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ABSTRACT

Research on source use and plagiarism in second language writing in recent years has suggested that rather than being the result of intent to deceive or moral failure on the part of the student, unacknowledged textual borrowing can have a number of causes, including cultural, developmental, and educational factors. This thesis aims to further research in this field by considering the complex relationship between student understandings of plagiarism and the ways in which they use sources to construct knowledge in their texts.

This case study of an undergraduate English for Academic Purposes class uses a mixed methods approach, combining surveys, qualitative analysis of reflective journal and interview data, and text analysis to examine the student knowledge of source use and plagiarism from a sociocultural perspective. This allows for a fuller understanding of the varied contexts in which writing takes place, and the impact these contexts have on the students' writing processes.

Analysis of this data revealed that a majority of students had some awareness of both the nature and importance of plagiarism as an issue at the university, as well as an understanding of the reasons for the restrictions on textual borrowing, but that there was a variation in the extent and specificity of that knowledge. It also revealed that a number of the students were very aware of the cultural, institutional, and disciplinary contexts in which they were writing. However, examination of the text data revealed that even a nuanced understanding of plagiarism did not guarantee the students' abilities to use sources successfully in their writing, and that they employed a number of non-standard textual borrowing strategies in their work. The thesis uses cultural-historical activity theory to help explain the relationship between aspects of student knowledge and practice, and to situate source use in second language academic writing within its wider cultural, institutional and disciplinary contexts.
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CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION

Academic integrity is an issue that causes heated debate in the academic community and has been extensively researched for a number of years in the fields of first language composition studies as well as in applied linguistics and second language writing. In a review of the literature, Marsden (2003) identified approximately 200 studies done into types of academic dishonesty in the past 75 years, and Fielden and Joyce (2008) noted 125 studies of academic integrity from 1998-2006 in Australasian publications alone. Many studies report that plagiarism and cheating, among university students in particular, is commonplace and on the increase. The Center for Academic Integrity, which defines integrity as “adherence to moral principles; soundness of moral character; honesty” ("Why Integrity", 2012) claims that more than 70% of tertiary students in the United States have been involved in cheating of some kind. Other studies report on student plagiarism in countries as diverse as Taiwan (Lin & Wen, 2007), Finland (Löfström & Kupila, 2013), Iran (Rezanejad & Rezaei, 2013), Egypt (Nejati, Ismail & Shafaei, 2011), Malaysia (Smith, Ghazali & Minhad, 2007), and Turkey (Yazici, Yazici & Erdem, 2011). In addition to these studies, there have been numerous conferences and international journals (for example Plagiary and the International Journal for Academic Integrity) devoted solely to issues of academic integrity.

Discussions of academic integrity and plagiarism also form an important part of university policies, in which the practice is widely condemned and a number of researchers investigating ESB (English speaking background) and NESB (Non English speaking background) plagiarism have identified key commonalities in the ways in which they frame plagiarism as a largely ethical issue (Lea & Street, 1998; McGowan, 2008; Pecorari, 2001; Pecorari & Petrić, 2014; Sutherland-Smith, 2008, 2011; Yamada, 2003). Pecorari (2001), for example, surveyed 54 international universities’ policies on plagiarism and found an almost “universal view of plagiarism as an academic crime” (p. 243), with the frequent use of punitive terms such as “allegation”, “hearing”, “trial”, “jury” and “verdict” reinforcing the plagiarism-as-crime analogy. Similarly, in her analysis of American college websites, Yamada (2003) identified a common understanding of plagiarism as unacknowledged “exploitation” (p. 255) of another author’s ideas or words, while Lea and Street (1998) found in their study an institutional discourse of “law and authority” (p. 168) surrounding plagiarism. Other studies, such as McGowan (2008) and Sutherland-Smith (2008, 2011), have also identified a common institutional perception of plagiarism as an academic crime, framed around the concepts of misconduct, detection, and punishment.
The term plagiarism, when used in the context of academic writing, is most commonly defined as the inadequate referencing of another text in one’s own piece of writing or presenting someone else’s work as one’s own, although it can also encompass practices such as purchasing completed assignments from the Internet, unauthorised collaboration on assignments, or using the organisation of ideas and content from a source to structure one's own work (Raimes, 1999). Discussions of plagiarism often begin with a statement on the derivation of the term, namely from the Latin “to kidnap” (for example, Blum, 2009; Raimes, 1999; Hayes & Intron, 2005a, 2005b; Pecorari & Petrić, 2014; Sutherland-Smith, 2005, 2008), and a brief look at handbooks written for student writers demonstrates that mainstream representations of plagiarism have not moved far from the term’s original meaning. Consider the following definitions of plagiarism taken from a selection of writing handbooks:

When you use another author’s intellectual property – language, visuals, or ideas, in your own writing, without giving proper credit, you commit a kind of academic theft called plagiarism. (Hacker, 2008, p 410)

Plagiarism is the ‘theft’ or unacknowledged borrowing, of ideas, data or phrasing. (Murdick, 2003, p. 178)

To plagiarize is to present another person’s words or ideas as if they were your own. Plagiarism is like stealing. The word plagiarize comes from the Latin word for kidnapper and literary theft. (Troyka, 1993, p. 555)

Plagiarism is wrongly using someone else's words or ideas, and it is a serious offense. (Oshima & Hogue, 2006, p. 128)

The theft metaphor is extended in composition manuals such as Hacker (2008) in which she advises student writers that they must closely follow citation and attribution conventions because of the moral obligation which they owe to the ‘owners’ of the source texts they use in their writing. She writes, “To be fair and ethical, you must acknowledge your debt to the writers of those sources. If you don't, you commit plagiarism, a serious academic offense” (Hacker, 2008, p. 415).

Leight (1999) examined such definitions taken from a large number of writing handbooks and publication guides, and as with institutional policies, found that four main metaphors were used to frame discussions of plagiarism: plagiarism as theft, as a violation of ethics, as unacknowledged borrowing, and as “intellectual laziness” (p. 227). Such definitions
of plagiarism, which represent the practice as equivalent to theft or other unethical or undesirable practices, are examples of what Valentine (2006) calls the “ethical discourse” (p. 90) of plagiarism, within which, plagiarism is seen largely as a symptom of “moral decay” (Baurain, 2011, p. 123) within academia.

The framing of plagiarism as an ethical issue introduces to academic writing and source integration the complex notion of intention, and Sutherland-Smith (2008), in her analysis of university definitions of plagiarism, noted that institutions differ widely in their understandings of intentionality. While some of the institutions surveyed acknowledged that plagiarism may occur unintentionally out of ignorance or lack of skill, others did not acknowledge that inappropriate source use can occur unintentionally. However, even if the act is acknowledged as unintentional, it is still often considered as damaging to an institution in which it takes place. Adler-Kassner, Anson and Howard (2008), for example, argue that within the dominant anti-plagiarism discourse, students who have been caught plagiarising are represented either as “duplicitous cheats” or as “naive innocents” (p. 233), who, by engaging in this practice, are threatening the principles of authorship and originality that underlie the modern academy.

Moreover, even if instances of plagiarism are considered as unintentional, they are often conflated with intentional plagiarism and judged by the same criteria (Leight, 2008; Pecorari, 2008; Valentine, 2006). In the Simon and Schuster Handbook for Writers, Troyka (1993), for example, states that unintentional plagiarism is “no less serious an offense” (p. 555) than intentional plagiarism. Similarly, the plagiarism policy at the university where this study was undertaken treats intentional and unintentional plagiarism as similar phenomena, “Plagiarism is defined as copying another’s work, whether intentionally or otherwise, as presenting it as one’s own” ("Plagiarism", n.d.).

Within this discourse, learning about plagiarism and appropriate source integration strategies and referencing conventions appear to be seen as a straightforward case of familiarising oneself with institutional policy and rules of citation and referencing. Price (2002) notes in her analysis of university policies on plagiarism that such policies commonly assume “that possession of the document is tantamount to absorption of its meaning” (p. 102). In other words, once the definition has been read by the student, ignorance of citation conventions or form is no longer a defense, and if the student breaks the rules again they may be assumed to be intentionally transgressing standard conventions and rejecting the academic writing process (Pecorari, 2008).

However, a perhaps unintended consequence of conflating intentional and unintentional plagiarism in this way is, as Howard (1999) suggests, the effective exclusion of
the student writer from the equation, as the writer’s morality becomes derived from “mediating textual features rather than from any direct consideration of the writer him or herself” (p. 108). Indeed Howard (1999) argues that the very terms “unintentional” or “inadvertent”, when used to describe student plagiarism which appears not to be the result of a desire to deceive, are simplistic and misleading in that they imply that the action or text arises out of a simple lack of knowledge, or as noted above, an ignorance of academic convention, whereas in reality the transgression may be the result of a number of complex pedagogical, discursive, or cultural factors.

A large body of research literature on student plagiarism still reflects such attitudes, focusing primarily on plagiarism as an ethical issue in discussions and analyses of student textual borrowing (see for example Chapfika, 2008; Fielden & Joyce, 2008; Lin & Wen, 2007; Lund, 2004). Moreover, fears of student plagiarism appear to have been exacerbated by technological developments and the increased availability of source material via the Internet (Flowerdew & Li, 2007b; Introna & Hayes, 2008; Scanlon, 2003; Sutherland-Smith, 2008). This has resulted in what Howard (2007) has called “widespread hysteria” (p. 12) about student textual borrowing practices, which in turn have led to the rise of plagiarism detection programmes such as Turnitin which claim to be able to identify plagiarism in student writing and are now widely used in 135 countries throughout the world (Stapleton, 2012; "Our company", 2013).

However, conventional views of student plagiarism have been increasingly challenged by a growing body of literature which argues that discussions of student plagiarism must go beyond such accusatory viewpoints and moral dichotomies, which Pennycook (1996) describes as “inadequate and arrogant” (p. 226) to consider the full range of issues that underlie textual borrowing in student composition. Price (2002) argues that plagiarism should no longer be seen as a “pure moral absolute” (p. 90) as such a perspective obscures the complexities and amorphous nature of an issue that involves such diverse concepts as authorship, originality, and knowledge production. These complexities are masked, however, by the confident language of institutional policies, composition manuals, and plagiarism detection programmes which have a tendency to use the term plagiarism as a short hand for a range of perceived failures and infractions. A number of researchers, such as Thompson and Pennycook (2008), Howard (1999) and Buranen (1999) have asserted that the term plagiarism is a problematic one because of the diverse beliefs and practices that it encompasses. According to Buranen (1999), the term plagiarism has become:

- a kind of waste basket, into which we toss anything we do not know what to do with: it can refer, at various times, to outright cheating…to appropriating large
blocks of text without attribution; to omissions or mistakes in citations; to paraphrasing an original too closely…. (p. 64)

Yet another layer of complexity is added when we consider the relationship of textual borrowing to NESBs. Whether or not NESB students plagiarise more than students from English-speaking backgrounds is a contentious issue. Some researchers (Deckert, 1993; Park, 2003; Pecorari, 2008) note that there is a commonly held assumption among educators that NESB students are more likely to plagiarise than ESBs. However, Buranen (1999) suggests that stories of NESB plagiarism are usually anecdotal rather than research-based, often circulating among instructors as urban legends.

Some comparative empirical research does show NESB students have both different attitudes and textual borrowing practices to ESB students (for example Campbell, 1995; T. Hyland, 2009; Keck, 2006, 2007; Maxwell, Curtis & Vardanega, 2006, 2008; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2005; Shi, 2004; Sun, 2009). However the extent, the nature, and the causes of such differences are less clear. Indeed some researchers suggest that unacknowledged textual borrowing in some form is widely present in a variety of texts, but because of NESB students sometimes’ lower levels of writing proficiency, plagiarism in their writing is simply more visible. Howard (1999), for example, discusses the ways in which all writers engage in what she terms “patchwriting” (making only minor changes to source texts by altering grammatical structure or substituting synonyms for content words (Howard, 1995)), when the source text is difficult to understand.

In recognition of the complexity associated with student plagiarism, within applied linguistics much of the literature has focused not on intentional plagiarism, where the intent is to deceive or to knowingly cheat, but on unintentional plagiarism, where the student may have unknowingly broken conventions of citation and acknowledgement. Pecorari (2003, 2008) has termed this second form of plagiarism “non-prototypical plagiarism”. Other researchers have also eschewed the term plagiarism in order to avoid association with the strong moral undertones seen in the definitions presented above (Buranen, 1999; Chandrasoma, Thompson & Pennycook, 2004; Sutherland-Smith, 2005, 2008). Alternative terminology used to describe the phenomena includes “patchwriting” (Barks & Watts, 2001; Campbell, 1995; Howard 1995, 1999; Pecorari, 2008), “transgressive and nontransgressive intertextuality” (Chandrasoma et al., 2004), “language re-use” (Flowerdew & Li, 2007a), and “textual borrowing” (Keck 2006, 2007; Pennycook, 1996). By using such alternatives to the term plagiarism, discussions and analyses of student textual borrowing practices may be able to
move beyond dichotomies of right and wrong, and avoid the “ethical binaries” of honest/dishonest and right/wrong identified by Valentine (2006).

While it is difficult to establish whether a student has transgressed conventions knowingly or unknowingly from examining a text alone, researchers examining source use in second language academic writing have employed a variety of techniques in attempts to explain the role of intention in textual borrowing. These include qualitative text-based interviews that accompany text analyses and requiring students to provide examples of sources used in their writing for analysis. Such methods enable researchers to focus on the factors that influence students as they engage in source-based writing without the issues of cheating or other transgressive practices obscuring questions of learning and teaching, and move research towards a greater understanding of the role of source use in L2 student composition (note that while it is acknowledged in many cases the participants were multilingual, the terms L2 and second language will be used hereafter to refer to the students’ main language of use in non-native contexts such as New Zealand, as is standard in the applied linguistics literature (Richards & Schmidt, 2014)).

Indeed, recent research in applied linguistics has identified a number of factors that may contribute to NESB student plagiarism. For example, many researchers have been interested in the ways in which students’ cultural backgrounds influence their textual borrowing practices. Research in this vein often uses surveys and qualitative analyses of beliefs and attitudes towards plagiarism to investigate the extent to which students’ past beliefs and experiences influence their textual borrowing practices (see Deckert, 1993; Dryden, 1999; Hayes & Introna, 2005a, 2005b; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2005). In particular, a number of researchers have suggested that the textual borrowing beliefs and practices of Chinese students writing in the L2 are heavily influenced by the tradition of Confucianism and also by the traditional Chinese examination system, which is said to foster a respect for authoritative sources and encourages pedagogical techniques such as memorisation (for example Lund, 2004; Shei, 2005; Sowden, 2005a; Taylor & Tingguang, 1991). The influence of this thought tradition is said to lead students to develop concepts of textual ownership, authorship, and attribution that run contrary to those standard in the Western academy.

Other researchers, while acknowledging that the cultural backgrounds of students are significant in language learning, have situated NESB student textual borrowing practices within a framework of academic literacy rather than one of contrastive rhetoric, often using text analyses of student writing in conjunction with qualitative analyses of student beliefs. Such investigations interpret textual borrowing as a largely developmental process that can be facilitated by pedagogical interventions and new instructional approaches to L2 writing (for
example Angélil-Carter, 2000; Hirvela & Du, 2013; T. Hyland, 2009; Li & Casanave, 2012; Pecorari, 2003, 2008a; Shi, 2004; Weigle & Parker, 2012). Indeed Howard (1999) suggests that patchwriting is a textual strategy that all writers use at some stage, “a means whereby everyone encounters, enters and appropriates discourse” (p. 91) She argues that framing patchwriting as plagiarism results in learning being obstructed as students are forced to remain at the bottom of the “textual hierarchy” by academics who function as disciplinary and institutional gatekeepers (Howard, 1999, p. 91). Researchers working within this framework advocate instruction into appropriate source incorporation strategies and referencing conventions to enable students to become better enculturated into new academic environments and discourses.

However, additional researchers have pointed out the difficulties inherent in teaching plagiarism avoidance strategies to students when there may be significant differences in the way sources are incorporated into texts across disciplinary boundaries. As argued by Pecorari and Shaw (2012), “There is not a single model of appropriate source use that applies across all assignment types and in all disciplines across the university” (p. A1), and yet this diversity may not be recognised at an institutional or disciplinary level. A number of empirical studies have examined the ways in which students integrate sources into their writing across the disciplines, and have considered the ways in which source use varies in different disciplinary contexts (for example, Chandrasegaran, 2000; Flowerdew & Li, 2007a; Shi, 2012; Wheeler, 2008).

Another thread of research into L2 student textual borrowing and plagiarism has taken a different approach, informed by critical theory and thinkers such as Foucault, Bakhtin, and Kristeva to examine the issues of authorship, power, identity, and knowledge construction within student writing and textual borrowing, and the ways in which ideology is perpetuated through the moral discourse of plagiarism (Rajagopalan, 2004). This research (for example Abasi & Akbari, 2008; Chandrasoma et al., 2004; Ouellette, 2004; Thompson, 2011) foregrounds the hegemonic nature of discourses on plagiarism that can relegate students, especially NESB students, to the margins of academia and disempower them as writers and learners.

It can be seen that the literature on NESB student textual borrowing covers a broad range of issues and has documented a number of influences on the ways in which learners use sources in their writing. However, questions remain over the extent to which each of these factors influence L2 student writing and the specific ways in which the influences interact with each other. As suggested by Hu and Lei (2012), investigation is still needed into L2 student textual borrowing that considers the issues from a more integrated perspective.
Moreover, the exact nature of the relationship between student beliefs about and knowledge of textual borrowing, and their practices of textual borrowing as demonstrated through their writing remains to be established. For example - if the ability to use sources is developmental, what is the nature of this development? Do beliefs about source use inform practice, and if so, what characterises this relationship? This thesis attempts to further research in the field and to bring together the different factors that influence student beliefs and practices of textual borrowing and plagiarism through an examination of the following research questions:

1. What knowledge do NESB undergraduate students studying at a New Zealand university have about plagiarism and source use?
2. How do NESB undergraduate students in a New Zealand university use sources in an English for Academic Purposes writing course?
3. What is the relationship between their knowledge and practice of source use?

In order to investigate these questions, this thesis has employed a mixed methods approach, conducting a case study of an undergraduate English for Academic Purposes (EAP) writing class that was taught in the linguistics programme of a major New Zealand university during 2007. Specifically, an embedded case study design was utilised, in which a single holistic case was examined in conjunction with smaller “embedded” subgroups taken from the main group (Yin, 2006). In the case of this thesis, the EAP class made up the primary case, from which survey data was collected on textual borrowing knowledge, beliefs and practices (N=47). Students who agreed to submit their reflective journals for analysis became a sub-group of the main class (N=28) and the secondary level of the case study. A further sub-group of students contributed their written course work (test, test essay, and research essay) as well as journal and interview data. The data from this group was analysed in the form of individual case studies and made up the tertiary level of the study. It was hoped that this approach, with its multiple data sets and types of analyses, could identify and explain different aspects of student textual borrowing, ranging from a broad survey of the beliefs and practices of the whole class, down to a more in-depth analysis of the ten individuals who took part in interviews and provided their written work for analysis.

The theoretical perspective informing this study has been developed from sociocultural theory, an integrative approach which considers the role of social, historical, and cultural contexts in knowledge construction and learning, and which has become influential in many areas of second language acquisition and applied linguistics in recent years (Lantolf & Beckett, 2009). Specifically, the thesis utilises activity theory (Engeström, 1987, 1999, 2000,
2001), a branch of sociocultural theory which may be particularly suited to the analysis of writers and writing, as, according to Prior (1998), writing “is not a solo activity, but a confluence of phylogenetic, cultural-historical...trajectories that weave together people, practices, artefacts, and institutions” (p. 138).

As discussed earlier, various terminologies have been used in the literature to describe conventional and non-conventional textual borrowing practices. In this thesis, the terms plagiarism, textual borrowing, and source use are used refer to student beliefs and knowledge of inappropriate borrowing practices, and also to their attempts at using conventional textual borrowing practices, such as acknowledged quotation, paraphrase, and summary. The term textual borrowing has been used in the research questions stated above, as it encompasses both those practices which are appropriate (acknowledged via citation or attribution), and those that are unacknowledged. The term academic writing is used in this thesis to refer both to writing produced by researchers within the academy and to refer to those pieces of writing that the students produced in the context of the EAP course (Nelson & Castelló, 2012), which included short pieces of source based writing, journals in which the students reflected on their experiences with the writing process, and longer source-based argumentative essays.

Eight chapters make up this thesis. This chapter has introduced and problematised the notion of plagiarism and presented the specific research questions that frame the study. Chapter Two, the Literature Review, presents the background, theoretical, and empirical literature pertaining to L2 student writing and textual borrowing, specifically the cultural, developmental, and writer identity approaches, followed by a discussion of sociocultural theory which provides the theoretical foundation for the study. In Chapter Three, Methodology, the mixed-methods approach of the thesis is outlined, and the specific research methods and types of analyses (quantitative analysis of survey data, qualitative analysis of journal and interview data, and text analysis of student writing) are examined. Chapters Four, Five, and Six present the results of the data analysis. Chapter Four presents the results of the class survey analysis and discusses the quantitative results in the form of descriptive and inferential statistics, in addition to the content analysis of the open question items. Chapter Five presents the results of the qualitative analysis of the sub-group journal data, in which the participants wrote about their experiences with academic writing, plagiarism, and source use over the course of the semester. Chapter Six presents ten case studies of the participants who agreed to take part in semi-structured interviews and provide their course work for text analysis. This chapter contains both qualitative analysis of the participants’ journal and interview data, and text analyses of their written course work. Chapter Seven presents a discussion of the results in which the main findings of the study are examined within the
context of the existing literature, and Chapter Eight, the Conclusion, summarises the findings, in addition to considering the pedagogical implications of the study and making suggestions for further research into L2 student writing and textual borrowing.
CHAPTER TWO - LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Overview

In this chapter the literature pertaining to NESB student textual borrowing is introduced and the influencing factors on textual borrowing or plagiarism that have been identified by researchers are discussed. These main influences include the students’ cultural background, level of academic literacy, and their perceptions of authorship, originality, and knowledge construction. Possible weaknesses in these research areas are identified, and the theoretical perspective of the thesis, namely sociocultural theory, is introduced and examined.

2.1 Cultural Influences on Textual Borrowing

As mentioned in the Introduction, one of the often-cited influencing factors in NESB students’ textual borrowing practices is that of the differences between the students’ cultural background and the culture in which they are writing. Researchers have examined the role of various cultural influences, including differences in education (Deckert, 1993; Hayes & Introna, 2005a, 2005b; Moon, 2002), rhetorical tradition (Sowden, 2005a, 2005b), and contrasting beliefs about writing and authorship (Sun, 2009; Evans & Youmans, 2000, 2002). One of the early scholars to suggest a cultural explanation for NESB student textual borrowing in academic writing was Deckert (1993) in his examination of Hong Kong Chinese students’ ability to recognise, and attitudes towards, plagiarism. Deckert argued that Chinese students who come from a system which privileges rote learning may rely heavily on sources rather than attempting to develop their own voice and style, as is required by the conventions of Western academic writing. This significant article prompted a debate in the applied linguistics literature about the factors contributing to inappropriate textual borrowing in NESB academic writing. Pennycook’s (1994) influential response to Deckert’s (1993) article is discussed below. Deckert shifted the debate on student plagiarism away from a focus on dishonesty and cheating to suggest that the cultural context from which the learner came can influence the way students use sources in their writing in much the same way as their L1 influences their syntax and vocabulary.

A number of other studies have also attributed student textual borrowing primarily to cultural differences, and much of this research focuses on NESB students from Asian countries (Chen & Ku, 2008; Dryden, 1999; Lackie & D’Angelo-Long, 2004; Lund, 2004; Marshall & Garry, 2006; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2005; Shei, 2005; Sowden, 2005a; Taylor & Tingguang, 1991). For example, Dryden (1999), in a survey of Japanese student and faculty
beliefs about plagiarism, suggested that Japanese educational culture has a heavy focus on exam preparation, the use of multiple-choice questions, and a lack of focus on composition and writing skills. This, he argued, leads to privileging of “the mastery of factual information, personal discipline and endurance” within the Japanese educational system, which he contrasted with the Western tradition of “intellectual growth [that] proceeds from arguing through, and sometimes against, authoritative sources” (p. 77). Indeed Dryden (1999) suggested that the term plagiarism as it is understood in the West does not exist in Japanese, a factor which, he argued, may account for lenient student and faculty attitudes towards textual borrowing identified in his study. Dryden (1999) suggested that the Japanese rhetorical tradition is influenced by Confucianism, arguing that in the Confucian tradition, “Knowledge is considered static, something to be mastered through arduous study and preferably memorized, because of the intrinsic moral benefits such discipline imparts. Original thinking should be avoided” (p. 82). According to Taylor and Tingguang (1991), the Confucian concepts of social harmony and consensus mean that students and writers are reluctant to be critical of others’ work, which is said to lead to an over-reliance on source material at the expense of original argument.

Rinnert and Kobayashi (2005) forwarded a similar argument in a comparative study of American and Japanese student perceptions of plagiarism. Their results showed that the Japanese students were both more accepting of examples of plagiarism and attached less importance to citation than the American students in the study.

Writing about Chinese students, Shei (2005) and Chen and Ku (2008) also attributed unacknowledged textual borrowing primarily to cultural differences, suggesting that there is an emphasis on memorisation in the Chinese educational tradition that may lead to Chinese learners engaging in unacknowledged textual borrowing. Similarly, Sowden (2005a) suggested that there are factors in Chinese educational and rhetorical cultures that may cause unacknowledged textual borrowing in the L2 writing of Chinese students. He argued that reproduction of Confucian texts without citation was required in Chinese civil service examinations, a factor that could influence the way contemporary Chinese writers relate to sources in their writing. He also suggested that the cultural notions of respect for the authority of teachers and the importance of consensus could lead to Chinese students’ reluctance to challenge authorial authority and develop original argument.

Lund (2004), in his examination of a Korean doctoral student’s writing, suggested that NESB students from “Confucian-influenced societies” (p. 93) engage in extensive unacknowledged copying out of respect for the source authors, arguing that such copying is a sign of humility towards those source authors. This, coupled with insufficient critical thinking
skills and ignorance of Western referencing convention, mean that NESB students are likely to have “an especially difficult time functioning within Western conventions of textual ownership” (Lund, 2004, p. 96).

However, the assumption that cultural factors influence student textual borrowing practices is not limited to research on Asian students. Lackie and D’Angelo-Long (2004), for example, suggested that NESB students, in particular from the Middle East and Pacific Rim countries are “more likely to exhibit particular homage to authority” (p. 35) in their writing. This, they argued, along with an increased propensity to imitate, may lead to more unacknowledged textual borrowing in NESB student writing from those backgrounds.

Two significant points are suggested by these arguments. Firstly, such researchers suggest that NESB students have markedly different attitudes to textual borrowing and knowledge construction than ESB students in terms of how they view its significance and how they practice textual borrowing. Secondly, they suggest that students have different attitudes towards the authority projected in the source texts that leads to copying rather than to synthesis. Taken together, it is suggested that such factors may lead to what appears to a Western academic audience as plagiarism. The perception and creation of an authorial voice within composition is considered in more detail in section 2.3.5. Here, however, the key point to note is that these authors suggest that the predominant influence on voice in student texts is their cultural or ethnic background.

In a number of other studies the influence of cultural background continues to be identified as a major influence on student composition and textual borrowing practices (Bradinova, 2006; Chandrasegaran, 2000; Dryden, 1999; Evans & Youmans, 2000; Gilmore, Strickland, Timmerman, Maher, & Feldon, D., 2010; Sherman, 1992). Hayes and Introna (2005a), for example, examined the attitudes of NESB university students studying in England towards both intentional (what the authors term “cheating”) and non-intentional plagiarism. Using survey data, interviews and focus groups, the authors identified various factors influencing the students’ textual borrowing practices, but suggested that the overriding cause is cultural difference. Indeed, Hayes and Introna (2005b) and Introna and Hayes (2008) suggested that because of these cultural differences, NESB students may actually be “predisposed to plagiarise” (Hayes & Introna, 2005b, p. 55). Sun (2009), in her study of NESB students’ perceptions of paraphrasing strategies and attitudes towards source use, also suggested that student from cultures that value memorisation are more likely to plagiarise.

Gilmore et al. (2010) conducted a large-scale study analysing the research proposals of 113 graduate students across different disciplines, programmes of study and language backgrounds (40.7% of the sample were NESB students). Using SafeAssign software to
identify instances of plagiarism in the research proposals, they found that 50% of the NESB students’ research proposals contained “plagiarism” (the exact nature of the textual borrowing is not specified) compared to around one third of ESB students. The authors suggested that “cultural differences in conceptions of plagiarism” (p. 24) may have explained this result.

Chandrasegaran’s (2000) survey of Singaporean university students’ abilities to recognise non-prototypical textual borrowing and attitudes towards plagiarism found that while the participants were familiar with unacknowledged verbatim copying as a form of plagiarism and viewed this practice negatively, they were less able to recognise unattributed paraphrasing as a form of plagiarism and tended to view this as acceptable practice.

Although focusing on students from a variety of cultural backgrounds and in different L2 institutional and disciplinary contexts, what these studies share is the underlying argument that the key factor influencing student beliefs and practices is NESB students’ cultural heritage. Therefore, it may be suggested that these studies are informed by the field of contrastive rhetoric, which views difference in second language texts primarily as a product of the writer’s cultural background. This model is examined in the following section, and some limitations of the model and these studies are suggested.

2.1.1 Contrastive rhetoric and the cultural causes model of textual borrowing

The notion that culture can influence writing is an idea that has been examined extensively in the field of contrastive rhetoric, which Connor (2002) defined as examining “differences in ESL and EFL writing across languages and cultures” (p. 493). This branch of applied linguistics research focuses on a broad range of issues, including analysis of rhetorical patterns and genres, evaluations of different meanings of literacy, and assessments of the impact of different educational systems on language learning (Hedgecock, 2005). Connor (2002) suggested that contrastive rhetoric approaches are underlined by the belief that it is the interference of linguistic and rhetorical patterns of the L1 that dominate the students’ choices in the L2. Contrastive rhetoric in linguistics originated with Kaplan’s (1966) seminal article in which he examined the paragraph organisation of NESB student compositions written in English. Kaplan identified five different rhetorical patterns in which, he argued, influence of the L1 rhetorical tradition could be seen. The literature which links NESB student textual borrowing to culture continues in this vein, considering the ways in which elements of the students’ cultural backgrounds “interfere” (Connor, 2002) with their academic writing in the L2 and prevent them from successfully integrating sources in their writing in a manner which conforms to Western academic convention.
2.1.2 Limitations of contrastive rhetoric and the cultural causes model.

While the field of contrastive rhetoric has developed significantly from the early work of Kaplan and others and investigates rhetorical traditions of other cultures in sophisticated and methodologically diverse ways (Connor, 2002; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996), some researchers continue to argue that the model of contrastive rhetoric remains limited in several key respects (Scollon, 1995; Wheeler, 2008; Zamel, 1997). Zamel (1997), for example, suggested that viewing features of student language and texts in the L2 as being primarily products of their L1 background results in a limiting perspective that reinforces the notion that cultural influence on student composition is inherently negative. Bloch (2008) also commented on the problems with such a model of L2 writing, suggesting that while cultural and linguistic differences would not normally be considered in this light, “resistance to the idea of deficit, both in rhetorical and moral terms, seems to fade away when discussing plagiarism” (p. 221).

Other critics of the contrastive rhetoric approach (for example, Atkinson 2004; Baurain, 2011; Bloch, 2008; Kubota & Lerner, 2004; Pennycook, 2001; Phan & Baurain, 2011; Spack, 1997) have also pointed to the problems inherent in using it as a framework to analyse cross-cultural differences. Atkinson (2004), for example, suggests that contrastive rhetoric is based upon an overly simplistic notion of culture, and notes that poststructuralist approaches that foreground the heterogeneity and complexity of culture have had little impact on this field of research. Phan and Baurain (2011) note that, on identification of non-standard features in L2 texts, contrastive rhetoric may represent a “de facto imposition of Western values in English writing” (p. xii). Pennycook (2001) has also criticised applied linguistics for its tendency to reproduce static notions of culture, suggesting that Kaplan’s (1966) initial work produced rigid cultural boundaries against which non-Western norms are measured and found to be deficient. The tendency of contrastive rhetoric to reproduce dichotomies (Bloch, 2001) and perpetuate stereotypes has also been recognised by Spack (1997), who argued that views of culture forwarded in contrastive rhetoric tend to be outmoded and even damaging when applied to pedagogy, while Baurain (2011) suggested that attempts to link unacknowledged textual borrowing and plagiarism to cultural causes arise from “a morally lethal combination of half-truths and ideological assumptions” (p. 129).

The limitations of the contrastive rhetoric model of cultural/textual difference can also be identified in empirical research on student textual borrowing practices. A number of studies demonstrate the complexities and difficulties associated with attributing plagiarism to cultural causes (Bloch 2012; Bloch & Chi 1995; Gu & Brookes, 2011; Liu, 2005; Thompson & Pennycook, 2008; You 2005). For example, Liu (2005) warns against cultural stereotyping in discussions of Asian student plagiarism, arguing that the main basis for what he terms
“cultural conditioning hypothesis” (p. 234) are the unreliable reports of NESB students accused of plagiarism. According to Liu (2005), such students may claim that copying without attribution is an acceptable strategy in countries such as China. However in an examination of Chinese composition textbooks, Liu demonstrated how such textbooks do in fact contain discussions of plagiarism and citation practices, which undercuts the assumption that acknowledgement of sources is not the norm in Chinese academic writing and suggests that the belief in plagiarism as a moral issue is not restricted to the West. Liu recognises differences in educational practice and cultural beliefs such as the use of memorisation, rote learning, and the sharing of knowledge, but argues that to suggest that the logical next step from these practices is plagiarism is inappropriate and unsubstantiated.

Liu (2005) notes that it is inaccurate and misleading to examine the beliefs or practices of Asian writers as a monolithic group, as this term encompasses a wide variety of cultures and language groups, and the researcher should not assume that the cultural influence will be uniform across different national and linguistic backgrounds. Indeed, students of many backgrounds and L1s encounter difficulty with plagiarism and thus it is not enough to attribute this difficulty to cultural background alone (Pecorari, 2003). Gu and Brookes (2011) support this view, arguing that increasing globalisation and regional differences in China make it “virtually impossible” (p. 143) to make generalisations concerning Chinese learners. Similarly, Kumaravadivelu (2003) argues against what he terms the “harmful homogenization” that results when learners are grouped together under the umbrella term “Asian” (p. 709). Moreover, similar textual borrowing practices and attitudes have been documented among NESBs from a wide variety of locations, including Italy (Sherman, 1992), Greece (Hayes & Introna, 2005a), the Middle East, and the Pacific Rim (Lackie & D’Angelo-Long, 2004).

Liu’s (2005) argument also points to a methodological issue with studies into textual borrowing that rely on surveys to gather data on student attitudes towards plagiarism, since as Liu (2005) suggests, unreliable informant accounts can influence the results. Moreover, terminology used in survey instruments may produce inaccurate results. For example, in their survey, Rinnert and Kobayashi (2005) chose to use a term for plagiarism that translates as “second hand account” because the more technical terms carried negative connotations. Yet Wheeler (2008) suggested that the choice of the more neutral term may have caused the more lenient attitude towards textual borrowing observed among Rinnert and Kobayashi’s (2005) participants. The Introduction to this thesis discussed the ways in which plagiarism in English also carries very negative connotations – it follows then that in comparative surveys of ESB and NESB attitudes, ESB students may indicate that they do not plagiarise out of an
awareness of the negative connotations of the term, rather than as a reflection of their actual composition processes.

As Pecorari (2003), Angélil-Carter (2000) and Howard, Serviss and Rodrigue (2010), as well as the numerous studies into L1 textual borrowing have pointed out, ESB students also have extensive difficulty with unintentional plagiarism in academic writing, despite being from a rhetorical tradition that, supposedly, values a distinct authorial voice, argumentation, and ownership of knowledge. Moreover, Baurain (2011) argued that what he terms the “cultural deficit approach” (p. 128), which represents unacknowledged textual borrowing as an issue primarily affecting NESB students, tends to overlook the incidence of similar textual borrowing practices and attitudes in ESB contexts. This is a methodological and theoretical issue that the literature which suggests cultural conditioning (Liu, 2005) causes NESB textual borrowing does not adequately address. Indeed Kumaravadivelu (2003) calls attention to the difficulties of attributing characteristics to learners on the basis of their culture at all, because “it is almost impossible to control a multitude of variables in order to isolate culture as the sole variable that can be studied” (p. 713).

Comparative analyses of ESB and NESB student textual borrowing (e.g., Buranen, 1999; Campbell, 1995; Keck, 2006, 2010; T. Hyland, 2009; Hu & Lei, 2012; Maxwell, Curtis & Vardanega, 2006, 2008) have found that different groups do have different textual borrowing practices and perceptions of plagiarism, and that source integration is less successful in NESB student texts, but by no means are the ESB students entirely successful either, suggesting that textual borrowing is difficult to master for all developing writers. Textual analyses such as these add weight to the notion that the issue of inappropriate textual borrowing results from developmental causes rather than primarily cultural ones, an idea that is examined in section 2.2 of this chapter. Maxwell et al.’s (2006) survey of NESB and ESB university students in Australia found that ESB students reported engaging in unacknowledged textual borrowing more than the NESB students. Similarly, their 2008 study found that there was no significant difference between ESB and NESB groups in their perceptions of the seriousness of plagiarism. Buranen’s (1999) study of NESB students from over twenty countries also found that respondents reported that understandings and perceptions of plagiarism in their home countries and that of the institution in the United States in which they were currently studying differed very little.

In another comparative ESB/NESB study, Martin (2012) found that those students that identified themselves as coming from what he termed an “individualist” culture, were more likely to plagiarise in their written work than students who identified as being from “collectivist” cultures (usually associated with Asian students). Martin (2012) concluded that
the study went against “popular perceptions of cultural norms and ethnic differences in plagiarism” (p. 270).

However it would be inaccurate to say that cultural factors have no impact on students’ writing practices and beliefs about source use and plagiarism. Shi (2006) found that ESB and NESB undergraduate students had contrasting understandings of the seriousness of plagiarism in a Western context, and contrasting epistemological beliefs concerning the ownership of words and ideas. However, rather than attributing these differences primarily to cultural causes, Shi (2006) points to the importance of the intra-cultural and individual differences in the beliefs and attitudes of the participants. Bloch and Chi’s (1995) comparative study of the citation practices of Chinese and English-speaking academics identified a divergence between the two groups, evident in both the frequency and type of citations used in academic articles - the Chinese writers tended to use a less argumentative rhetorical style, use citations less frequently, and cite from older and more traditional texts than their English-speaking counterparts. However, Bloch and Chi (1995) argued that inferences regarding the causes of these differences must be made cautiously. They suggest more practical and material concerns may influence the Chinese academics’ source use and rhetorical style, such as the lack of availability of more recent sources, or concern over contradicting prevailing political doctrines.

Moreover, they pointed to the complexity of the rhetorical tradition in China, stating, “Chinese rhetoric is not monolithic, [and] that there are alternative and often contradictory forms of rhetoric” (Bloch & Chi, 1995, p. 263). They are critical of those studies (for example Matalene, 1985) that suggest that it is simply the cultural background of Chinese-speaking writers and students that lead to inappropriate textual borrowing. Bloch (2001) argues that plagiarism “both exists and is recognizable in Chinese academic life” (p. 217).

You (2005) also challenges what he terms the “essentialist link” between contemporary Chinese academic writing and Chinese rhetorical tradition and stresses that modern Chinese rhetoric is, in fact, characterised by originality and directness (p. 50). In his analysis of Japanese students’ attitudes towards plagiarism, Wheeler (2008) questions the perspective forwarded by Dryden (1999) regarding plagiarism and Japanese students, suggesting that in his study, participants were both aware of, and critical of, examples of inappropriate textual borrowing presented to them in written texts. Wheeler (2008) suggests, “attributing the students action to cultural difference is rife with negative potential” (p. 26).

While Bloch (2008), Bloch and Chi (1995), Wheeler (2008), and You (2005) pointed to the complexity of rhetorical traditions to challenge stereotypes about academic plagiarism, Scollon (1995) questions the degree to which rhetorical traditions influence composition
practices at all. He suggests that in a modern world characterised by intertextuality and interdiscursivity, students are more likely to be influenced by popular culture and oral/aural traditions, rather than historical traditions such as Confucianism.

In summary, there is a significant body of research examining the role of NESB students’ cultural backgrounds in shaping their textual borrowing beliefs and practices. According to this view, when NESB students enter a Western educational environment, it is cultural influence that can cause inappropriate textual borrowing, rather than any intent to deceive or cheat in their academic writing. This line of argument appears to be influenced by contrastive rhetoric research and the notion that culture is a determining factor shaping student writing practices and texts. Yet critics of this position point to the complexity of influences on student writing, and argue that textual borrowing practices and notions of authorship cannot be explained by cultural influences alone. They suggest that culture needs to be viewed as a complex, dynamic and multifaceted phenomenon, rather than a static deterministic force, and call for a more nuanced approach to considering the way in which culture influences NESB students’ textual borrowing beliefs and practices. As Ricento (2005) argues, although students from different cultures “may share different beliefs and practices, the representation of these beliefs and practices as ethnic traits perpetuates stereotypical thinking...often based on cultural constructions imposed by ‘outsiders’” (p. 896).

