSOTL. 2019a. "2019 Strategic Plan." https://issotl.com/strategic-plan/.

ISSOTL. 2019b. "New Resource on Being a Constructive and Collegial ISSOTL Conference Reviewer." Published October 18, 2019. https://issotl.com/2019/10/18/new-resource-on-being-a-constructive-and-collegial-issotl-conference-reviewer/.

Lundine, Jamie, Ivy Lynn Bourgeault, Jocalyn Clark, Shirin Heidari, and Dina Balabanova. 2018. "The Gendered System of Academic Publishing." *The Lancet*, 391 no. 10132: 1754–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30950-4.

Mercer-Mapstone, Lucy, and Gina Mercer. 2018. "A Dialogue Between Partnership and Feminism: Deconstructing Power and Exclusion in Higher Education." *Teaching in Higher Education*, 23, no 1: 137–43. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2017.1391198.

McKinnon, Rachel. 2016. "Epistemic Injustice." *Philosophy Compass* 11, no. 8: 437–46. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/phc3.12336.

Miller-Young, Janice, and Michelle Yeo. 2015. "Conceptualizing and Communicating SoTL: A Framework for the Field." *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* 3, no. 2: 37–53. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.3.2.37.

Morrison, Toni. 1988. "Unspeakable Things Unspoken: The Afro-American Presence in American Literature." *Michigan Quarterly Review* 28, no. 1: 1–34.

Mott, Carrie, and Daniel Cockayne. 2017. "Citation Matters: Mobilizing the Politics of Citation Toward a Practice of 'Conscientious Engagement.'" *Gender, Place, and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 24, no. 7: 954–73. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2017.1339022.

Poole, Gary. 2013. "Square One: What is Research?" In *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning In and Across the Disciplines*, edited by Kathleen McKinney, 135–51. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Potter, Michael, and Brad Wuetherick. 2015. "Who is Represented in the Teaching Commons?: SoTL through the Lenses of the Arts and Humanities." *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning 6*, no. 2: 1–16. http://dx.doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2015.2.2.

Rose, Shirley K. 1996. "What's Love Got To Do With It? Scholarly Citation Practices as Courtship Rituals." *Research in the Language of the Disciplines* 1, no. 3: 24–48.

Russell, Emily, Lucy Littler, and Nancy Chick. 2020. "Surfacing Disciplinarity: Citation as a Site for Integrative Learning." *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*: 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022220944737.

Stewart, Abigail, and Virginia Valian. 2018. *An Inclusive Academy: Achieving Diversity and Excellence.* Boston, MA: MIT Press.

Sumner, Janet Lawrence. 2018. "The Gender Balance Assessment Tool (GBAT): A Web-Based Tool for Estimating Gender Balance in Syllabi and Bibliographies." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 51, no. 2: 396–400.

Sumner, Janet Lawrence. 2020. "Gender Balance Assessment Tool (GBAT)." Last modified December 17, 2020. https://jlsumner.shinyapps.io/syllabustool/.

Sword, Helen. 2012. *Stylish Academic Writing*. Harvard University Press.

Sword, Helen. 2019. "The First Person." *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* 7, no 1: 182–90. http://dx.doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.7.1.12.

Thomson, Pat. 2019. "Writing a Journal Article - How Many References?" *Patter*. Published 1 July 2019. https://patthomson.net/2019/07/01/writing-a-journal-article-how-many-references/.

van der Lee, Romy, and Naomi Ellemers. 2015. "Gender Contributes to Personal Research Funding Success in The Netherlands." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 112*, no. 40: 12349–53. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1510159112.

APPENDIX: QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	Response type	Response options
Demographic questions		
Country	Open response	N/A
Institution		
Job/role title		
Discipline		
Gender identification		
Race		
Sexual orientation		
Pronouns		
Career stage	Multiple choice	Early/Mid-/Late-career
Publishing and writing practices		
Where do you most often look for SoTL writing and research?	Multiple choice: check all that apply	❏ Academic journals ❏ Specific book publishers ❏ Newsletters ❏ Blogs ❏ Through colleagues ❏ Within bibliographies ❏ Other

In what forms have you published or plan to publish your SoTL work?		❏ Empirical articles ❏ Reports of SoTL studies ❏ Theoretical/conceptual articles ❏ Reflective essays ❏ Literature reviews or other syntheses of existing literature ❏ Book/article/conference reviews ❏ Opinion pieces ❏ Blog posts ❏ Other
Citation practices		
Which citation style do you prefer?	Multiple choice	❏ APA ❏ Chicago ❏ MLA ❏ Other
Why do you prefer this style?	Multiple choice: check all that apply	❏ It is required by my discipline ❏ I am most familiar with it ❏ It privileges information that I value (e.g. publication dates, author's full name, or source page numbers)

When you cite published literature, what principles guide which articles you reference?	Rank in order of significance	❏ Citation count of the article (widely cited) ❏ Rank or impact factor of the journal in which an article is published ❏ It is written by someone I know ❏ It is published in my target journal for publication ❏ Reputation of the source ❏ To strategically engage with particular scholar(s)/writer(s) ❏ To engage in conversation / discourse with other individuals ❏ To engage in specific conversations / discourses ❏ The work is considered "canon" Other
When you cite an article, do you know/seek details about the author(s)?	Multiple choice	❏ Yes ❏ Sometimes ❏ No
What extra information do you seek on author(s)?	Open response	NA
How do you go about finding this information?		
Why do you seek this information?		
Do you consider diversity or representation in your citation practices?	Multiple choice	❏ Yes ❏ Sometimes ❏ No
What kinds of diversity do you consider/seek?	Open response	NA
How do you go about finding this information?		
Why is this important to you?		
Do your citation practices in SoTL differ from your disciplinary work? Please explain.		

Copyright for the content of articles published in *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* resides with the authors, and copyright for the publication layout resides with the journal. These copyright holders have agreed that this article should be available on open access under a Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/). The only constraint on reproduction and distribution, and the only role for copyright in this domain, should be to give authors control over the integrity of their work and the right to be properly acknowledged and cited, and to cite *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* as the original place of publication. Readers are free to share these materials—as long as appropriate credit is given, a link to the license is provided, and any changes are indicated.