One study which takes a more nuanced approach to the issue of cultural influences in student academic writing is Hu and Lei’s (2012). In this large-scale study of 270 Chinese undergraduate students, the authors examined students' abilities to recognise plagiarism in given text samples, and also the students' self-assessments of their source use and referencing abilities. Hu and Lei (2012) found only a small proportion of these Chinese students were able to recognise word for word copying and unacknowledged paraphrase as unacceptable textual borrowing. However, they found that the students who did identify the plagiarism viewed the textual borrowing as negative, and also that students who reported themselves competent in textual borrowing and referencing strategies were more likely to identify the plagiarism in the given texts. Given the interaction of the different variables in the study they argue that research needs go beyond “a simplistic dichotomy of culturally unacceptable versus culturally acceptable” (Hu & Lei, 2012, p. 842).

2.2 Academic Literacy, Writer Development, and Textual Borrowing

This section examines studies into textual borrowing that suggest that rather than being primarily an issue of cultural interference, the main factor affecting source use and
unintentional plagiarism is the writers’ stage of academic literacy development. While there have been a variety of methods and types of analysis used to develop this interpretation, for example, textual analysis (Campbell, 1995; Dong, 1996; Keck, 2006; T. Hyland, 2009; Moore, 1997; Pecorari, 2003, 2008a; Shi, 2004; Storch, 2009), qualitative case studies (Angélil-Carter, 2000; Currie, 1998; Hsu, 2003; Leki & Carson 1994; Spack, 1997), and qualitative interviews (Bloch, 2001), inappropriate textual borrowing in this area of research is largely seen as a practice engaged in by inexperienced writers who, given sufficient time, practice, and instruction, can learn to integrate sources into their texts and follow the conventions of academic authorship.

As such, these studies can be situated within the framework of academic literacy approaches that recognise that distinct and specialised skills are required in order to acculturate to and succeed in the academic community (Ferris & Hedgecock, 1998; Newman, 2002). This section discusses the principles of academic literacy as they relate to textual borrowing studies, and suggests some possible limitations of such an approach.

According researchers such as Snow (2005), the concept of academic literacy has grown out of recognition that literacy is not a single phenomenon, but rather involves a complex set of practices and skills. Similarly, Kern (2000) defines literacy as “the use of socially-historically, and culturally situated practices of creating and interpreting meaning” and notes that it “draws on a wide range of cognitive abilities, on knowledge of written and spoken language, on knowledge of genres and on cultural knowledge” (p. 383). Thus, it has become clear that the skills involved in the development of literacy are not general, but are specific to different contexts and communities (Kern & Schultz, 2005).

According to this view, the academic community is one of these contexts in which there are specific elements that constitute competency. Academic literacy can be thus defined as the different competencies and types of knowledge that students need to succeed in an academic environment such as content knowledge, research skills, and the understanding of different academic genres, disciplines, and conventions (Braine, 2002; Newman, 2002; Newman, Trenchs-Parera & Pujol, 2003; Spack, 1997). Snow (2005) suggests a useful model of academic literacy - she argued that academic literacy comprises of an adequate understanding of linguistic characteristics (including academic language functions), background knowledge, cognitive thinking, and knowledge of discourse communities. It is clear that an understanding of citation and acknowledgement plus the ability to integrate sources successfully into texts, what Barks and Watts (2001) term the triadic model of quotation, summary, and paraphrase, is relevant to Snow’s model and the other definitions of academic literacy discussed here.
Moreover, one of the key understandings underlying an academic literacy approach is that these competencies develop longitudinally (Braine, 2002). Thus, academic writing in general and appropriate source use in particular can be seen as a “complex process of literary development” (Hedgecock, 2005, p. 600). The following sections review this literature, firstly starting with influential research in L1 writing and then moving on to discuss the relevant studies in the field of second language writing. Literature investigating the development of textual borrowing in undergraduate and postgraduate writing is examined, as well as research into pedagogical intervention to improve student source use, and literature that has developed out of the related field of integrated skills, which examines source use in the larger context of language assessment.

2.2.1 L1 studies into textual borrowing and writer development.

It is beyond the scope of this literature review to investigate fully the research into L1 writing development and textual borrowing. However, L1 writing research has had a significant impact on the development of L2 writing research, and several studies of L1 writing development have been influential in the literature on L2 textual borrowing (Leki, 2002). The first of these is Britton, Burgess, Martin, McLeod and Rosen (1975), in which educational researchers in Britain conducted a longitudinal study into the writing development of ESB students aged from 11-18. Based on their research they argued that novice writers proceed through distinct developmental phases when learning to write from sources. Writers began by mechanical textual copying, but with experience developed the ability to synthesise their source texts without resorting to copying. Similarities can be seen here between writing development and the interlanguage of developing L2 learners, described as a phase of transition in which a learners’ language constitutes of an “unstable set…of characteristics” (Bussmann, Trauth & Kazzazi, 1996, p. 235-6) that come to resemble the L2 more accurately as proficiency is gained.

In L1 composition studies, the idea of source use as developmental was taken up by Howard (1995), who suggested that plagiarism was an issue of academic literacy rather than morality. Howard developed the influential concept of patchwriting, which she identified as a textual strategy in which students copy from a source text, changing elements of the vocabulary and syntax at sentence level, but leaving the sense and overall structure of the passage largely unaltered. Like Britton et al. (1975), Howard (1995) argued that patchwriting is a developmental phenomenon, a stage that all writers go through while acquiring academic literacy. Howard did not suggest that patchwriting is an acceptable substitute for more conventional (and hence more acceptable) forms of academic writing. Indeed other
researchers such as Pecorari (2008) have noted that patchwriting remains an unsuccessful strategy that may result in textual incoherency and lack of a clear argument in student writing. However, what Howard (1995) stressed was the need for the recognition of this textual strategy as a legitimate part of a writer’s development. In later work, Howard (1999) continued to argue for patchwriting as a form of learning, not just for students, but for all writers in university settings, noting that “all of us patchwrite all the time, but we usually cover the trail” (p. 7).

Textual borrowing in L1 composition was also examined in Hull and Roses’ (1989) case study into a student in a community college adult literacy programme in the United States. Hull and Rose found that one of the distinguishing features of their participant’s writing was her tendency to incorporate into her writing large portions of text that were only slightly changed from the source text or copied directly. However, interview data showed that rather than being deceitful or dishonest in her writing, the student was actively attempting to present herself as a successful and knowledgeable writer, and that from her perspective, her copying was a marker of “good academic citizenship” (Hull & Rose, 1989, p. 148).

2.2.2 L2 studies into textual borrowing and writer development.

Like the above L1 studies into textual borrowing and writer development, a significant body of research into L2 writing suggests that plagiarism results from the demands of academic writing that are exacerbated by the additional challenges of composing in a second language (Barks & Watts, 2001). In this body of research, different methods are used to document the development of academic literacy among NESB students such as text analysis, citation analysis, mixed methods, and qualitative analysis, but they are linked in their focus on source use as primarily a developmental phenomenon (Angélil-Carter, 2000; Campbell, 1995; Currie, 1998; Hsu, 2003; Flowerdew & Li, 2007a; Hirvela & Du, 2013; T. Hyland, 2009; Li & Casanave, 2012; LoCastro & Masuko, 2002; Pecorari, 2003, 2008; Shi, 2004; Spack, 1997; Storch, 2009; Weigle & Parker, 2012). This section discusses research that examines the developmental aspect of source use and textual borrowing, dividing the literature into four sections: (a) research into undergraduate textual borrowing, (b) research into postgraduate textual borrowing, (c) research examining pedagogical interventions, and (d) research into integrated skills in academic writing.

2.2.3 Undergraduate textual borrowing.

One of the earliest studies into student textual borrowing practices is Campbell’s (1995) important experimental study of undergraduate ESB and NESB composition and
source-use practices. Campbell found significant differences in how the ESB and the NESB groups used source texts, both in terms of where the text was used in the composition, how the source text author was cited, and the nature of the integration. However, her results showed that both groups engaged in non-standard textual borrowing, such as direct copying, without adequate citation and used inadequate source-text integration.

Given that both groups had difficulty with the composition task, she argued that cultural factors were not sufficient to explain the results (Campbell, 1995). Instead, she theorised that “perhaps university composition students are still completing the stage of being able to quote, summarize and expand in academic style without copying, and with continued academic writing they will progress to a higher stage” (p. 222). She also suggested that language proficiency may be a significant factor in students’ ability to integrate sources successfully in their writing, and that students need to be instructed in conventions of source use and referencing in order to facilitate this development (Campbell, 1995).

A number of empirical studies have followed Campbell (1995) in analysing the differences between source use in L1 and L2 writing (e.g., Keck, 2006, 2007, 2010; Howard et al, 2010; T. Hyland, 2009; Shi, 2004). Like Campbell (1995), Shi (2004), for example, compared summary and opinion tasks produced by the two groups of undergraduate students under controlled conditions. She found that the Chinese students borrowed more and longer strings of words from the source text than the ESB students, and that they attributed significantly less language in the summary task than the opinion task. T. Hyland (2009) also compared textual features of ESB and NESB undergraduate student compositions produced under timed conditions, finding that both groups exhibited problems with source use such as “vague references, mixed references, patchwriting, and confusion of quotes and paraphrases” (p. 70).

Both authors suggested that the problems inherent in these student texts are developmental. Shi (2004) for example, pointed out that L2 speakers may naturally rely on direct copying as a resource as they move towards membership in the academic community. Similarly, T. Hyland (2009) concluded that students need to move through a number of stages before they are able to consistently follow appropriate referencing and citation conventions.

Keck (2006) developed a typology to characterise students paraphrasing strategies. Comparing the paraphrasing ability of L1 and L2 undergraduate writers, Keck (2006) found notable differences in the way the two groups used paraphrases in their writing. The L2 writers relied on the wording of the source texts more closely while the L1 writers tended to restate the original text using different wording. She too suggested that proficiency could have been a factor in the poor paraphrasing skills of the L2 students (Keck, 2006).
Howard et al. (2010) also examined textual borrowing strategies used in L1 and L2 undergraduate compositions. They found that “students are not writing from sources; they are writing from sentences from selected sources” (p. 188) and suggested that the use of patchwriting, paraphrase, quotation and unacknowledged textual borrowing suggested a global lack of comprehension of the source texts. Concluding that plagiarism is more of a reading problem than a writing problem, they suggested, “plagiarism is difficult to avoid if one is constructing an argument from isolated sentences pulled from sources” (p. 188).

Other studies of L2 source use have focussed solely on NESB students in a variety of academic contexts. For example, Currie’s (1998) ethnographic case study of a NESB undergraduate student writer over the course of a semester revealed that her subject had significant difficulties with the demands of academic writing. Unlike the timed experimental studies of Campbell (1995), T. Hyland (2009), Hsu (2003) Keck (2006), and Storch (2009), Currie’s study had a naturalistic design, examining all the writing produced by the student for her undergraduate course work as well as conducting interviews with the participant and her instructors. Currie uncovered many factors contributing to the student’s textual borrowing practices, which took the form of extensive copying from word to paragraph level, sometimes verbatim and sometimes with minor revisions. These factors included a lack of explicit instruction and guidance, “cognitive overload” (Currie, 1998, p. 10) caused by task difficulty, and language proficiency. However, she concluded that the stages that Diana (a pseudonym) was going through were largely developmental, suggesting, “it is possible to view Diana’s behaviour as simply a natural consequence of her developing proficiency; in short, a way to manage” (Currie, 1998, p. 10).

Li and Casanave (2012) combined text analysis with qualitative interviews in their case study of L2 undergraduate first year writers’ source use. The results of these studies confirmed the results discussed above. The participants in this study, while they stated that they understood the plagiarism policies of their institution, engaged in extensive patchwriting and unacknowledged source use, but again the authors concluded that this was primarily developmental.

2.2.4 Postgraduate textual borrowing.

Research into postgraduate NESB students and source use (for example Bloch, 2001; Davis 2013; Flowerdew & Li, 2007a; Pecorari, 2003, 2008, Weigle & Parker, 2012) has found that, like their undergraduate counterparts, more experienced writers also undergo difficulties incorporating sources into their writing. This indicates that while language proficiency may influence textual borrowing, it is not the only factor involved in the
development of academic literacy and that advanced speakers and writers of English continue to exhibit considerable difficulty with source use. Pecorari (2003, 2008), for example, analysed the writing samples of postgraduates studying in the United Kingdom in comparison with their source texts and found a high incidence of copying across the samples. Her results, she argued, support Howard’s (1995) patchwriting model – although her participants were postgraduates with a high level of proficiency in English, many of them were inexperienced with academic composition and engaged in inappropriate textual borrowing practices “not caused by the intent to deceive but by the need for future growth as a writer” (Pecorari, 2003, p. 338).

In a study of postgraduate science students writing in English, Flowerdew and Li (2007a) found similar results to the studies discussed above – the participants copied extensively from source texts despite an awareness among the participants of plagiarism and a belief that it was not appropriate. The authors speculated that what they term “language re-use” is, as the other research suggests, “a means of developing an appropriate disciplinary discourse” (Flowerdew & Li, 2007, p. 459) that may disappear over time as the students acculturate to the disciplinary norms of their respective fields.

Bloch’s (2001) research also supports the developmental thesis. From analysis of interviews with Chinese graduate students in the physical and social sciences, Bloch (2001) suggested that plagiarism may result from “writing strategies that could change as the learner’s language skills develop or as the rhetorical context changes” (p. 220).

Another significant study into the source use of postgraduate students is Davis’ (2013) analysis of the textual borrowing strategies of Chinese postgraduates, which focussed on four features of source use in their academic writing: citation, paraphrase, use of reporting verbs, and attribution strategies. The students continued to have difficulties with source use over the two-year period that they were studied, and Davis (2013) suggested that this time period is not enough for international students to develop competence in textual borrowing and source integration. Importantly, Davis (2013) argued that the research shows that the students’ progress during the period of the study was not linear, with two of the students developing more problems with source use as they progressed from their pre-Masters EAP programme to their MA work. This study adds another dimension to the argument that source use is developmental, and suggests that a consideration of the context in which students are using sources (in this case the disciplinary context) is crucial to understanding the problems students have with source use and textual borrowing.
2.2.5 **Pedagogical intervention.**

Also taking a developmental perspective on source use abilities are studies reporting on the effect of instruction on the development of plagiarism and appropriate source use in L2 student writing (Conzett, Martin & Mitchell, 2010; Hsu, 2003; McGowan & Lightbody, 2008; Moon, 2002; Storch, 2009, 2012; Wette, 2010). For example, Hsu’s (2003) case study of an undergraduate ESL composition class used textual analysis based on Campbell’s (1995) model of type and function of source use (this model is discussed in detail in the section 3.6 of the thesis). Hsu (2003) conducted a pre-post instruction analysis of student diagnostic compositions combined with a questionnaire survey. She found that while students were notionally aware of plagiarism at the beginning of the semester, their essays still exhibited significant unacknowledged textual borrowing. However, after a semester of instruction, students were able to incorporate sources more successfully and recognise plagiarism in writing samples. Hsu (2003) suggested that student plagiarism is due to low proficiency levels and lack of citation convention knowledge, but argued that instruction in strategies such as quotation, paraphrasing, and summarising can improve student writing.

Conzitt et al. (2010) reported on their attempts to deter L2 writers from inappropriate textual borrowing in an intensive English programme which included revisions to the institutional anti-plagiarism policy to make it more “audience appropriate” (p. 297) in addition to implementing more comprehensive source-integration instruction and exercises designed to raise student awareness about issues of academic honesty.

McGowan and Lightbody (2008) reported the results of a pedagogic intervention in an undergraduate English as an Additional Language class in Hong Kong, in which the students were given instruction to raise their awareness of plagiarism and ability to use sources appropriately in their writing. After instruction, the students reported an increase in their understandings of plagiarism and the authors reported that the quality of student writing in the course overall improved. Wette (2010) conducted an action research study on a NESB composition course, investigating the impact of an instructional unit on source use techniques on the class. Analysing the classes’ pre and post-unit tests and essays, she found that students improved in their abilities to incorporate sources successfully and a decrease in direct copying, although aspects of source use such as accurate summarising and citation integration were still difficult.

Another longitudinal study is Storch’s (2009) pre-post instruction analysis of NESB student composition. Using Keck’s (2006) paraphrase typology, Storch (2009) analysed attempted paraphrases in students’ compositions. However, Storch noted that while some features of the texts improved after a semester of instruction, the post-instruction results still
showed difficulties with paraphrasing and close copying of source texts. Unlike Hsu (2003), Storch (2009) suggested that one semester is not enough time to see improvement in source use strategies, but the author does suggest that a longer period of time could see improvement in student writing abilities.

2.2.6 Integrated tasks literature.

Synthesizing, or the ability to integrate texts and ideas from multiple sources, has also been explored in empirical studies within the applied linguistics literature (see for example, Leki and Carson, 1994). In particular, this skill is explored in research concerning NESB student source use which focuses on integrated writing tasks investigating how students use sources in written tests such as the TOEFL (Cumming, Kantor, Baba, Erdosy, Eouanzoui, James, 2005; Plakans & Gebril, 2012), and the Georgia State Test of English Proficiency (GSTEP, Weigle & Parker, 2012). For example, Weigle and Parker (2012) conducted a comparative study of undergraduate and graduate student source use across varying levels of proficiency in the GSTEP. Using Shi’s (2004) textual borrowing taxonomy, the researchers found little evidence of textual borrowing across any of the groups, and little difference between the under and postgraduate students, or across different proficiency levels.

Plakans and Gebril (2013) examined the ways in which students integrate sources in the written section of the TOEFL. Unlike Weigle and Parker (2012), they found a relationship between effective source use and test score, with the higher scoring students engaging in less direct copying than the lower scoring students who were less effective in integrating the sources into their texts. Although the integrated tasks literature sheds valuable light on student use of sources in writing assessment, particularly as it relates to the question of proficiency, writing produced under timed conditions may not reflect the ways in which students use sources under naturalistic conditions. Because plagiarism affects students’ writing in varied educational contexts and across a wide range of task types the integrated tasks literature is of limited applicability to this thesis.

Although these studies into the textual borrowing practices of NESB writers employ different methods and participants from different cultures, proficiency levels, and levels of expertise, what links them is the perspective that inappropriate textual borrowing can result from neither intent to deceive nor cultural interference, but is an outcome of a common and possibly necessary stage in the development of a novice or less experienced writer. Chandrasoma et al. (2004) suggested the possibility that this developmental phase is similar to interlanguage – just as a learner’s process of language acquisition will go through various phases, so too does their ability use sources. What is important, they argued, is not to see such
patchwriting or textual borrowing as transgressing institutional norms, but “in its own terms as part of a developing system” (Chandrasoma et al., 2004, p. 189).

2.2.7 Limitations of the developmental perspective.

The above research undoubtedly contributes a great deal to understandings of the ways in which NESB students use sources in their writing, and provides useful pedagogical suggestions for the improvement of student textual borrowing practices. However, one methodological issue with the literature on textual borrowing which conducts quantitative analyses of textual borrowing strategies across variables such as task type, proficiency level, or cultural background is that such studies may obscure how individuals perceive and practice textual borrowing and source use. T. Hyland (2009), who compared ESB and NESB textual borrowing practices in a timed writing assessment, suggests that “individual students...bring a wide range of abilities to their reading and writing of academic texts” (p. 70), regardless of their linguistic, cultural, or educational backgrounds. Larsen-Freeman (2006) suggested that the tendency of research in second language acquisition and applied linguistics to make statistical comparisons between groups of learners may obscure important differences that exist between individuals and within individual performance and make language development appear as “a process of increasing conformity to a target language” (p. 590). She noted that, “when group data are disaggregated, it is clear that there are many paths to development” (p. 590). Perhaps what is needed is less focus on the differences or similarities between different groups of learners in ways they appropriate texts (ESB/NESB, proficiency levels, task types) and more of a focus on the “individual learner trajectories” (Larsen-Freeman, 2006, p. 590) to uncover the diverse ways in which learners use texts in their academic writing.

Moreover, some scholars have suggested that there are limitations to approaches that views skills such as citation and documentation as proficiencies that can be developed in the student writer through instruction and practice. Canagarajah (2002b), for example, noted that while research which focuses on the development of academic literacy contains many insights, it nevertheless can convey a potentially normative attitude in which students that do not conform to the academic community are seen as deficient or problematic. Baurain (2011) argued that attempts to acculturate students into new academic communities with a different set of assumptions and conventions regarding academic writing, construction of knowledge, and source use can become a “way to pour students into a mould and to monitor and control their work” (p. 126) which, although benign on the surface, is not too far removed from the perspectives which characterise moral and punitive approaches to plagiarism and textual borrowing.
Other researchers question the validity of approaches which attempt to initiate students into a community when the principles that underlie that community may be, in fact, opaque, even to expert writers and researchers (Canagarajah, 2002b; Duff, 2010; East 2010; K. Hyland, 1999, 2005; Pennycook, 1994, 1996; Scollon 1994, 1995; Spack, 1997; Zamel, 1993). Zamel (1993), for example, suggests that rather than viewing the academy as one community, we need to view each discipline as a distinct cultural community with its own norms and conventions. She argued that generic descriptions of norms, such as citation and acknowledgment as they are taught in EAP classes, may not recognise the specificity of the conventions in the individual disciplines. She suggested that “the tendency to categorize academic discourse of particular communities can lead to theoretical frameworks and instructional models that oversimplify our understanding of academic work and reduce it to a fixed idea that does not represent reality” (Zamel, 1993, p. 21). Duff (2010) also stated that rather than being a fixed entity, academic discourse is “a site of internal and interpersonal struggle” in which “language codes, cultures and ideologies of literacy may differ” (p. 170).

Chandrasoma et al. (2004) likewise stressed the importance of recognising the significance of disciplinarity in text construction and source-use conventions. Defining disciplinary knowledge as “the repertoire of knowledge by which a particular discipline is characterized and represented” (Chandrasoma et al., 2004, p.190), they suggest that within each discipline there is a wide variety of perceptions and practices which can make the initiation of students into discursive conventions difficult and confusing.

Russell (1995) noted that even when different disciplines use the same discourse features, they assign different functions to these features depending on the norms and conventions of that discourse, and he suggested that there are important differences in the ways in which different disciplinary discourses appropriate textual features. Russell (1995) wrote about general composition courses taught in English departments across North America, but his argument that such courses are based on the twin myths of “autonomous literacy” and “universal educated discourse” (p. 65) which decontextualise academic writing may equally be made about the discourse of EAP.

Several empirical studies into textual borrowing in L2 academic writing have focussed upon disciplinary differences in NESB student textual borrowing practices (Chandrasegaran 2000; Flowerdew & Li, 2007a; Hu & Lei, 2012; Pecorari, 2006; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2005; Shi, 2012; Sun, 2009). For example, in a large-scale study of 715 Japanese university students, Rinnert and Kobayashi (2005) examined questionnaire and interview data to ascertain if there are disciplinary differences in Japanese students’ recognition of and attitudes towards different types of textual borrowing. They found that, while the participants overall
lacked knowledge of plagiarism, the students with a humanities or social sciences background demonstrated a greater ability to recognise plagiarism and held stronger opinions as to the unacceptability of plagiarism than students from a science background.

Similarly, Sun (2009) found that Taiwanese postgraduate students’ knowledge of paraphrasing strategies varied along disciplinary lines. Participants from a humanities background (specifically English language instruction) were more able to recognise inappropriate paraphrases than those from a management or science background. Shi (2012) also examined students’ abilities to recognise inappropriate paraphrasing and their judgements about when it is necessary to cite sources. She found that students (and faculty) from a science background were less concerned with whether words were appropriately paraphrased and more concerned with content and ideas. Likewise, Pecorari (2006) identified significant differences in the ways in which humanities and social sciences students and those from the “hard” sciences used source texts, with the latter engaging in more unacknowledged textual borrowing.

However, research which is concerned with students’ acculturation into academic disciplines (as discussed in section 2.2 on developmental approaches to plagiarism and textual borrowing), and that supports pedagogical approaches that teach students how to talk, write, and think within those discourses may not recognise the discipline-specific nature of textual practices. Like Spack (1997) and Zamel (1993), Lea & Street (2006) warn against models of academic writing that presume the stability of disciplinary discourse, and argue that students cannot be expected to “reproduce it unproblematically” (Lea & Street, 2006, p. 369).

Thus, it seems as if one the criticisms of the cultural conditioning hypothesis (Liu, 2005) can also be applied to an academic literacy model, as the tendency to view culture as “discrete, discontinuous and predictable” (p. 343) can also be present in representations of academic culture, which may result in failure to recognise the heterogeneous nature of academic discourse (Zamel, 1997). This homogenising effect and its influence on student textual borrowing practices was explored by Paxton (2007) who found that “the monologic nature” of economics textbooks gave students in the study a misleading view of the nature of discourse within the discipline and that the resulting “impression of consensus” (Paxton, 2007, p. 109) conveyed in the textbooks may lead to rote learning and plagiarism.

Similarly, K. Hyland (1999, 2000), who examined disciplinary differences in citation practices, argued that citation varies enormously across disciplinary boundaries. Like Russell (1995), he is critical of the assumption that “academic writing is a limited textual practice, a set of steps which, if executed correctly, produces successful textual genres” (K. Hyland, 2000, p. 114). He suggested that this is an implicit assumption underlying EAP courses taught
at university level, but argues that “academic literacy is unlikely to be achieved through an orientation to some general set of trans-disciplinary academic conventions and practices” (K. Hyland, 2000, p. 145) such as paraphrase and citation. East (2010) also stressed the need to approach the issues surrounding student textual borrowing critically, arguing for an approach that recognises that implicit rules and conventions that are upheld within the academy may be unclear or even invisible to NESB students from other educational and cultural contexts.

This research then, suggests that rather than patchwriting being a benign and possibly inevitable step towards students’ development as writers within academic discourse, this very perspective may in fact position students as outsiders writing without a sense of authority. [The issue of voice, identity and plagiarism is further considered in the following section, 2.4]. Thus, if the studies into NESB student textual borrowing are informed by a model of academic writing that does not fully acknowledge the complexities involved in disciplinary conventions, citation, and authorship as the above literature suggests, we must look models in which these complexities are addressed. Such a framework may be found in the literature on identity and writing and is discussed in the following section.

2.3 Authorship and Intertextuality in NESB writing.

While the previous sections have examined NESB student plagiarism within the contexts of contrastive rhetoric and academic literacy approaches, this section considers a different perspective on the issue of textual borrowing that investigates the role of authorship, identity, and voice in student writing and its relationship to unintentional plagiarism. Specifically, this literature examines the ways in which students position themselves as authors within their texts and how they relate to authorial voices in source material. This research suggests that unintentional plagiarism may occur when the students are either unable to establish a strong authorial voice within their writing, are unable to suitably distinguish their own voices from those in the sources they are using, and suggests that plagiarism as a concept is not robust enough to deal with the complex notions of authorship, originality, and identity that are central issues in writing and text construction. The research in this section draws partly on poststructuralist approaches and the work of theorists such as Foucault (1979), Kristeva (1986), Barthes (1977), and Bakhtin (1981).

As noted by Bloch (2012), the concept of authorship is central to any discussion of plagiarism, and the relationship of plagiarism to questions of authorship and voice has been recognised by researchers such as Howard (1996, 1999), Scollon (1994, 1995) and Pennycook (1994, 1996, 2001) in their critiques of the cultural conditioning hypothesis, and by Liu
(2005) and Abasi and Akbari (2008) in response to the developmental model. For Pennycook and Scollon, the questions surrounding plagiarism and NESB students cannot be answered solely through the lens of the cultural conditioning hypothesis or explained as a developmental issue, rather, they challenge the very foundations upon which the concept of plagiarism is constructed.

Pennycook (1994, 1996) and Scollon (1995) argued that the concept of authorship, which underlies any notion of plagiarism, is historically and culturally contingent. Scollon (1995), for example, argued that contemporary conceptions of plagiarism are based on particularly Western notions of individuality, knowledge, and authorship. He suggests that such a concept of plagiarism “presupposes a common ideological ground in the creative, original individual who…presents his/her own work to the public in his/her own name” (p. 1). Scollon argues that while plagiarism assumes a transparent relationship between the writer and the factual material presented, this relationship is in fact a problematic one. He suggests that one of the causes of plagiarism in NESB writing may not be a misunderstanding of the referencing conventions, but conflicting notions of “authorial presence” (Scollon 1994, p. 41).

Pennycook (1996) and Howard (1999) reviewed the ways in which modern ideas of authorship have grown out of Enlightenment understandings of individualism that place the author “as creative guarantor of meaning and originality” (Pennycook, 1996, p. 209). Howard (1999) suggested that during the medieval period, tradition and knowledge were elevated over individual authorship. This view, she wrote, contrasted with that of the eighteenth century in which understandings of individualism, emerging out of the work of Enlightenment thinkers such as Descartes and Locke, coincided with the development of printing when “writers for the first time had the possibility of making an independent living from their writing” (Howard, 1999, p. 70). Similarly, Pennycook (1996) suggested that the eighteenth century saw a rupture between the previously held belief in authorship as mimesis, and the new “productive paradigm of the modern” (p. 205) in which individuals came to be seen as capable of producing (and owning) thought and text.

Research into the theory of authorship has been informed by the work of post-structuralist theorists such as Foucault (1979) and Roland Barthes (1977) who both point to the Enlightenment as the key juncture in the emergence of the modern idea of the author. In his seminal essay “What is an Author?” (1979), Foucault suggested that in seventeenth or eighteenth centuries, literary discourse, which had heretofore been accepted for its own sake without the need for an individual author or creator, “came to be accepted only when endowed with the author function” (p. 149).
Of course, historically, ideas of authorship were not uniform and Foucault (1979) noted that the concept of the author is always inextricably linked with the discourse, and in the medieval period, for example, scientific works were considered authentic and valid only when marked with the name of a celebrated author (such as Pliny or Hippocrates). Indeed Howard (1995) noted that theories of authorship have always been both heterogeneous and contradictory, and as such “render impossible any sort of unitary representation” (p. 793).

Accordingly, it follows that modern understandings of the author as the sole originator of meaning and owner of a text have also been challenged, most notably perhaps, in the area of poststructuralist criticism. Barthes (1977), in his essay, “The Death of the Author”, argued that a text is:

not a line of words releasing a single ‘theological meaning’…but a multidimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash. The text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the immeasurable centres of culture. (p. 146)

This quality of the text as derived from multiple sources and rendering multiple meanings was termed intertextuality by Julia Kristeva (1986). While originally used to describe literature, the concept of intertextuality has become widely influential and Bloome and Egan-Robertson (1993) identified a wide variety of scholarship outside the field of literary studies that use intertextuality as a key analytical concept, including the areas of reading and writing research. As Bazerman (2004a), a key figure in the field of composition studies, notes:

Almost every word and phrase we use we have heard or seen before. Our originality and craft as writers comes from how we put those words together in new ways to fit our specific situation, needs, and purposes, but we always need to rely on the common stock of language we share with others. If we did not share the language, how would others understand us? (p. 83)

2.3.1 Authorship in L2 writing.

Thus we can see modern theories of authorship challenged by the postmodern, in the way that contrasting interpretations of authorship have always challenged each other (Angèil-Carter, 2000; Bloch, 2012; Howard, 1999; Pennycook, 1996; Scollon, 1994, 1995). Yet within the academy, such recognition of complexity has not been readily extended to discussions of student composition or plagiarism. In this sense, what Howard (1999) terms “academic textual values” (p. 15) are in competition with postmodern understandings of authorship and text. While, as shown in the previous section, academic discourse and its
conventions surrounding knowledge, source use, and textual integration are far from homogenous (K. Hyland 1999, 2000; Lee & Street 2006; Spack 1997; Zamel 1993), Howard (1999) argues that the academy tends to share a set of assumptions in which the academic author is characterised as autonomous, original, proprietorial, and moral. These “facts” of authorship, she argues, are considered “normal, natural and uncontestable” (Howard, 1999, p. 58) by the academy, even though in other areas they have become outmoded.

Student composition and the question of plagiarism, one could argue, stand at the intersection of competing sets of textual values, and in NESB student writing in particular, features which silently define other texts are made visible. Various aspects of NESB student authorship and identity have been explored in the L2 writing literature. The methods used include citation analysis (Borg, 2000), ethnography of communication (Ouellette, 2004, 2008), naturalistic case study (Abasi et al., 2006; Abasi & Akbari, 2008), interviews and text analysis (Paxton, 2007; Pecorari & Shaw, 2012; Thompson, 2005, 2011; Thompson & Pennycook, 2008). Thompson (2011), for example, used the work of Bakhtin (1981) and Kristeva (1986) to examine intertextuality in student academic writing, while Pecorari and Shaw (2012) showed that faculty perceptions of intertextuality in student writing remain conflicting and lacking in consensus. McGowan (2008) commented that the often-cited admonition for students to “use their own words” to avoid plagiarism can be counterproductive, given that “words are a social construct shared by the cultural community that devised them” (p. 4).

Pennycook (1996) too reminds us that the concept of originality, which underlies contemporary conceptions of authorship and composition, is itself a historically contingent one, recognition of which “raises profound questions about plagiarism” (p. 211). He suggested that there is significant tension between the stress within academic discourse on originality, and the unacknowledged textual borrowing which the discourse of plagiarism condemns (Pennycook, 1996).

Empirical studies into NESB plagiarism and textual borrowing have identified such tensions. Spack (1997), for example, observed conflicts between the need to acknowledge source texts and the need to be original in her case study of the acquisition of academic literacy by a Japanese undergraduate student. She argued that it is problematic to ask students to “fulfil the seemingly conflicting goals of borrowing ideas and being original” (Spack, 1997, p. 36).

The consequences for students being caught between the differing expectations of the academy regarding authorship and originality can be significant, and a number of researchers have explored the ways in which NESB students can be relegated to the periphery of their
educational contexts due to perceived differences in the way they construct textual knowledge (e.g., Abasi & Akbari, 2008; Canagarajah, 2002b; Leask, 2006; Pennycook, 1994, 2001; Saltmarsh, 2005). Canagarajah (2002b) argued that the complexities of academic writing are not only confusing to NESB students, but that they can be perceived as “hegemonical and repressive” (p. 33) by multilingual writers, representing a significant power differential between the Western academic discourse and the “knowledge traditions” (p. 33) of their own cultures.

Similarly, Leask (2006) outlined the ways in which discourses on plagiarism construct NESB students as “culturally inferior others who must be taught how to learn other by rote and imitation, whose learning styles impede critical thinking, and who are likely to result in inadvertent plagiarism” (p. 185) Abasi and Akbari (2008) suggested that such positioning of NESB students as on the outsides of academic discourse denies students the authority to legitimately assume the voice of an author, thereby perhaps causing inadvertent textual borrowing in student writing. They remarked that there is a conflict between institutional expectations for students to create a strong authorial voice in their texts and their positioning by the academy as novices. They argued that “while faculty would state that they desire their students to write professionally…some of their pedagogical practices send the opposite message, signalling to the students that they were not authorized to do so” (Abasi & Akbari, 2008, p. 9). Abasi and Akbari suggest that the degree of control faculty have over student work, including assigning topics, stipulating the sources to be used, and the ways in which to use them causes students to be interested in “satisfying the professors’ requirements rather than creating new meanings and practicing writing with authority” (Abasi & Akbari, 2008, p. 9).

2.3.2 Common knowledge and textual borrowing.

An added layer of complication concerning authorship and knowledge construction via citation arises when considering what sources are not necessary to cite. As noted by researchers such Bloch, (2012) Price, (2002), Scollon, (1994), Angélil-Carter, (2000), and England, (2008) the area of common knowledge is often given as one type of knowledge which does not need to be referenced in academic writing. For example, Price (2002) demonstrates in her analysis of university institutional plagiarism policies that anything which “would pass for common knowledge, or ‘fact’” is stated as unnecessary to cite. The Dishonest Practice Policy at the university where this study was conducted contains a similar statement, advising students that: “Common knowledge, such as some facts, folklore, common sense...
observations and shared information within your field of study or cultural group does not need to be referenced” (“Dishonest Practice Information for Students”, n.d.).

Similarly, England (2008) demonstrated the ways in which composition handbooks frame common knowledge as one area of knowledge which students are not required to cite in their academic writing. She noted that common knowledge is often defined either in reference to its form (whether or not it is an established fact) or in reference to its availability (how many places the student has seen this piece of information). Such an explanation can be found in Hacker’s (2008) *Rules for Writers*, which suggests that “As a rule, if you have seen certain information repeatedly in your reading, you don’t need to cite it” (p. 480), while Troyka (1993) indicated that “Common knowledge is information most educated people know” (p. 556).

While such material presents the idea of common knowledge to students as a relatively straightforward aspect of source use which is standard across the academy (Pecorari, 2008), like other aspects of academic writing the knowledge of what to cite and what not to cite is highly situated and dependent on disciplinary, institutional, and cultural contexts which may not be apparent to novice writers who are not familiar with the characteristics of discourse in their fields (Bloch, 2012; Prior, 1998; Scollon, 1994). Bazerman (1985) made this point in his composition handbook *The informed writer: Using sources in the disciplines*, in which he noted that what is considered common knowledge is largely audience dependent. He also discussed what he terms “deep sources” as “those ideas and information you came across long before you began work on the essay in question” (p. 357). His advice to students is that, although such deep sources may influence a writer’s current position on or interpretation of an issue, it is generally only necessary for a writer to cite the sources used for the “current project” only (p. 357).

Empirical studies have demonstrated that the issue of common knowledge and citation requirements is a concern of many student writers as they compose their assignments (Chandrasoma et al., 2004; Flowerdew & Li, 2007a; Shi, 2010, 2011). Shi (2010) and Flowerdew and Li (2007), for example, both found that one of the frequently given reasons for not citing source material was that the students concerned considered the material to be common knowledge. However, Shi’s (2011) large scale study of faculty and student assumptions about citation found that both faculty and students held highly individualised ideas about what material was necessary to cite and what material was not. She found that there were no significant differences in the way the different groups (faculty/non faculty, graduate/undergraduate, and disciplinary and language background) judged the material. Shi (2011) pointed out the difficulty students face in making judgments about citation in writing -
students need to be aware that their idea of common knowledge and that of their instructors may differ, but “there is no point of shared judgment among instructors” (p. 329).

The lack of agreement on what constitutes common knowledge in Shi’s study would appear to be confirmation of the arguments made earlier, that definitions of common knowledge are unable to contain the “nebulous and blurred boundaries between acknowledged and unacknowledged sources and the nature of intertextuality in student writing” (Chandrasoma et al., 2004, p. 181).

2.3.3 Plagiarism and the Internet.

The ways in which notions of common knowledge intersect with the concepts of authorship and originality come to the fore in discussions about the ways in which digital technologies and the Internet have shaped student academic writing, especially in terms of unacknowledged textual borrowing and plagiarism. Some studies have suggested that source material found on websites such as Wikipedia that have no clear author may be appropriated by students who consider such information common knowledge (Bloch, 2012; Chandrasoma et al., 2004). England (2008) also discussed the ways in which the availability of information on the Internet problematises the issue of common knowledge in student writing. As mentioned earlier, England (2008) noted that common knowledge is sometimes defined in terms of its availability. However, when the same information is available on multiple websites across the world, the suggestion that it is unnecessary to cite information that has been seen repeatedly in student readings (Hacker, 2008, p. 480) may lose some of its usefulness. While a large body of literature examines the role of the Internet in L2 student writing and textual borrowing (e.g., Belcher, 2001; Bloch, 2001, 2012; Chen & Ku, 2008; Flowerdew & Li, 2007b; Howard, 2007; Introna & Hayes, 2008; Sutherland-Smith, 2005, 2008; Stapleton, 2005; Thompson, Morton & Storch, 2013), it is beyond the scope of this thesis to consider all aspects of this complex issue in detail. However, key to the research questions in this thesis is the observation made in the literature that because of the relative ease of availability of information from the Internet, and the ambiguities surrounding the authorship of some material, students may consider Internet material as less constrained by conventions of acknowledgment and attribution. One empirical study by Sutherland-Smith (2005) found that a number of students reported not citing Internet information as they considered the Internet as a “free zone”, containing common knowledge that was “available to everyone” (p. 23). Similarly, Bloch (2001) asked, “Can the traditional concept of authorship be maintained in a medium where one text can be easily linked to an infinite number of other texts?” (p. 223).
2.3.4 Voice and identity in student writing.

Another area of L2 writing in which the traditional concepts of authorship have been challenged is research into student authorial identity and voice. According to Atkinson (2001) the concept of voice is “exceedingly complex” (p. 109). However, as it is a central term in a discussion of textual borrowing and NESB composition, this section attempts to outline the key points. First appearing in the work of the Russian theorist Bakhtin (Wertsch, 1991), Ivanič and Camps (2001) suggested that the term voice has been used in applied linguistics and composition literature in two ways – firstly, it is used to “refer to expressions of a writer’s own views, authoritativeness, and authorial presence” (p. 7). In this definition, the term voice is equated with “having something to say” (Ivanič & Camps 2001, p. 7). In contrast to this, voice can also be used to convey textual self-representation – Ivanič and Camps argue that writers convey a sense of themselves, either consciously or unconsciously, through the choices they make in their writing (lexical, syntactic, semantic, and so on). For Matsuda (2001), voice is “the quality that makes impersonation or ‘mimicking’ possible” (p. 40). A related concept is that of stance, which is defined by K. Hyland (2005) as “a textual ‘voice’ or a community recognized personality...It is the ways that writers intrude to stamp their personal authority on their arguments or step back and disguise their involvement” (p. 176).

Ivanič and Camps (2001) stress, however, that the concepts of voice and stance are themselves cultural constructs, and the degree to which a text expresses an opinion differs depending on the context in which it is created. The view that the expression of one’s voice as argument or opinion in the text is culturally determined is echoed by researchers such as Atkinson (2001), Matsuda (2001), Stapleton (2002), and Helms-Park and Stapleton (2003) who suggest that arguments which stress the importance of a stance or clear point of view in academic writing are underwritten by the assumption that a strong authorial voice is equated with effective writing. In academic writing, voice as the expression of a point of view is constructed through specific discourse features, such as particular lexical and syntactic choices (Ivanič & Camps, 2001), but more importantly for this discussion, through citations of source material and the stance that is taken towards that material.

If voice is defined as self-expression within a text, it is clear that it is an issue closely related to the concept of authorship, and also to the practice of textual borrowing (Stapleton, 2002). As was discussed earlier in section 2.1 on the ways in which culture may affect textual borrowing, various researchers have suggested that differing conceptions of authorship across cultures may contribute to student plagiarism (Deckert, 1993; Dryden, 1999; Evans & Youmans, 2000; Lackie & D’Angelo-Long, 2004; Sherman, 1992). It was noted that critics of
this viewpoint out the ease with which such discussions can fall prey to cultural stereotyping. Yet it is also true that the question of what is an author is central to a discussion of plagiarism.

Researchers investigating L2 student writing and source use have considered the ways in which student perceptions of authorship and voice have an impact on the composition process and several empirical studies have examined the ways in which L2 writers construct voice or establish a point of view through examining discourse features such as citation and attribution (Borg, 2000; Petrić, 2012; Petrić & Harwood, 2013). For example, Borg (2000) investigated the ways in which ESB and NESB postgraduate students used sources in their written assignments by analysing the form and the function of their citations. He found that NESB students used both fewer citations and more extended direct quotations (a quotation of more than forty words). Borg’s research is similar to that of Campbell (1995), Hsu (2003), T. Hyland (2009), Keck (2006, 2007), and Shi (2004), which also coded the type and form of citations in NESB compositions. As mentioned in section 2.2, such analyses ascribe the difficulties NESB students have with citation conventions in English to their stage of academic literacy. Borg (2000), however, suggests a different reason behind such difficulties. He argues that rather than being a problem with formatting or the technical aspect of citations, the NESB students in his study found establishing a stance towards their source material problematic. In particular, the NESBs in his study had difficulty dealing with information quoted within the text from a secondary source. Using Scollon’s (1994) concept of lamination that refers to the ways in which authorial voice is created within a text, Borg suggests that the NESB students were unable to commit themselves fully to their argument.

While Borg (2000) focussed largely on citations and the ways in which they act to construct authorial presence in texts, other studies have analysed voice in student writing using a Bakhtinian framework (Abasi et al., 2006, Abasi & Akbari, 2008; Ouellette, 2004, 2008; Soo, 2008; Thompson, 2005). Abasi et al. (2006), for example, conducted a naturalistic case study to elicit data about graduate student awareness of the identities they construct through their academic writing. They found significant differences between more and less experienced academic writers, with the more experienced writers overtly attempting to portray themselves as “intertextually knowledgable” (Abasi et al., 2006, p. 108) through the use of layers of citation and referencing. These writers were able to strongly convey their authoritative voices. In contrast, the less experienced writers did not conceive of themselves as authors of their texts, nor were they self-reflexive about their own roles in text construction. Indeed Abasi et al. (2006) suggest that these students “considered the act of writing as an isolated mental activity divorced from the social context of writing” (2006, p. 106). Abasi et al. (2006) contended that the inappropriate textual borrowing observed in their
study was due to both the students’ perceptions of themselves as writers, or lack thereof, and of their understandings about their source texts as authoritative. They suggested that these students view the source texts as authoritative, and hence, incontestable (Bakhtin, 1981). Authoritative language, Bakhtin (1981) contended, “demands we acknowledge it…permits no play with the context framing it…[and] is indissolubly fused with its authority” (p. 342). Consequently, these students were unable to “enter into a dialogic interaction with the source texts to generate new meanings” (Abasi et al., 2006, p. 112).

Borg (2000) and Thompson (2005) also suggested that inadvertent student plagiarism can result from students’ perceptions of themselves as authors who are unable to take an effective stance toward their source material. Thompson (2005) commented that the tensions between the expectation of instructors of students to develop authorial presence in their texts, but at the same time strictly follow academic conventions for referencing and source use, creates instability and contradiction within students’ authorial identities.

Thus, this thread of research suggests that inadvertent plagiarism or inappropriate textual borrowing may occur when students do not have a strong sense of authorial identity or presence, or perceive the authority of the source text to be incontestable. This research is based on theoretical approaches to voice, identity and intertextuality, and postmodern approaches that problematise the concept of knowledge and authorship in textual construction.

However, not all research in the area of voice and identity points to the identities of NESB student writers as inherently problematic or deficient. Ouellette (2004, 2008), for example, conducted an ethnographic study of an NESB undergraduate composition class to form a broad picture of the ways in which the cultural and social context of writing affects student writing. He suggested that research into the cultural contexts of plagiarism has a propensity to “ensnare itself…in concerns or struggles over the western ideology underlying plagiarism” (Ouellette, 2004, p. 46). Interestingly, Ouellette found that the students in his study were active participants in the construction of their texts and of their authorial presence within those texts. Ouellette examined the dialogic nature of student discourse, focusing not only on text construction but also on talk and the construction of meaning in the composition classroom, between students, and between students and instructors. In doing so, Ouellette drew on the work of Bakhtin and his concept of heteroglossia, which he explained in the following way: “an instance of language is populated with the multiple voices of others. It is from these multiple voices that the individual voice maps itself out with respect to other voices, thereby appropriating language for its own use” (Ouellette, 2004, pp. 30-31).
As mentioned in section 2.3.1, one critique of research into voice is that an individualised voice tends to be uncritically equated with effective writing. Stapleton (2002) argued that research into student voice can be in danger of falling into a Kaplan-esque (1966) dichotomisation that equates a strong authorial voice with quality academic writing, and poor academic writing with a lack of authorial voice and identity. The findings of Helms-Park and Stapleton (2003) supported this view. In a study of NESB student voice, which utilised a Voice Intensity Rating Scale, they found no significant correlation between the intensity of the voice used in the essays, and the overall quality of the writing.

Canagarajah (2002a) also warned against the tendency to assume that the notion of competing discourses and voices within texts and disciplines is foreign to NESB students. He suggested that as post-colonial subjects, NESB students are in fact subject to “multiple, hybrid and overlapping” (Canagarajah, 2002a, p. 121) discourses. He posits that instruction which aims to familiarise NESB students with mechanical academic discourse features in English should be set aside in recognition of the fact that NESB students “may negotiate…discursive conflicts on their own terms, generating creative textual alternatives to write with integrity and relevance” (Canagarajah, 2002a, p. 121). Ivanič (1998) also notes that students are not passive recipients of discourse but rather actively participate in the construction of discourse through their textual choices.

There can be little doubt then, that the concepts of authorial voice and presence and plagiarism remain inextricably linked. The process of writing is one in which the student writer must learn to intertwine his or her voice, whether overtly, as required, for example, by the genre of the argumentative essay, or in a more subtle form, with those of their source texts, which are themselves a patchwork of voices and multiple points of view (Borg, 2000, Groom, 2000). The polyphonic nature of writing is, as we have seen, theorised in the work of critics such as Kristeva (1986), Barthes (1977) and Bakhtin (1981), and demonstrated empirically in academic writing citation studies, yet the question remains as to the ultimate pedagogical usefulness of this approach. While texts may be the result of an interplay of voices and the site of contestation of authority and knowledge, the fact remains that NESB student writers in the academy are judged (either rightly or wrongly) on the strength of their writing and their ability to follow specific academic conventions of source use integration, citation, and acknowledgement. Moreover, my separation of the literature into that which focuses on the development of source use within the context of academic literacy, and that which focuses on issues of voice, intertextuality and authorship is perhaps an artificial one. As Oullette (2008) argued, the ability of students to create a stance and an effective authorial
voice, and to situate themselves within the intersection of intertextual voices within their compositions, may be a crucial aspect of development in itself. He suggested, cases of identity negotiation and inappropriate textual borrowing might be discussed in developmental terms that recognize essential learning patterns and open up possibilities for NNES writers to make active choices in the construction of academic discourse. (Oullette, 2008, p. 269)

Thus, what is needed is perhaps an approach that brings together the different threads of plagiarism research, and does not create artificial dichotomies between the various potential influences on student textual borrowing. As noted earlier, Hu and Lei (2012) suggested that an integrated viewpoint is crucial to a nuanced understanding of student beliefs and practices about source use and plagiarism, and the relationship between them. The next and final section of the Literature Review considers sociocultural theory as a theoretical framework that may bring such an integrated approach to the question of NESB student textual borrowing.

2.4 Sociocultural Theory, L2 Writing and Plagiarism

It is clear from the above review of recent perspectives on student plagiarism, that the issue is complex, involving not only the mechanics and skills involved in source use itself, such as quotation, paraphrase and summary, but also encompassing wider questions of how pedagogy, culture, knowledge, power, and subjectivity interact and impact on the composition process. One theoretical framework that may allow these disparate threads to be drawn together and address the research questions of the thesis is sociocultural theory. This section addresses sociocultural theory by examining key aspects of the work of Lev Vygotsky and its place in second language acquisition and applied linguistics research. It then examines the framework of activity theory through the ideas of Engeström and suggests why activity theory may be a fruitful approach through which to examine the issue of student plagiarism in second language academic writing.

Sociocultural theory developed primarily out of the writings of researchers and psychologists working in the Soviet Union in the first half of the twentieth century, or what has been termed the “Russian school” of cultural historical psychology (Engeström & Miettinen, 1999; Wertsch, 1998). Vygotsky and his contemporaries aimed to understand human cognition and the ways in which the mind is fundamentally shaped by the social, cultural, and historical contexts in which it develops. In attempting this, they were reacting
against the dominant paradigm of psychological thought that created stark dichotomies between the individual and society, between subjects and objects, and between the mind and the body (Stetsenko, 2005).

Within the field of sociocultural theory (SCT) various terminology has been associated with Vygotsky’s theories. Lantolf & Beckett (2009) note that the term “sociocultural” was not one that was commonly employed by Vygotsky, who instead discussed his ideas using the terms “cultural psychology” or “cultural-historical psychology”. The American researcher and theorist James Wertsch, who is sometimes credited with introducing the term sociocultural theory into common usage (Lantolf & Beckett, 2009; Thorne & Tasker, 2011) said that he preferred the term “sociocultural” because the goal of the theory was to “understand how mental action was situated in cultural, historical and institutional settings” (Wertsch, 1991, p. 16). Although the term sociocultural omits the historical element, Wertsch (1991) felt that “failing to incorporate the cultural into the title risks an even greater error, that of reducing cultural differences to historical differences” (p. 16)

Wertsch (1991) suggested that there are several main, interrelated ideas that were fundamental to Vygotsky’s sociocultural theories and that continue to inform research in SCT today. The first of these is Vygotsky’s idea that the development of higher mental functions such as logical thought, voluntary attention, and certain types of memory arose as a direct result of an individuals’ interaction with not only the people but also the objects surrounding him or her. He stated, “Every function in a child’s cultural development appears first, on the social level, and later, on the individual level; first between people (interpsychological) and then inside the child” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 57). Thus for Vygotsky, the development of particularly human forms of thinking (Wertsch, 1991, 1995) arise out of a child’s interaction with the world and the people, material and symbolic objects which populate it. For Vygotsky, the external environment did not simply influence ways of human cognition, it created human cognition, or as Pavlenko and Lantolf (2004) put it, “the social environment is not the context in which the mind is formed, but the very source out of which specifically human minds develop” (p. 164)

A second theme identified by Wertsch (1991) as being key to understanding Vygotsky’s thought is that of mediation. According to this idea, humans do not experience the world directly but rather through culturally constructed artefacts that can be physical, such as tools and everyday objects or symbolic systems of signs, such as writing and number systems, and language (Vygotsky 1978). It is through the use of these artefacts that humans are able to control and regulate their behaviours and environments. Not only does mediation through
culturally constructed artefacts enable humans to regulate or control behaviour, it also has the ability to transform forms of human cognition. Vygotsky (1978) describes the process of mediation using the following example:

Even such comparatively simple operations such as tying a knot or marking a stick as a reminder change the psychological structure of the memory process. They extend the operation of memory beyond the biological dimensions of the nervous system (p. 39).

It is important to note that according to SCT, the process of cultural mediation is an interactional or bidirectional one, which “simultaneously modifies both the environment and the subject” (Cole & Engeström, 1993. p. 9). Hence the ways in which the theory was an attempt to transcend the dichotomies between individual thought and outside context become apparent, as through mediation both are not only interrelated, but regulated and transformed.

In his research, Vygotsky focussed primarily on symbolic tools rather than physical ones and the foremost of these symbolic artefacts was language (Kozulin, 1986; Lantolf, 2000; Wertsch 1991). Vygotsky (1978) argued that, as with other forms of artefact mediation, the use of language enabled not only communication between individuals, but enabled individuals to regulate or control their own behaviour. He wrote:

The specifically human capacity for language enables children to provide for auxiliary tools in the solution to difficult tasks, to overcome impulsive action, to plan a solution or a problem prior to its execution and to master their own behaviour. (p. 28)

Vygotsky’s theories have provided a rich theoretical framework for researchers working in a number of fields, including second language acquisition (SLA) and applied linguistics. Sociocultural approaches to language learning within SLA have come to be wide-ranging and influential, and on their first appearance in the field, were in marked contrast with the then-dominant cognitive paradigm of language acquisition (Zeungler & Miller, 2006). Earlier theories of language learning in SLA largely focussed on language as “a self-contained system” (Young & Miller, 2004, p. 540), rather than the ways in which context influences language and learning. In contrast, sociocultural approaches to language and language learning, while still being concerned with the ways in which cognitive processes arise and develop, emphasise the rich and varied contexts in which these interactions take place (Zeungler & Miller, 2006) and the influence of social, cultural and historical relationships and artefacts on thought and learning (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).
It would be perhaps inaccurate to suggest that cognitive and sociocultural approaches are incompatible - indeed Watson–Gegeo (2004) suggested that recent research in the cognitive sciences parallels the sociocultural principle that “cognition originates in social interaction and is shaped by cultural and sociopolitical processes” (p. 331). Nevertheless, we could perhaps say that when SCT began to emerge in the field of SLA it represented a significant departure from the then-dominant cognitive paradigm (Young & Miller, 2004; Zeungler & Miller, 2006). In the subfield of L2 writing, where cognitive approaches have also been historically dominant, SCT has been influential in foregrounding the social, cultural and historical dimensions of the development of academic writing. According to Chandrasegaran (2008), “viewing writing as a social process does not deny that there are cognitive processes in reading and writing” but that these are seen as aspects of writing practice that are “inseparable from writing as a social and cultural activity” (p. 240).

Examples of SCT in second language writing research on source use and plagiarism can be seen in the work of Evans and Youmans (2000, 2002), who use Vygotsky’s (1978) notion of the Zone of Proximal Development to explore the ways in which learners construct knowledge of plagiarism through dialogue with peers. Evans and Youmans (2002) suggested that it is through interaction with peers and experts, that students working within their Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1978) can construct more complex understandings of plagiarism. In addition, research using concepts such as situated learning (Wenger, 1998), and legitimate peripheral participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991) has explored the ways in which participation in the social and cultural world shapes the development of learners’ knowledge about appropriate citation and source use practices (Dong, 1996; Mansourizadeh & Ahmad, 2011; Pecorari, 2006; Petrić, 2012). Pecorari (2006), for example, in her examination of graduate student writing found that although the texts had the “superficial appearance of appropriateness” (p. 26) there were many ‘occluded’ or not-visible aspects of source use, such as extensive unacknowledged verbatim quotations and unacknowledged secondary citation. She suggested that such practices result from the students’ position on the periphery of their discourse communities, participation in which is difficult because the textual features that they are attempting to learn are not visible themselves (Pecorari, 2006).

Abasi and Graves (2008) examined the role of university policies on plagiarism in the development of student authorial identity from a sociocultural perspective, finding that these policies simultaneously decontextualise source use while foregrounding the moral and punitive aspects of plagiarism discourse. Gu and Brookes (2011) conducted a case study of ten learners studying in the United Kingdom, investigating the ways in which their
perceptions of plagiarism were informed by tensions arising from “changes in their cognition, sense of identity, and sociocultural values” (p. 140).

2.4.1 Cultural-Historical Activity Theory.

Another branch of SCT that has become influential in applied linguistics, and is particularly applicable to L2 writing research is that of Cultural-Historical Activity Theory (CHAT). Described as a framework or approach to research (Engeström 2000, Kuutti & Engeström, 2006), activity theory developed out of the work of Vygotsky’s student A. N. Leont’ev, who, like Vygotsky, was interested in the processes of mediation via culturally constructed artefacts, but focussed less on the analysis of individual developmental processes and more on the ways in which collective practices developed within social, historical and cultural contexts (Stetsenko, 2005). Kozulin (1986) suggested that while Vygotsky examined meaningful activity and its role in the development of human cognition, it was Leont’ev who developed a concept of activity which foregrounded “practical (material) actions” (p. 264) in the analysis of activity. The transferral of the primary unit of analysis from the individual to the collective activity arose, in part, because of the insights made by SCT into the relationship between the individual and society. Because, as Vygotsky had shown, human cognition develops out of the interaction of the individual with the sociocultural context, an individual could no longer be studied in isolation from that context (Arievitch, 2008; Kuutti & Engeström, 2006), or as Stetsenko (2005) argued, human development became “conceptualized as originating from practical transformative involvements of people within the world, and as a process can only be understood by tracing its origination in these involvements and practices” (p. 74). Leont’ev (1978) wrote of the importance of contextualising individual actions within the framework of activity:

Under whatever kind of conditions and forms human activity takes place, whatever kind of structure it assumes, it must not be considered as isolated from the life of society. In all of its distinctness, the activity of the human individual represents a system included in the system of relationships of society. Outside these relationships human activity simply does not exist. (p. 50)

Leont’ev (1978) demonstrated the necessity of explaining human actions within their wider contexts through the illustration of the activity of a collective hunt, in which, although the individuals share the same motive, that of obtaining food, the actions of some of the individuals, particularly the beaters who drive the animals away from themselves (but towards
the hunters), appear contradictory unless seen in the context of the hunt activity in its entirety (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Leont’ev’s conception of activity had a tripartite structure - the highest level was the activity that is driven by the motive, the individual action with its associated goal, and the level of operation, or the “means, physical or mental through which an action is carried out” (Lantolf & Appel, 1994, p. 20). Lantolf and Appel (1994) clarified Leont’ev’s three levels of activity in this way: “The level of motive answers why something is done, the level of goals answers what is done, and the level of operations answers how it is done” (p. 21).

2.4.2 Engeström and Activity Systems.

Contemporary, or third generation, activity theory has grown out of Leont’ev’s concept of activity to focus on the ways in which different activity systems within society interact with each other (Engeström 1987, 1993, 1999, 2000, 2001). Like Leont’ev, Engeström (2000, 2001) posited that the prime unit of analysis in activity theory today is collective activity, and that individual actions can only be understood when seen examined within the context of the entire system. Secondly, he argued that due to the divisions of labour within a system, activity systems are the sites of “multiple points of view, traditions, and interests” (Engeström, 2000, p. 136). Another key feature of activity theory for Engeström involves the place of contradictions within an activity system, but he suggested that the tensions and contradictions that arise within a system, or when two activity systems come in contact with one another, can be a source of change and transformation. He wrote: “Activity systems are best viewed as complex formations in which equilibrium is an exception and tensions, disturbances and local innovations are the rules and engines of change” (Cole & Engeström, 1993, p. 9). Engeström (1999, 2000, 2001) adapted Vygotsky’s traditional mediational triangle, in which a subject’s experience of the world is mediated through culturally constructed artefacts, to represent an extended activity system. In the expanded model, a subject’s experience is mediated by a number of interrelated factors, including rules and conventions governing the activity system, the wider community in which the activity is taking place, the division of labour within that community, and the tools and the object towards which the activity is directed. Nardi (1996) noted that the object can be understood as the objective of the activity, being that which “motivates the activity, giving it specific direction” (p. 73). Havnes (2010) suggested that Engeström’s model “integrates Leont’ev’s focus on object-related activity and collective object driven motive with Vygotsky’s emphasis on material and psychological tools and the mediated act” (p. 495).
Activity theory has proven to be a fruitful framework for research in applied linguistics in general, and in L2 composition studies in particular, because it theorises the various contextual factors that influence a student’s academic writing. Prior (2001) examined the value of conceptualising writing as activity, suggesting that “usual representations of writing collapse time, isolate persons, and filter activity...Actually writing happens in moments richly equipped with tools (material and semiotic) and populated with others (past, present and future)” (p. 57). Bazerman (2004b) suggested that analysing writing through the framework of activity enables researchers to examine concept and knowledge formation, the ways in which learning opportunities are made available, and the role of instructors in structuring and supporting learning opportunities. Activity theory also enables an examination of the relationship between thought and practice. Negueruela-Azarola (2011), who analyses learner beliefs as conceptualising activity, focuses on this dialectical relationship, arguing, “It is not a question of collecting both data as evidence of belief and data as evidence of actions; but rather a question of conceptualizing beliefs and their contradictions as ideas that emerge in the very act of sense making” (p. 361).

Studies within applied linguistics have applied an activity-theoretical framework to examine various aspects of L2 writing, including investigations of high school-level L2 writing (Kibler, 2010; Parks, Holt, Hamers & H-Lemonnier, 2005), student perceptions of L2 writing (Basturkmen & Lewis, 2002; Kalikokha, Strauss & Smedley, 2009), writing in professional settings (Parks, 2000), undergraduate and graduate L2 writing (Haneda, 2007; Peters, 2011), goals of adult L2 writers (Cumming, A., Busch, & Zhou, 2002), and peer response in L2 writing groups (Zhu & Mitchell, 2012). Lei (2008), for example, employed activity theory to examine learner strategy use in L2 writing and used Engeström’s mediational triangle to analyse learner strategies in writing as artefact mediated, rule mediated, community mediated and role mediated. Fujioka (2014) applies activity theory to examine the interactions between L2 graduate writers and their instructors. Li (2013) used activity theory as a framework to describe and characterise the activity system of L2 students engaged in source-based writing, and not only to examine the contradictions and tensions within the students’ own activity systems, but also the ways in which different activity systems interact with each other “across and beyond the academy” (p. 84). She suggested that: “the activity of source-based writing can be viewed as a process working through contradictions in the direction of a certain object” (p. 74).

However, although Li’s (2013) article focuses on source use in L2 student writing from an activity-theoretical perspective, there appear to be no studies within L2 writing research that focus on the issue of L2 student plagiarism using this framework. Yet it would
seem that such an approach could shed light on questions surrounding L2 student plagiarism for several reasons. Firstly, by viewing source-based academic writing as an activity system in which individual subjects work towards a common motive of knowledge construction, we can conceive of individual students working within that system, but also instructors and others involved in the assessment of student writers and writing. We can consider that system as one bounded by a set of assumptions and rules about the appropriate use of sources, rules that can have serious consequences for the students if broken. An activity-theoretical perspective also foregrounds the division of labour within the system, and the power relations between members of that system. In addition, such a framework allows us to analyse the mediating artefacts, both physical (such as computers, search engines, print materials) and symbolic (source use strategies, essay genres, rhetorical forms) through which the students construct their source-based writing. Activity theory can also be used to analyse both an individual’s learning processes as well as a larger group through the heuristic of the activity system (Roth, 2004; Russell, 1995; Swain, Kinnear & Steinman, 2011), and thus is useful for the analysis of all levels of this embedded case study, from the larger EAP class group through to the individuals who are analysed on a case by case basis (See section 3.2 for a detailed discussion of the design of the study).

Moreover, unintentional plagiarism, which is the focus of this study, suggests that there is a dissonance between the L2 writer beliefs and their actions. As reported in the literature (e.g., Howard et al., 2010; Pecorari, 2002, 2008; Storch, 2009), many students who claim to have knowledge of plagiarism or who have been instructed in source use techniques, produce writing that contains, in some instances, large amounts of non-prototypical (or inappropriate) textual borrowing. However, activity theory transcends dichotomies such as thought and practice, seeing them instead in a dialectical and transformative relationship:

Activity...describes a powerful dialectic rooted in contradictions such as thinking and doing, knowing and performing...learning can be seen as a resolution, often ephemeral, to these tensions that produce changes in the conceptual, social, and material conditions of one’s everyday life. (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 209)

Such tensions that exist within individuals can also be seen operating within the activity system, between individuals who have different beliefs and expectations about source use and plagiarism, and between instructors and students who may have contrasting beliefs and goals. Moreover, using activity theory as a framework we can see activity systems coming into conflict and causing tensions and contradictions (Engeström & Sannino, 2010),
as the cultural, social and historical backgrounds of the students come into contact with the norms and expectations operating within the context of the university.

Activity theory may also help illuminate questions of agency in L2 student plagiarism. As the literature review has shown, non-prototypical textual borrowing is often associated with the issue of intentionality, and a student’s claim that their unacknowledged textual borrowing is unintentional is sometimes not considered to be a defence (Decoo, 2008; Price, 2002; Troyka, 1993). However, activity theory complicates the issue of agency, according to Lantolf and Thorne (2006), “with its concomitant components of intentionality and desire, agency is a culturally (in)formed attribute whose development is shaped by participation in specific communities of practice” (p. 239). Thus, viewing student plagiarism through the lens of activity may serve to render the issue of fault, blame, and morality become less central as an individual’s actions need to be considered within this wider socio-cultural context rather than as arising from within an individual acting in isolation from this context.

2.5 Summary

This chapter has provided a review of the literature into NESB student inadvertent plagiarism. Three broad areas of research have been identified – the cultural conditioning approach (Liu, 2005), the academic literacies approach, and the author identity approach, and the theoretical framework for each has been examined. It appears that while each strand contributes much to our understanding of student plagiarism, they nevertheless leave questions unanswered. It is suggested that sociocultural theory could provide an analytical framework that brings together a focus on the cultural, pedagogic, and institutional contexts in which student composition takes place.
CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

3.0 Overview

This chapter presents the methodology used for the study. It begins by outlining the theoretical framework of the research, which is based on a qualitative approach, and presents the institutional setting of the research and the ethical concerns associated with the project. The research design and data collection instruments are then examined, followed by an analysis of data management and coding procedures. The criteria for adequacy, validity, and reliability are also presented.

3.1 Qualitative Inquiry and Hybrid Research

This study aimed to investigate L2 learner knowledge and beliefs about source use and composition in academic writing. At first glance, the issue of source use may seem to be a straightforward, even mechanical one – students learn the “triadic model” (Barks & Watts, 2001, p. 252) of source use, quotation, summary and paraphrase, insert a citation in the correct form and continue with the composition. Yet in reality, as has been discussed in the Literature Review, learning to use sources appropriately in academic writing is a complex and challenging process (Casanave, 2004). Students must learn not only the mechanics of quotation, paraphrase or summary, but also become familiar with an academic culture of writing which has its own values and conventions about the nature of knowledge, authorship, and composition, conventions which remain opaque to many learners.

Due to the complex and fluid nature of knowledge and beliefs, a primarily qualitative approach was undertaken in order to answer the research questions. Rather than viewing the world as comprised of entities and phenomenon that can be isolated and measured, as is common in quantitative inquiry, qualitative inquiry rests on the assumption that reality is multifaceted, ever changing, and subject to multiple interpretations, termed by Denzin and Lincoln (2000) as a “relativist ontology” (p. 21). Moreover, qualitative research is naturalistic, aiming to investigate phenomenon in their natural setting rather than in artificially manipulated situations (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Qualitative research also has a holistic focus, aiming to investigate features that unify aspects of those natural settings (Patton, 1990). Patton (1990) argues that such holistic approaches view reality as a “complex system that is greater than the sum of its parts” (p. 49).
Another key feature of qualitative research is that it is interpretive – the researcher aims to understand the ways in which people construct meaning around their experiences (Merriam, 2002). Qualitative research aims to produce rich description (Geertz, 1973) in which thorough and detailed analyses of the context of the phenomena under investigation and the participants and actions involved are given to aid in understanding and interpretation. The researcher is able to use data gathered to then inductively build hypotheses and theories to understand meaning behind the phenomena (Merriam, 2002).

Research methods common to qualitative inquiry include interviews, participant observation, diaries, and ethnography (Mackey & Gass, 2005). However, Davis (1995) contends that it is not the technique that makes a piece of research qualitative - rather that it is the overall focus or perspective of the research. Denzin and Lincoln (2000) also argue that it is not the research technique that defines the research as qualitative but the underlying theoretical foundation, noting, “Qualitative research…privileges no single methodological practice over another…Qualitative researchers use semiotics, narrative, content, discourse…even statistics, tables, graphs and numbers” (p. 6).

Following this, the research took an overall qualitative approach, maintaining that the naturalistic, interpretive, holistic nature of qualitative inquiry is most suitable to gain an understanding of learners’ knowledge and beliefs regarding textual borrowing and authorship, and the ways in which these intersect with standard academic conventions and culture. The main qualitative methods used were analyses of learner diaries and interviews.

However, some quantitative techniques were also used to complement the qualitative data, making the study what has been termed hybrid research, in which both interpretative and statistical methods can be used (Ellis, 2007). In this study, surveys were used to provide background information and to point to areas of inquiry that required further and more in-depth investigation (Allan, 1991). Other quantitative data obtained included text analysis, which provided information on the specific ways in which sources were used in student texts.

Yet, while some quantitative techniques have been used in the thesis, it maintains a theoretical orientation that is more akin to the qualitative approach and the tenets it exhibits, as outlined above. Rather than being a weakness, Ellis (2007) argues that this hybrid of qualitative and quantitative techniques may be ideally suited to investigate complex phenomena such as language learning.
3.2 Research Design

This section outlines the research questions that form the basis of the study and discusses the research design. The institutional setting and participants are introduced and data collection techniques are discussed.

3.2.1 Research questions.

The study aimed to investigate the following questions:

1. What knowledge do NESB undergraduate students studying at a New Zealand university have about plagiarism and source use?
2. How do NESB undergraduate students in a New Zealand university use sources in an EAP writing course?
3. What is the relationship between their knowledge and practice of source use?

3.2.2 Case study.

The research employs the case study as its methodological framework. Case studies aim to describe learners and language learning from a holistic perspective within a defined setting, for example, individuals, programmes, or institutions (Mackey & Gass, 2005; Merriam, 2002; Stacke, 2000). Key to this definition for Mackey and Gass (2005) is that the “bounded” or clearly delineated nature of the category of analysis should underlie all case study research. Yin (2006) and Stacke (2000) suggest that as well as providing rich insights into the case itself, case studies can be used to build, extend, or test hypotheses.

For this thesis, the case under analysis was a single class of NESB students studying in an English for Academic Purposes course. While the students were from a variety of cultural and linguistic backgrounds, they constitute a single case in that they all shared the common context of the classroom instruction, readings, discussions, and assignments. This makes the class a bounded unit as defined by Merriam, 2002, Van Lier (2005) and Stacke (2000).

According to Yin (2006), case studies are particularly suited to answering research questions that are descriptive and explanatory. This focus can enable the researcher to provide holistic and in-depth descriptions of the case within its real life context (Merriam, 2002; Yin, 2006). The research questions of this study are both descriptive and explanatory, seeking to describe the ways in which NESB students use sources in their academic writing, as well as looking to explain the underlying reasons for those source use behaviours. However, the research examines not only the single case of an English for Academic Purposes class – it also
gives insight into the phenomenon of plagiarism in NESB student writing. As such, it complies with Stacke’s (2000) criteria for what he terms an instrumental case study, or one which seeks to “provide insight into an issue [and]…facilitate our understanding of something else” (p. 437).

Yin (2006) suggested that the key to a successful case study is the collection of a variety of data, such as documents, interviews and physical artefacts (such as copies of students’ work). These types of data collected from different sources are a form of triangulation (Stacke, 2000) that aids in making the findings of the study robust (Yin, 2006). Triangulation is achieved in this study through the use of multiple data sources - a questionnaire, different types of student texts (tests and an essay), reflective journals, and interviews, thus fulfilling the criteria for case studies of collecting data from a variety of sources.

The overall design of the study accords with what Yin (2006) terms a single holistic case study with embedded sub cases. The whole class was asked to complete a questionnaire and reflective journals were collected from the volunteers within larger group. A smaller core of students who participated in interviews and provided further course work for analysis made up the embedded sub case. This approach has the advantage of giving both a broader overview of the class in question, as well as an in-depth picture of the core sample of interview participants.

### 3.2.3 Institutional setting.

The data for this study was collected from a large New Zealand university. At the time of the data collection there were 2660 international undergraduate and postgraduate students studying at the university, which was 8.6% of the total student population (“Student Facts and Figures”, n.d.). The university requires that undergraduate students from non-English speaking backgrounds attain 5.5 in the IELTS examination or a score of 525 on the paper-based TOEFL examination before entering the university. Other suitable examination scores, such as the Cambridge Advanced English Certificate or the Cambridge Proficiency certificate, are also accepted as evidence of competence in English.

Specific English language support is provided to international students in several ways. Firstly, many of the NESB students at the university initially enrol for a foundation year, in which they study a variety of subjects to prepare them for various degree programmes at the university. Additionally, at the time of the data collection, students accepted directly into the university were able to take courses in academic English offered by the Linguistics Programme – either a general English for Academic Purposes course or subsequent Advanced
English for Academic Purposes course. These were first-year courses specifically designed for NESB students and cover academic speaking and listening skills, as well as academic writing and reading skills, although students at any undergraduate level were able to enrol. These were recommended for students across disciplines, and the general EAP course was a requirement for computer science majors.

The institutional approach to student plagiarism can be found in the University’s Dishonest Practice policy, which defines plagiarism as, “copying or paraphrasing another’s work, whether intentionally or otherwise, and presenting it as one’s own” ("Plagiarism", n.d.). While the policy does recognise that plagiarism may be intentional or unintentional, both forms are dealt within under the rubric of Dishonest Practice. According to this policy, unintentional plagiarism “is usually due to lack of care, naivety, and/or lack of understanding of acceptable academic behaviour. This kind of plagiarism can be easily avoided” ("Dishonest Practice Information for Students", n.d.).

There are two levels of plagiarism within this policy - Level One plagiarism, which is dealt with by Heads of Department, is for “first offence” textual borrowing in which “the student’s actions may be regarded as inadvertent or naive”, and Level Two plagiarism which is dealt with by the Pro-Vice Chancellor. Such plagiarism includes “repeat offense[s]”, “deliberate offenses” or “circumstances where the student can reasonably have been expected to understand acceptable academic practice” ("Dishonest Practice Information for Students", n.d.). Penalties for plagiarism include reprimands, resubmission of work, disqualification from the student’s degree programme, and exclusion from the university. Plagiarism detection can be undertaken at the university using SafeAssign detection software. However this was not available at the time of the data collection.

3.2.4 Participants.

Participants for the study were recruited from students enrolled in the general EAP course offered by the Linguistics Programme. The course was designed to cover general areas of academic English, including speaking and reading skills, the research process, and essay composition. Students came from a variety of ethnic backgrounds, although the majority of the class identified themselves as Chinese, in keeping with the overall institutional make-up of international students. Also enrolled were students from Korea, Japan, Spain, Iraq, and Tonga. At the start of the course, the students enrolled in the class were asked to complete a questionnaire about their knowledge of and beliefs about source use and authorship in academic writing and their academic backgrounds.
At a later stage in the course the researcher asked for volunteers willing to allow access to their reflective journals and other course work for the study. Of the 69 students enrolled, 30 agreed and signed consent forms. These students made up the Writing Sample Group (WSG). After the completion of the course, the WSG was contacted via email and asked to participate in interviews designed to discuss their background, experiences and beliefs about academic writing and source use. Of the 30 students contacted, 12 agreed to participate in interviews. Two of the respondents did not have a complete set of written data, so I decided to conduct pilot interviews with these students. The remaining ten students became the participants for the embedded case study portion of the project. All students who participated in the interviews were given a book voucher to compensate them for their time.

3.2.5 Ethics.

Ethical considerations were important in this project because of the sensitive nature of plagiarism within academia. Before the commencement of the study, approval was obtained from the university Ethics Committee. In order to protect the rights of those involved, participants were given an information sheet detailing the aims of the project and assured that their identities would remain totally confidential throughout the course of the study. Participants were then asked to sign a consent form to show that they understood that participation was entirely voluntary and that they had the right to withdraw from the project without negative consequences. Participants were assured that no identifying details would be included in the final thesis or any papers published from the project (See Appendix A for examples of the Information Sheet and Consent forms). Individual codes were assigned to each participant, depending on whether they had contributed questionnaires only to the project, or questionnaires and journals. Those students who agreed to take part in the interviews and whose data made up the ten individual case studies (see Chapter Six) were assigned pseudonyms to protect their identities.

It was particularly necessary to ensure that the participants were not compromised by my dual role as a researcher and instructor in the course. Accordingly, I recruited students for the study from outside of my own tutorial group, ensuring that I would not be responsible for marking the work of students in the study. Moreover, I put procedures in place for any instances of plagiarism that arose in the course to be referred to the course coordinator. Additionally, I conducted the interviews with the students after the completion of the course, so that they might feel free to discuss issues concerning their writing with me without fear of it influencing their course work.
3.3 Data Collection

The following sections outline methods for data collection, providing a description of and justification for each method used, and a discussion of the relevance of each method for the study. Data was collected throughout the course and also after its completion over a period of eight months from February to November 2007 in the following forms:

1. Questionnaire.
2. Reflective journals.
3. Writing samples.
4. Semi structured interviews.

3.3.1 Questionnaire.

The first type of data collected for the study was a questionnaire, which was administered at the beginning of the semester and completed by 47 students (see Appendix B for sample questionnaire). Questionnaires are a widely used method of data collection in a variety of areas in education, second language acquisition, and applied linguistics research (Brown, 2001; Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2000; Nunan, 1992; Punch, 2003), suitable for collecting a range of information including factual data and data about respondents’ attitudes and beliefs (Dörnyei, 2003). Both closed and open questions may be used in questionnaires. Closed items, which may come in the form of dichotomous response items, frequency of behaviour scales, and Likert scale items (Punch, 2003) are quick to answer and are able to be easily analysed by the researcher (Dörnyei, 2003). Open or short answer questions (Brown, 2001) can also be used in questionnaires and lend richness to the data or indicate areas of concern not raised in closed questions (Dörnyei, 2003).

However, while closed questions may be easy to rate objectively, the question of bias in the selection and construction of the items is an issue that needs to be addressed. Denscombe (1998) noted that closed questions may reflect what the researcher prioritises rather than what the respondent feels is important and Dörnyei (2003) commented that even when the questionnaire is carefully constructed, items still may only reflect respondents' perceptions. Open questions, although they may provide richer data, take longer to answer and hence may be omitted altogether by the respondents. There may also be greater difficulties in the coding and analysis of open questions (Davies, 2007; Dörnyei, 2003).

However, the large amounts of data questionnaires can potentially yield when designed carefully make them useful to give a general picture of a population or group, and are thus particularly suitable for investigating second-language learning, especially when used in conjunction with other types of data, such as interviews (Dörnyei, 2003). Triangulation of
data can mitigate any weaknesses in the depth of the questionnaire data collected (Brown, 2001).

3.3.2 Description of the instrument.

The initial topics for the questionnaire were formulated after analysis of the research questions and the relevant literature on NESB academic writing, source use, and plagiarism in accordance with Dörnyei’s (2003) recommendation that the questions used in the survey instrument should have a strong theoretical foundation. The questionnaire contained three sections - Section A: Academic Writing and Use of Sources contained mainly frequency-of-behaviour rating scale items (Punch, 2003) designed to measure the frequency and type of academic assignments done by the respondents at the university and in their home countries. This list was formulated after assessments of common university writing tasks and student experiences of academic writing provided in studies such as Horowitz, (1986), Leki & Carson, (1994) and Shih (1986). Also included in Section A were frequency rating scale items concerning students’ source use practices and open questions to elicit student definitions of plagiarism and data on student understandings of the causes of unintentional plagiarism.

Section B: Beliefs about Academic Writing and Source Use contained Likert scale questions designed to gather information on students’ beliefs about source use, authorship, and institutional policy regarding plagiarism. In order to reduce the biases of order effect (in which respondents prefer the left-hand side of the scale) and acquiescence (in which respondents agree with statements they are unsure about), the negative end of the scale (Strongly Disagree) was placed on the left and the positive end of the scale (Strongly Agree) was placed on the right (Dörnyei, 2003).

The concluding section was designed to elicit students’ biodata (Brown, 2001). It was placed last in line with Dörnyei’s (2003) recommendation, in order to focus respondents’ full concentration on the main part of the questionnaire. In addition to questions concerning the students’ sex, country of origin, first language, subject major, and year of study, the section contained dichotomous response items (Punch, 2003) to gather factual data on students’ educational experience before coming to the New Zealand university and their experiences with academic English.

Following its initial design, the questionnaire was checked by fellow PhD students in peer debriefing sessions, and then piloted on a group of five NESB students not involved in the main part of the study. No major problems were detected in the design or content of the questionnaire, although minor changes were made to wording and to the overall format. It was then administered in the EAP course tutorial groups by the individual tutors. Of the 69
students in the course, 47 agreed to complete the questionnaire, which is 68% of the class. This response rate exceeds the minimum response rate of 60% recommended by Punch (2003).

3.3.3 Writing samples.

Another type of data collected was writing samples from students’ course work, which will be explained in the following sections.

3.3.3.1 Source-use tests.

Students were given two take-home tests to assess their knowledge of the conventions of source use, paraphrasing and paragraph construction (see Appendix C for test specifications). In test one, students were required to paraphrase a section of a given source article and in the second test, they were asked to write two paragraphs using the source articles and their own experiences. It was hoped that these tasks would allow the students to demonstrate their ability to paraphrase, which is an essential skill in appropriate source use (Hirvela & Du, 2013; Keck, 2006), and their ability to integrate sources into their own writing, as well as the more mechanical tasks of correct referencing and creation of a bibliography.

3.3.3.2 Argumentative essay.

Students were required to write a 1250 word argumentative essay on topics that were developed in consultation with the reference librarian at the main university library. Students were also given guidelines as to the types of sources they could use for the essay – a minimum of five sources from scholarly journals, books, or book chapters (see Appendix D for the research essay specifications). Prior to the research, students attended a tutorial at the library run by the reference librarian to familiarise them with the library databases, search strategies, and referencing techniques.

Students were required to submit copies of the sources that they used in their essays. It was hoped that since students were aware that the source material was readily available to the markers, any intentional plagiarism would be discouraged (Pecorari, 2003). Text analysis was used to compare these original sources to the student essays, and it was assumed that any inappropriate source use discovered in the analysis was indeed inadvertent, due to the fact that students submitted sources with the essays themselves.
3.3.3.3 Reflective journals.

Student reflective journals were also collected for analysis. Learner journals or diaries (Bailey, 1990) have been used in second language acquisition for a number of years. Early studies, such as Bailey (1983), focused on affect in language learning, while more recently, diary studies have investigated the areas of learner perceptions of language instruction (Tse, 2000), learner strategies (Halbach, 2000), and language exploration (Allison, 1998). In journal studies, the learners provide personal accounts of their language learning and experiences by regularly documenting them in written form (Bailey, 1990; Krishnan & Hoon, 2002). By documenting their experiences in a regular and systematic fashion, learners may be able to generate and connect ideas (Porter, Goldstein, Leatherman & Conrad, 1990), and in this sense, journals may not be simply a reflection of learner knowledge but actively facilitate the development of new knowledge and modes of thought. Secondly, this rich data may not be available through other forms of data collection, such as observations or surveys, in which the questions may be a reflection of the concerns of the research rather than the concerns of the learners (Mackey & Gass, 2005; Tse, 2000).

As with other techniques, there are methodological issues with learner diaries as a form of data. Nunan (1992) and Mackey and Gass (2005) noted that generalisability can be difficult with diary studies as they often use a small number of participants. Moreover, as with other forms of introspective data, the question remains as to whether or not they are an accurate reflection of the events and experiences they purport to record (Nunan, 1992; Tse, 2000). However, journals remain a unique mode of investigation into learner experiences that are less likely than other forms of data collection to be mediated by the influence of researchers’ preconceived priorities and categories. For this study journals were able to provide rich data relevant to the question of learner knowledge and knowledge construction, and helped to generate hypotheses and triangulate data collected via the other methods of surveys, interviews, and student texts (Tse, 2000).

The journals used were part of the internal assessment for the EAP course. At the beginning of the semester, students were given guidelines for the completion of the journals, in line with the suggestions made by Porter et al. (1990), namely that the journal should be a place to discuss experiences with learning and reactions to class readings and discussions. Porter et al. (1990) noted that making the task more akin to free writing, although still a formal assignment, can make expressing personal or complex ideas in an L2 less daunting for the students.

Three of the journal topics written on by the students were collected for the study - a journal on plagiarism, one on students’ writing autobiographies, and one on their
understandings of the research and writing process. Students were given guidelines on the length of the diary entries (Porter et al. 1990 suggest a minimum of a paragraph), which were to be between 400-500 words (see Appendix E for reflective journal specifications and topics). However, not all of the students in the WSG completed all of the journal assignments, so it was decided to analyse the journals on plagiarism only (25 of the students in the WSG completed this assignment). There was a complete data set of journals obtained from the Interview Group (IG) and these journals provided important contextual information that was investigated further in the semi-structured interviews.

3.3.3.4 Interviews.

Interviews are a long-established and widely used research tool in qualitative and educational research and they have also been used extensively in explorations of second language acquisition (Nunan, 2002; Tierney & Dilley, 2002). The interview can be used for a variety of purposes, including measuring values, knowledge, beliefs, and testing hypotheses (Cohen et al., 2000). Semi-structured interviews, which according to Nunan (2002) are preferred by researchers working in an interpretative tradition, are those in which the researcher has an outline in mind of the structure of the interview, but are flexible enough to focus on the issues that the participant raises. Thus, the semi-structured interview has, according to Freebody (2003) the advantage of retaining some structure and focus on the core issues identified by the researcher, while at the same time allowing the researcher to pursue any fruitful avenues of questioning that arise during the course of the interview (Jones, 1991).

However, social scientists also note a number of disadvantages with interviews. Freebody (2002) warns that interviews should not be treated as “transparent windows” (p. 81) into another’s knowledge or beliefs. However, he argues that this need not be a disadvantage. Rather, he suggests that understanding interviews as “cultural practices” (Freebody, 2003, p. 81) can enhance the validity of research practice.

A second disadvantage of interviews is bias on the part of the interviewer, for example, as demonstrated through the use of leading questions (Cohen et al., 2000). However, Kvale (1996) suggests that leading questions may in fact be usefully employed to delve deeply into participants’ knowledge and beliefs about a subject. He argues that if the interview is seen as a dialogue in which the interviewer and the participant co-construct knowledge, rather than an event in which the participant’s knowledge is simply gathered by the interviewer, leading questions and sources of bias are not such a concern.

Interview participants were sought from the WSG. Of the 30 students contacted, 12 responded, which Kvale (1996) suggests is a suitable number to reach data saturation in
interviews. Questions were theoretically and empirically based and the interview schedule was drawn up after an analysis of the students’ reflective journals (See Appendix F for sample interview schedule). While similar questions were asked of every student, due to the flexible nature of the semi-structured interview I was able to pursue topics of interest and relevance as they arose (Cohen et al., 2000). The first two interviews were conducted as pilots. This decision was made because complete data sets were not available for these two students. The interview schedule for the remaining students was altered after analysis of the pilot interviews and after peer debriefing sessions with fellow Linguistics PhD candidates, leaving a total of ten interviews for the main analysis.

Richards’ (2003) transcription conventions were used, indicating pauses and overlaps, emphasis, verbal fillers, intonation, and non-verbal features in addition to language content (See Appendix F for example interview transcript), which provide a sufficient level of detail for interviews that will be analysed qualitatively (Richards, 2009).

3.4 Data Management

Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) defined data management as the creation of order in the data, a process that includes indexing and filing, backing up, looking for missing data and ensuring safe storage. This section discusses the data management procedures undertaken after the recruitment of the participants for the study and the collection of the different forms of data.

3.4.1 Questionnaire.

After their completion, copies were made of the questionnaires. These were then organised into two groups – one group for the students who had volunteered to be in the WSG group and the other for students who did not want to supply writing samples. The data from the closed questions was then entered into the SPSS software programme for statistical analysis. The data from the open-ended questions were entered verbatim into a Word file and stored for qualitative analysis.

3.4.2 Student writing samples.

Electronic copies of both the source-use tests and argumentative essay were submitted by the students and stored electronically. Hard copies were also made, filed, and stored. In
addition to the essays, students submitted copies of the sources that they used for the essays for the purpose of checking sources.

3.4.3 Qualitative data - journals and interviews.

Reflective journals were submitted electronically as well as in hard copy to the students’ individual instructors. The journals were then converted into plain text format and exported into the HyperResearch qualitative data analysis computer programme for coding and analysis. Interviews were recorded using a digital voice recorder and the files were transcribed into Microsoft Word files, before being converted into plain text format and exported into the HyperResearch software.

3.5 Data Analysis

This section outlines the methods of data analysis for the different types of quantitative and qualitative data collected in the study, namely, the questionnaire data and the source-use tests and argumentative essay, the reflective journals, and the interviews.

3.5.1 Quantitative data.

The first step in the analysis of questionnaire data was to assign each questionnaire unique codes for ease of identification and maintenance of the participants’ confidentiality (Dörnyei, 2003; Gorard, 2003). A coding frame was then developed and numerical values were assigned to the responses for each type of question. The coding frame functioned as a key to be used when the data was entered into SPSS. For example, in item A1 “How often do you do the following types of academic writing in your studies at this university?”, the predetermined responses were the following: Never=5, Seldom=4, Sometimes=3, Often=2 and Always=1. Students were given eight options to choose from, each representing a different type of academic writing.

Numerical codes, which had been reversed in order to mitigate the biases of order effect and acquiescence were re-reversed, so that “Always” was coded as five and “Never” as one. For questions 1.i-vii, the responses were assigned as follows – Always=5, Often=4, Sometimes=3, Seldom=2 and Never=1. These codes were then entered into the coding frame. For Item 1.viii, students were asked to specify other types of academic writing not listed in the above responses. In this case, each different type of writing was also assigned a numeric value, with the categories being extended as much as necessary to encompass all the given
answers (Dörnyei, 2003). These codes were entered into the coding frame for each closed question.

Once the coding frame had been established and the data from the closed items entered into an SPSS spreadsheet, data were then checked for inaccuracies, such as impossible data (for example, the entry of a 7 on a 1-5 coded item), contradictory data, or implausible data (Dörnyei, 2003; Mackey & Gass, 2005). One such example of contradictory data was in the responses to Item 4.vii in Section A of the questionnaire. Question 4 concerned the types of academic writing done in the students’ home country. Item 4.vii was “I did not do any academic writing in my home country” and was designed for those students who did not have experience of academic writing prior to coming to New Zealand. However, it became clear when entering data into the spreadsheet, that a number of students had ticked this response in addition to noting the different types of academic writing they had done in the past. Dörnyei (2003) suggests that implausible responses resulting from inattentiveness may be omitted from the analysis. In accordance with this recommendation, Item 4.vii was omitted. Several other items that had been left unanswered by all the participants were also deleted, such as open response items designed for students to add additional information when no extra responses were given.

### 3.5.2 Types of data.

Before deciding on what statistical procedures to perform in the analysis of questionnaire data it is necessary to identify the types of data that have been gathered, as this determines the procedures that can be undertaken. The data gathered in surveys can be classified into three types: nominal, ordinal, and continuous (Oppenheim & Oppenheim, 1992). Nominal (sometimes also known as categorical) data is obtained when the numerical scale used in the item is randomly assigned. Typically, such scales are used to elicit information such as sex or race. An example of nominal data from this questionnaire is Item C16 “What is or are your first language(s)?” In this example, there were ten languages given by respondents, each of which was assigned a numerical value. However the number assigned to each language was arbitrary. Items C14-19, and A5 also gathered nominal data.

The second type of data that can be obtained in questionnaires is ordinal data that is gathered from scales in which the response items are ranked (Oppenheim & Oppenheim, 1992). Examples of ordinal scales in the questionnaire were items A1-4, and A6-9, in which participants were required to answer frequency-of-behaviour questions (Punch, 2003) on a five-item scale from Never to Always. Section B, the Likert scale items, also used ordinal scales. In ordinal scales, although the categories in each item are ranked, the distance between
the categories is not equal (Argyrous, 1997). For example, while most would agree that an occurrence that is “often” occurs with more frequency than one that happens “sometimes”, the precise number of times that equals sometimes or often will not be the same between participants.

The third type of data is continuous data, which can be either ratio or interval (Barnes & Lewin, 2011). Like ordinal data, continuous data is obtained from a ranked scale, however unlike ordinal data, the values occur at equal distances (Dörnyei, 2003). For example, Items C18 (year of study) and C19 (years in New Zealand) elicited ratio data because the data were of equal distance from each other (Barnes & Lewin, 2011). Item A5 “How many sources do you usually use when you are writing an academic assignment” also elicited continuous (ratio) data.

Whether data is nominal, ordinal, or continuous is significant because it determines the types of analyses that can be conducted. While interval data can be analysed using parametric techniques, including analysis of mean (or average) and standard deviation, both nominal and ordinal data require non-parametric statistical techniques. It was decided to follow Dörnyei’s (2003) recommendation and treat the Likert scale data as ordinal, given that the perceived distances between the categories (from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree) may vary between respondents, making the calculation of the mean untenable (Barnes & Lewin, 2011; Dörnyei, 2003).

3.5.3 Descriptive statistics.

The next step in analysis was the application of descriptive statistics to the data, which, according to Mackey and Gass (2005), are suitable for providing an overview and a general understanding of the data set. Descriptive statistics can be divided into three categories: (a) measures of frequency, which reveal the frequency with which a behaviour or phenomenon occurs; (b) measures of central tendency, which show the mode, median, and mean of the data; and (c) measures of dispersion, which reveal the relationship of individuals to the central tendency. However, as noted above, measures of the mean or average, as well as measures of central tendency (standard deviation) may not be appropriate for ordinal or nominal data. Instead, the central tendency of nominal and ordinal data can be represented with the median or mode, while percentiles or quartiles can be used to measure the spread. Accordingly, frequency tables for the frequency of response and Likert scale items were created, and percentages calculated. For the ratio data in Items A5, C18, and C19, the mean was calculated in addition to the median and mode.
3.5.4 **Inferential statistics.**

Inferential statistics are able to explore the correlation between variables, and in some cases make predictions about the wider population on the basis of the data (Barnes & Lewin, 2011). In order to perform inferential statistical analysis, a minimum sample size of 30 participants is recommended (Barnes & Lewin, 2011) - the sample size for this questionnaire was 47. It was hoped that by comparing the independent variables of cultural background, year of study and major, and the dependent variables of source use practices and attitudes (questionnaire items 51-65), any differences between groups’ beliefs and practices regarding source use could be identified.

In order to decide what statistical tests could be performed on the data it was first necessary to check on its distribution by testing the distribution of responses for the three independent variables (language background, disciplinary background, and year of study) for questionnaire items 51-65 using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for normality (Pallant, 2013). Most items returned a score of 0.05 or less which was not sufficient to indicate normality (See Appendix I for table illustrating these statistics). Accordingly, it was decided to apply non-parametric statistics to the data, as recommended by Barnes and Lewin (2011), who note that non-parametric statistics are appropriate when the data is not normally distributed, and also when the majority of the data are nominal or ordinal.

For the influence of language group it was decided to compare Chinese language background students (N=29) to non-Chinese language background students (N=18, spread across nine languages). As demonstrated in section 2.1, many researchers have suggested that Chinese students in particular have contrasting beliefs and practices concerning source use. While this choice did not allow any insights into the non-Chinese language background group, which was a diverse one, by focusing on the Chinese language background group it gave the potential for questions of cultural influence to be addressed. The Mann-Whitney U Test was used, which is suitable when wanting to find out if there is a difference between two categorical (in this case Chinese/non-Chinese language background) and continuous variables (practices and beliefs regarding source use and plagiarism) (Pallant, 2013).

For the remaining two sets of independent variables, disciplinary background (grouped as Humanities, Commerce, and Science) and years of study (grouped as 1/2 years, 3/4 years, and 5 years or over) used the Kruskal-Wallis Test, which is a non-parametric test suitable for comparing multiple categories with one dependent variable (Pallant, 2013).
3.5.5 **Open items - qualitative data.**

The questionnaire also yielded an amount of qualitative data from the items in Section A Q 11-12, which were open questions. For Question 11, 36 responses were given, or 75%, and for Question 12 there 30 responses, or 63%. These were transcribed and analysed using content analysis (Brown, 2001; Dörnyei, 2003). In this procedure, response coding is used to assign codes to features in the text, which are then put in categories according to type (Brown, 2001). Following this, a tally is made of the relevant features that produce nominal or categorical data that can then be subject to quantitative analysis (Brown, 2001; Dörnyei, 2003).

The data from these questions was transcribed into Microsoft Word files and answers were assigned an identification code based on the number and group the participants came from (for example A group, participant number 16 became A16). Codes were then assigned to the text manually to reduce the data into manageable portions and then gathered into categories. The following sections give details about and examples of the coding and analysis of the open questions.

3.5.5.1 **Question 11. “Understanding of Plagiarism – please describe in your own words what you believe plagiarism is”.”**

This question required participants to define plagiarism in their own words. A list of 39 codes was developed and assigned to the text and the codes were then assigned to categories based on type. The following categories to which these codes were assigned were adapted from Pecorari’s (2002) definitional model of plagiarism that identified different components of institutional plagiarism definitions:

1. Actions: this category was assigned to the verb students used when defining actions used that, in their views, result in plagiarism. Codes assigned to this category included USE, COPY, TAKE, and STEAL.

2. Objects: this category was used to group together codes representing the object of the plagiarising action, or the objects or people that students perceived were subject to the plagiarising action. These codes included the following: OPINIONS, WORKS, IDEAS, WORDS, THEORIES and EVIDENCE.

3. Manner: a third category was assigned to codes that described the ways in which the students understood plagiarised material to be used. These codes included: WITHOUT CITATION, WITHOUT CREDIT, WITHOUT QUOTATION, and WITHOUT ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.
4. Indirect objects: this category was used to represent the students’ descriptions of the person (abstract or concrete) or source from whom the plagiarised material was taken. Examples of such codes were: OTHERS, ARTICLES, and SOURCE. For codes in this category a distinction was made between personal indirect objects representing people, such as OTHERS and PEOPLE, and impersonal ones representing objects such as ARTICLE and SOURCE.

5. Judgements: a last category was used for responses which added a judgement about plagiarism after the initial definition, beyond that implied by their choice of plagiarism -action verb, as in the following examples:

JUDGE plagiarism is illegal (Q 11 C1)
JUDGE therefore it is wrong (Q 11 C3)

3.5.5.2 Question 12. Understanding of plagiarism - please describe in your own words how you believe unintentional plagiarism (inappropriate source use that occurs without the writer realising it) might occur.

Question 12 required students to explain their views on the possible reasons for inadvertent plagiarism. The following codes were developed and assigned to the text, and grouped under the main category of Reasons:

1. FORGETTING: This code was used when the student indicated specifically that some kind of forgetfulness was involved in the omission, for example “I forgot where it [the source] came from” (A17); “Sometimes forgot to reference what is needed” (C1).

2. REFERENCING ERROR: This code was assigned to data in which the student indicated an error with referencing as the cause of the plagiarism. For example, “Try to use other author’s ideas or work without references” (B9).

3. SOURCE INCORPORATION ERROR: This code was used when the error resided in the student’s use of source incorporation techniques, such as quotation, summary or paraphrase. For example, “You get a quotation from a book but just change a few words in it and you didn’t cite/reference it” (B10).

4. INCORRECT SOURCE ERROR: This code was used when the student indicated awareness than an inappropriate source type had been used. For example, “Using such as wikipedia” (B13).

5. CONFLICTING EPISTEMOLOGICAL BELIEFS (CEB): This code was assigned when students described contrasting understandings of knowledge as the reasons behind inadvertent plagiarism. Mori (1999) describes epistemological beliefs as
“beliefs about the nature of knowledge and learning” (p. 379). Examples of utterances coded as CEBs are: “The way of understanding languages can be given between nations and cultures” (A6); “When I confuse between common knowledge and personal knowledge” (A13).

3.6 Text Analysis - Overview

This section examines how the student writing samples were analysed. It begins with an overview of text analysis in L2 writing studies, examines the existing studies into source use in L2 writing and discusses the ways in which the texts were coded and analysed in this study.

Text analysis has been used to study a variety of phenomena both in L1 writing studies, in the fields of rhetoric and composition studies, and in L2 writing in linguistics (Hinkel, 2005). As discussed in section 2.2.3, 2.2.4 and 2.2.5, research into textual borrowing and plagiarism in L2 writing has focused primarily on the ways in which students have used paraphrase, summary, and quotation in their texts (for example, Campbell, 1995; Hsu, 2003; Keck, 2006, 2007; Pecorari, 2003; Shi, 2004). These categories of source use have been termed the “triadic model” (Barks & Watts, 2001, p. 252) of source use that forms the foundation of instruction into source-based writing. Several of these studies are comparative (Campbell, 1995, Keck, 2006, 2007) while others focus solely on L2 writing (Hsu, 2003, Pecorari, 2003, Shi, 2004).

There are several issues with the existing studies into source use and textual borrowing that need to be addressed. Firstly, some researchers, such as Campbell (1995), Shi (2004), Hsu (2003), and Keck (2006, 2007) have used data elicited under timed conditions using a minimum number of sources provided by the researcher. Accordingly, the compositions used in these studies may differ in their treatment of source material from student compositions that are completed over longer periods of time under naturalistic conditions. Moreover, as the students in these studies were provided with and used only one or two sources in their compositions, this may have affected the way in which they incorporated the source material into their writing and led to an over-reliance on the source material and inappropriate textual borrowing. Compositions in which the students themselves choose both the number and type of sources may utilise the source material in starkly different ways.

Secondly, the coding scheme used in these studies may at times be unable to represent the variety of practices employed by students in their source use. Keck (2006) suggested that
the coding scheme developed by Campbell (1995) and adapted by Hsu (2003) and Shi (2004) may be inadequate to categorise the types of textual borrowing found in the student texts. Campbell herself noted that her categories of source use represent “points along a continuum rather than clearly defined separate categories, making interpretation difficult” (p. 216). Keck (2006) expanded on this to argue that existing studies “vary considerably in their assumptions regarding the extent to which…a paraphrase does (or should) borrow from the original excerpt” (p. 263).

The current study attempted to address these issues in the following ways. Firstly, because the writing samples were collected in a naturalistic rather than an experimental context, it is hoped that they represent more truly authentic forms of student writing. This is true both of the source–use tests which were completed over a period of several days, and of the essay, which the students had several weeks to complete. Secondly, in this study, for the research essay students were able to use a minimum of five sources which may have reduced over-reliance on source material that may have contributed to the high levels of inappropriate textual borrowing identified in the previous studies (Campbell, 1995; Hsu, 2003; Shi, 2004). Moreover, as students were required to research and choose their own source material for the essay, it is possible that they had different levels of engagement with, and hence understanding of, the source material which could mitigate the overreliance on sources seen in earlier studies.

Thirdly, the coding scheme used to analyse the student texts was designed to be more specific, aiming to reduce the number of ambiguities in the coding and categorisation of forms of source use. Student texts were compared to the sources used in the essays and each instance of source use was coded according to its type, form of documentation used, and location in the composition. The coding was therefore deductive in that it applied codes that were predefined to the data (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). The following section outlines the specific ways in which the data was coded.

3.6.1 Textual data coding and analysis.

Student texts were firstly compared to their source texts and attempts were made to identify the excerpts of the source texts that the students had incorporated into their writing (either cited or non-cited). The student texts and borrowed source-text excerpts were then put side-by-side into tables for ease of comparison and coding. While some studies have used computer programmes to match student to source texts (T. Hyland, 2009; Keck, 2006, 2007), others have adopted a hand matching technique (Campbell, 1995; Pecorari, 2006; Shi, 2006; Soo, 2008; Weigle & Parker, 2012), since, while computer programmes may be able to
capture strings of words directly copied from the source texts, direct copying is only one aspect of textual borrowing. Other borrowed strings that have been modified in some way (closely or extensively), may not be identified by computer programmes.

This procedure was uncomplicated for the first take-home test, the paraphrase assignment, as only one passage from the source text was used. For the second take-home test, the test essay, the students were asked to incorporate two articles (provided for the assignment) into their essay to support their own ideas, and it was similarly easy to identify specifically where in the source texts they borrowed text or ideas from, even when citations were absent.

However, identifying the source texts for the research essay was more challenging, as the students were required to do their own research and use a minimum of five independently researched sources in their essays. The matching process was made easier by the fact that students were required to submit photocopies of the sources they had used in their essays (the relevant pages of articles or books), and so the majority of sources were easy to find. In the few cases where the students did not include all the relevant material I was able to access it from the library, as they were usually included in the reference lists.

The next step was to identify the borrowed or adapted strings of words within or across the orthographic sentence, which was used as the unit of analysis (Shi, 2004; Weigle & Parker, 2012). In the text analysis literature, several techniques have been used for quantifying the amount of borrowed text students have incorporated into their work. These different approaches are a result of the fact that no actual or concrete definition exists as to precisely how much text constitutes plagiarism (Campbell, 1995; Soo, 2008). Several researchers, for example Storch (2009), have counted a string of two or more consecutive content words taken exactly from the source as a unit of borrowed text. However, one problem with this approach is that using two consecutive content words as the minimum unit of borrowing captures many words that could be classed as acceptable common usage, collocations (defined by Swan, 1980 as combinations of words that are conventionally used together), or set phrases. Under this scheme, fixed expressions such as “culture shock”, “media violence”, and “animal testing” that appeared in the essay prompts would count as textual borrowing. Yet it is difficult to imagine how the students would have been able to write their essays without using them.

An alternative approach was taken by Cumming et al. (2005), which was to count strings of three or more words, either content or function words, as units of borrowing. There are also limitations with this approach in that a three-word string does not “capture” as much textual borrowing as the two-word string approach. In addition, such an approach may also
identify three-word collocations as part of the borrowed string. However, using a three-word approach would be more likely to identify true strings of borrowing rather than commonly accepted phrases or two-word collocations, such as the examples given above.

Taking all the above factors into consideration, a coding scheme developed which drew on coding schemes developed by Shi (2004), Soo (2008) and Weigle and Parker (2012) who used text analysis to examine patterns of textual borrowing in student texts. The consistency of the analysis was achieved through the use of a second rater, as recommended by Brown (2001). The second rater, a fellow Linguistics PhD student, was asked firstly to match the student texts to the source texts, and then identify and code the words that had been borrowed from the source texts. Each instance of coding was then compared and the rate of inter-rater reliability was calculated. For the paraphrase data there was 90% agreement on coding and for the test essays there was 81% agreement.

There were several points of disagreement to be resolved. For example, the second rater had counted attributing phrases and cohesive markers in borrowed strings but I had not. After discussion it was decided to omit these from the count. Another difference was the way in which we dealt with very minor changes in the borrowed strings, such as changes in punctuation or in number. It was decided, as mentioned above, to use the code C for instances of borrowing which had been only slightly modified in this way.

A further area of difference was in deciding on the boundary between extensive modification, or a summary of the source text the students’ own ideas. It was decided to use the code extensive modification when a direct link could be established between the student texts and specific passages in the source texts.

The following codes were applied to the data:

*C - copying:* This code was used when the strings of (three or more content or function) words were copied exactly from the source texts. Very minor alterations to word form were also counted as copies, such as the addition or deletion of a plural, for example the source phrase “previous learning experiences and learning styles” was used by one student as “previous learning experience and learning style”, which was counted as a copied string of six words, and coded as C [6].

*M - close modification:* As well as instances of direct copying, students also borrowed strings from the source texts which they modified in some way, such as adding or deleting words, substituting synonyms for content words, or changing the word form
(such as nominalising verb forms, etc.) Such strings were identified as modified, and coded as M (plus the number of words in the string).

**EM - extensive modification:** In the literature on student paraphrase there is not one standard definition of exactly what constitutes a successful paraphrase (Keck, 2006). In attempting to identify unsuccessful source use in student composition, researchers have tended to focus on strings of words that are traceable back to the source texts, either through direct copying or close modification. However, as plagiarism definitions state, plagiarism is considered as unacknowledged borrowing of ideas as well as words. Accordingly, it was considered necessary to include this code to represent instances in which students incorporated ideas from the source texts into their work, but did not use strings of more than three words from the source text, either directly copied or closely modified, as in the above examples. Such strings were counted as EM for extensive modification.

In this study, the code EM for extensive modification was used in a similar way to that of Soo (2008) and Howard et al. (2010) who use the term paraphrase to refer to excerpts of text which exhibit “no overt traces of direct textual borrowing”, (Soo, 2008, p. 177). Howard et al. (2010) define paraphrase as “restating a passage from a source in fresh language, though sometimes with key words retained from that passage” (p. 181). It was decided to use the term “extensive modification” rather than paraphrase to avoid confusion with the first written assignment that was called the Paraphrase Assignment. Two key elements needed to be present to code an excerpt of student text as extensive modification - it was necessary to be able to clearly identify the passage in the source text that the students rewrote, and it was necessary to be able to identify the ideas taken from the source text.

**S - summary:** Another type of textual borrowing that appeared in student texts was neither borrowing of words (copied or modified) or ideas specifically identifiable as linked to certain passages in source texts. Rather, these borrowings appeared to be attempts to summarise much larger segments of the source text. The term summary is often used in composition literature to refer to texts in the following way, “A summary reviews the main points of a passage and gets the gist of what an author or speaker says...A summary captures the entire sense of the passage in very little space” (Troyka 1993, p. 568-569). A common assignment in composition or academic writing classes is
to require students to write a summary of an article with a specified word limit, for example 100 words. However, in the data for this study no student incorporated such a complete synopsis of source texts into their work, but there were attempts to capture main ideas in their own words that were not paraphrases (identifiable rewritings of specific passages), although neither were complete and accurate representations of the propositional content of a source. Such attempts, although not conforming to traditional definitions, were termed S for summary.

Q - quotation: Direct quotations taken from the text marked with quotation marks were coded as Q.

BI - borrowed idea: This code was used for data in which it was apparent that the student had borrowed an idea from a source, but that was not a summary (a précis of an article) or a paraphrase (a rewrite of an identifiable passage in the source text without borrowed language). Without additional data in the form of text-based interviews it was not possible in all instances to identify the sources of the ideas in the student texts. However, ideas were classified as borrowed if the following criteria were met - when there was an accompanying citation or a phrase of attribution, or where it could be linked to a specific text by the researcher. Abasi and Akbari (2008) call this type of textual borrowing “Global patchwriting: Ineffective appropriation at the level of ideas” (p. 5).

CI - common idea: This code was applied to data that expressed a commonly held sentiment in the form of for example an idiom or saying. For example, an instance of this was found, in one participant’s essay, “There is an old saying in Chinese that ‘children are the masters of future’” (ZRE ll. 57). The following table provides examples of each type of code:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Source Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>As time flies by, we all recognise the technology has changed frequently nowadays, it created a lot different media which exposure to violence in media, including television, movies, music and video games and the internet, as a significant risk to the health of children and adolescents. C[23]</td>
<td>The American Academy of Pediatrics recognizes that exposure to violence in media including television, music and video games, as a significant risk to the health of children and adolescents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Textual Borrowing Codes and Examples
4500 medical procedures were carried out on monkeys in United Kingdom in 2005. M[13]

They find that it is difficult to meet the criteria of American Academic demands. EM [14]

In 2005, just over 4500 of the medical procedures carried out in the United Kingdom were carried out on monkeys, representing just 0.16 percent of all animal tests. Even native American students find the initial period of adjustment difficult, with from 30-50 percent expressing fears they will not be able to meet college course demands.

In Kurt Squire and Henry Jenkins’ article, Orson Scott Card, a famous United States science fiction writer, emphasized the importance of how games should be United States, children are constantly learning from the environment around them, it is not bounded by the school walls. When games are introduced to the United States’ military, they had very clear goals. The game America’s Army was deployed to train the soldier’s combating skills; it is used with real world situation and is guided by the seniors. Although there is violence in the video game itself, the soldiers are not killing people for no reason; they are learning from the game and applying it to the real life. If they do not learn the skill that they need to know, they will be in trouble when they are facing the real enemies.

One of the students at Columbine High School expressed their view on media violence after a shooting broke out at their school: “From a very early age, we are given toy guns and we watch violent action cartoons. Children, especially boys, will be very violent towards each other and parents will say, ‘boys will be boys.’ That is pathetic” (Massey, 1999). Q [37]

Children like to imitate what they see on TV and films, and today’s society is intoxicated with violent information that children are blinded what is good and what is bad (Goodale, 1997; Massey 1999). BI [30]

Guns itself cannot kill people; it is people that kills people. CI [11]

In addition to adding the codes of EM, S, BI, and CI, several more amendments were made to the scheme used by Shi (2004) and Weigle and Parker (2012) in this study. It was found that orthographic sentences that exhibited textual borrowing often contained more than one kind of borrowing. For example, a sentence containing a modified string of words might also contain directly copied strings. Another example would be an extensive modification of a
source passage that contained either modified or directly copied text, in addition to the student’s own language. In order to reflect this combining of textual borrowing strategies I decided to merge the codes where necessary. For example, a sentence might contain a modified string of eight words, but embedded in those words might be a copied string of three - this would be coded M [8] C [3]. In instances where codes were merged in this way, the dominant strategy or type of borrowing would be put first in the code string, as in the following example:

Table 3.2 Example of Combined Codes - Close Modification with Embedded Copied String

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Text</th>
<th>Source Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small animal’s cancer system accrues much faster than human’s cancer system growth M[9] C[3] NR NA.</td>
<td>Another considerable advantage in the use of small rodent experimental cancer systems accrues from the much more rapid growth of cancers in small mammals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instances of textual borrowing were also coded for the presence or absence of an in-text citation. The codes R for referenced and NR for not referenced were used. In some instances, students referred to authors in their own essays that had appeared in the source text, but which they had seemingly not consulted themselves. This was evident when the cited sources did not appear in their own references list, but were clearly referred to in the primary source texts. In these cases the textual borrowing was coded as Rsecondary.

Table 3.3 Example of Reference codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Finally, there is a risk that video game players can be influenced by the violence in the game (Howe, 1999). BI [18] R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>There is a suggestion that the real factors which cause an increase in violence in society are not the media but weapons such as guns and knives. BI [27] NR Aimplicit (nominalisation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsecondary</td>
<td>Hoffman believes that it is desirable to realise the sufficient wealth from developed nations in order to increase aid and reduce poverty in those developing nations (2005). Rsecondary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The codes for attribution were based on the coding scheme used by Groom (2000), in which instances of source use were identified as having either an explicit attributive phrase identifying the name of the author, or an implicit attributive phrase in which the author is not named explicitly but is referred to indirectly though a reference to the study, with the use of a
noun or anaphoric phrase, as illustrated below. Instances of source use which did not have an attributing phrase were coded NA. In several instances, attributive phrases were copied directly from source texts, as a part of a longer piece of directly copied text. In such cases the attributive phrase was coded as Acopied.

Table 3.4 Examples of attributive phrases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example with attributive phrase</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>It believes to</em> have serious and negative consequence either short term or long term as children witness high quality of violence.* M [11] NR A implicit (passive)</td>
<td>A implicit (passive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>According to Berger,</em> he believes that children who use the aggressiveness while play video games likely to use their game behavior in real life. (Berger, 2003, p. 111) P [21] R A explicit (author)</td>
<td>A explicit (author)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Many people immediately point</em> out that the media, such as films, TV programs, and video game should be responsible for such a tragic event.* M [10] NR A implicit (noun phrase)</td>
<td>A implicit (noun phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>TV has as much potential for good as for ill.</em> C [9] NR NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted here that while some research has attempted to distinguish acceptable from unacceptable textual borrowing (such as Pecorari and Shaw, 2012), this coding scheme does not distinguish between transgressive and non-transgressive borrowing in the coding of the data. This is because whether or not a piece of textual borrowing is acceptable depends on a number of contextual factors, such as the interrelationship between the borrowing, attribution and referencing, and the pedagogic, disciplinary, and institutional contexts in which it takes place.

3.6.2 Quantifying the codes.

The codes were quantified by counting the number of words coded as C, M, P, or S, and then calculating these as a percentage of the total words of the student text (the paraphrase assignment, the test essay, or the research essay) to give a picture of the relationship between the source texts and the student texts.

Descriptive statistics were used to provide a picture of the amount of each type of textual borrowing by calculating each type as a percentage of the total amount of words in each assignment. Calculations were also made for the percentage of instances of source use
that contained a reference and attributive phrases. It was hoped that this analysis would show the ways in which students incorporate sources into their writing, helping to answer Research Question 2 - How do NESB undergraduate students in a New Zealand university use sources in an English for Academic Purposes writing course?

3.7 Qualitative Data

This section explains the analysis procedure for the qualitative data. Qualitative coding progresses through a number of stages that lead to the researcher being able to develop the data into a “core of emerging theory” (Merriam, 1998, p. 114). This section explains the steps that were taken to code and analyse data from the reflective journals and the oral interviews, and how the categories and themes that emerged from the data were used to develop theory about the students’ experiences with and practice of academic writing and source use.

3.7.1 Inductive and deductive analysis.

In qualitative analysis, the data is coded and categorised to enable researchers to draw inferences from, develop theories, and reach conclusions about their research questions (Merriam, 1998). Analysis may be inductive, whereby patterns and themes that are not pre-imposed by the researcher are allowed to emerge from the data (Hatch, 2002). Inductive analysis can also be iterative and issues that arise in the coding of one set of data may be used to inform another data set, or issues to be further examined in the existing data (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005).

Another approach to analysis is the deductive approach, in which the researcher uses pre-established questions to frame the analysis. Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) note that inductive and deductive approaches should not be viewed as dichotomous, but rather as existing on a continuum, both of which are relevant and necessary to qualitative inquiry. The analysis of the data in this thesis combined both deductive and inductive approaches - it was deductive in the sense that several of the broad themes identified in the data were established from the research questions regarding attitudes, beliefs, and practices regarding source use and plagiarism. In addition, codes that had been created during the content analysis of the questionnaire data (as described in Section 3.6.5) were applied to the journal and interview data where appropriate.

However, coding and analysis also revealed themes that had not previously been considered, and which emerged from analysis within and across the different data sets. The
process was also iterative in that initial coding, beginning with the reflective journals, informed the questions and ideas that were explored in the open interviews.

3.7.2 Coding.

The first data to be coded were the reflective journals written by the participants about their experiences with and knowledge of plagiarism. The initial coding of this data set provided the core around which the study was framed, and the topics and issues identified in these journals informed choices made in the rest of the study and the formulation of topics in the reflective interviews.

The first step was to identify the portions of text that were to be coded. These text segments (Creswell, 2005) varied in length from phrases and sentences to longer paragraph-length utterances or statements that represented relevant ideas, opinions, and practices of the participants (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). Text segments were identified in the Microsoft Word files by reformatting the original journals or interview transcripts and allotting each segment to a separate line or lines. This process was a preliminary one, and during the cycles of coding, text segments were often changed as the coding and analysis progressed.

Once the text segments had been identified, the initial coding was carried out using a hybrid coding scheme in which several different types of codes were applied depending on the data in question (Saldaña, 2009). The first codes to be applied were descriptive or topic codes, which use noun forms to summarise the “basic topic” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 71) of a text segment. Descriptive codes were used to identify, for example, particular institutions attended by the participants or disciplines they had worked in, and whether it was in the participant’s home country or in New Zealand (HOME COUNTRY/NZ). Initially, each separate institution and subject was coded (e.g., INST HOME COUNTRY LANGUAGE INSTITUTE or DISC LINGUISTICS). However, due to the wide variety of institutions attended and subjects that the participants had taken, it was necessary to collapse some of these codes and make them more general. Individual institutions and subjects were replaced with more generic descriptions, as can be seen in the following example:

I (graduated) from high school, [HOME COUNTRY SCHOOL] and I went to Beijing to some kind of Language Institute [HOME COUNTRY TERTIARY].... That’s why I took some kind of English class, and in the English department in the Second Language Institute in Beijing [DISC ESOL], and I also took some specialized class like IELTS. [EXAM IELTS] (YY Int. p. 1)
Descriptive codes were necessarily general, however, in some cases it was necessary to assign sub-codes (Saldaña, 2009) when it was important to maintain a degree of specificity in the coding. For example, the descriptive code, SOURCE was applied to text segments in which the participants mentioned the types of sources they typically found during the research process. It was necessary to specify these sources, as the types of sources students use in research and writing has been identified in the literature as a possible contributing factor in NESB student plagiarism (see Section 2.3.5), and so these were given as sub-codes, for example: SOURCE INTERNET; SOURCE JOURNAL; SOURCE TEXTBOOK.

A second type of code used in the analysis was the process code which Charmaz (2008) notes are appropriate to describe actual and conceptual actions identified in the data through the use of gerunds. According to Charmaz (2008), such coding allows researchers to “see implicit processes, to make connections between codes, and to keep their analyses active and emergent” (p. 164). Process coding can be used to describe concrete activity as well as “more general conceptual action” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 77). Process coding was widely used in the analysis, as participants’ descriptions of their own developing practices and forms of knowledge were key in the data. Examples of process coding are given as follows:

I am not very comfortable about expressing my own opinion in my writing, as I am not very certain about what I know. [EXPRESSING OPINION] (R, J5)

We have to memorise things a lot, and basically, ah, the vocabulary, and ah, one of the grammar, even the, um, we have to um, memorise the whole paragraphs. [MEMORISING] (YM Int. p. 2)

A third type of code that was employed was in vivo coding, in which the code uses the language of the participant. In accordance with Charmaz’s (2006) recommendation, in vivo coding was used when the language of the participant was particularly salient or captured their individual perspectives. In vivo codes were specifically used when the participants were discussing their evaluations about plagiarism. The following examples were coded using in vivo codes:

It’s unfair for other people, because that’s not the people’s [the student’s] work, it’s not yours. [UNFAIR] (D Int. p. 13)

It can be cheating if we copy someone’s working in the exam. [CHEATING] (B22, D4)
For me, plagiarism is just like stealing things from other people because other people’s works have been used without permission. [STEALING] (C12, D4)

Initial coding of the journal data was completed by hand, with the relevant codes being written manually in the margins of the printouts. Once the initial coding of the reflective journals was completed it was decided to use Qualitative Data Analysis software (QDA), specifically the software programme HyperResearch. Hesse-Biber and Dupuis (2000) note that HyperResearch is an effective QDA programme that enables the researcher to apply codes to any length of data, develop categories, and test hypotheses. Moreover, using QDA the researcher can easily revise or reassign codes on multiple transcripts as the coding progresses (Drisko, 1998).

The Microsoft Word files that were used in the transcription of the reflective journals were converted into plain text files and imported into the programme, as well as the initial manual codebook with the individual codes and their operational definitions (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). The reflective journals were then recoded in HyperResearch and the codebook expanded. After the journals had been coded, initial coding of the interviews progressed. During this process, the codebook was revised and expanded substantially. The QDA programme allowed codes to be added where necessary, but also for codes to be renamed to allow for more or less specificity, or a different focus. For example, the code FIGURING OUT THE TOPIC was renamed as IDEA GENERATION STRATEGIES to more clearly represent the data, and the software was able to make global changes to code names. One drawback was that the line numbers of the original assignments and interview transcripts could not be imported into the programme, which meant that the texts had to be referred to by type (by journal number) or by page (for the interview transcripts).

For journal and interview data, where the analysis was primarily qualitative, the principles of reliability and validity drawn from quantitative enquiry may not applicable (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). As the initial coding scheme for the data developed, I spent several sessions discussing the coding with fellow post-graduate students, which resulted in the development and amendment of a number of codes. However, because in qualitative coding the researcher’s interpretations and analyses arise out of long-term immersion in the data (Strauss, 1987), inter-rater reliability measures were not sought.

Once the initial coding had been completed, codes were assigned to categories. This stage in qualitative analysis has been termed axial coding by Strauss and Corbin (1998) and involves establishing the ways in which the concepts are related to each other. It is necessary for all the codes in a given category to be homogenous, and for categories to be clearly
distinct from each other. In addition to assigning the codes into categories and subcategories, overlapping or repetition of codes was addressed and the number of codes was significantly reduced by grouping similar codes together - in all the number of codes was reduced from over 250 to 171.

An initial step in this process was to identify in the coding whether the text segment represented knowledge or experience gained prior to starting at the university or whether it was an emergent practice or knowledge form in the process of developing. Codes were thus amended with PRIOR or E (for EMERGENT) and grouped together. For example, in the following excerpt, the participant was discussing English language classes taken in her home country - the code PRIOR was added to STRUCTRING to indicate that it had taken place prior to her enrolment at the university, whereas in the second example, E was added to indicate that it was a current practice of the participant to use journals as a research source:

For the writing at first they taught me how to do the structure, they were like, very similar to um, language, ah to like the writing classes that sometimes you taught us last semester, like, oh you have this structure for argumentative, or discussion or whatever. [PRIOR STRUCTURING] (YY Int. p. 2)

It’s easier to use different sources so I try to look for articles, um…yeah, I look for articles more than books. [E SOURCE JOURNALS] (S Int. p. 5)

This process made the codes within each category, and the categories themselves, both mutually exclusive and homogenous (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). As extensive manipulation of the codebook was difficult in the QDA software, a printout of the codebook was cut up and each code was manually cut and pasted into the relevant category or subcategory. The digital codebook was then revised into categories and subcategories according to the hardcopy, and the categories and subcategories were attached to each code in the codebook.

It was challenging to establish the major categories and develop mutually exclusive groupings of codes and categories (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005), and it became evident that a number of the initial groupings were too broad. However, to an extent this also was perhaps a reflection of the nature of the writing process itself, which is one that moves forward and backward between the processes of writing, research, and referencing, and is not one that is always linear or easy to categorise. The codes were grouped into categories and the initial letters of each category were assigned to the codes so that they would appear in groups in the HyperReseatch codebook. The main categories arising from the data were the following:

Category One - Academic Experience:
• Academic Experience Disciplinary (AXEXP DICS)
• Academic Experience Institutional (ACEXP INST)
• Academic Experience Pedagogic (ACEXP PED)
• Academic Experience Examinations (ACEXP EXAM)
• Academic Experience - Acculturating (ACEXP ACCL)

Category Two - Research Process Knowledge
• Researching Knowledge Prior (RKP)
• Researching Knowledge Emergent (RKE)

Category Three - Writing Knowledge
• Writing Knowledge Prior (WKP)
• Writing Knowledge Emergent (WKE)

Category Four - Referencing Knowledge
• Referencing Knowledge Prior (REF KP)
• Referencing Knowledge Emergent (REF KE)

Category Five - Plagiarism Knowledge
• Plagiarism Prior Knowledge (PPK)
• Plagiarism Emergent Knowledge (PEK)

An abbreviated form of the category name was added to each code in the codebook, so that the QDA programme would group the codes into the appropriate category. Thus in the codebook the code DISC COMMERCE became ACEXP DISC COMMERCE, EXPRESSING OWN OPINION became WKE EXPRESSING OWN OPINION, and USING SOURCE TEXTS AS MODELS became WKE USING SOURCE TEXTS AS MODELS (see Appendix H for an example coded interview transcript).

3.8 Adequacy, Validity, and Reliability

The following section outlines the ways in which the criteria for adequacy were established in the study. Traditionally, the quality of positivist scientific inquiry has been established via the concepts of validity and reliability. Validity ensures that a research instrument measures the phenomena that it sets out to measure, while the reliability of an instrument ensures that the results are consistent and replicable (Cohen et al., 2000). In quantitative inquiry, validity and reliability are achieved by various means, such as having an adequate sample size, reducing researcher bias, and choosing appropriate data collection instruments. Quantitative inquiry is based on an assumption that the phenomena under
analysis can be observed and measured by an objective researcher, with the same results being reproducible in future studies (Kvale, 1996; Merriam, 1998).

However, qualitative inquiry is based on an assumption that the world is constructed from complex multiple realities rather than a single reality that researchers can uncover via scientific methods (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Accordingly, researchers have posited a different set of criteria for establishing the “trustworthiness” of research, outlined by Lincoln and Guba (1985) as credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. These categories enable the researcher to ensure that the research process and results can be as rigorous as those gathered using traditional scientific approaches (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

3.8.1 Credibility.

In qualitative research, the concept of credibility replaces that of internal validity, and relates to the question of how well the findings of research represent reality (Merriam, 1998). According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), the credibility of a study can be enhanced through a variety of strategies such as prolonged engagement in the field, triangulation, peer debriefing, and clarifying researcher biases. This section defines each of these categories in turn and discusses how this study attempted to establish credibility.

The first way in which credibility can be enhanced is through a prolonged engagement in the field in order for the researcher to gain an adequate understanding of the research context, since, as Lincoln and Guba (1985) argue, “it is not possible to understand any phenomenon without reference to the context in which it is embedded” (p. 301). Prolonged engagement in the field enables the researcher to become immersed in the culture under investigation, which allows trust to be built between the researcher and the participants of the study. For this study, data was firstly collected from participants during and after the semester period, from February 2007 until May 2007. Written data was collected over this period. Once the semester was finished data collection continued as volunteers from the class were interviewed. In all, data collection ran from February to November 2007.

This extended period of data collection enabled the researcher to gain a thorough understanding of the culture of the class as a whole and of the smaller group of volunteers who agreed to participate in the study. As I was their course instructor as well as the researcher, I was able to gain insight into the workings of the class and establish a unique position in the group. Clearly there was a significant power differential between myself and the participants in the study because I occupied the dual role as researcher and instructor. In order to somewhat offset this imbalance, I recruited study volunteers from students who were not in my own tutorial group and whose work was graded by the course tutors rather than
myself as instructor. Moreover, I chose to conduct the interviews after the completion of the course so the participants would not feel as uncomfortable discussing potentially sensitive aspects of their work with someone in a position of power over them, and also so that trust might be established between us from my having known and worked with the students throughout the course. Through these means it was hoped that a clear picture of the context of the research setting and participants could be developed and the trust of the participants would be gained.

Triangulation is a second method by which the credibility of a study may be enhanced, which is defined by Cohen et al. (2000) as the use of multiple methods of data collection. Of the four different types of triangulation identified by Lincoln and Guba (1985) as source (or data) triangulation, method triangulation, investigator triangulation, and theory triangulation, this study employed triangulation of source and method. Firstly, data for the study was collected from a variety of sources: from a class questionnaire, from student texts (tests, essays, and reflective journals), and from interviews. In addition, different methods were used to analyse the data; quantitative statistical analysis was used for the questionnaire while the student journals and the interviews were analysed qualitatively, for themes and categories that illuminated and helped to answer the research questions. Lastly, the student texts were analysed linguistically to establish the form and the amount of the textual borrowing used, and descriptive statistical analysis was then applied to these results. It is hoped that by using multiple sources of data and forms of analysis, the credibility of the study, or the degree to which the results reflect reality, was thereby increased.

A further strategy for enhancing credibility is peer debriefing (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), which involves peers of the researcher providing critique of the instruments of data collection and methodological design of the study, as well as its theoretical foundation. Peer debriefing can expose the researcher to questions and issues not previously thought of, to provide opportunities for the researcher to test working hypotheses, and to test and develop the design of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Peer debriefing for this study occurred at several stages: the initial proposal for the study was presented and discussed at meetings of PALC (Post-graduate Applied Linguistics Club), a grouping of applied linguistics PhD students within the department. Feedback from the group was used to refine and develop the proposal for the study. The initial questionnaire was also given to fellow group members who made suggestions on the wording and the structure of the questionnaire, as was the initial interview schedule. Feedback was also incorporated at this stage. The overall methodological design was reviewed by this same group and subsequently revised.
Finally, Merriam (1998) noted that credibility can be strengthened if the researcher is transparent about his or her own biases and theoretical orientations at the outset of a study. Rather than being a disadvantage, the theoretical biases and position of individual researchers, as long as they are recognised and clearly stated, are a source of strength, since when “human beings are the primary instrument of data collection and analysis…We are thus ‘closer’ to reality than if a data collection instrument had been interjected between us and the participants” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 203). It is hoped that by using the strategies of prolonged engagement in the field, triangulation, peer debriefing, and identification of theoretical position of the researcher and foundation of the study, credibility of the study can be achieved.

3.8.2 Transferability.

The next category for establishing the trustworthiness of a study is transferability, which is similar to the concept of external validity in quantitative research. Transferability can be defined as the degree to which the results of one study can be transferred to other situations (Nunan, 1992). Qualitative research has traditionally been criticised for its lack of generalisability, particularly in studies that use small sample sizes. However Merriman (1998) notes that the aim of qualitative research is often to understand a particular phenomenon in depth, rather than to find out what holds true for the majority. As such, that the findings of qualitative inquiry may not be easily generalised is not necessarily a valid criticism. Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggested that the category of transferability replace generalisability for qualitative research. Moreover, they noted that the researcher (him or herself) is not able to establish transferability. Rather, they can only provide the details of the data collection and analysis through which another person is able to draw conclusions as to whether transferability has been achieved (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In order to provide the details by which another may make a conclusion about the transferability of the study, the researcher must provide rich and thick description (Geertz, 1973), and to this end, this study aimed to provide a detailed account of the data collection, analysis, and the findings so that the reader will be able to transfer the findings of the study to their own situations where applicable.

3.8.3 Dependability.

Dependability relates to the extent to which the researcher can account for changes over the course of the study, both in the phenomena under investigation and in the overall design of the study, which becomes modified as the researcher gains greater understanding. This concept is based on the assumption that the world and the multiple sets of realities within
it are in a state of flux, challenging the positivist view of a world that is static and hence measurable and replicable (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). The design of the study and changes to it were fully documented and made transparent to fulfil this criterion for adequacy.

3.8.4 Confirmability.

The confirmability of a study relates to the extent to which the study’s findings can be confirmed by another researcher (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Confirmability is similar to the concept of reliability in quantitative research, which measures the extent to which the findings of a study can be replicated (Mackey & Gass, 2005). To establish the confirmability of a study, the researcher must make enough data and details of the study available so that another researcher can examine the data to assess the interpretations of the initial researcher (Mackey & Gass, 2005).

Merriam (1998) pointed out that the traditional notion of reliability rests on the assumption that repetition is a prerequisite for truth. Qualitative inquiry, which rests upon a relativist ontology (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000) does not hold with the view that results should be able to be repeated, and instead, aims to produce findings that are consistent with the data presented in the study (Merriam, 1998).

In order to achieve this, several procedures may be undertaken – the investigator’s theoretical assumptions should be made transparent, triangulation may be used, and an audit trail, which gives detailed information on the collection and analysis of the data, may be created. This information may take the form of raw data, descriptions of data reduction and analysis procedures, and descriptions of data reconstruction and synthesis (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Lincoln and Guba (1985) also suggested that researchers keep a reflexive diary in which they record information about all aspects of the study.

This study aimed to establish confirmability through a thorough analysis of its theoretical foundations and assumptions, as well as the use of data and method triangulation, as outlined in section 3.8.1. Furthermore, an audit trail was created through the careful description of the data collection procedures and instruments (such as the copies of pilot and main questionnaire, the pilot interview schedule, and main schedule), data management, and analysis (e.g., the coding categories developed).

In addition to this, throughout the study I kept a reflexive journal that recorded the research process and which discussed question and issues that arose during all stages of the research, the framing of the proposal and design of the study and data collection through to the data analysis and findings. Through these procedures it is expected that enough detail has
been given so that the results may be checked, confirmed, modified, or questioned by another researcher (Mackey & Gass, 2005).

3.8.5 Reliability and validity.

As mentioned earlier, reliability and validity are measures to determine the quality of quantitative research. Dörnyei (2003) noted that it is not always possible to apply the procedures used to establish reliability and validity in large-scale standardised questionnaires to small-scale questionnaires such as the one designed for this study. However, he does suggest that all measurement instruments establish internal consistency, firstly by using multi-item scales in which differently worded questions are used to target the same underlying construct, and secondly, by measuring the internal consistency statistically. Accordingly, for Questionnaire Section B: Beliefs about Academic Writing and Source Use, multiple individual items were designed to measure underlying constructs regarding student beliefs about the following:

1. Institutional significance of referencing and plagiarism.
2. Disciplinary significance of referencing and plagiarism.
3. Significance of voice, originality and authority in academic writing.

For the Questionnaire data, SPSS was used to calculate the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the Likert scale items, which Brown (2001) suggests is an accurate and flexible method for establishing internal consistency of multi-scale items. It is recommended that the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient be in excess of 0.70 (Dörnyei, 2003). All groupings, except grouping 2, concerning student beliefs about the disciplinary significance of referencing and plagiarism, achieved a score of more than 0.70.

In addition to internal consistency reliability (Brown, 2001) as established by the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient, content validity was established by peer review of the initial questionnaire design by fellow applied linguistics PhD students and via the piloting process, during which revisions were made to the structure and content of the instrument.

3.9 Summary

This chapter has attempted to outline the key features of the qualitative approach that formed the theoretical basis for the study, and place the techniques used (qualitative and quantitative) within this framework. The research questions and design have been outlined, which comprises of a holistic case study with an embedded sub-case (Yin, 2006). The data
collection tools of a questionnaire, student writing samples, reflective journals, and interviews have been discussed and related to the research questions and data management and analysis procedures have been introduced. The trustworthiness of the study has been discussed, and the concepts of credibility, transferability, dependability, confirmability, validity, and reliability have been examined in relation to the research methodologies used. In the next chapter, Chapter Four, the results of the first set of data, the questionnaire, are presented and analysed.
Chapter Four - Results of Questionnaire Analysis

4.0 Overview

The following chapter presents and discusses the results of the Academic Writing and Source Use Questionnaire administered to the EAP course. This survey, which was completed by 47 participants at the beginning of the semester, was designed to elicit preliminary information regarding the students’ academic backgrounds and experiences with academic writing, and their beliefs, strategies, and reported practices regarding academic writing, source use, and plagiarism. The questionnaire was intended to gather data that suggested areas of further interest for the main qualitative part of the study. The data in this chapter contributes to answering Research Questions One and Two concerning participant knowledge and practice of plagiarism and source use.

Section 4.1 of the chapter reports the results concerning the educational background of the students, including their disciplinary and institutional experience. Sections 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 present the result of items concerning students’ beliefs and reported textual borrowing and attribution practices, while sections 4.4.4, 4.15 and 4.1.6 report the results of the Likert scale items regarding students’ understandings of plagiarism and academic writing. As stated in the Methodology Chapter section 3.5.3, these results are reported in the form of descriptive statistics.

In section 4.1.7 the results of non-parametric inferential statistics are reported, firstly for the Mann-Whitney U Test which was used to test for significance between in the Chinese-non Chinese language groups’ views and practices concerning plagiarism and source use, and secondly for the Kruskal-Wallis Test, which was used to test for differences between the disciplinary background and year-of-study groups and their beliefs and practices concerning source use and plagiarism. Finally, section 4.2 presents the results of the qualitative content analysis of the open question items, in which participants were invited to discuss in further detail their understandings of plagiarism and its possible causes.

4.1 Quantitative Analysis - Demographic Information

The majority of students surveyed were from China and identified Chinese as their first language (note that this item was an open-response fill-in item (Brown, 2001) in which Chinese was the language given by the respondents themselves). The next largest grouping was students from Japan, followed by Korea, and the Pacific Islands. In addition to this, there
were several participants from Spanish-speaking countries, Malaysia, Brunei, and Thailand. The majority of respondents reported Commerce as their major (Finance, Accounting, and Business Administration), followed by Humanities (Japanese, English/Linguistics, Law, and Psychology), and Science (Botany, Food Science, Zoology, Health Science, and Computer and Information Science). The most commonly reported year of study was third year. This information is summarised in the following table:

Table 4.1 Participant Demographic Information (N=47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan/English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese/Malay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil/Hindi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Year of Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second year</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third year</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth/Fifth year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.1 Educational background and institutional experience.

In Section C of the questionnaire, students were asked to report on their educational and institutional experiences before starting their academic programmes at the university. Most of the students indicated that they had attended high school in their home countries but that they had not begun tertiary studies there. Just over one third of respondents indicated that they had attended high school in New Zealand or another English speaking country, while approximately one fifth indicated that they had attended a tertiary institution in New Zealand or another English-speaking country prior to attending the university.

Table 4.2 Prior Educational Experience (N=47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Educational Experience</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended high school in home country</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended high school in NZ or other English speaking country</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended tertiary institution in home country</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended tertiary institution in NZ or other English speaking country</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2 Textual borrowing practices.

Section A of the questionnaire contained frequency-of-response items concerning students’ current textual borrowing practices during the writing process, and dichotomous response items in which they were asked to indicate whether different types of source-use required a citation or reference. Students were asked to indicate the ways in which they used source texts by noting how frequently they engaged in types of copying while writing. The term copying has been widely used in other surveys on NESB student textual borrowing (for example Hayes & Introna, 2005a, 2005b; Marshall & Garry, 2006; Maxwell et al., 2006), and is a description of unacknowledged textual borrowing which is commonly used in descriptions and definitions of plagiarism in institutional definitions and in composition manuals. These questions were designed to gather data on the degree to which the students felt textual transformation to be necessary in the writing process, or in other words, the amount of change that the students considered necessary to make to source texts before incorporating them into their writing.

As Table 4.3 shows, the majority of students seemed to believe that it was necessary to make at least some degree of change to source texts before incorporation. Well over half the students indicated that they never or seldom copied exactly from source texts while writing. The majority indicated that they made significant changes to source texts when
writing, with similar numbers responding that they put the ideas from the source texts into their own words.

It is possible that students indicated that they did not frequently copy from source texts because they perceived the term “copy” to have negative connotations and thus did not want to admit to engaging in negative behaviour. However, even if this was the case, the result is still interesting as an indicator of students’ awareness of textual borrowing conventions, if not their actual practice. These results suggest that the students were aware that at least some degree of textual transformation was necessary while they were engaged in academic writing, and that incorporating directly copied texts was not appropriate. However, these results provide insight into the participants' practices only, rather than whether they considered these practices appropriate or not. These results are illustrated in the following table:

Table 4.3 Writing and Source Integration Strategies (N=47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement: When you are writing which of the following do you do?</th>
<th>N/NVO</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O/ATT</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I copy the words exactly from the source</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I copy most of the words from the source but change a few/several words.</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I copy from the source but change several phrases.</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I write the ideas down from the source but use my own words.</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=Never, NVO=Not Very Often, S=Sometimes, O=Often, ATT= All the Time, NA=No Answer

4.1.3 Academic referencing - beliefs and strategies.

The next set of items was designed to elicit data on students’ knowledge of citation use and their reported citation strategies. Firstly, students were asked which of a given set of source types required a citation or reference. The list of source types used was adapted from composition manual recommendations about citation requirements (Hacker, 2008; Raimes, 1999). The majority of students were able to correctly identify the types of source use needing a citation or reference. Around three quarters of students correctly identified facts, theories and ideas, and quotations as needing a reference or citation, while fewer students (around one fifth) incorrectly identified common knowledge and their own ideas as requiring citation.
Table 4.4 Sources Requiring a Reference Or Citation (N=47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of source use</th>
<th>Affirmative responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facts taken from a source</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories or ideas suggested by other writers</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotations from a source</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common knowledge</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own ideas</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next set of questions asked about respondents’ practice with referencing, in which students were asked how often they incorporated unreferenced quotations, paraphrases, and summaries in their writing. While the previous set of questions had been designed to ask about students’ knowledge of referencing requirements, this set of questions was intended to gather data on their actual referencing practices while writing. This set of questions was designed to complement the items illustrated in Table 4.3 on strategies with copying because I wanted to ascertain the extent to which problems with source use derive from students’ lack of paraphrasing abilities (i.e., the extent to which they directly copy or transform text) or from a lack of knowledge of referencing conventions (or indeed both of these).

According to the results, over half the students indicated that they never or seldom incorporated unreferenced quotations in their work, suggesting that this type of source use is the easiest for students to comprehend and use appropriately. However, students reported using unreferenced paraphrasing more often - in fact almost three quarters of the respondents indicated that they used unreferenced paraphrases either sometimes, often, or all of the time, while almost half indicated that they used unreferenced summaries in their writing either sometimes, often, or all of the time. These results contrast with the results illustrated in Table 4.4 in which 68% of students indicated that paraphrases required a reference, and 64% indicated that summaries required a reference. This suggests a degree of divergence between what students know to be correct source use and what they say they do in their own writing. It also suggests that when thinking about source use, students may view textual transformation (via paraphrase) and referencing (acknowledging the author of the source) as separate issues, which would indicate a significant misunderstanding of source use conventions. These results are illustrated in Table 4.5.
Table 4.5 Referencing Strategies Used While Writing (N=47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement: How often do you-</th>
<th>N/NVO</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O/ATT</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use a direct quotation from a source without reference?</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase (put into your own words) of a source without reference?</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarise a source without reference?</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=Never, NVO=Not Very Often, S=Sometimes, O=Often, ATT= All the Time: NA=No Answer

4.1.4 Understandings of referencing and authorship in academic writing.

Whereas the items discussed in the previous sections were designed to gather data on the respondents personal beliefs and practices regarding source use, the items in this section were designed to ascertain the students’ perceptions of the degree of emphasis placed on the need for referencing and the importance placed on plagiarism at an institutional level, both at the university where the study was conducted and in their home countries. These Likert multi-scale items were designed to measure student beliefs regarding the institutional significance of referencing and plagiarism, student beliefs regarding the disciplinary significance of referencing and plagiarism, and student beliefs regarding the significance of voice, originality, and authority in academic writing.

As mentioned in the previous chapter in section 3.2.5 on reliability and validity of the survey instrument, the Cronbach alpha coefficient was calculated for the Likert scale items in order to establish the reliability of the scale. Items were grouped according to the underlying attributes they were designed to measure. All groups except Group B “Student beliefs regarding the disciplinary significance of plagiarism” achieved a score in excess of 0.7, which is the minimum measure recommended for reliability (Dörnyei, 2003). Accordingly, as recommended by Dörnyei, the results from Group B have been omitted from the presentation of the results in this chapter (the results for this group and a summary table of the alpha values for all groups can be found in Appendix M).

4.1.5 Student beliefs regarding the institutional significance of referencing and plagiarism.

Students were asked to report on their understandings of the importance of acknowledging sources at the university and to compare the emphasis on correct citation to their previous academic institutions. Well over three quarters of the students agreed with the statement that the university placed a strong emphasis on acknowledging sources in academic writing. The results also indicated a contrast in the emphasis on source use between the
current university and academic institutions in their home countries, with almost half of the participants indicating that they felt the emphasis to be stronger here than at their previous institutions. In addition to this, 44.7% suggested that they had received instruction into plagiarism prior to starting at this university. However, these results should not be taken to mean that plagiarism and source use are not important in academic institutions outside of ESB countries, as almost three quarters of respondents had previously indicated that they had not attended tertiary institutions in their home countries and therefore were perhaps not able to report accurately on these conventions. However, they do perhaps indicate that it is the students’ perception that there are differences in source use conventions and practice between cultures, which may have influenced their attitudes and practices towards source use at this university. The results are illustrated in the following table:

Table 4.6 Perceptions of Institutional Emphasis on Source Use Conventions (N=47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SD/D</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>A/SA</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>This university strongly emphasises the importance of acknowledging sources used in academic writing.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>There is not so much emphasis on using the correct documentation at my school/university in my home country.</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>I was not taught about plagiarism before coming this university.</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S=Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, U=Undecided, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree, NA=No Answer

4.1.6 Student perceptions of voice, originality and authority in academic writing.

In order to ascertain student beliefs about their own role in the academic writing process, students were asked a set of questions concentrating on their perceptions of their own voice and sense of originality in writing, and also concerning the relationship between their own ideas and those expressed by the writers of source texts. These were designed to explore issues of authorship and identity discussed in the literature on student textual borrowing, and the idea that unacknowledged textual borrowing may result when students do not have a strong sense of themselves as authors or an inability to separate their own voice from the authorial voices constructed in the source texts (See Literature Review section 2.1).

The majority of students indicated an awareness of both the importance of their own ideas in academic writing, and that they liked to express these ideas in their writing, as
illustrated below. The majority of the students appeared to consider originality to be important to them in their academic writing, as demonstrated in Table 4.7:

Table 4.7 Importance of Own Ideas in Academic Writing (N=47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SD/D</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>A/SA</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>My own ideas are important to me when I write.</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>I prefer to express my own ideas in my writing.</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Academic writing should focus on expressing my original ideas.</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S=Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, U=Undecided A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree, NA=No Answer

In addition to items focusing on the expression of student voice, a number of questions concerned the role of authorities and experts in academic writing. The answers to this set of questions were less definitive, suggesting that there may be a tension between students’ perceptions of their own voices in their writing, and their perceptions of the role of authoritative sources. Although there was still an emphasis on the importance of their own voices here (with 42.6% and 38.3% disagreeing with the statements that indicated expert voices were more important than their own), in this category there were many more undecided respondents than in the other categories. Yet respondents still appeared to perceive the function of academic writing to be the combining of the students’ original thought with the ideas of the source-text authors, as illustrated below:

Table 4.8 Role of Originality and Authoritative Sources in Academic Writing (N=47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SD/D</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>A/SA</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>My own ideas are less important than authorities and experts in my fields of study.</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>I prefer to express the ideas of others in my writing.</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Academic writing should combine my original thought with the ideas of experts in the field.</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>I prefer to combine my own ideas with the ideas of others in my writing.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
59 Academic writing should focus on expressing the ideas of experts in the field. 23.4% 38.3% 29.8% 8.5%

S=Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, U=Undecided, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree, NA=No Answer

In summary, the analysis of the Likert scale items appear to indicate that the majority of students recognised both the institutional significance of referencing and plagiarism, as well as the rhetorical significance of the importance of their own sense of voice and originality in writing. They did not seem to suggest that the students were unaware of source use conventions, or that they considered source texts to be authoritative to the extent that they could not express their own voices through their texts.

4.1.7 Differences in knowledge and practice between cultural, disciplinary and year-level groups.

As has been discussed in the literature on NESB student textual borrowing (see section 2.1), a number of researchers have suggested that different cultural and disciplinary groups have different attitudes and practices towards plagiarism and source use. Accordingly, for items 51 to 64 of the questionnaire, it was decided to compare ways in which participants from different language groups, disciplines, and year-level groups perceived plagiarism and source use. These items were selected for analysis as they specifically concerned student perceptions of plagiarism and source use which have been linked in literature to cultural background, disciplinary background, or level of academic literacy (see sections 2.1, 2.2.3, and 2.2.7).

The Mann-Whitney U Test was used to compare Chinese and non-Chinese language background students’ for items 51-64. The same procedure was preformed for disciplinary groups (Humanities, Science, and Commerce) and year level (1/2 years, 3/4 years, and 5 years or over), using the Kruskal-Wallis Test, as described in section 3.5.4. However, no significant differences were found between these groups. For the first independent variable tested, language background (Chinese vs. non-Chinese groups), the p-values ranged from .109 to .939. A p-value of .05 or less is necessary to indicate statistical significance (Pallant, 2013). Similarly, for the independent variable of disciplinary group, the analysis of the Kruskal-Wallis test returned p-values ranging from .069 to .943. The Kruskal-Wallis test applied to the independent variable of year of study (1/2, 3/4, and 5 years or over) returned p-values in the range of .146 to .998. As none of these items tested for significance returned scores of .05 or lower, the differences between the independent and dependent variables were not statistically significant (Pallant, 2013). (See Appendix I for tables detailing these results).
This perhaps suggests that individual differences rather than cultural or disciplinary differences, or differences in the participants’ year of study were influential in determining the ways in which the students perceived and used their sources in their writing. This significance of individual differences as determining factors in student beliefs and practices concerning source use and plagiarism is explored further in Chapter Six, in which the case studies of the Interview Group participants are presented.

4.2 Qualitative Data

In addition to the quantitative data analyses presented above, the questionnaire was designed to elicit qualitative data on student understandings of plagiarism and its possible causes and ascertain the degree to which their understandings corresponded with standard definitions of plagiarism as given in the university’s Dishonest Practice Procedures within the Policy on Academic Misconduct (“Dishonest Practice Information for Students”, n.d.). It was hoped that by requiring the students to explain their understandings using their own language, data with a greater level of depth and detail would be gathered. This section reports the findings of the content analysis of the open questions in the questionnaire, the coding procedures for which were set out in Section 3.6.5.

4.2.1 Describing plagiarism.

Question 11 of the survey asked students to provide definitions of plagiarism from their own understanding. In this section of the questionnaire, 38 answers were provided. In order to analyse the different elements of the definitions and their degree of comprehensiveness, the specific wording of each definition provided was broken down into the following codes, adapted from Pecorari’s (2002) definitional model of plagiarism: action (the verb used to describe the “plagiarising action”), objects (referring to the direct object of the “plagiarising action”), manner (referring to the way in which the action is carried out) and indirect object, referring to the person or thing indirectly affected by the plagiarising action.
Table 4.9 Summary of Definitions Coding Scheme (N=38)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Action (doing)</th>
<th>Object (what)</th>
<th>Manner (how)</th>
<th>Indirect Object (from)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>using</td>
<td>opinions, works</td>
<td>without citation</td>
<td>others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>stealing</td>
<td>ideas</td>
<td>use as one’s own</td>
<td>others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>stealing</td>
<td>ideas</td>
<td>use as one’s own, without citation</td>
<td>other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>copying</td>
<td>work, ideas</td>
<td>without acknowledgement</td>
<td>another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>copying</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>without quotation</td>
<td>others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>taking</td>
<td>ideas</td>
<td>put in own writing</td>
<td>someone else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>copying</td>
<td>works</td>
<td>without allowance</td>
<td>others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>taking</td>
<td>ideas</td>
<td>show as my own</td>
<td>others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>copying</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>copying</td>
<td>ideas</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>someone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17</td>
<td>copying</td>
<td>ideas, words</td>
<td>without reference</td>
<td>article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A18</td>
<td>taking</td>
<td>ideas, theories,</td>
<td>without permission</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>using</td>
<td>ideas, facts,</td>
<td>without citation</td>
<td>source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>using</td>
<td>ideas, words</td>
<td>without credit, pretending as one’s own</td>
<td>others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>copying,</td>
<td>ideas</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cheating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>copying,</td>
<td>sources</td>
<td>paraphrasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cheating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>copying</td>
<td>words, ideas</td>
<td>directly, without quotation or reference</td>
<td>writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>copying,</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>directly or indirectly, without reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cheating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>cheating</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>copying,</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>submit as one’s own</td>
<td>others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>taking</td>
<td>original words,</td>
<td>use as one’s own</td>
<td>another author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>copying</td>
<td>work, ideas, words</td>
<td>exactly, without references or changes</td>
<td>another’s work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>copying</td>
<td>work, ideas</td>
<td>directly</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>copying</td>
<td>words, ideas,</td>
<td>without reference or citation</td>
<td>books, journals,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td>newspapers, magazines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>Indirect Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(doing)</td>
<td>(what)</td>
<td>(how)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>copying</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>without reference</td>
<td>someone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>copying</td>
<td>sources, ideas</td>
<td>without paraphrasing</td>
<td>another author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>copying</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>submit as one’s own</td>
<td>others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17</td>
<td>using</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>without acknowledgement</td>
<td>other peoples'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B18</td>
<td>copying</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>without changes</td>
<td>others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>copying</td>
<td>intellectual property, source</td>
<td>directly, without reference or credit</td>
<td>a person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>copy</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>without reference, citation</td>
<td>someone else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>stealing</td>
<td>source</td>
<td>without citation</td>
<td>document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>use</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>without acknowledgment</td>
<td>others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>use</td>
<td>ideas, sources</td>
<td>without reference</td>
<td>others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>copy</td>
<td>writing, ideas</td>
<td>without reference</td>
<td>others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>copy</td>
<td>ideas, work</td>
<td>exactly, without reference</td>
<td>others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>copying, stealing</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>exactly</td>
<td>someone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>cheating</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action**: There were five verbs used in the students’ definitions of plagiarism. By far the most common was that of “copying”, which was used 23 times, or in 61% of the definitions. This suggests that the students saw plagiarism as largely an issue of textual transformation, or more specifically, lack of textual transformation. It is possible then, that if the student does not engage in direct copying that they may not consider themselves to be plagiarising? This is problematic given the wide range of behaviours that can come under the umbrella of the term (Buranen, 1999; Howard, 2000; Pecorari & Petrić, 2014). While copying may or may not have a negative connotation depending on perception of the individual students, the use of the terms “cheating”, ‘stealing”, and “taking” convey a stronger sense of disapproval, suggesting that the respondents who used these terms were taking, or at least reflecting, the moral stance of the dominant discourse of plagiarism. The frequency of verb use is illustrated in the following table:
Table 4.10 Verb Usage Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Times appearing in definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>copying</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stealing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheating</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Object: This code was applied to the portion of the definition in which the students described what could be inappropriately borrowed. Seven types of object were identified here, ranging from the abstract ("ideas", "theories" "opinions", and "intellectual property") through to the more concrete ("sources", "writing", "words", "pictures", "evidence", and "facts"). The most commonly used direct object was also what appears to be the most abstract and difficult to define, namely ideas, theories, and opinions, which were used in 22 of the 38 answers, or 58%. The more concrete objects appeared less often (see Table 4.10 below). This preference for the abstract objects over the more concrete objects could perhaps indicate a level of vagueness in the students’ understandings of the nature of plagiarism. While entirely appropriate on a theoretical level, these abstract objects could be more difficult to identify in practice, leading to a divergence between the students’ knowledge and practice of plagiarism and its avoidance in academic writing. Thirty-three of the definitions made reference to one or more objects of the plagiarising action, or 87%. However, as noted in the Introduction to this thesis, the ways in which institutional policies describe plagiarism are themselves vague, grouping a number of practices under the single definition.

Table 4.11 Object Usage Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Times appearing in definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideas, theories, opinions</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing, words</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures, evidence or facts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual property</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manner: This code was applied to the element of the definition in which the students described the ways in which the action of plagiarism or inappropriate textual borrowing could
take place. The different types of manner were identified as follows: “without reference or citation”; “submitting as one’s own”; “without acknowledgment or credit”; “exactly or directly”; “without quotation”; “without change”; “indirectly”; and “without permission”. The most commonly used expression of manner was without citation or reference, which was used in 15 of the definitions, followed by submitting as one’s own (nine uses), exactly or directly (seven times), and without acknowledgment or credit (six times). The remaining manner-expressions were used three or fewer times. Of the 38 definitions provided, a total of 33 made reference to one of these expressions of manner, or 87%.

Table 4.12 Manner Usage Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manner</th>
<th>Times appearing in definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without reference or citation</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitting as one’s own</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without acknowledgment or credit</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exactly or directly</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without quotation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without change</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirectly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without permission</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indirect object:* This code was applied to the section of the definitions in which students indicated from whom or what the object of the plagiarising action had been taken. These indirect objects were expressed either in the noun form (person, author, writer, document, source, or work) or in the more abstract pronoun form (another, other, someone). The abstract pronouns occurred most commonly in the definitions, with “another”/“other” or “someone” appearing in 22 of the definitions. “Another person”, “author”, or “writer”, and “document”, “source”, or “work” appeared five times respectively. Of the 38 definitions analysed, 31 made reference to one or more of these indirect objects, or 82%.
Table 4.13 *Indirect Object Usage Frequency*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Object</th>
<th>Times appearing in definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Another, other</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another person, author or writer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document, source or work general or specific e.g. magazine, article, or book</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Causes of inadvertent plagiarism.

In this question, students were asked to reflect on the possible reasons that inadvertent plagiarism in student academic writing might occur. In total, 31 responses were given. Frequency tables for each code were then created and percentages calculated to establish the most and least common types of reasons given for unintentional plagiarism. Assuming that unintentional plagiarism is caused by a gap in knowledge resulting in an error in the way the student has used source texts in their writing, the data here is presented in order of the complexity of that error - from simple errors of omission or errors in skill, to errors based on more complex beliefs about the nature of knowledge or cross cultural understandings of source use and plagiarism. The codes used in this subsection are as follows:

- forgetting
- referencing error
- source incorporation error
- incorrect source error
- conflicting epistemological beliefs

Table 4.14 *Causes of Inadvertent plagiarism*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>forgetting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>referencing error</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source incorporation error</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incorrect source error</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflicting epistemological beliefs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Forgetting:* Responses that used the term “forget” as a reason for inadvertent plagiarism were coded and assigned to the category of “forgetting”, which was the least
complex of the causes presented for inappropriate textual borrowing in the questionnaire data. There were six instances of forgetting given as a possible reason for inadvertent plagiarism. In one of the examples, the error was a result of forgetting the origin of the source material, “Sometimes I accept unintentional plagiarism when I use some common sayings in my essay but I forgot where it is come from” (A17). In the remaining instances, the responses indicated that the plagiarism resulted from the student having forgotten to include the references in the piece of academic writing, for example, “Forgetting to reference a work cited” (B16); “Forgetting to reference – sometimes forget to reference what is needed” (C1); “Paraphrasing but forgot to include the references” (A6), and “Forgetting to reference – sometimes forget to reference what is needed” (C1). One student referred to errors in forgetting the mechanics of referencing: “Sometimes it will be easily forgotten to add the quotation signs” (A18). The implication with these responses appears to be that the individual had the knowledge and ability to use source texts appropriately in their writing, but due to a lapse in memory did not use those texts appropriately. Thus this data suggests the belief that an error of omission can be the cause of inadvertent plagiarism.

In the next set of codes are referencing error, paraphrasing error, source number error and source incorporation error. These codes differ from the data which suggested error of omission or forgetting as a cause of the inappropriate textual borrowing, as the former suggests a pre-existing level of knowledge which was not used, whereas in the latter, a lack of knowledge or a different understanding of appropriate referencing and source use strategies can be inferred, as illustrated in the following examples.

Referencing error: This code was used for data in which students suggested that plagiarism could arise through error in referencing. There were seven instances of referencing errors in the data. However, as in the following example, the implication here is that rather than forgetting the reference, the reference is not needed, indicating a gap in knowledge of academic referencing conventions: “For example, you get a quotation from a book...and you didn’t cite/reference it coz you think it will be fine” (B7). Similarly, these comments suggest a gap in knowledge: “Try to use other author’s idea or work without references” (B9), “Perhaps they use the not correct way to citation their copy work from the source, therefore it causes unintentional plagiarism” (C3), and “use the paragraph from the internet and without stated the author or where it was found” (B17).

Source incorporation error: This code was applied to data that attributed plagiarism to error in source incorporation, either in the use of paraphrasing or quotations in academic writing. Once again, as with the data on referencing errors, the implication is that the error is due to a gap in knowledge or contrasting understanding rather than forgetfulness. There were
six examples of source incorporation error found in the data. The following excerpts illustrate errors in paraphrasing, or the way in which the writer has attempted to rephrase the language of the text into their own words. The suggestion is that if the amount of the change is inadequate, plagiarism can result: “change some words bit not much – means most of word still the same as before” (B4), “you get a quotation from a book but just change a few words in it and you didn’t cite/reference it coz you think it will be fine” (B7), and “When we define or describe something in the article or essay, use the same words or similar sentences” (B10).

Incorrect source error: There were students who suggested that plagiarism could arise not from the way in which the sources were incorporated into text, but from using the wrong type or number of sources. For example, respondent B2 said: “Using such as Wikipedia”, while B13 suggested plagiarism “often occurs as there are too many sources to be used and author may not realise”.

Conflicting epistemological beliefs: The largest group of reasons for inadvertent plagiarism appearing the responses from questionnaire item 12 were coded as contrasting views regarding the nature of knowledge and language, in other words, contrasting epistemological beliefs (Mori, 1999). Whereas the data presented above suggests that plagiarism could be caused by a failure to apply knowledge, or a gap in knowledge, the data represented by this code suggests that it is tension or conflict between two sets of beliefs or values that can result in plagiarism.

The majority of the responses coded in this category were concerned with individual differences in the way knowledge is perceived and used. Five of the responses suggested that different interpretations of common knowledge and text-specific knowledge could be a cause of plagiarism. For example, Student C1 noted the following: “Common knowledge – what the author/writer already knew, but thinks everyone else knew as well but everyone does not”. Similarly, Student C2 suggested that inadvertent plagiarism “Often happen when the writer thought that it is common knowledge, however he/she actually read it from an article”, while C3 wrote, “Unintentional plagiarism which writer does not realise whether the source is common knowledge or should reference from the document.”

In addition to different interpretations of common knowledge, different interpretations of source ownership were suggested by several respondents as possible causes for inadvertent plagiarism, as illustrated in the following excerpt:

It might occur when I am writing something and I write down an idea or knowledge that I learned from a previous reading in some source, now this knowledge is mine but I learned it from a source...I should give the credit, but sometimes it can be a reason of non-intentional plagiarism. (B1)
The following comments also suggest this view: “Unintentional plagiarism occurs when a person presents an idea that he/she did not know it was already used” (B8); “When you write academic writing, I maybe will use the source which I think in my head but meanwhile I can’t remember where it occurs and this I think its my own ideas” (B6); and “Some information you think you know but its actually in others writing” (C6).

4.3 Summary

This chapter has presented the results of the Academic Writing and Source Use Questionnaire, designed to gather preliminary data on the EAP course students’ knowledge, beliefs and practices regarding source use and plagiarism which could help point to fruitful avenues of inquiry for the rest of the research project. Overall, the results suggest that the students had been exposed to plagiarism and source use and referencing as ideas and conventions while attending educational institutions in New Zealand, and that they had a general understanding both of the prohibition against plagiarism in an institutional context, and of citation requirements in academic writing. However, they also suggested that the students’ perceptions of the importance of plagiarism, the need to use sources appropriately in academic writing, and their actual source use practices did not always converge. No significant differences were observed between participants from different language backgrounds, disciplinary groups or years of study (note that while every effort was made to make the items clear and understandable to the respondents, some ambiguities may have remained. Accordingly, the results have here have been interpreted cautiously). These two issues, student understandings of plagiarism and source use and their textual borrowing practices, are examined in greater detail in the next two chapters, which present the results of the analysis of the journal data (in Chapter Five) and in the individual case studies (Chapter Six).
5.0 Overview

This chapter presents the results of the qualitative analysis of the reflective journals provided by the EAP course students, as outlined in section 3.3.3.3. A total of 34 reflective journals about plagiarism and source use were analysed from two participant groups. The first group consisted of students who had agreed to the use of their written work for the project. The second group consisted of students who, in addition to providing samples of their written work for analysis, agreed to participate in in-depth interviews about their written work and experiences with plagiarism and textual borrowing.

The themes emerging from analysis of this data are presented and discussed with reference to the categories and sub categories that were formed during coding. Individual codes are explained and illustrated with quotes from the data. The source of each example is given as an in-text citation, with the participant’s study identification code and journal number. In several instances data appears under two codes, specifically appearing under the code of prior plagiarism experience, and assessment related consequences. This is because this data illustrates both the participants’ past encounters with the concept of plagiarism, and their present understandings of the consequences plagiarism.

The major categories to emerge from the data concern participant understandings of plagiarism, textual borrowing, and source use. The first category, Prior Forms of Plagiarism Knowledge, was developed out of the students’ discussions of their experiences, perceptions, and knowledge of plagiarism before enrolling in the EAP course. The second category deals with the participants’ emerging understandings of plagiarism and source use, and identifies the different aspects of their knowledge of plagiarism and textual borrowing. The third category examines participants’ evaluations, beliefs, and value judgments concerning the significance of plagiarism, while the fourth category concerns participants’ self assessments of their own knowledge of plagiarism. Taken together, it is hoped that this examination provides a more contextualised and nuanced understanding of the role and significance of plagiarism, textual borrowing, and source use in students’ academic development than the questionnaire data examined in the previous chapter was able to provide. The categories constituting these three major themes are illustrated below:

- Prior experiences and forms of plagiarism knowledge
  - prior learning
  - describing plagiarism
• Emergent forms of plagiarism knowledge
  o describing plagiarism
  o perceived causes of plagiarism
  o perceived consequences of plagiarism
  o knowledge of plagiarism avoidance
• Participant evaluations about plagiarism
• Self assessments of plagiarism knowledge

Data is referred to by participants’ group name and number, and by journal number. For example, B5, D4 refers to participant five from the B group (non-interview group), diary four.

5.1 Prior Forms of Plagiarism Knowledge

This category was developed out of participants’ discussions of prior experiences with plagiarism and textual borrowing. Two subcategories were formed - the first concerns participants’ experience with prior learning about plagiarism and the second deals with their prior understandings of the nature and importance of plagiarism in academic writing.

5.1.1 Prior learning.

In the reflective journals a number of students discussed past experiences with learning and instruction into source use, textual borrowing, and plagiarism, as illustrated with the following codes:

Prior learning home country: The majority of the participants who mentioned experiences with plagiarism or source use instruction in their home countries indicated that they had not received formal instruction. Some participants articulated their learning experiences explicitly, as demonstrated in the following quotations: “teachers have not told us about it” (B28, D4), and “I was not taught of this [plagiarism] at high school in China” (B5, D4). For others, a lack of formal instruction was inferred from comments that plagiarism was not an important issue or did not exist in their home countries. Others suggested that conventions at their current university contrasted with the source use conventions in their L1. This can be seen in the following examples: “China don’t have the terms of plagiarism. Students don’t need to worry about this issue...plagiarism [is] not taken seriously in my country” (B11, D4); “[this university] treats plagiarism much more seriously compared with my previous understanding about plagiarism in my home country” (B24); “[this university] is completely
different from my countries’ university because I have never heard about the system of plagiarism at my countries university” (B3, D4); and “In my home university...the different ways of plagiarism do not exist” (C11, D4).

These perceptions were not necessarily accurate representations of the status of plagiarism and textual borrowing in those countries, and taking student comments about the status of plagiarism in their home countries at face value is a weakness of some of existing literature on NESB student textual borrowing (see section 2.1). However, it can be inferred that such individuals did not have significant prior learning about plagiarism or its significance in ESB contexts either through formal instruction or via more informal means.

Yet the data indicated that a number of students had received instruction into other aspects of academic writing before coming to the current university. For example, one student had felt himself to be quite experienced with academic writing, but despite this, had had no prior learning about plagiarism before coming to New Zealand: “I started to write essay since when I was 14...and I have never heard about Plagiarism. The first time I know what plagiarism means [was] when I was 18, the time when I arrived to New Zealand (B14, D4).

A lack of focus on plagiarism in previous experiences with academic writing can also be inferred from the comments of those participants who indicated that referencing had not been required in their academic writing in their countries of origin. For example, one student noted, “when we have academic writing back in China’s high school we were not asked to provide any references or bibliography for any sources we used in our writing” (B7, D4), while another suggested, “we use Google to search for articles...and copy the key points from the articles online, we just put the ideas into our own words that all, we don’t really need to reference the source” (C4, D4). Again it should not be inferred that the students’ comments were an accurate reflection of the stance on plagiarism taken by their home country. As illustrated in section 4.1.1, the majority of the students did not have previous tertiary experience and it may be that their perceptions were a reflection of institutional differences (e.g., between high school and university) rather than cultural differences in plagiarism awareness. However, the qualitative data did show a tendency for the participants to extrapolate from individual experience to a more general cultural context, giving rise to the belief expressed by a number of students that plagiarism was not an issue in their home countries.

Several other participants perceived copying without referencing as a textual borrowing strategy that had been acceptable in previous contexts. In the following example, the student expressed the belief that copying demonstrated the depth and breadth of her research to her instructors:
When I was studying in my own country with academic writing, we have never ever needed to reference when we copied materials from the library as our own work; however, our teacher did not criticise what we did, they think that is a good way for student to learn the new knowledge and they advocate student to do that, they were not strict with this plagiarism issue. (C3, D4)

A similar perception was expressed by another participant who noted that copying had been considered an acceptable and indeed desirable practice in her prior academic writing:

In China we were encouraged to use famous sentences of others because it shows you have done a broad range of readings and it adds big credits to the writing. We did not have to reference at all. It did not matter if we copied some of existed work as long as it is not massive. I felt comfortable with the system. (B5, D4)

It is not clear what precisely this participant meant when she referred to “famous sentences of others” - whether she was referring to the ideas of eminent academics, or famous political or philosophical figures. It is also important, as mentioned above, not to make assumptions about the rhetorical traditions of other countries on the basis of such comments (see section 2.1.2). However, the comments do represent the students’ individual prior beliefs about textual borrowing that may have served to mediate their writing and the construction of knowledge in their texts. They also illustrate an awareness of their instructors’ expectations regarding textual borrowing and source use which motivated them to produce quality academic writing within the context of their own educational and cultural environments.

A further point to add concerns the use of the word “copy” in these examples. As discussed in the previous chapter (section 4.1.2), while its use is generally considered to have negative connotations in ESB tertiary academic contexts, it was unclear whether the respondents themselves attached such negative connotations to the term. It would seem that in the examples discussed above, the students did not necessarily consider copying to be a negative practice. This is significant because in institutional perceptions of plagiarism copying is considered a clear violation of textual borrowing conventions. It appears that tensions may arise if participants used their previous experiences with and perceptions of copying to mediate their current writing practices. Participants’ awareness of the potential contradictions between these two sets of academic norms will be discussed further in section 5.2.3 Perceived causes of plagiarism.
Prior learning at another New Zealand educational institution: Participants had attended other educational institutions in New Zealand, including high school, Foundation Year at several universities, language centres and the city Polytechnic before enrolling at their current university. However, the participants reported receiving contrasting levels of instruction into appropriate source use, techniques and plagiarism. In several instances, plagiarism was presented to the students as an issue of morality and ethics. This approach appears to have made a lasting impression on one participant who stressed the gravity with which the issue was approached:

I first heard of this term in the seventh form. It was the first thing discussed in all subjects and the most emphasised topic during the entire school year. Many lecturers couldn’t stress enough how plagiarising is a serious ‘crime’ and so I took it seriously. (B8, D4)

For others, the issue of plagiarism and textual borrowing appears to have been presented within the context of appropriate source use techniques as a learning issue. For example, participant B12 noted, “I started learning how to do referencing in Foundation...We even had a referencing test to see if we could write them correctly” (B12, C4). Participant B4 wrote that she had been taught citation and referencing conventions and the importance of appropriate textual borrowing, all of which she felt had improved her academic writing and contributed to better grades in her work:

Our tutor [took] patience to teach us how to avoid plagiarism. She let us know how important to give the reference at the end of the essay...[we] need to give double quotation marks and wrote the authorship’s name at the end of the sentences. Further more, if we using the authorship’s idea also need to write the name at the end. I have allowed all she said and get the good marks compare somebody wants to shirk the responsibility. (B4, D4)

This awareness of the mechanics of source use and textual borrowing, such as the correct use of quotations and knowledge of what and when to cite, indicated a level of prior learning different to those who focussed only on plagiarism as a moral issue only. Yet this student also appears to have internalised aspects of the ethical discourse on plagiarism, as demonstrated through her description of acknowledgment and referencing as “responsibility”.

However, for other participants who had studied in New Zealand prior to enrolling at the university, plagiarism had not been discussed, nor had referencing been a requirement in their academic writing. One such participant stated, “My previous experience was in high
school where we were taught to write out thoughts using all the resources you can use and never told about using references” (C1, D4). Similarly, a participant who had done prior study at a Polytechnic noted, “I did not concern about reference and how to reference properly as our lecture did not require for that” (C6, D4). It is unclear whether this lack of referencing was course-specific, institution-specific, or indeed whether these were accurate perceptions of previous source use requirements. However, it does suggest that for these students, appropriate source use had not played an important role in their academic literacy development and that whatever the nature of the instruction or source use requirements, these had not been considered significant by the participants themselves.

Prior learning at the university: Several participants reported having learnt about plagiarism during their time at the university where this study was conducted. One student credited her current knowledge of plagiarism to prior learning at the University, writing, “I have always understood what plagiarism is and what the consequences are from past papers here” (C9, D4). Two participants mentioned that they learned about plagiarism not through formal instruction but from course artefacts such as outlines: “I have only heard about plagiarism in university. At the beginning I did not understand what the word means, until I read the course outline for one of my papers” (B29, D4). One of the participants noted that although he had gained some knowledge about plagiarism from his previous courses at the university, he felt this to be inadequate: “I knew a little bit about this topic because most courses emphasised on this matter in university... Lectures usually do not go through this topic with us; a note of plagiarism is simply included in every course outline (B5, D4).

Prior learning from experience: The above codes demonstrate the contexts in which students had developed their knowledge about plagiarism and textual borrowing prior to beginning the EAP course. An additional source of learning emerged in students who had submitted written assignments for assessment and been penalised for inappropriate textual borrowing. In other words, their understanding of plagiarism was mediated by first-hand experience. Two participants had been penalised for failing to include a reference list with their assignments. The first case was an individual student essay:

After I failed one of my essays because I did not include all of the references in my article I started to realise how serious this matter can be, I became very cautious in my writing ...I did not want to lose any more marks because people suspect me cheating. I accepted this ‘silly rule’ because I did not want to fail. (B4, D4)
While this student appears to have disagreed with the conventions of source use and rules against plagiarism, the experience of failure and fear of being viewed negatively by her instructors caused her to accept the institutional requirement to follow referencing conventions in her writing.

In a second example, the assignment was a collaborative presentation in which the group was hampered by a lack of experience and knowledge. Although the participant had been aware something important was missing from the project, the group had been unable to identify what this was. On receiving the marks for the presentation it became clear to the students that their lack of knowledge had resulted in serious consequences for the group: “We suffered the shock...The tutor said we forgot to reference the statistics we displayed on the overhead projector, which means we plagiarised and lost a lot of marks” (B20, D4).

Although these students were penalised for omission of references in these assignments, their experiences seemed to have led to an increased understanding of the nature of plagiarism and the range of source use errors that can occur. As Participant B20 noted, “since then I realise that not only copying other student’s task applies to plagiarism, moreover is the task [which] is done without reference that also marks as plagiarism” (B20, D4).

Another participant reported a similar experience at a New Zealand high school in which an accusation of plagiarism had led to the development of better knowledge of source use conventions and plagiarism avoidance:

When the first time I did my assignment in high school in NZ, I did not know what is reference. The teacher gave me zero mark for my assignment because I did not use the reference. After I understand what plagiarism is, I start to learn how to write and avoid it. (B12, D4)

For all of these students, the experience of having had inappropriate textual borrowing identified in their texts and their attention drawn to the issue of plagiarism led to a greater understanding of source use conventions, and the nature of the consequences associated with plagiarism.

5.1.2 Describing plagiarism.

In addition to discussing their prior experiences and learning about plagiarism and textual borrowing, students discussed the extent of their prior understandings. These encompassed their prior descriptions of plagiarism, the extent to which they considered
plagiarism awareness to be significant, and their understandings of textual borrowing to be an acceptable practice.

Student definitions of plagiarism were identified in the journal data and coded using the definitions coding scheme developed for the questionnaire open items, as discussed in sections 3.5.5 and 4.2. A definition given in the journals was identified as a past understanding when accompanied by an indicator such as the use of the past tense, prepositions such as “before”, or phrases such as “used to”. Such definitions, following Pecorari (2002), were identified and coded using the following codes: action (verb used to describe the plagiarising), object (what is plagiarised), manner (the way in which the plagiarising takes place) and indirect object (the person or object from whom object is taken). For each individual definition, examples from the journals are given.

**Action:** The main verb used to describe the action of plagiarism in the participants’ prior understandings was that of copying, as demonstrated in the following examples: “Before the word plagiarism [had] been discussed in class my understanding of plagiarism was very narrow, limited. The word plagiarism in my mind was equal to copy” (B17, D4); “Before I was thinking that plagiarism is only copying other’s work” (B9, D4); “I thought that plagiarism is just the copy of other’s work” (B10, D4); “At the beginning I thought that plagiarism just means copy” (B4, D4); and “Before I thought the plagiarism is only about when students copy” (B19, D4).

Participant B11 noted that in her prior understanding, minor textual modification was all that was required to legitimise the textual borrowing: “If I copy exactly the words from other’s assignment or article, then I have to reference it, otherwise it’s plagiarism. However I can change a few words, and then it becomes my own work” (B11, D4). Another student had also equated direct coping with plagiarism: “I used to only consider the facts that it is about copying other’s works...so as long as I can avoid copying others’ work straight away will keep me out of plagiarism” (C6, D4).

As noted above, the term copy could have neutral or negative connotations, depending on the context of use, and it was unclear in the questionnaire and the journal data whether the respondents were aware of this. The use of the adverb “only” in these definitions has two possible interpretations (Swan, 1980). Firstly, the use of only could act to qualify the verb “to copy” and function to lessen the significance of the verb (i.e., “it wasn’t serious, I only copied it”). Secondly, only could function to narrow the extent of the definition (i.e., “I understood plagiarism to be one thing - only copying, and not inadequate paraphrasing”). Although ambiguity exists in these descriptions, they do suggest that students either had very narrow
interpretations of the range of behaviours that could constitute plagiarism, or that they did not consider it to be a serious transgression. More data on student perceptions of the importance of plagiarism awareness is discussed under the code *Importance of plagiarism awareness* below.

Object: Few participants indicated in their descriptions what they had considered the object of the plagiarising action to be, and for these students, the legitimacy of the borrowing largely depended on the nature of the text being reproduced. Participant B25, for example, had felt that plagiarism was an artistic, not an academic issue, noting: “I thought that it is only related with artistic activity, so not connected to me” (B25, D4). In contrast, participant B19 felt that only unacknowledged use of what he considered to be truly academic sources constituted plagiarism, or “those famous writers’ work or copy from those academic sources without reference or quoting” (B19, D4). He had not considered that plagiarism could occur between students or with other non-academic sources.

*Importance of plagiarism awareness:* Many participants discussed the extent to which they had considered plagiarism to be an important issue in their prior educational experience. A common response was that students felt they had underestimated the importance of plagiarism in the past, or indeed not considered it to be important at all. For example, participant B25 indicated, “I did not think that the plagiarism is such an important issue” (D4). Participant B10 wrote, “I did not realize it would be so serious” (D4). Similarly, participant B6 suggested, “I didn’t think plagiarism is such a serious activity” (D4). Participant B2 appeared to have been unconcerned about the presence of plagiarism in his writing, and doubtful as to its significance, saying,

> At very first time I didn’t take plagiarism seriously because I didn’t think it is very important and I didn’t care very much. I only thought ‘who would know’ and ‘why I have to do those kinds of things to write academic essays? (D4)

These quotations appear to indicate that while a degree of awareness of plagiarism had been present, students had underestimated its importance, or, as in the case of participant B2, challenged and rejected it.

This section has presented the data on the participants’ past experiences with and understandings of plagiarism and textual borrowing. It appears that while a number of students did not have a great deal of prior learning, others had received formal instruction or learned about plagiarism and textual borrowing via other avenues. In addition, many students
had not considered plagiarism as an important or relevant issue in their academic writing. They also had a limited understanding about the types of textual borrowing behaviours that could be interpreted as plagiarism, or challenged its importance. Students’ emerging understandings of plagiarism is considered in the next section, and the ways in which these interact with past understandings is examined.

5.2 Emergent Forms of Plagiarism Knowledge

In this sub-category data is presented in which participant understandings of plagiarism and source use demonstrate a degree of change. The term emergent has been used, following Abasi and Akbari (2008), to refer to knowledge that represents a degree of transformation in understanding. The participants discussed many emergent understandings of the issue of plagiarism, and the different facets of this knowledge were coded, analysed, and placed into the following subcategories:

- describing plagiarism
- perceived causes of plagiarism
- perceived consequences of plagiarism
- self knowledge of plagiarism
- plagiarism avoidance strategies

5.2.1 Describing plagiarism.

This section presents data on participant understandings of the definition of plagiarism. Such understandings are significant because student familiarity with definitions of plagiarism, for example as cited on university websites and course outlines, is often taken as an indicator of their degree of knowledge (Pecorari 2001, 2002, 2003; Sutherland-Smith, 2008; 2011). It was assumed that descriptions of plagiarism given in the present tense would represent their emergent perceptions and understandings. These descriptions were coded and analysed using the questionnaire data-coding scheme (see sections 3.5.5 and 4.2) with the addition of several elements to encompass the more detailed and specific definitions that the students provided in the reflective journals.

*Action: As with the data from the questionnaire, the most frequently used verb in student definitions of plagiarism was that of “copying”, which was used 15 times in the journal discussions. This has been identified as an ambiguous term that could have positive, negative or neutral connotations depending on the individual context. The strongly negative verbs of
“cheating”, “stealing”, and “taking” appeared more frequently in the journal data than the questionnaire data, and had not been present at all in the Prior Learning data. This suggests that over time the students had adopted a more strongly judgmental stance more in keeping with the dominant ethical discourse on plagiarism (Valentine, 2006). Moreover, although only a few students linked intentionality and plagiarism explicitly, the use of “cheat” and “steal”, verbs that require intention on the part of the actor, suggest that these students viewed plagiarism as an intentional rather than an accidental act. The issue of intentionality and textual borrowing is addressed further in section 5.3.

Several action verbs also appeared in the journal data that had not been present in the questionnaire or Prior Learning data. These were “quoting” which was used in four of the definitions, “cutting and pasting” which was used in three of the definitions, and “buying” and “paying” which was used by one student. While some of the literature focuses on the Internet’s role in student plagiarism (see section 2.3.3), the fact that only three students referred to the act of cutting and pasting and only one to the act of purchasing text off the Internet suggests that digital plagiarism was not significant to these students. Rather, they appeared to understand plagiarism more abstractly as a moral issue. Student judgments of plagiarism and its moral implications are discussed further in section 5.3.

Object: The most commonly referred to object in the journal definitions was “work” (used 19 times), followed by “ideas” and “thoughts” (used 11 times), and “writing”, “words” or “language” (nine times). More concrete terms such as “articles” and “pages” were used less frequently. While work may be considered less abstract than ideas and thoughts, both objects lack specificity, suggesting that the students lacked concrete knowledge of the range of objects that can be used when writing from sources. The data from the questionnaire also suggested that the students favoured the more abstract objects in their definitions.

Manner: Also analysed was the manner in which appropriating act of plagiarism (Sutherland-Smith, 2008) may be taken. The three most frequently used phrases were the same as in the questionnaire data, namely, “without reference or citation” (12 uses), “submitting as one’s own” (six uses), and “without acknowledgment or credit” (six uses). Also appearing in the journal data were “in an exam” and “indirectly”. One phrase of manner, which appeared twice in the journal data, was “with incorrect citation”.

Indirect object: Students described many indirect objects of the plagiarising action in the journal data, such as “another person”, “author” or “writer” (13 uses), and “someone” (10
times). The more specific indirect objects, such as “document”, “source” or “work” were the least frequent, again suggesting a lack of specificity in the students’ understandings and perceptions of plagiarism.

While it appears that the students’ knowledge of plagiarism demonstrated a degree of change from the previous section, an examination of these definitions suggests several problems inherent in attempts to measure student knowledge of plagiarism using definitions of plagiarism as evidence of understanding. For the most part, students were able to produce a reasonable definition of plagiarism in both the journal and the questionnaire data - the majority providing four-part definitions describing the action, the object, and the manner in which the plagiarising action could be taken in addition to indication of the indirect object affected by this action. However, a closer analysis of the constituent parts of the definitions shows a wide variation in the degree of specificity for each of these terms, and as has been shown, the definitions tended towards the general or abstract rather than the specific and concrete. It may be questioned how much knowledge students with such a general understanding actually have, and indeed how useful such definitions, as expounded in institutional policies, course guidelines or other sources of course information, may be. Yet it is often expected that if students familiarise themselves with such material, this knowledge will be adequate to prevent inappropriate textual borrowing in their work.

5.2.2 Perceived causes of plagiarism.

Another aspect of plagiarism and source use knowledge identified in the journals was student understandings of the contributing factors underlying inappropriate textual borrowing. Initially, codes that had emerged from the content analysis of the open questionnaire items were applied to this data, as described in section 4.2.2. However, additional codes emerged from the journal data as more complex contributing factors were suggested here. The following codes were used to constitute this sub-category:

Knowledge gap: Interestingly, only three students indicated that an individual’s lack of knowledge or inexperience with academic writing and source use conventions could be a contributing factor in student plagiarism. These comments were: “because bad works in academic writing can be made by the students who have not gotten any idea of plagiarism” (B3, D4); “sometimes it might occur that the writers have no intention to plagiarize, but they do that because they do not know about when they should or should not cite” (B30, D4); and “Plagiarism may happen as student may not have any experience on essay writing on particular issues” (B13, D4).
Conflicting cultural or educational contexts: In addition to individual gaps in knowledge, there were a number of responses which, as with the questionnaire data presented in section 4.2.2, suggested, that contrasting belief systems between the students’ home countries and their country of study could result in inappropriate textual borrowing. These contributing factors operate at the higher level of the sociocultural context of knowledge construction. The beliefs expressed in this data suggest that if textual borrowing conventions or common practices are perceived to differ between countries, the student is likely to attribute their inappropriate textual borrowing to their perception of conventions or practices in their home country.

Such beliefs are illustrated in the following quotes: “Because of the cultural difference, some form of plagiarism might be accepted in some countries...the concept of plagiarism may be interpreted differently from countries in western and countries in eastern” (C10, D4); “As foreigners from totally different cultural backgrounds, studying in a Western academic system with lacking knowledge of writing culture and conventions would easily put us into unintentional plagiarism” (B13, D4).

Conflicting epistemological beliefs: The most commonly expressed belief was that plagiarism could occur when students had different interpretations of source-specific and common knowledge, and the resulting referencing requirements. As with the questionnaire data, this code incorporated Mori’s (1999) term “epistemological beliefs” to refer to student understandings about the nature and source of knowledge. This belief can be seen in the following examples: “Some people might use their common knowledge to write an essay unfortunate they read from the article somewhere else” (C2, J4); “Because sometimes it is complicating to know when your common knowledge finishes and [when] starts the knowledge of the other people” (C11, D4); and “I think it dues to the confusion of common knowledge and knowledge derived from some people’s works” (B30, D4).

Such comments convey an awareness of conflicting cultural perspectives on the epistemology of knowledge, suggesting that what is considered common knowledge may itself be culturally specific. One participant further questioned whether students who are in the process of developing academic literacy are able to make this distinction: “What is the definition of common knowledge that we need to cite, how the term common knowledge understood differently among cultures does. Is it possible for students who have limited knowledge to judge what common knowledge is?” (B24, D4).
As can be seen from the examples above, the participants perceived a range of different contributing factors that could lead to plagiarism. Interestingly, despite a tendency to link plagiarism with cheating or stealing, as was the case with the definitions data, none of the students attributed intention to cheat as a contributing factor when describing the potential causes of plagiarism. All of the causes mentioned here including gap in knowledge, lack of experience, contrasting educational and cultural contexts, and conflicting epistemological beliefs appear to be the result of unintentional plagiarism. This suggests a tension between the commonly held perception that plagiarism involved cheating and stealing (see section 5.3) and the perceptions of its causes or contributing factors, which were largely unintentional. However, in the following section, which deals with perceived consequences of plagiarism, the issue of intentionality is again implicated, as many of the consequences described by the students appear to be the result of deception.

5.2.3 Perceived consequences of plagiarism.

Another aspect of students’ emergent knowledge of plagiarism pertained to their understandings of the range of possible consequences that can result from unacknowledged textual borrowing. The participants identified several different consequences of plagiarism ranging from constraining their own learning, negative impact on their assessment and university careers, to consequences in the wider environment outside of and beyond educational institutions. This data is represented in the following codes:

Learning consequences: This code was used for data in which the participants indicated the effect that inappropriate textual borrowing could have on their own learning or the learning of other individuals. Two types of such consequences were identified. Firstly, several students indicated that plagiarism could lead to a gap in the students’ knowledge, or prevent them from assimilating new knowledge, as in the following examples: “It can be cheating if we copy someone’s working in the exam and the student can’t learn anything when they copy the other person’s work” (B22, D4); “If you plagiarism, even you can get the high mark but that is not your own proper work, it means you do not learn new knowledge and do not understand it by yourself” (C3, D4); and “If we didn’t have [rules against] Plagiarism than everyone will be copying other people’s work and students will therefore not learn anything” (C9, D4).

Others suggested that plagiarism could lead to damage to the learning process itself. These comments include: “When people for some reasons want to copy works from others, that influences the attitude to study, which means they will depend on copying for ever and it is pointless to learn things actually especially in the exams” (B20, D4); “The value of learning
is thinking, creativity and innovation. So if a person plagiarise it means that there is no point of going through the learning process” (B29, D4); and “Students learn something in school, and they need to write their own to understand what things they actually learned in school. If student copy other people’s work, they cannot learn anything and improve their skills” (B9, D4).

Assessment related consequences: Many participants were aware that plagiarism, if identified by an instructor, could negatively affect their course assessment through partial or total loss of marks. Students made both generalised statements about how plagiarism might affect assessment and gave specific examples of instances in which they had been personally affected when plagiarism had been identified in their work. General understandings of assessment related consequences can be seen in the following examples: “Because any kind of plagiarism might affect the marks in your papers” (C11, D4); “I have heard that they penalize the students by giving them an F” (B30, D4); “I have to learn those things before I make mistakes for other papers which I get penalize too” (B2, D4); and “It could involve failure for the paper” (B13, D4).

Other participants gave personal accounts of their experiences with the assessment related consequences of plagiarism. As discussed in section 5.1.1 under the code of Prior learning through experience, four participants had lost marks when their work had been identified as inadequately referenced by instructors and two of these students had failed their assignments. Participant B20 wrote about how his group had lost marks for their presentation, although he did not mention whether or not they had failed. As noted earlier, it appears that these examples were instances of unintentional plagiarism.

Another participant described the plagiarism of his friends at high school in his country of origin. Unlike the previous two examples, this appears to be an instance of intentional plagiarism, as it involved one student completely copying the work of another student and submitting it as his own: “my friends copied each other assignment. When the teacher was marking the assignments, he found out because one of them copied the essay including the other guy’s name. So it was like one person gave in two essays” (B29, D4).

Institutional consequences: This code was applied to data in which students expressed an awareness of how plagiarism could affect their position at an institutional level in the University. For example, participant B30 wrote that the institution could “sometimes even force the students to withdraw from the University” (D4). Participant B13 suggested “The issue of plagiarism might very important as student will expulse from the university and this
may affect the future of a person” (D4), while participant B8 was aware of how a charge of plagiarism could affect her career at the university, noting that “it carries major consequences that can hurt my academic record” (D4). In the following example, the participant expressed an awareness of the institutional consequences of plagiarism from his observations of his high school friend who had been involved in copying and submitting another student’s essay, “The teacher gave them a zero and they were suspended for a week” (B29, D4).

**Extra institutional consequences:** Participants also demonstrated awareness of the effects that plagiarism could have beyond the university and other educational settings. Such extra-institutional consequences included damage to careers and loss of productivity in the workplace or of one’s professional reputation. All of the consequences identified appeared to result from instances of intentional plagiarism or dishonest practice. For example, participant B6 wrote:

> We cannot success without honest[y], there are less companies and bosses [that] likes the dishonest people, and the plagiarism activity will not be covered for long time...if we always cheat now, we will become less ability for the jobs even for future jobs. Thus, we need consider no cheating on our studying life now. (D4)

Participant C5 proposed that charges of plagiarism could damage established careers, due to “the lost of their reputation in public” (D4). Participant B19 noted that even if an individual’s plagiarism was not uncovered in an educational context, his or her consequent lack of knowledge would become apparent in the workplace:

> Even if they do plagiarism in the exams as well...after that people still have to use the knowledge they learnt from university to get a job. If he or she were copying most work from some else in university, even if they got the degree, they still understand nothing. They will not be able to shoulder their job, and of course no one employer would like to hire them. (D4)

Other students indicated consequences that could occur at a wider sociocultural level beyond that of the individual. For instance, several participants suggested that plagiarism could result in loss of productivity in the workplace. Participant B24 wrote, “Large amount of plagiarism can cause a decrease in productivity” (D4). Similarly, participant B6 noted, “The people and manufactures will not make new ideas and new products, because they all busy to copy each others” (D4). Several students pointed to the potential damage that plagiarism
could have on creativity and the free development of ideas, which could result in a reluctance to share information and make new ideas public, as expressed by participant B24:

Everyone wants to be respected by others, and they share their ideas with the rest of world in expectation of being respected and rewarded. If their ideas are randomly copied by other people, and the people who plagiarism was not punished for that but get famous, less and less people will be willing to share their ideas as if plagiarism is accepted by the general public. (D4)

**Legal consequences:** Only two students mentioned the issue of breach of copyright as a consequence of plagiarism. Participant C2 said, “The authors have the right to sue anyone who copies their work” (D4), while participant B8 wrote, “It breaks copyright laws.” (D4).

**5.2.4 Knowledge of plagiarism avoidance.**

Another key aspect of student knowledge of plagiarism is the knowledge of textual borrowing and source use strategies (Barks & Watts, 2001). This knowledge was evident in a number of the students’ journals, in which they explained the strategies they used or were intending to use in order to avoid inappropriate textual borrowing in their academic writing. Data that demonstrated students’ knowledge of such plagiarism avoidance strategies was grouped under the sub-category of Knowledge of plagiarism avoidance, which was made up of the following codes:

**Plagiarism avoidance through referencing:** Referencing was the most commonly suggested plagiarism avoidance strategy, implying that students perceived that referencing was the principle requirement for appropriate textual borrowing. Some of the students indicated that references were needed when making direct quotations from the source text: “I know when I quote the author's work I have to make a reference” and “we need to give credit such as quotation marks, references” (B4, D4). Others suggested that references were needed when incorporating ideas, as in the following examples: “I know that if I am using the words or even ideas of other person I should give this person the credit and write it down in my references” (B1, D4) and “In my opinion, we can avoid plagiarism in many ways. We could give credit to the person who had the original idea or theory” (B29).

Some participants appeared to view referencing specifically as a means of protecting against a charge of plagiarism, noting, “I usually do the reference and bibliography very carefully detailed, it makes the readers easier to find the sources and proves I am not
plagiarizing” (B19, D4) and “Previous experiences have taught me that I have to reference my sources correctly to avoid plagiarism” (B8, D4).

Two students indicated that not only were references required to avoid plagiarism, but that referencing could enhance the overall quality of their work. For example, one student noted, “References have to be on top of the mind and produce the best writing I can” (B20, D4). Similarly, one participant desired to emulate published work in her use of references to illustrate the breadth and quality of her research:

After I know what plagiarism is, I started to reference all my information that I put in my essay or assignment. And I feel that I am more professional than before. Because all the good writer put their reference in their book or article. (B14, D4)

Plagiarism avoidance through quotation: Another avoidance strategy that was indicated by several students was the use of quotations. For example: “We could also use quotation marks to define the part which we copied” (B29, D4); and “Making quotations and referencing within the article and at the end of article is a crucial character of a good academic writing in university” (B5, D4).

Plagiarism avoidance through paraphrase and summary: Students appeared to be less aware of the role of paraphrasing as a strategy to avoid plagiarism, and this was not widely discussed in the journal data, although one student wrote:

The method that is widely used in university is that we paraphrase the written words of the person who originally write the article. I would like to mention the original text or change around the order of the sentences. No. It means that the text should be fully understood and then written in our own words. (B29, D4)

This data appears to support the view that one key aspect of the participants’ knowledge was that plagiarism resulted from copying that had not been adequately referenced. In a sense this represents both a form of knowledge, in that text material that is not adequately referenced can be deemed as plagiarised, but also a gap in knowledge. In relying on referencing of quoted material and ideas taken from source texts, students may be blind to the many other forms of plagiarism such as inadequate paraphrase and summary and omission of referencing. Indeed far fewer students mentioned the need for adequate paraphrasing in their journals, as demonstrated with the examples above. It also adds weight to the idea already suggested that there was a tension in the students’ knowledge between
practices they saw as the result of intent to deceive and profit from that deception (as seen in the definitions and causes data), and how they perceived their own textual borrowing practices.

5.3 Participant Evaluations About Plagiarism

In the following section data is presented in which the students evaluated different aspects of plagiarism and textual borrowing as well as their own knowledge of plagiarism. Whereas the previous two sections examined aspects of student past and emergent knowledge, this section examines the ways in which students judged the act of plagiarism and those individuals implicated in it, as well as their own source use abilities.

As discussed in the Introduction, much of the plagiarism literature outside of applied linguistics, as well as discussions of plagiarism in academic writing textbooks and university websites, focuses on the moral and ethical aspects of textual borrowing, broadly characterising it as an academic crime (Pecorari, 2001; Pecorari & Petrić, 2014; Yamada, 2003). The following examples suggest that to a large extent the students had assimilated or internalised this viewpoint and many framed their own discussions of plagiarism in moral terms. Several of the codes illustrated in this subsection, cheating and stealing were also used in the participants’ definitions of plagiarism (as discussed in section 5.3). However, in addition to using these terms in their initial definitions, many of the participants discussed their perceptions of plagiarism in further detail in their journals, and this data is explored here. The following codes were developed in the analysis of student evaluations about plagiarism:

*Importance of plagiarism awareness*: The majority of students described plagiarism as an important issue, although the degree of detail with which this perception was expressed differed widely. In addition, it is unclear whether or not the participants expressed this view because they felt that that this was expected. These examples illustrate such views: “I agree that plagiarism is very important issue. It should be learned and understood by university students” (C10, D4); “I believe that plagiarism is an important issue that everyone should pay attention to...I strongly agree that plagiarism is an important issue that we should change the way of our thinking toward” (C2, D4); and “Plagiarism is a very important issue to us, especially as tertiary students. From our own perspectives, by knowing well the definition of plagiarism we can avoid it in our daily works of assignment, presentation and assessments” (B13, D4).
These comments represent the prevailing view among the participants that plagiarism was a significant issue of which they needed to be aware. However, a smaller number of participants expressed perceptions about plagiarism that challenged aspects of the more conventional views. For example, the following two participants expressed the belief that the institutional focus on plagiarism detracted from focusing on the content of academic writing. In the first example, the student appeared to believe that instructional time spent discussing plagiarism avoidance comes at the expense of actual teaching, thereby detracting from the educational experience of the class as a whole. In the second example, the student suggested that if the individual student focuses too much on plagiarism avoidance, this could detract from the quality of the essay as a whole:

People put too much attention to it: students have to spend lots of unnecessary time to make sure of not breaking the rule and lectures pay more attention to the documentation rather than the qualities of writing itself...I am hoping for people to realise that in university academic writing is used for testing of students’ learning, not for testing of someone’s cheating. In my opinion, the emphasis of plagiarism should be reduced and the rule should be relaxed for students. (B5, D4)

I agree it is an important issue for an essay but also need to be balance. It mean when I writing an essay, there are two important issues for me need to be consider. One is plagiarism and another is the content of the essay. Because some student just focus on how to avoid the plagiarism and not spend time to think about how he can get better for the essay. (B4)

*Plagiarism as theft:* Another common evaluation was to equate plagiarism with theft or stealing, as illustrated in the following examples: “For me, plagiarism is just like stealing things from other people because other people’s works have been used without permission” (C12, D4); “I consider plagiarism is a way of stealing, because you catch an idea and make it yours” (C11, D4); and “Some peoples’ behavior is more seriously, they steal other peoples’ work and submit as their work” (B28).

Students who expressed this perception appeared to equate unacknowledged textual borrowing of ideas or text in an academic context with the theft of money or commercial goods: “copying someone else’s writing is just like stealing an apple from a shop” (C1, D4); “It is the same as steal other’s money (B25, D4)”; and “Plagiarism...constitutes academic...
theft...someone’s words and thoughts are personal property, so if you use their words without telling them is just like stealing too” (B7, D4).

These students appeared to view plagiarism as a criminal or illegal act. Some of the participants used these actual terms in their discussion, as in the following excerpts: “If people plagiarise in an academic environment it means they are stealing, that is an illegal behaviour...I know plagiarism is illegal for academic students to do” (C3, D4); “Plagiarizing is illegal” (C5, D4); and “If stealing other’s private property is illegal, if it is an important issue, then plagiarism can be the same case...Plagiarism is a form of stealing too” (B11, D12).

Such excerpts convey a strong sense of wrongdoing, but we can also infer something about the ways in which these students viewed textual knowledge, that is, as an entity that can be owned by an individual author and thus also taken illegally. In taking this view, the students appear to have internalised or at least outwardly accepted a key feature of the moral discourse of plagiarism, which, as discussed in section 2.3.1, has at its centre the idea of the author as original and proprietal (Howard, 1999).

Plagiarism as cheating: Similarly, much of the data conveyed a sense of plagiarism as a form of cheating, as in the following excerpts: “Cheating is dishonest behaviour and we should know plagiarism is equal cheating...cheating is one of the worst behaviours in the society and everybody hates a cheater” (B22, D4); “Some people buy article from the internet or pay somebody to write an article, this is cheating” (B28, D4); and “Plagiarism...means dishonest to the original writer and your reader, it also means unethical” (B4, D4).

Plagiarism as unfair: A strong sense of the injustice of plagiarism was also suggested by students who regarded plagiarism as unfair, not only to abstract authors of unspecified academic texts, but to the students themselves as producers of texts and ideas. Participants considered that it was unfair that someone who had used another’s text without attribution would get acclaim to which they were not entitled. For example, participant C1 noted, “It could be a person’s 20 years of research and someone else may talk about it as it is his/her own in 5 minutes and get all the credit” (D4). Other students felt not just that plagiarism could result in undeserved recognition, but that it undermined their own individual efforts, as in the following excerpt from participant B7’s journal:

I consider myself being a hard-working student always - I spend more time and put more effort on the something in the hope of learning more and getting better grades. My effort can only be protected if plagiarism is forbidden. Imaging that
if other students stole my works and hand them in as their own, everybody gets good grades but it would be very unfair to me. (D4)

Participants B8, B20 and C12 also reflected on the way plagiarism could undercut their own efforts with their writing: “Most students put quite a lot effort and time on their studying, assignment, and exam. Whatever the marks they got is from their own work. If some students get someone else’s work without any own effort, it is unfair for those students who did study hard” (B8, D4); “If those people get passed the exams or paper, it is strongly unfair to those who study hard and paid effort for study” (B20, D4); and “That is not fair to those who have actually worked hard and done something they are satisfied with and it is so wrong to used other peoples’ work as well” (C12, D4).

Plagiarism and intention: Much can be inferred about the students’ perceptions of the role of intentionality and plagiarism from the data, notably from language used in their definitions of plagiarism and their evaluations of plagiarism (the use of the terms cheating, cutting and pasting, and stealing, for example, implying a high degree of intent), and also from their understandings of the causes of plagiarism. However, only a small number of participants overtly mentioned intentionality. These students appeared to be aware of the fact that some textual borrowing could result not from an intent to deceive but from another cause, such as a lack of knowledge, as in the following excerpts: “most people are properly doing it without realizing” (B2, D4); “the unintentional plagiarism is much more complicate and difficult to identify” (C5, D4); and “some students get caught for plagiarizing but they might not have meant it as we always involved with people’s ideas and work around us” (B29, D4).

The relationship between evaluations of plagiarism and understandings of intentionality is significant because if students largely perceive plagiarism as a deliberate act of dishonesty, which may variously involve as cheating or stealing, then it seems likely that when it comes to their own textual borrowing practices, many students may not consider their own efforts at integrating sources into academic writing in the terms discussed above. Thus, again there appears to be a tension between the way in which plagiarism is presented to students at an institutional level, their knowledge and evaluations of plagiarism, and their evaluations of their own abilities and practices.
5.4 Self-Assessments of Plagiarism Knowledge

In addition to evaluating the role of others in relation to plagiarism and assessing its importance, students provided assessments of their own knowledge about appropriate source use and plagiarism. While several of the participants expressed confidence in their level of knowledge, the majority of students wrote that they found one or more aspects of appropriate source use difficult. These difficulties ranged from the concrete and mechanical, such as the correct way to paraphrase, to more abstract issues such as questions over the nature of common knowledge and the role of student collaboration in academic writing. The codes for this sub category are as follows:

Confidence: A small number of participants expressed confidence in their knowledge of plagiarism and their abilities to successfully avoid it in writing, as illustrated by the following quotations: “In general, in my opinion I think I have enough understanding about plagiarism” (B30, D4); “Although I was not taught of this in high school in China, but I am fairly confident now about this topic” (B5, D4); “I believe that I have learned everything I need to know about plagiarism in a border scale” (B24, D4); and “I am pretty sure I am completely understood about the meaning of plagiarism and academic writing...I think I will be fine whatever I have to do if the topic is around the plagiarism and academic writing” (B22, D4).

Fear: Only one of the participants overtly expressed fear about the possibility of unintentional plagiarism in his work and apprehension about the consequences of such inappropriate textual borrowing. However this fear motivated the student to be more aware of appropriate textual borrowing in his own work: “It actually scares me just thinking about it and that makes me work harder to try avoiding the use of Plagiarism by making sure I cite and reference other people’s work that I have used” (C9, D4).

Uncertainty - paraphrasing: Several participants expressed deeper doubts concerning the use of paraphrasing as a source-use strategy and its relationship to plagiarism. For example Participant B7 wrote:

If you read someone work, and rewrite his/her work in you own language, is it still a kind of plagiarism?...it counts since you stole that person’s thoughts [but]...it does not count...since you don’t have any words or sentence structures used the same as that person’s work (D4)
This example illustrates a common confusion expressed in both the journal and the questionnaire data regarding the relationship between textual transformation and plagiarism. As noted in section 4.1.2, many of the students appeared to believe that if the source text was rewritten in their “own” words, then this was sufficient to comply with source use norms and conventions. In this example, Participant B7 was able to articulate a tension that exists between student understandings of idea borrowing versus textual borrowing, the relationship between the two, and what “counts” as plagiarism.

Uncertainty - epistemology of knowledge: The most commonly expressed doubt in the data concerning appropriate source use was that of the difference between source specific knowledge and common or general knowledge. The code epistemology of knowledge was used again for data in which students expressed their perceptions of difficulties in identifying ownership of knowledge (Mori, 1999). While it appears that most students were aware that referencing was a general requirement in academic writing, they were less able to identify referencing requirements for more abstract textual material such as theories or ideas. This uncertainty took three forms. Firstly, a number of students expressed difficulties with identifying what information was considered common knowledge and thus in need of a reference. Secondly, they were concerned that ideas might occur simultaneously in several places or between several people, and how to reference that material in this case. Thirdly, they expressed concern over ownership of knowledge generated in a collaborative study session. The following examples illustrate these uncertainties:

Uncertainty - common knowledge: Students were generally aware of the convention that common knowledge did not require a reference in their academic writing, but understandings of what actually entailed general or common knowledge appeared to be lacking. For example, Participant B1 noted that while he felt he had a general understanding of source-use strategies, he could not be sure of the borders between common and source-specific knowledge: “I think my biggest problem is not to find out what is plagiarism but it is to know where my personal knowledge begin and where it ends” (D4). He also felt that he could not be sure if the knowledge that he considered as his own had not, in fact, been assimilated from source material at some unspecified time in his past:

I also know that my personal ideas are just that ones who are of common knowledge and without any theoretical background, and it could be plagiarism all the ideas and knowledge that I have developed as an student immersed in
some topic as I got this knowledge from some specific and proved sources. (B1, D4)

A similar perception was expressed by participant C1, who was concerned about identifying the source of knowledge:

It is hard to distinguish between your own thoughts to what has been already published. Also, there is common knowledge that we do not know who stated originally. What happens to these common knowledge do we still be accused of being plagiarised? (D4)

While such comments illustrate the difficulties that students perceived with appropriate source use, they also foreground a tension inherent in the discourse of plagiarism itself. As was mentioned in section 2.3.2, definitions of common knowledge can be problematic and limited, and in this data we can see that the students themselves may perceive these tensions and internalise them as individual problems.

Uncertainty - simultaneously arising ideas: Participants also identified the possibility of different unrelated authors simultaneously having the same idea as an area of uncertainty in their plagiarism knowledge. This concern is illustrated in the following three student comments: “Maybe two different people come up with same thought or idea by chance. In this case, it would complicate to judge” (B31, D4); “If two persons have same experience and write a journal about it, then who is copying whose work?” (C5, D4), and “This is perhaps a coincidence concerned, and marked as plagiarism if the common ideas appear between two or three people?” (B20, D4).

Uncertainty - collaboration: Related to the data concerning the source and ownership of ideas and knowledge in published texts is the concept of student collaboration and the question of referencing work that has arisen out of group work, as in the following example from Participant B2: “we might be sitting in a group doing a project and sharing our ideas. If I used someone’s idea; does that mean I am cheating?” (D4).

In summary, this subsection has attempted to outline the different facets of the participants’ emergent understandings about plagiarism and source use in academic writing that arose out of an analysis of their reflective journals. This data revealed that students were aware of multiple aspects of the issue of plagiarism and source use, ranging from definitions,
institutional significance, causes, consequences, and plagiarism avoidance strategies. It has also shown how significant difficulties and gaps in knowledge were evident in their understandings, and that there was an on-going tension between what textual practices were considered unintentional and those that were intentional, and their causes and results. However, I have suggested that this on-going tension may not be the result simply of a lack of learning on the part of the students but because of their internalisation of a discourse which itself is inherently complex and problematic.

5.4 Summary

This chapter has illustrated and analysed the main aspects of the participants’ knowledge and beliefs about plagiarism, textual borrowing, and source use that arose out of the journal data. This thematic analysis has revealed that there were many aspects to student knowledge of these key elements of academic writing, encompassing both their prior learning and experiences, and their emergent knowledge of forms, causes, and consequences of plagiarism. In addition, this chapter has shown how the participants’ beliefs about issues such as plagiarism’s importance, its moral and ethical connotations and issues surrounding intentionality can add to and complicate that knowledge.

However, as plagiarism and textual borrowing are issues of textual practice as well as knowledge and belief, an analysis relying on journal or questionnaire data will be limited as it can only examine the aspects of that knowledge as students perceive them. The next chapter examines the relationship between students’ perceived knowledge and actual practice of source use through a series of ten case studies. This came from the Interview Group, a subset of the study participants and combines a qualitative analysis of these students’ journal and interview data with a textual analysis of their course work to examine the interplay between student knowledge of plagiarism and the practice of academic writing.
CHAPTER SIX - CASE STUDIES

6.0 Overview

This chapter presents ten participant case studies to further explore the issues surrounding student source use and textual borrowing knowledge, beliefs and practices introduced in the previous results chapters. The participants discussed are students from the writing sample group who volunteered to take part in interviews designed to elicit further in-depth data about the sociocultural contexts in which these beliefs and practices were embedded.

Qualitative data were coded according to the scheme developed and presented in the previous chapter (see Chapter 5.0), which was augmented with the following categories:

- Academic Experience
- Research Process Knowledge
- Writing Knowledge
- Referencing Knowledge

In addition, the chapter presents the results of the text analysis of the students’ course work, specifically the paraphrase assignments, take home test essays, and research essays written during the semester. Each text was examined for the types and extent of textual borrowing, both legitimate forms, such as paraphrase, summary and quotation, and non-legitimate forms (Pecorari, 2003), such as direct copying and patchwriting (Howard, 1995). Texts were also examined for the presence or absence of references and for patterns of attribution. The following codes and categories were used in the analysis of the text data (The coding methods used for the text data are discussed in detail in section 3.6.1):

- Textual borrowing strategies
  - direct copy
  - close modification
  - extensive modification
  - summary
  - quotation
  - borrowed idea
  - common idea
- Referencing strategies
  - referenced
• not referenced
• secondary reference

• Attribution strategies
  ° explicit
  ° implicit

References for the qualitative data are made using the participant’s initials and data type. Journal data is referred to by journal number and interview data is referred to by page number. Text data is referred to by type (P for paraphrase assignment, TE for take home test essay assignment, and RE for research essay) and by line number. For example, YY J4 refers to Yao Yao’s fourth journal entry, D Int., p. 17 refers to Daniels’ interview, page 17, while XW RE 1 16 refers to Xiao Wen’s research essay, line 16. The article excerpts which the students used for their take home test essays can be found in Appendix J. References for the sources used by students in their research essays can be found in Appendix L.

6.1 Xiao Wen

Xiao Wen completed technical college in China before attending an IELTS preparation course and courses in general and academic English at the university Language Centre. During this time she gained some experience in academic writing, working on assignments such as summaries, journals, and essays. After attending the Language Centre she enrolled in a Business Certificate at the city Polytechnic. At the time of the data collection she was in her second year of an Accounting degree. Xiao Wen was a motivated student who felt that practice and hard work were necessary to succeed as a writer of academic English and she regularly engaged in writing outside of class in addition to completing her course requirements. She also took additional writing courses in order to improve her writing skills.

Xiao Wen was confident expressing her own opinion in her writing. However, she felt that the expression of stance depended on contextual factors such as the assignment type or the requirements of the instructor or task, noting that the expression of stance depended on “what you are doing...if you [are] doing a big group presentation, they [the instructors] would like you to present your different argument, different point” (XW Int. p. 8). She also felt it was important to support her opinion with source material. When asked if she liked to express her own point of view in her writing, she replied, “sometimes...but they [her opinions] always have to follow the facts to make the point’” (XW Int. p. 9).
However, Xiao Wen felt that her language proficiency was a barrier to the development of her writing, noting that sometimes her grammar and vocabulary limited the extent to which she could express herself and her ideas in her assignments:

It is frustrated that I could not use my language to express myself...I cannot express myself in a proper way, it is not enough, and [I am not] able to express myself deeply and exactly in English instead of my language (XW J5).

In particular, Xiao Wen felt constrained by what she perceived as her limited vocabulary and grammar, “sometimes we want to use complex words, however this is not going to work – the more complex words, the more mistakes we can make” (XW J6).

Xiao Wen’s experience with research for source-based writing began at the Language Centre, where she researched sources such as newspaper articles and Internet information. For her Accounting assignments, she used the Library’s digital databases to access a variety of sources such as journal articles, books, and textbooks. Xiao Wen felt it was important to use what she considered as “academic sounding sources”, stating that her instructors discouraged the use of Internet material in academic assignments because it was not “academic enough” (XW Int. p. 7).

Xiao Wen appeared to be familiar with conventional source integration techniques, preferring to use quotations that were useful to “show the audience...what’s the original meaning” (XW Int. p. 12). She also used quotations to support her own ideas in her writing and to demonstrate to the reader the source of her ideas and breadth of research. She reported using paraphrasing and summarising in order to “abstract the long article to the short main idea” (XW J6).

Xiao Wen noted that in her previous experiences with source-based academic writing in China referencing had not been required and copying had been an acceptable strategy: “we have never ever needed to reference when we copied materials from the library as our own work; however our teacher did not criticise what we did” (XW J4). Similarly, at the Language Centre and Polytechnic, Xiao Wen said that while she had been introduced to the idea of putting her sources into a bibliography, she felt that the requirements for referencing had not been strict, and she had been accustomed to borrowing source material without citation, noting, “I did not concern about reference and how to reference properly as our lecture did not require for that, I just copied the whole paragraph from the article or journal without reference” (XW J4).

However, she was aware that the referencing requirements were more rigorous at the university. For her Accounting courses, Xiao Wen said that referencing and the correct use of
bibliographies was always a requirement, noting, “They will comment if your references are not quite, sometimes they correcting, like when you hand in the report they will correcting your reference, if they’re not right...quite, quite strict” (XW Int. p. 8). While she was now attempting to use sources correctly, she continued to find aspects of referencing challenging, including how often to cite from a source when using an extended amount of content material. She also found it difficult remembering the correct form of references, noting that she was “still not sure quite how to reference in the exactly way, I always have trouble to remember which is the right way to reference” (XW J4).

As can be seen from the above examples, Xiao Wen’s perceptions of source use and referencing were developing over time, and she exhibited an emerging awareness of the need to utilise appropriate source use techniques in her academic writing. However, Xiao Wen also appeared have internalised aspects of the ethical discourse of plagiarism (Valentine, 2006), describing plagiarism as, “Immoral, unethical...if people plagiarise [in an] academic environment, it means they are stealing, that is an illegal behavior” (XW J4). She extended these negative perceptions to students who plagiarised, suggesting that students involved in unacknowledged textual borrowing were “lazy” and did it out of “convenience” (XW Int. p. 15). Xiao Wen linked plagiarism to negative consequences for learning, arguing, “If you plagiarism, even you can get the high mark, but that is not your own proper work, it means you do not learn new knowledge and do not understand it by yourself” (XW J4). Xiao Wen stated that in China she had been unaware of restrictions against plagiarism in academic writing and consequently felt that plagiarism was “not so important” there (XW Int. p. 15). She had first learned about plagiarism at the city Polytechnic, where she had been told, “you shouldn’t plagiar[ise], otherwise you will get a penalty and then you wont get a mark” (XW Int. p. 5).

However, despite being unequivocal in her own negative perceptions of plagiarism, Xiao Wen also felt that restrictions against plagiarism could be partly dependent on contextual factors, such as institutional policies and attitudes. For example, she felt that attitudes towards plagiarism at the Polytechnic were more lenient than at the University, suggesting, “The University’s more serious [about plagiarism] than the Polytechnic. The Polytechnic is sort of like a small family and a few plagiarism is ok…it won’t get you really, um serious penalty” (XW Int. p. 18). Such comments illustrate a tension between a strongly held belief in the unethical nature of unacknowledged copying and an awareness of contexts in which the restrictions against plagiarism could be relaxed or did not apply.

An analysis of her text data revealed that despite such beliefs, her course work exhibited several areas of weakness in the ways she integrated source texts into her own
writing. In Xiao Wen’s first assignment she was able to extensively modify the majority of the source passage using her own words (53%), although in places her paraphrase was embedded with strings of closely modified text, as in the following example (close modifications in bold):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Xiao Wen’s paraphrase</th>
<th>Source text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition, they could not suitable for the culture especially academic aspect such as the lecturer teaching style, doing assessment and examination is different from their own country (ll. 10-12).</td>
<td>Almost always, the foreign student finds the professor’s expectations, teaching strategies and reading assignments and examinations differ from those of teachers in his or her home country (Maxwell, ll. 10-11).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this sentence it is apparent how the text in bold relies heavily on the lexis and syntax of the source passage with synonym substitution (teaching strategies→teaching style; reading assignments→doing assessment), changes in number (examinations→examination) and verb form (differ→is different from) being the predominant strategies, which closely follow Howard’s (1995) definition of patchwriting. However, Xiao Wen also used prototypical source integration strategies, and was also the only student to incorporate a quotation into her paraphrase, which was referenced although not attributed to the author of the source text.

The take-home test essay differed from the paraphrase assignment in that the students were required to write a two-paragraph essay that combined their own ideas on the topic with relevant material from two provided source texts. In Xiao Wen’s take home test essay there were six instances of textual borrowing identified. Almost a quarter of the word count was identified as summary, as Xiao Wen condensed the main points of one of the source articles across several sentences, two of which included in-text citations (note that the text used was Maxwell, which was incorrectly cited by Xiao Wen, who used the author's first name, Martha). However, within this summary there were also several instances of direct copying embedded into her writing, as illustrated below (direct copying underlined, close modification in bold):
Table 6.2 Text Comparison for Test Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Xiao Wen’s test essay</th>
<th>Source text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In U.S universities, they have an institution to support those students come from overseas (Martha J, 1974, p91) because we find the same problem exist in the lecture, it is not easy to follow lecture’s word especially their idiom (ll. 25-8).</td>
<td>Professors who use academic jargon and idioms confuse the student who is trying to understand new technical terms and take notes in English (Maxwell, ll. 18-20).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondly, how to read assignment with 200 pages per night per course, thus, students need to develop effective skimming and scanning skills to keep them going (Martha J, 1974, p92) (ll. 29-30).</td>
<td>Political science instructors assign as many as 200 pages per night per course. Students soon realise they cannot read every word and must develop effective skimming and scanning skills to survive (Maxwell, ll. 33-35).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition, the student undertake the exam under time pressure, they suggest them do not read the word in a hurry; it will get the lower grade if they do (ll. 32-33).</td>
<td>...the student writing under time pressure must plan answers accordingly. It is important to tell the student that the professor or teaching assistant who reads and grades the paper does so hurriedly and unless the paper is clear and well organised the student may earn a lower grade even though he or she understands the subject (Maxwell, ll. 51-55).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-prototypical strategies were used least frequently in Xiao Wen’s test essay and direct copying and close modification comprised only 9.6% of the total word count.

Xiao Wen wrote her research essay on the topic of the social effects of media violence, which was one of a number of argumentative essay topics chosen by the research librarian at the main university library. In Xiao Wen’s research essay, which used five self selected sources (two books and three academic journal articles), 39 instances of textual borrowing were identified, which made up 42.7% of the total word count. Contrasting with her previous two assignments, the main strategy that Xiao Wen used was direct copying,
which made up almost a quarter of the total word count. This extensive direct copying was in evidence from the first sentence of her essay:

Table 6.3 Text Comparison for Research Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Xiao Wen’s research essay</th>
<th>Source text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As time flies by, we all recognise the technology has changed frequently nowadays, it</td>
<td>The American Academy of Pediatrics recognizes that exposure to violence in media including television, music and video games, as a significant risk to the health of children and adolescents (AAP, p. 1222).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>created a lot different media which exposure to violence in media, including television,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>movies, music and video games and the internet, as a significant risk to the health of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children and adolescents (ll. 2-4).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that in the research essay Xiao Wen relied so heavily on direct copying to incorporate sources into her text here and elsewhere in her essay suggests that process of acquiring this form of academic literacy is not a linear one and that a student’s successful use of sources in one instance does not predict the successful integration of sources in the next instance. Nor can the direct copying in this essay be attributed to an intent to deceive or to present the language or ideas as her own, as while two of the strings of direct copying illustrated above were not referenced or attributed, a number (four) of directly copied strings identified elsewhere in the essay did contain references to their sources, and three contained phrases attributing the text to the author of the source text. Thus Xiao Wen appears not to have been appropriating the text in order to present it in her own voice, but was still unable to incorporate the source material into her text in a manner which was in accord with academic convention. In addition to the direct copying, there was a small amount of close modification (4.1%) and extensive modification (4.4%) identified, in addition to two instances of quotation (3.2%).

While some of her textual borrowing was referenced and attributed (of the 39 borrowed strings, 36% were referenced and 15% attributed), the overall picture of source use in Xiao Wen’s essay was complicated by the fact that she incorporated material into her essay that had not been included in her references list. In particular, extensive strings of borrowed words were identified that appeared to have come from a set of Psychology lecture notes, which was identified by comparing her essay to the lecture notes that had been submitted by
another of the study participants who was writing on the same topic. It is unclear whether Xiao Wen intentionally attempted to create a misleading impression of her source use - in the following example of textual borrowing, she provided a reference for the source, but it too was a secondary reference which appeared to be taken from the lecture notes:

Table 6.4 Research Essay Source Text Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Xiao Wen’s research essay</th>
<th>Source texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Although television has the potential to support development, but it often show negative cognitive lessons on children, individuals leaving the action movie had even higher levels of hostility than individuals prior to viewing the action movie. (Black &amp; Bevan, 1992) (ll. 78-80).</td>
<td>High quality programmes can aid learning (PSYCH notes). Individuals leaving the action movie had even higher levels of hostility than individuals prior to viewing the action movie (Black &amp; Bevan, 1992 - cited in PSYCH notes).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In several other instances Xiao Wen used secondary references, citing authors who had been referred to in the source texts but which she had not consulted herself or put in her reference list, thus making it difficult to clearly identify the authorial voices speaking in her essay. As Pecorari (2006) noted, citations make a “tacit promise” (p. 6) to the reader that the relationship between the sources and the text is what the writer signals it to be, through the use of referencing conventions. In the above example, Xiao Wen signals that she consulted Black and Bevin (1992) to make her point. It is possible that she did consult this source and omitted to include it in her references list. It is more likely, however, due to the fact that the copied excerpts are identical to those found in the Psychology lecture notes (also omitted in references list), that this is the source that Xiao Wen copied from. The inclusion of this borrowed text in Xiao Wen’s essay is further evidence of how appropriate textual borrowing practices and overtly inappropriate ones can exist in close proximity in the same piece of student work. A summary of the types of textual borrowing, and of the patterns of referencing and attribution in Xiao Wen’s research can be found in Appendix K.
6.2 Mariko

Mariko was the only Japanese student in the case-study group. She had taken English as a Second Language (ESL) and a variety of other subjects at high school, and had completed many written assignments in those classes. At University, Mariko was majoring in Zoology, for which she was required to write frequent assignments, and she noted that her internal assessment in Zoology consisted of presentations and reports, as well as longer essays.

Mariko felt academic writing in English to be challenging on a number of levels, both in terms of composition content and rhetorical form, and noted the added layer of complication arising when she attempted to translate from her L1, stating, “it is harder for me because I always think what I want to write in Japanese first and translate it to English so sometimes my writing does not make any sense” (M J4). For Mariko, her interest in and knowledge of a topic determined her ability to express her opinion in her compositions, and she felt that familiarity with her topic enabled her to express her ideas more successfully, noting that when she did research she could “get more knowledge of that topic, not just writing about what I feel” (MJ5).

If such familiarity was lacking, this negatively affected her work and she commented, “If the topic was the thing I really know, I can write it more interesting, but if I did not like the topic, I still write it, but normally it sounds very strange. Like my opinion is not clear “ (M J5). As with Xiao Wen, confidence with the content knowledge in her assignments enabled Mariko to feel comfortable expressing a stance in her essay.

When researching her assignments Mariko accessed a variety of sources using the Library’s digital catalogue and databases, and, as with her writing, she felt more confident in her ability to find sources if she was familiar with her topic, noting, “I find it easy to conduct research when I really understand that topic and have some knowledge of that topic” (M J6).

When integrating sources into her academic writing, Mariko commented that quotation was her preferred strategy, which she used to back up her own ideas. Mariko said that she avoided paraphrasing when she was not confident that she could rewrite enough of the source texts in her own words to avoid inappropriate textual borrowing. Indeed, inappropriate source use and its penalties were often at the forefront of Mariko’s mind when she was writing. When paraphrasing, for example, she said, “if I change the words sometimes it doesn’t make sense…but then if I copy too much it’s gonna be plagiarism” (M Int. p. 10).

Mariko had been familiar with the practice of academic citation for some time, having learnt referencing at high school. She said that she had been able to use sources in her assignments as long as she provided acknowledgement, saying, “When I had research in high
school I was allowed to use Internet resources and was allowed to use that source on the research essay as long as it was quoted” (M Int. p. 18).

However Mariko had not been introduced to the concept of plagiarism until she started studying at the university. Mariko felt that plagiarism awareness was an important issue in academic writing, commenting, “I feel we need to think more about how to make people avoid plagiarising” (M J4). However, like many of the participants, she had a limited understanding about the range of behaviours that could be considered as plagiarism. This can be illustrated by her comments in her journal, in which she wrote that plagiarism is “like people just copy and paste the work from the internet, book and other sources available and pretend it is their work” (M J4). The use of the term “pretend” in this quotation implies that Mariko considered textual copying to be an intentional act. She reiterated this understanding in the interview, during which she said, “copying exactly the things, the other people’s work” (M Int. p.12).

In addition to learning about plagiarism in the formal setting of the university, Mariko was familiar with several examples of plagiarism from her personal experience and she had been able to use her knowledge to point out inappropriate textual borrowing in the written work of several of her peers who had been collaborating on an assignment. These students had copied information from different Internet sites and included it unacknowledged and directly copied into their assignments. The friends had not believed that this was plagiarism, but following Mariko’s advice they changed their work before submitting it: “They changed paraphrase – so it was good” (M Int. 16-17). However, when asked if proficiency had been an issue in this instance and in student plagiarism in general, Mariko observed, “I think not...because it happens in my own country” (M Int. p. 16).

When discussing plagiarism in Japan, Mariko appeared to believe that cultural norms about the expression of ideas and opinions could influence textual borrowing practices, suggesting, “Japanese people like to follow other people…so I think many people plagiarise” (M Int. p. 15). She also felt that students from other Asian countries could have this trait, stating that unidentified students had advised her to “just copy other people’s work” and that these students were “from Asian countries, so I felt like Asian people don’t have too much opinions” (M Int. p. 16). However, as noted earlier, she did not feel that she herself had a problem with creating a stance in her compositions, as long as she was confident in her content knowledge of the topic.

While she attributed copying in Japanese contexts to a lack of strongly held opinions, she was also aware of a case of plagiarism in Japan in which a reputedly famous author had plagiarised another’s work. As she explained, “The person who made that Haiku said he
thought of it for a long time and finally came up with a good one, but later on people found that the Haiku he made was another person’s” (M J4). Thus there appeared to be a tension between Mariko’s belief in Asian (her term) peoples’ lack of opinion as expressed in their writing, and her own views on self-expression in her academic writing. In addition, the fact that she was able to identify a public case of plagiarism suggests that her views about the status of plagiarism and textual borrowing practices in Japan were not entirely accurate.

Further tensions became evident when comparing Mariko’s beliefs about textual borrowing to her own source use practices. While she believed that unacknowledged copying was wrong and was able to point this out in the work of other students, in her own writing she relied heavily on non-prototypical textual borrowing strategies, notably direct copying and close modification of the source text. In her paraphrase assignment, these two strategies made up almost 95% of her total text, possibly indicating that the cognitive demands of successfully conveying the propositional content of the source (Wette, 2010) and expressing it in language sufficiently removed from the source text may have been too much for Mariko at this point in the course. Examples of her heavy reliance on the source text are given below (closely modified text is in bold, directly copied text is underlined):

Table 6.5 Text Comparison for Paraphrase Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mariko’s paraphrase</th>
<th>Source text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S universities have different entrance requirements and academic standards, but</td>
<td>Although U. S. universities vary in entrance requirements and academic standards, all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all universities share certain academic rituals (ll. 12).</td>
<td>share certain academic rituals which may make adjustment difficult for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from other countries, depending on the students’ expectations, previous learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experiences and their styles of learning (ll. 2-3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The adjustment makes difficult for international students, because of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students’ expectations, previous learning experiences and their styles of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learning (ll. 3-4).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In her first sentence Mariko combined two strategies, directly copying two strings from the source text, which are shown as underlined. That she attempted to transform the text into her own words is evident with the textual modifications made - these modifications included synonym substitution (such as vary ➔ have different; students from other
countries→international students), addition of words (all→all universities), and minor changes in word order (make adjustment difficult→adjustment makes difficult; learning styles→styles of learning). She also separated the clauses of the original sentence, making it into two separate sentences. Such minor modifications are clear evidence of what Howard (1995) terms patchwriting - Mariko was attempting to use her own words to rewrite the passage, but the modifications she made were too minor to substantially change the original wording, and in both of her sentences in the above example there were instances of direct copying among her modifications.

In the take home test essay Mariko employed a different textual borrowing strategy. The majority of her essay was comprised of her own ideas about cultural adjustment, supported by two direct quotations. These two quotations were modest in length, making up 16.7% of the total word count of the essay. No other textual borrowing strategies were identified, suggesting that to a large degree, Mariko relied on her own ideas in the construction of the composition. Material borrowed from other texts was used for illustrative purposes only, as shown in the examples below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.6 Text Comparison for Test Essay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mariko’s test essay</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Later on I had many culture shock like it says,”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In her research essay, Mariko wrote about the topic of the ethics of animal testing. She used eight sources in this essay, six of which were in her reference list (two articles from academic journals, one newspaper article, and three books) and two that were not included but identified by the researcher from in-text citations. In this essay, Mariko attempted a variety of textual borrowing techniques, some prototypical and some non-prototypical. In total there were 33 instances of source use identified, which made up 53% of the total number of words in the essay.

Prototypical strategies of quotation and extensive modification were in the minority, being used in only five instances in the essay, making 7.5% of the total word count. There were three instances of extensive modification identified, as well as two quotations and one
borrowed idea (as discussed in section 3.6.1, borrowed idea was defined as an instance of source use that is neither an extensive modification, nor a summary, but is signalled as coming from an outside source with the use of either an attributing phrase or a reference).

Non-prototypical source use strategies predominated, the most common being direct copying, with 26 directly copied strings being incorporated in the essay. As with the paraphrase assignment, these copied strings were sometimes embedded in closely modified text, which was the second most widely used textual borrowing strategy, making up 11% of the total word count. This combining of strategies, as with the paraphrase assignment, could be taken as evidence that Mariko was attempting, although unsuccessfully, to use her own words to transform the text. The way in which Mariko combined these two strategies is illustrated in the following examples (closely modified text is in bold and directly copied text is underlined):

| Table 6.7 Source Integration Techniques - Direct Copying and Close Modification |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Mariko’s essay                  | Source text      |
| The use of animal for medical   | The basic principal is that the use of live vertebrates for medical and scientific research is prohibited if the procedure is likely to cause the pain or other suffering in the animal (Esling, 1981, p. 41-2). |
| and scientific research is     |                  |
| prohibited if the procedure is  |                  |
| likely to cause pain or suffer  |                  |
| to animals (ll. 110-111).       |                  |

Here we can see that the majority of the sentence is copied directly from the source text, but that an attempt has been made at modification at the beginning of the sentence (with synonym substitution: live vertebrates \(\rightarrow\) animal) and changes in word form (suffering \(\rightarrow\) suffer). This pattern of combining direct copying with close modification was the predominant pattern of source use in Mariko’s essay.

However, extensive parts of the essay were also complete sentences directly copied from source texts with no modification. Of the 33 instances of source use identified, there were 11 strings of words directly copied from source texts with no modification (26% in total), as in the following table in which it can be seen that the majority of the sentence is copied directly (underlined) from the source text and integrated into her essay:
An examination of patterns of referencing and attribution adds to the erratic pattern of source use that emerges from this data. In terms of referencing and attribution strategies, Mariko provided references for less than half of the identified instances of source use (42.2%), and even fewer attributive phrases. In fact, the two phrases of attribution she included in her essay appeared to be copied from her source material. However, the relationship was not a transparent one, with prototypical source use being referenced or attributed and non-prototypical source use lacking referencing or attribution because over a third of the directly copied strings were also referenced. A summary of Mariko’s source use, referencing and attribution strategies can be found in Appendix K.

6.3 Yue Yan

Yue Yan had attended high school in China, and then went to a Language Institute in Beijing where she took English classes in preparation for study overseas. She had not been required to do substantial amounts of writing in her general English classes, but some English composition had been necessary for her IELTS preparation class. Yue Yan commented that students viewed such compositions as largely formulaic and that similar topics were regularly recycled, suggesting, “Some topics for IELTS are, um, very classical topics for IELTS writing tasks…people have been writing again and again and again “ (YY Int. p.3). She noted that students regularly shared exam information with each other, discussing things such as commonly occurring topics, and that she had a notebook in which she “kept track of the most popular IELTS topics at that time” (YY Int. p.9).

While studying in China, Yue Yan felt that she had lacked the confidence and knowledge needed to write successfully. In particular, she felt she had lacked the ability to express her own ideas and opinions in her writing, noting, “even if I had my own opinion I
don’t think I can express it at that moment” (YY Int. p. 3). When asked why she felt this to be the case she replied, “I think just language barrier, cos I wasn’t very confident” (YY Int. p. 3-4). Yue Yan said that she used memorisation and copying as a strategy to cope with this difficulty, explaining, “I tried to improve my English by remembering some sentences...like some kind of good and classical English writing, and it was like, ‘oh I have to learn this structure or learn this sentence that I might use later’” (YY Int. p. 3).

Her lack of confidence and her perceived limited language proficiency made it difficult when Yue Yan came to New Zealand to study at the university Language Centre. Here she had been encouraged to begin writing in English straight away, which she found particularly difficult, commenting that, “in China I had to spend a few days about it, and write the structure… and say something about the topic…and then here I was encouraged to write the essay immediately…I was a little bit shocked!” (YY Int. p. 7).

On entering the Foundation Year she had continued to study academic English, learning how to write different types of essays including descriptive and argumentative essays, but she said that at the current university she had not done a lot of academic writing, as her Computer Science course required mainly shorter assignments.

However, she now felt more comfortable writing academic English and appeared to gain confidence from the structure provided by different essay genres, noting, “Discussion and argumentative essays may be the most familiar types of essay to me. They both follow the basic rules of writing an academic essay” (YY J5). In addition, Yue Yan felt that she was now able to more adequately express her own point of view, stating, “I often feel comfortable to express my own opinion in the writing [and] use appropriate academic English” (YY J5).

Yue Yan was a self-motivated student who often wrote in English in her own time in addition to her assignments, and she felt very aware of what she perceived as the expectations of her instructors concerning her academic writing. She was concerned that her writing should have an appropriate academic style, and described often rewriting her assignments attempting to improve this style, noting, “I rewrite again, again, again, just to, you know, try to make it more academic” (YY Int. p. 17).

Yue Yan was also developing awareness that different academic contexts had different conventions and expectations. For example, in her Computer Science course she had begun writing in a formal academic style, but by observing the writing styles of her fellow students, she found that, “they write really casual...so sometimes I was thinking its maybe not really necessary to have English style writing in Computer Science (YY Int. p. 18). Conversely, Yue Yan felt that in her International Business courses formal academic style was a
requirement, and that instructors demanded “the very, very strict academic style” (YY Int. p. 15).

Yue Yan also felt confident with the process of researching source material. For her writing in China, research had not been required but she did it anyway to enhance what she perceived as the quality of her work, saying, “I think I didn’t have to, but I did a lot of it because I wanted to have…more ideas…I might not even use the ideas, but I just wanna say, like, what other peoples’ opinions on those topics” (YY Int. p. 8). During her Foundation Year English course, which she described as a “really serious class” (YY Int. p. 9), she had gained additional experience in using source material in her writing. She said she now was accustomed to using the Library’s digital databases to find a variety of source types, such as books and journal or newspaper articles.

Yue Yan described using a variety of source integration techniques in her academic writing and was able to demonstrate knowledge of quotation, summary, and paraphrase. She said that she liked to use quotations in order to increase reader interest in her own work preferring quotations containing, “some really, really good sentences…fantastic sentences…people will be attracted by those sentences” (YY Int. p. 18). Yue Yan noted that she also enjoyed paraphrasing, which she described accurately as “you basically have the same ideas and you just restructure the sentence and then, ah, because you just wanna resay it again or something, but you use your own language” (YY Int. p. 18). She was also aware of the requirements of summary writing, which involved writing “in your own words, but the same ideas in the short, maybe just one paragraph” (YY Int. p. 18). However, Yue Yan felt that a lack of reading proficiency meant that sometimes she was not able to understand her sources, which she felt impacted on her writing, noting “Because of the language barriers, sometimes I feel confused about the ideas of my topic, and result in the weaker statement or evidence to support my essay (YY J5).

Yue Yan was first introduced to referencing during her Foundation Year, where “they sort of encouraged us to do research, but to try to reference” (YY Int. p. 11). Now she was at her current university she had a general understanding of the institutional requirements for referencing, noting that, “Acknowledgement is required when produce an academic writing...It seems that students are expected to understand the importance of acknowledgement as well as how to know to reference in academic style” (YY J4).

With referencing she was becoming aware of disciplinary differences in conventions and requirements, noting in relation to her Computer Science assignments for example, “we don’t have citations or something, we don’t have to say, quote, someone says something else, or something. I wouldn’t normally do that, because it’s not required” (YY Int. p. 15). While it
is important to note that such observations do not necessarily accurately reflect the actual policy of individual departments, they are significant in that they illustrate Yue Yan’s own developing understandings of the referencing rules and conventions that mediated her writing.

Yue Yan said that while she was aware that referencing was important, she was sometimes still unsure about when to reference her sources, noting, “I cannot say that I am 100% sure because I, sometimes when I write I do [get] confused” (YY Int. p. 19). When such confusion arose, Yue Yan employed the strategy of referencing “all the time” because she considered it to be “a safe plan” (YY Int. p. 20). Elaborating on this strategy she said, “sometimes I think I’d rather just reference it because...you don’t have to worry about it later” (YY Int. p. 20).

Although, as mentioned earlier, she had written from sources in her academic writing in China, Yue Yan felt that referencing had not been required there, rather, that the focus had been on content and on expression: “Previously I was expected to write good academic essay based on how much I understand the topic and how well I could express my idea... I can show it in my work without acknowledgement” (YY J4). In fact, she appeared to perceive referencing as unnecessary in academic writing in “Eastern” cultures in general, noting, “Most of the Eastern countries do not have the ideas of referencing in academic writing” (YY J4).

However, she had been aware of the issue of plagiarism before she came to New Zealand and she stated that, prior to leaving China, she had been warned by peers that plagiarism was considered a serious issue in English-speaking countries. She had been told, “if you are going to study abroad…Western people are very sensitive about, you know, if you borrowed some ideas from somewhere and you have to say where you have borrowed them from” (YY Int. 10).

The first time Yue Yan received formal instruction about plagiarism was during her Foundation Year, during which the instructor emphasised that plagiarism awareness was especially important for international students:

Plagiarism – that’s the first time I actually hear the words very seriously from the lecturer…she stand in front of the whole class, hundreds of people, and she was like ‘Ok I know you international students may not be familiar with this but today we’re gonna talk something…very important’. And she just kept emphasise really, really important. (YY Int. p.9-10)

Yue Yan had initially been confused by this focus on plagiarism, and feared inadvertently plagiarising in her writing, saying, “I was very, very afraid that...every time I
think I wrote a little bit and I went to ask my teachers...is it plagiarism?” (YY Int. p. 11). She said that she felt “panicked” that she would accidently plagiarise her source texts while writing. In particular, she felt that she was unable to distinguish between ideas taken from her source texts and her own ideas, commenting, “I was a little bit afraid that I couldn’t distinguish the boundary that, which, which part is, you know, I borrow the ideas from someone else and which part is my own ideas” (YY Int. p. 11). Echoing a common theme in the qualitative data examined in Chapter Five (see sections 5.2.2 and 5.4) concerning the epistemology of knowledge (Mori, 1999), Yue Yan felt that the borderline between her own acquired knowledge and the knowledge represented in the source texts might become blurred and that an accusation of plagiarism might be the result.

In order to overcome her difficulties, she had received support and instruction from the staff at the Foundation Year and she now felt she had a “much better” understanding of plagiarism, which she now defined in the following way: “Plagiarism can be described as the action of copying other peoples writing and idea without mention where it is from” (YY J4). However, like Mariko, Yue Yan had a narrow focus on plagiarism as copying, which perhaps reflects a limited understanding of the wide range of behaviours that may be considered plagiarism by the academy.

Yue Yan felt that plagiarism could be caused by several factors. Inadvertent plagiarism could be caused by lack of knowledge due to students’ educational or cultural backgrounds (“it’s an educational background thing”, she noted (YY Int. p. 20)), or as the result of conflicting epistemological perspectives on knowledge. She also felt that it is possible for different people to have the same ideas, suggesting, “you write something, but someone else write it exactly the same, but maybe sometimes you have...the exactly same idea...there are a lot of people in the world” (YY Int. p. 21).

However, in Yue Yan’s view, individual motivations as well as epistemological tensions could impact on textual borrowing practices. For example, she suggested that intentional plagiarism could result from student laziness, explaining, “Because sometimes they just lazy, they just wanna do something from the Internet, they just wanna copy” (YY Int. p. 12). Yue Yan also noted that students who copy without reference might do so out of a desire to model their work on someone else’s, noting, “maybe they just think the sentence itself is really, really good, cos they think it’s a fantastic essay” (YY Int. p. 12). Indeed, Yue Yan had noted earlier that she liked to incorporate “fantastic sentences” from source texts into her own writing, although she said the she was always sure to provide references for sections of text she incorporated into her own work. This comment supports the view expressed earlier
that students may incorporate source material not only for content knowledge, but because they see its form as a model on which to fashion their own work.

When asked about institutional attitudes towards student plagiarism, Yue Yan felt that instructors had similar expectations of international and New Zealand students, noting, “before they marks us they already told us how to do it, so they will have, maybe, very similar expectations from the native English speaker or Western people” (YY Int. p. 21). She felt that the majority of students were “very clear” about the rules against plagiarism at the University, and said that students either “just try to avoid [it]” or try to “not be caught by the teacher” (YY Int. p. 20). Yue Yan felt that such students were at risk of facing the institutional consequences of plagiarism, observing, “For university, student who copy someone else’s essay, or copy someone else’s idea without referencing, might get kicked out from the university immediately” (YY J4).

The predominant source use strategy Yue Yan used in her first written assignment, the paraphrase assignment, was extensive modification, and she was able to convey the main ideas of the source text without relying heavily on its language. While there was a small amount of direct copying (two instances of copied strings of three and four words), these were interspersed with strings of extensively modified text. In total, 65% of her paraphrase consisted of extensively modified text, while 11.5% was closely modified. Direct copying constituted only 4.1% of the total word count of the assignment.

In her take home test essay there were nine instances of textual borrowing identified. Extensive modification was again her most frequently used strategy, featuring in five instances of textual borrowing and making up just over one third of the total word count of the essay. There were two instances of direct quotation incorporated into her test essay, a small amount of close modification (6.8%) and only two instances of direct copying (1.8%), which were short strings of three words interspersed in a larger paraphrase. Looking at these strategies used by Yue Yan in her test essay, it appears that she had been largely successful in avoiding non-prototypical textual borrowing.

However, while the textual borrowing itself was largely appropriate, the patterns of referencing and attribution used in her test essay suggest that she still did not have an adequate understanding of textual borrowing conventions. Of the nine instances of textual borrowing identified, only two were referenced with an in-text citation, one being a quotation and one a string of extensively modified text. There was only one instance of an attributive phrase acknowledging the author of the source text, a quotation introduced with an explicit attributive phrase. The relationship of referencing and attribution to instances of textual borrowing illustrates the complex interplay between the language of the source text, the
student’s voice and the authorial voices in source texts. In order to successfully incorporate the source texts into their essays, the students need to transform the language of the source with the appropriate level of modification but also clearly indicate whose voice is speaking in the essay through attributive phrases and references. In Yue Yan’s test essay, although she was largely successful in her transformation of the language of her sources, she was less successful in attributing these texts to their original authors. Thus the admonition to write “in your own words”, as often appears in instructional literature on plagiarism avoidance, may not help students avoid plagiarism, as even if the words are their “own”, this does not mean that the students are exempt from acknowledging the original authorial voice via phrases of attribution and referencing. Thus, this guideline is one of many explicit and implicit rules and conventions surrounding source use, yet violation of any of these rules may attract charges of plagiarism in student writing.

In her research essay Yue Yan chose the topic of violence in the media. She used six sources: two academic journals and four newspaper articles retrieved using the university database. These sources were used extensively with 34 instances of textual borrowing identified, making up 65.9 % of the total word count. The strategy which appeared most often in the essay was the borrowed idea, which she used 19 times, and which made up a third of the total word count. It appears that in these instances, Yue Yan was able to incorporate ideas from different sources into her essay without recourse to the actual language of the sources, as illustrated in the following examples (note that in this table there is no source text comparison because these were instances of source use whose ideas appeared to come from the source text but which could not be directly linked to the source text linguistically):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.9 Examples of Borrowed Ideas from Yue Yan’s Research Essay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yue Yan’s essay</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although, people who enjoy violence in the media argue that there are more factors that can cause violence in society because only a minority can be mentally influenced by media-violence (Massey, 1999) (ll. 4-6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finally, there is a risk that video game players can be influenced by the violence in the game (Howe, 1999) (ll. 16-17).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these examples, the instances of borrowing were not linked to the source texts by language, as I was unable to find examples of extensively borrowed language from a comparison with the source texts. However, they are linked at the level of ideas. That Yue
Yan was aware of this link is demonstrated by that fact that in two instances, in-text citations were present. Of the 19 instances of borrowed idea identified in the essay, 13 were referenced with in-text citations, while eight contained attributive phrases, either explicit or implicit, thus making it easier to identify the authorial voices in the research essay than the take-home test essay.

The next most frequently used strategy was that of extensive modification, which was also the predominant strategy used in her paraphrase assignment and her take-home test essay. Strings of extensive modification, which were identified as being the main source incorporation strategy in 11 instances of textual borrowing, representing a fifth of the total word count. As with the other participants, Yue Yan frequently combined strategies within a single orthographic sentence, and several of these instances of extensive modification also contained other forms of textual borrowing, such as quotation and close modification, as is illustrated in the following example (attributive phrase is in italics, closely modified text in bold):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yue Yan’s research essay</th>
<th>Source text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lavers also claims that both former FBI agent and psychiatrist are believe an certain type of violent film launched in 1960 has significant influence on young people and result in an increased number of serial murder (2002) (ll. 66-68).</td>
<td>In her media violence primer, activist Smith observed that “the most extreme form of violence, the splatter or slasher genre, was launched in 1963...Former FBI agent Robert Ressler and forensic psychiatrist Park Elliot Dietz, both experts on serial murder, believe these films have helped fuel the increase in serial killing because of the explicit linking of torture with murder in films targeted at a teenage audience (Lavers, 2002, p. 71).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here it can be seen that although the main strategy used is to extensively modify the source text, there are also instances in which the text of Yue Yan’s sentence resembles closely the language of the original, which she modified with deletion of words (Former FBI agent Robert Ressler and forensic psychiatrist Park Elliot Dietz → former FBI agent and
psychiatrist) and substitution (1963→1960s; the increase in serial killing→increase in serial murder). It would appear that although there is insufficient paraphrasing in these examples to be considered acceptable (and so could be classed as plagiarism according to many definitions), because there is both a reference in the form of an in-text citation and an explicit attributive phrase there was no intent to deceive. In total, 10 of the instances of extensive modification were referenced with in-text citations, and nine also contained an attributing phrase (five explicitly referring to the author and four implicit attributions which referred to research or other).

The least frequently used strategies were quotation, of which there were three instances comprising 7.7% of the total word count (all three quotations were referenced, while one was attributed explicitly to an outside author) and direct copying, of which there were three instances identified. In two instances the copied strings were embedded in larger strings of borrowing which were combinations of modified and extensively modified text. Both of these larger embedded strings were referenced with in-text citations. The third example was more substantial copying that occurred in the first sentence in the essay. In this sentence, Yue Yan directly copied the essay prompt, as illustrated below (copied text is underlined):

Table 6.11 Research Essay - Essay Prompt Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yue Yan’s research essay</th>
<th>Source text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For many years, <em>people</em> debated whether the exposure to violence in the media, such as on television, in video games and on the internet can cause an increase in violence in society (ll. 1-3).</td>
<td>Prompt: Does exposure to violence in media, such as television, in video games, and on the internet, cause an increase in violence in society?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examining the patterns of referencing and attribution across the essay as a whole, 76.4% of the instances of textual borrowing were referenced and 59% incorporated attributive phrases. These figures would suggest that the intertextual voices in this essay were relatively transparent, with most of the instances of source use containing references to sources and over half being attributed either explicitly or implicitly to an outside authorial voice. Summary tables of Yue Yan’s patterns of textual borrowing, referencing and attribution can be found in Appendix K.
6.4 Daniel

Daniel was a student from China who was familiar with a variety of forms of writing and assignment types and was quite confident in his ability to write academic English. He reported that his writing had been based mainly on his own knowledge or in response to material provided by the instructors, such as pictures, but he had considered the writing instruction to be “useless” and comprised of mainly translation-based exercises (D Int. p. 1).

His first experience with instruction in English composition in New Zealand was during an IELTS preparation course at a private language centre. However, he noted that the instruction for the writing section of IELTS had involved mainly essay memorisation, “For the writing part, it’s like a formula” (D Int. p. 3). Like Yue Yan, Daniel suggested that this type of writing did not require a high level of academic English, and was thus ineffective as preparation for university study: “You don’t need academic skills to finish your writing, so it’s not very helpful” (D Int. p. 3).

His Foundation Year in Auckland was the first time he was required to do what he perceived as substantial academic writing, which he described as “quite useful” (D Int. p. 2), including topics such as paragraph and essay structure. At university, Daniel wrote essays regularly for his Commerce courses (he reported having to submit a 1200 to 1500 word essay every two weeks), but noted that for his Computer Science papers, less writing was required.

Daniel exhibited some awareness of the writing requirements of different disciplinary contexts and took what he perceived to be the expectations of his different instructors into account while writing his essays. For example, he felt that in Computer Science and Telecommunications, his instructors prioritised content knowledge rather than academic style or rhetorical form. He stated that with his Computer Science reports, “the markers are judging it from a technical point of view; as long as you can explain what you did in that computer program, you will likely get a full mark for your report (D J5). Similarly, for Telecommunications he noted, “the requirements for the paper is not very high, again if you express your idea and understanding well, you will usually get a reasonable mark” (D J5).

Another contextual factor influencing his writing was Daniel’s perception of his instructors’ views on the creation of stance in his essays. While he felt confident expressing his own opinion in his writing, saying, “I can freely express my points of view as long as I can give evidence to support what I believe” (D J5), he felt that this was not always appropriate or expected. In his Accounting courses, for example, the conventional essay genre was that of discussion, noting, “you cannot argue” (D Int. p. 10).

Daniel was experienced using a variety of research techniques. He first began to research sources for his assignments during his Foundation Year and had become accustomed
to using digital resources as well as doing general Internet research. However, he was aware that certain sources were considered inappropriate for use in academic work, commenting, “They want academic journals…no Internet reference, because Internet reference not that academic” (D Int. p. 16).

Daniel had first learned academic source integration techniques during his Foundation Year, when students were required to integrate these sources into their writing using appropriate techniques. Daniel continued to use techniques such as paraphrasing and summarising, but described paraphrasing as the most difficult. He was particularly concerned that inadequate paraphrasing could lead to a charge of plagiarism, stating, “The most difficult thing is, like, rewriting like, to, from the author’s opinion to your own ideas, and sometimes – ‘is that plagiarism?’ You are always confusing yourself” (D Int. p. 10). Daniel would solve this difficulty through avoidance. When asked what he would do if confused about when to reference Daniel replied, “I say – ‘forget it!’ I don’t use that” (D Int. p. 10).

Daniel had become familiar with referencing from his time studying at Auckland, where students had been expected to reference sources and provide reference lists. Indeed, correct referencing had been a central issue in student academic writing there, and he stated, “the most major issues in our writing…you can copy the idea, from the, another article, but you have to use in text reference…And make sure the author’s name and the year’s in the bracket” (D Int. p. 5). In contrast, in his prior experience with writing in China, referencing sources had not been required. There he had been accustomed to using Google to search for sources, noting, “we don’t really need to reference the source” (D Int. p. 2).

Now that he was studying at university Daniel felt that he had a clear understanding about the institutional expectations regarding referencing of sources, but felt that different disciplines had different conventions regarding referencing. For example, for Computer Science and Mathematics he stated:

We never got told to put references for the algorithms that we used in our [Computer Science] program. We could find out who invented these algorithms, but we never have to use references…I guess this is the same with Maths, you don’t have to write references for every theorem you have used. (D J5)

However, in other disciplines such as Taxation, he noted that referencing was expected, and commented, “if you copy the standard from the taxation books you have to make in text reference” (D Int. p. 8). Although he was aware of differences in disciplinary referencing requirements, Daniel stated that he always referenced his sources as much as
possible, as he felt that it afforded him protection against a charge of plagiarism. He stated, “too much reference probably wouldn’t get you in trouble, so always try to give as much reference material as you can for the things you used in your work” (D J4).

The concern about plagiarism and its possible consequences was a thread running throughout Daniel’s data and he described it as “a really stressful issue” (D Int. p. 9). Although he had not received formal instruction about plagiarism in China, he felt that academic plagiarism was sometimes an issue there as well as in New Zealand, especially at the tertiary level:

In Chinese universities normally the professors and the doctors have to research their own topics, and our Chinese education system, we got the list for the plagiarism, we put all the articles and the useful sources together and make a database, and when some professor have new articles to publish, we have to check how, did you plagiarise from other paper’s ideas. (D Int. p. 6)

He stated that his Foundation Year was the first time he had become aware of the seriousness of plagiarism in a New Zealand context. Daniel felt that knowledge of plagiarism, which he defined as “things like copying without reference and copying large amounts of other’s work” (D J4), was important in the academic domain, noting, “If you want to be a professor, or teachers or whatever, you have to know that [about plagiarism] otherwise, how can you teach your students to do not, without you not know any knowledge about that” (D Int. 15). Like many of the other study participants, he framed plagiarism largely in moral terms: “I always consider copying is not ethical” (D J4), further arguing, “It’s unfair for other people, because that’s not the people’s [the student’s] work, it’s not yours” (D Int. p. 13).

However, despite stressing the unethical nature of unacknowledged textual borrowing, he stated that sometimes he and his classmates fabricated references for their assignments. This would occur in a specific class in which, in Daniel’s view, the instructor did not check the references or bibliography. He noted, “For some Accounting papers we just make up the bibliography, even if we don’t use the resource” (D Int. p. 15). When asked why he did this, he replied, “the teacher says, you have, you need more then five, 10 resource, academic resource, but the problem is it’s really hard to find the 10” (D Int. p. 16). This statement illustrates a tension between Daniel’s stated belief that plagiarism was unethical, and his actual writing practice that was motivated not by ethical considerations but by his desire to follow the guidelines specified by the tutor and his difficulties in obtaining adequate source material.
It is possible that Daniel did not view the fabrication of references as plagiarism. However, he also reported engaging in practices that definitely fell within his own definition of plagiarism, mentioning that different subjects were more stringent than others when it came to referencing requirements. According to Daniel, Accounting was one subject in which “you cannot copy”, but that in Management it was “quite easy” to copy and not be reprimanded (D Int. p. 11). Daniel believed that such practices went unnoticed by his instructors.

Another tension was evident in his views on the possible causes of plagiarism. Whereas previously he had suggested that at a faculty level at universities in China plagiarism was taken seriously, at a personal level, he felt that plagiarism was not important:

The history, it’s different, and our culture is different…here, your work is yours, not ours, and you have to finish it by yourself…We don’t have the, I have never seen the, you know, book about copyright or plagiarism, probably I’m not paying attention to that because I’m not, I don’t care in China. (D Int. p. 18)

While Daniel appears initially to be suggesting that sociocultural and historical differences have an impact on textual borrowing practices in China, he admitted that the lack of concern with plagiarism is perhaps specific to him as an individual rather than indicative of a cultural trait. He also suggested that plagiarism could result when students worked collaboratively on assignments, once again ascribing this desire to collaborate on work to students’ cultural background:

All the Asian students have the traditional background for the homework, like, for the homeworks, we all normally do together, rather than individual…So the problem is, you cannot say it’s plagiarism, because we get own ideas, everyone has own ideas, the problem is…it’s unfair for the people who do more work than others. (D Int. p. 13-14)

Daniel also suggested that contrasting views concerning common and source-specific knowledge could contribute to possible plagiarism, noting, “We also notice the issue with defining what is common knowledge and what isn’t. For example, it is very hard to find out who discover the world is round” (DJ4).

As well as sociocultural differences in perceptions of knowledge construction and knowledge ownership, Daniel suggested that more immediate concerns of individual students, such as workload, could contribute to plagiarism, saying, “You are too busy, and probably
you need to write the book or the assignment, and you would need lots, lots of resources...maybe you missed one or two” (D Int. p. 15).

However, despite these influences, Daniel generally felt that students had, or should have, a clear understanding of what plagiarism was and that there was sufficient information available to explain plagiarism to students. As such, instances of unintentional plagiarism were, in his view, unlikely. He said, “the truth is, every single paper has a course outline, and one page must be, talk about plagiarism” (D Int. 16). Accordingly, when asked if he felt that students were generally aware of plagiarism he replied: “Yeah, very clear” (D Int. p. 17), although he felt that it could be more confusing to international students due to differences in educational background, noting that the, “teaching system is different, and the culture is different” (D Int. p. 17).

Daniel was aware of several consequences of plagiarism, including assessment-related consequences, and he noted that he generally tried to avoid unacknowledged textual borrowing, as he did not “want to get a zero mark” (D Int. p.11). He also commented on the negative impact on student learning, saying, “Students are here to prepare themselves for the future, copying or stealing other peoples’ work wouldn’t help them learn what they need to know” (DJ4). He also suggested that plagiarism could have extra-institutional consequences, suggesting, “If anyone can use other people’s work without permission, people will be reluctant to create something new, because they know their hard work will be copied and used the next day” (DJ4).

Daniel was one of only a few participants to mention legal issues associated with plagiarism, saying that plagiarism could result in legal action (D J4) which he illustrated with an example of an academic at Beijing University in China who “stole somebody works assignment and put it in his works and he published the one book...and he got a very serious charge in court” (D Int. p. 19).

Although Daniel appeared to have a relatively good degree of knowledge of both the possible causes and consequence of plagiarism, this knowledge was less evident in his actual writing. An examination of his textual data revealed that he relied on a variety of non-prototypical strategies throughout his written work during the course. In his paraphrase assignment, reliance on the words of the source texts was highest and he used close modification as the primary strategy. As with the other students, within the closely modified passages there were also instances of direct copying of shorter strings of words. Taken together these combined strategies comprised 92% of the total word count of the assignment. An example of Daniel’s textual borrowing strategies is given in the table below, in which his opening clause was directly copied (underlined), followed by close modification (in bold)
with synonym substitution for content words (such as learning experience→study experience; difficult→quite hard; may→could), and deletion.
Depending on the student’s expectations, previous study experience and style, RO adjustment to the universities in U.S. could be quite hard for some (ll. 1-2).

Daniel’s take-home test essay was considerably shorter than the assignments of the other students (130 words). In this assignment, as mentioned above, he relied mainly on his own ideas, and only two instances of textual borrowing were identified. While both of the quotations were referenced, in both instances Daniel used a secondary reference rather than reference to the actual author of his source articles. Neither instance incorporated an attributing phrase.

In Daniel’s research essay, written on the topic of violence in the media, the instances of textual borrowing were difficult to identify, and on a number of occasions it appeared that Daniel was incorporating non-referenced and unattributed material into his essay. However, in the absence of direct links to source texts via copied or modified language, references, or attributing phrases, I was unable to code these as clear instances of textual borrowing. In total there were 10 identified instances of textual borrowing that made up 27.5% of the total word count of the essay. Compared to the other participants, this was a relatively small number of identified instances. As mentioned in the Methodology chapter (see section 3.6.1), several criteria had to be met to code a piece of text as borrowed - it either had to be referenced or contain an attributing phrase (explicit or implicit), or be linked linguistically through strings of borrowed language (directly copied, or closely or extensively modified). Although there were a number of instances in Daniel’s essay that “sounded” like they had come from another source, it was not possible to link these to a source with one of the linguistic markers described above. As Pecorari (2003) noted, it is likely that such an approach will leave some textual borrowing unidentified. However, alternatives to hand coding, such as computer coding programmes, also have drawbacks when it comes to identifying textual borrowing in student work (see section 3.6.1).

Table 6.12 Textual Borrowing Strategies in Paraphrase Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Text - Daniel</th>
<th>Source Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depending on the student’s expectations, previous study experience and style, RO</td>
<td>Although U. S. universities vary in entrance requirements and academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjustment to the universities in U.S. could be quite hard for some (ll. 1-2).</td>
<td>standards, all share certain academic rituals which may make adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>difficult for students from other countries, depending on the students’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expectations, previous learning experiences and learning styles (Maxwell,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ll. 1-7).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The following sentences from the beginning of Daniel’s essay illustrate this point. While it would seem unlikely that the details of the Virginia Tech campus shooting would be something Daniel had knowledge of without consulting an outside source, it is not until the fourth sentence (D RE II. 6-7) that his language can be linked linguistically to a source text, in this instance, to the language of the prompt itself, which he modified with addition of content words (film) synonym substitution (television ➔ TV programmes) and deletion (of game). Nor did the language appear in any of the source articles provided by Daniel.

**Table 6.13 Research Essay Source Text Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daniel's Research Essay</th>
<th>Source texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On April 16, a school shooting broke out on the Virginia Tech’s campus (l. 1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seung-Hui Cho, a Korean student, killed 32 people and injured many others before taking his own life (ll. 2-3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is not the first time that school shootings broke out in America, and certainly not the first time that innocent lives were lost (ll. 4-5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many people immediately point out that the media, such as films, TV programs, and video game should be responsible for such a tragic event (ll. 6-7).</td>
<td>Prompt: Does exposure to violence in media, such as television, in video games, and on the internet, cause an increase in violence in society?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One strategy Daniel did use, which was not identified in any of the other research assignments, was that of summary. As mentioned earlier, the participants tended to borrow idea units (Howard et al., 2010) rather than more substantial sections of source texts to incorporate in their essays. Daniel, however, did summarise a substantial part of one of his source texts that made up 11.4% of the total word count of the essay. Within this summary, while he mainly used his own words to explain the propositional content of the text, there was some close modification (shown in bold) where Daniel’s language closely resembled that of
the source text. The summary did contain an explicit attributive phrase, but was not referenced. Daniel’s use of summary is shown in the following table:

Table 6.14 Summary and Close Modification Used in Daniel’s Research Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daniel's Research Essay</th>
<th>Source texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Kurt Squire and Henry Jenkins’ article,</td>
<td>For Card, most existing educational games have been little more than “flashcards” that operate according to a drill and practice model...Instead of replacing the textbook, he argued, educational games should be more like the school corridors, where kids experiment, interact, create and share what they create with others outside the rigid strictures that contemporary games impose (Squire &amp; Jenkins, 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orson Scott Card, a famous United States science fiction writer, emphasized the importance of how games should be United States, children are constantly learning from the environment around them, it is not bounded by the school walls (ll. 56-59).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When games are introduced to the United States’ military, they had very clear goals (l. 60).</td>
<td>When games are used in the military they are...used in conjunction with real world simulations (Squire &amp; Jenkins, 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The game America’s Army was deployed to train the soldier’s combating skills; it is used with real world situation and is guided by the seniors (ll. 62-3).</td>
<td>Games are used in conjunction with real-world simulations (like rifle ranges). Learning is guided by more experienced members of the military community (Squire &amp; Jenkins, 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although there is violence in the video game itself, the soldiers are not killing people for no reason; they are learning from the game and applying it to the real life (ll. 64-5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If they do not learn the skill that they need to know, they will be in trouble when they are facing the real enemies (ll. 66-7).</td>
<td>There are real consequences if you don’t master the material or if you fail to apply it correctly to real-world situations (Squire &amp;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Towards the end of Daniel’s essay, there were three instances of textual borrowing that contained extensive sections of direct copying, two of which were referenced with in-text citations. In total, there were 94 words copied directly from source texts, making up 8% of the total word count of the essay, as illustrated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daniel's Research Essay</th>
<th>Source texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An independent Television Commission’s research survey in 1998 showed that 46% of children have a television in their bedroom and only 43% of parents monitor and prevent their child watching unsuitable programmes (Browne &amp; Hamilton, 2005) (ll. 76-78).</td>
<td>For example, in England, according to the Independent Television Commission’s research survey in 1998, 46% of children have a television in their bedroom and only 43% of parents monitor and prevent their child watching unsuitable programmes (Browne &amp; Hamilton-Giachritsis, 2005).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, Daniel copied directly from the source text (underlined), including the attributive phrase but, incongruously, provides a reference. This would suggest that the presence of directly copied text cannot be in itself evidence of that the student is intentionally appropriating textual material in order to deceive. Rather, the fact that Daniel provided a reference for this instance of textual borrowing would suggest that in his mind he was employing a legitimate strategy.

Patterns of referencing and attribution in Daniel’s research essay exhibit a similar relationship between directly copied and closely modified text with one third of directly copied strings and two thirds of closely modified strings being attributed to an outside author. Summary tables of Daniel’s source use, referencing and attribution strategies can be found in Appendix K.

6.5 Yu Ming

Like Daniel and Mei Li, Yu Ming began her study of English at high school in China. She described her English classes as mainly based on vocabulary and grammar instruction.
with extensive use of memorisation as a learning technique, noting, “we [had] to memorise things a lot…the whole paragraphs and then repeat in the class” (YM Int. p. 2).

She came New Zealand to undertake the university Foundation Year, during which she was required to complete a variety of assignment types, including longer (1500 word) assignments such as argumentative, discursive, and explanatory essays. At the university where the study was conducted, Yu Ming was majoring in Accounting, for which she wrote reports, summaries, and extensive case analyses.

Yu Ming perceived her writing to be an important part of her work, saying that writing was “as essential part of academic development” (YM J5). She felt that her writing abilities were developing at university, noting, “Although I am still having difficulties through writing, I cannot say I am a poor writer, that’s because I already study at University and I am still learning over time” (YM J5), and she felt that with practice she would continue to improve.

However, Yu Ming found that she remained limited in the extent to which she could successfully write academic English. In particular, she suggested that difficulties with essay structure limited her ability to create a strong stance in her writing, noting, “I am not good at organising the ideas into a proper structure...That is why I am not quite enjoying the expressing of own opinion in the writing” (YM J5).

As a result of this perceived difficulty, Yu Ming liked to use source integration techniques such as summary and paraphrasing because this enabled her to rely less on her own interpretation, with which she was less confident. She observed that summaries, for example, were “all about reading and understanding other peoples’ ideas...it still contains less attention from interpretation than the other forms [of assignments] because it does not involve our personal thinkings” (YM J5).

Source-based writing had been new to Yu Ming when she arrived in New Zealand. In China she had been required to use only her own thoughts in her writing, noting, “The school [in China] only required us to write according to our personal thinkings, so we just need to write what we think (YM Int. p. 3). Yu Ming commented that the writing she did in her Foundation classes had contrasted strongly with the writing she had done in China: “writing the [assignments] in New Zealand, this is whole new experience for me. I didn’t know I have to use other source, when I writing – I learned that from here” (YM Int. p. 3).

Yu Ming had begun developing confidence with research and had specific knowledge of the relevant databases for her work, such as Science Direct and Business Source Premiere. One motivating factor in her research was her awareness of the instructors’ expectations regarding quality sources. Yu Ming felt that her instructors preferred the use of books and
academic journals to Internet material, and as such, she tried to use these sources as much as possible in her writing.

When integrating source material into her essays, Yu Ming said that she was very aware of the need to provide references for her sources when using quotations, paraphrases, or summaries. She said that she had first learned appropriate referencing techniques in her Foundation Year, and when asked if she had been required to use referencing in all her Foundation courses she replied, “Yeah, as long as that involves writing” (YM Int. p. 6).

She had not been required to use references in her writing at high school in China, but felt that at tertiary level, referencing was important which she deduced from observing her father’s writing, who was an academic in China. She said, “I think they are expected to reference cos my father is a lecturer in the university and I see him...doing some writing, I think he did put lot of references in” (YM Int. p. 12). In making this observation, Yu Ming’s perception contrasted with participants such as Daniel, who felt that referencing was not necessary in Chinese academic writing.

Yu Ming felt appropriate referencing of sources to be very important at her current university, saying, “I [am] always really um, be careful with reference” (YM Int. p. 10). In part, she made a note of references to help her keep track of her source material, because “otherwise, after several days I will forget where it’s come from” (YM Int. p. 10). However, Yu Ming was sometimes unsure about how frequently to cite her source material: “One thing I’m still having problem with the academic writing is how often we should used the referenced researches for one point. Particularly one per paragraph” (YM J4). Although this comment demonstrates that Yu Ming still did not have a sophisticated grasp of the nuances of referencing and integrating source material into her writing, it does show that she was aware of the gaps in her knowledge, and was actively attempting to build on her existing knowledge to create a fuller understanding of referencing and source use conventions.

Plagiarism was a key issue Yu Ming was aware of in her writing. Defining plagiarism as “copy[ing] someone else’s essay without acknowledging them…or copy someone else’s idea without referencing” (YM J4), she said that she had first noticed plagiarism as a major issue in academic writing during her Foundation Year. At first she had thought that any use of others’ opinions in her writing was “wrong” but that over time she had become aware that it was “ok to use other’s work, but you have to mention it, otherwise...what’s the point, writing that assignment?” (YM Int. p. 6). Again it is possible to see that Yu Ming’s knowledge of plagiarism and textual borrowing conventions was developing as she became more familiar with academic writing.
Yu Ming felt that students generally tended to lack awareness of the significance of plagiarism for their own writing. She said that although information about plagiarism was readily available to students via artefacts such as course outlines, many students did not read this information. In addition, she felt that discussions of plagiarism in her courses were often cursory, and that students were seldom given adequate instruction on how to avoid it. Yu Ming said that prior to taking the EAP course, she had thought that plagiarism was always intentional, and mainly concerned direct copying. She commented that she “used to only consider the facts that it is all about copying others’ works intentionally, so long as I can avoid copying others’ work straight away will keep me out of plagiarism” (YM J4). Yu Ming clearly equated plagiarism with intentional copying, thereby implying that if direct copying is not undertaken, then the textual borrowing is appropriate. However, Yu Ming now understood that other forms of inappropriate source use could result in a charge of plagiarism. She felt that most cases of student plagiarism were “by accident” (YM Int. p. 13).

Yu Ming noted that such unintentional plagiarism could be the result of several causes. Firstly, like many other participants in the embedded case study group and the larger journal group, she suggested that confusion over the difference between common knowledge and discourse-specific knowledge could result in plagiarism. She also felt that a student’s cultural and educational background could contribute to confusion over the attribution of source material, suggesting, “the differences of the culture issues quite a lot of difficulties in the application of sources in academic writing, especially for international students” (YM J4). In particular, she felt that different pedagogical techniques between cultures could be problematic, noting that international students sometimes used the language of source texts as models for their own writing, which could result in plagiarism: “sometimes you read the article [and] you start to learn what their way to say these kinds of things, so it’s um, easy to follow their mind” (YM Int. p, 9).

However, despite personally viewing student plagiarism as largely inadvertent, she felt that most instructors perceived student plagiarism to be largely intentional and that the assessment-related consequences due to this tension could be significant. She described how one of her friends submitted an assignment that she had asked someone else to check for her. This second student, who had already taken the course, had added a small amount of text, which had been identified by the instructor as identical to material included in an assignment the previous year. Consequently, the assignment received a zero mark. Yu Ming said that her friend had “tried hard” to pass the assignment, but that the instructor had determined that this was a case of intentional plagiarism (YM Int. p 13). Thus, it is clear from the qualitative data that Yu Ming was aware of both possible causes and consequences of plagiarism, and that
avoiding unacknowledged and inappropriate textual borrowing in her work was at the forefront of her mind as she worked to develop her academic writing.

In her initial paraphrase assignment, like many of the other participants, Yu Ming used a combination of close and extensive modification of the source text, often within the same orthographic sentence. This combining of strategies can be seen illustrated in the following table, in which the first sentence conveys the source content largely in her “own” words, whereas in the second, she employed synonym substitution (foreign student $\rightarrow$ overseas student; American spoken idiom $\rightarrow$ American dialect; strange $\rightarrow$ extraordinary) and closely followed the syntax of the original passage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.16 Source Use in Yu Ming’s Paraphrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yu Ming’s Paraphrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However, the overseas students have another assorted problem that they have to familiarize themselves into the different situations (ll. 9-10).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, Overseas students from both English speaking counties and non-English speaking counties are often found the American dialect extraordinary (ll. 11-12).

There was no direct copying identified in her assignment, and the majority of the source use was extensive modification (56.3%), while close modification of the type illustrated above constituted 36.8% of the total word count. In addition to the textual modification, Yu Ming incorporated one explicit attributive phrase in her assignment.

For her second assignment, the take home test essay, there were five instances of source use identified. The majority of these instances involved prototypical source use, two instances in which she extensively modified strings of her source text (neither referenced nor attributed), and two instances in which she incorporated quotations, which were referenced and introduced with explicit attributive phrases.

There was one instance identified as close modification of the source text that was not referenced or attributed. In this instance, which is illustrated in Table 6.17, Yu Ming initially...
used her own words and ideas, but in the final lines included a string of closely modified text taken from the source in which she uses synonym substitution (essay exams→exam writing; good→a certain level of):

Table 6.17 Close in Yu Ming’s Take-Home Test Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yu Ming’s Test essay</th>
<th>Source Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hence, all of the problems above could frequently lead to a poor result in the examinations for international students, because the <strong>exam writing often requires</strong> <strong>Success on essay exams requires good certain level of writing skills</strong> (ll. 25-7). <strong>writing skills</strong> (Maxwell, l. 50).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For her research essay, Yu Ming wrote about the economic relationship between wealthy and developing countries, using four newspaper articles, three academic journal articles, and one book as source material. However, finding direct links between the source texts and Yu Ming’s essay was difficult, and only 12 instances of source use could be identified. In total, the identifiable instances of textual borrowing constituted 26.5% of the total word count. Of these, she integrated sources fairly successfully in her essay, and the majority of the 12 instances of source use identified involved the prototypical strategies of paraphrase and quotation (which together made up 16.3% of the total word count). Also identified were borrowed ideas, the content of which were linked to source texts with the use of references or attributive phrases (four instances, 8.7 %). Ten of the 12 instances of source use identified were referenced with in-text citations and 10 contained attributive phrases (nine explicitly referring to the author and one with an implicit attribution).

There was no direct copying and very little close modification identified. However, like the other participants, Yu Ming often combined forms of textual borrowing in the same string of borrowing, and her extensively modified strings also contained elements of close modification. A summary of the textual borrowing strategies used by Yu Ming in her all assignments and the patterns of referencing and attribution her research essay can be found in Appendix K.

### 6.6 Susana

Susana was on a one-year exchange from her university in Spain. When she arrived at the current university she had had little experience with different forms of academic writing,
since her assessment in Spain had been predominantly examination-based. She said that there was no internal assessment at her Spanish university, and that students were able to pass the examinations by memorising the lecture notes: “more or less summarising the notes the whole semester, yeah, that’s all we learn” (S Int. p. 3).

She felt that at her home university little attention was paid to academic writing, commenting, “the professors did not demand any type of style in the essays we made” (S J5). Interestingly, while Susana came from a totally different cultural background than the other students in the study who were all from Asian countries, the comments she made about academic writing and the memorisation of texts was similar. This in itself raises questions about approaches that ascribe cultural background as the main influence on student writing practices and use of source texts (as discussed in section 2.1).

Susana felt that she was gaining experience with a number of different types of academic assignments, including essays and summaries, and felt that her ability to write academic English was improving, stating, “I have learned many things related to the different styles, depending on the subject you are writing (letters, science, Linguistics etc.)” (S J5). She was becoming more confident with essay writing and stressed the importance of combining content material with conveying a clear opinion, particularly in argumentative writing, stating:

An argumentative essay requires to have great knowledge of the topic you are going to discuss about and at the same time, to have a clear position about your opinion of the topic and when you had a general vision and had clear all the opinions, and your position about the topic, is then when you can start developing your argument. (S J6)

Her writing was mediated by a sense of her instructors’ expectations about academic writing, whom she felt expected students to convey a strong point of view in their texts (“they want us to express our own opinion” (S Int. p. 4-5)), as well as a clear sense of structure: “in all the papers…they report the same, like introduction, key ideas, um, and the conclusion” (S Int. p. 12).

Susana reported having done little previous academic research. Having predominantly taken literature courses prior to the EAP course, she noted that she was accustomed to using mainly her own ideas supported by examples from literary texts rather than secondary source material, but that she also sometimes used articles to support her own arguments, stating, “I’m not obliged to, but it’s easier to use different sources so I try to look for articles…I look for opinions in books and try and contrast my opinion with, with the other book” (S Int. p. 4).
When integrating source material into her writing, Susana noted she liked to use paraphrases, but like many of the other participants, she found it difficult to rewrite the material using her own words. Accordingly, she said that she found it easier to use quoted material, not only because she could thereby avoid paraphrasing, but also because she was wary of inappropriate textual borrowing. Indeed, she said that in using quotations she could always be sure that she was not “making anything illegal” (S Int. p. 6). Susana said that she always attempted to reference her source material appropriately but noted that this was difficult because referencing was not required at her university in Spain. Accordingly, when she arrived at the current institution, she lacked a basic knowledge of academic referencing conventions, commenting, “I did not know there were so many different styles and I even do not know the MLA style which is so necessary for my studies [in] English literature” (S J4).

As noted above, Susana was concerned about referencing because she did not want to transgress the boundaries of academic convention in her writing. Her use of the term “illegal” to describe inappropriate textual borrowing demonstrates the extent to which she was anxious about breaking these rules. She said that she had been vaguely aware about plagiarism before coming to New Zealand, but that restrictions against plagiarism in academic writing at her home university were more relaxed. She had been aware of one case of plagiarism at her university, but this had not been considered as serious, explaining, “one professor discovered plagiarism in an essay and the professor told the student that she had to repeat the essay again without any punishment or nothing” (S Int. p. 9). Susana felt that this stress on plagiarism was frightening at first: “at the beginning I was scared…like, all of a sudden it was very important here” (S Int. 9).

Like the other study participants, Susana felt that plagiarism was mainly an issue of textual copying which she described as “Just to copy the same, the same…paragraph, yeah, the same lines written in the book” (S Int. p. 10). Since arriving in New Zealand she also appeared to have internalised aspects of the ethical discourse of plagiarism (Valentine, 2006), describing it as a form of theft: “I consider plagiarism as a way of stealing, because you catch an idea and make it yours” (S J4). However, she also suggested that inadvertent plagiarism could occur due to confusion over the nature of common knowledge, suggesting, “because sometimes it is complicating to know when your common-knowledge finishes and starts the knowledge of the other people” (S J4).

Susana was aware of several consequences of plagiarism, making the observation that “any kind of plagiarism might affect the marks in your papers” (S J4). She also noted the unfairness that could stem from undeserved recognition gained from plagiarised assignments,
“firstly in yourself because you get something that you really do not deserve, not only in your marks but in other things, such as recognition” (S J4).

However, this awareness of the institutional significance of plagiarism and the fear of transgressing boundaries in her own work did not prevent non-prototypical textual borrowing from appearing in her writing. Susana’s paraphrase assignment was a combination of two main textual borrowing strategies - extensive modification, in which she successfully rendered the propositional content of the source text in her own words, and close modification, in which she relied heavily on strategies of addition, deletion, and synonym substitution of content words. Like the other students, her orthographic sentences combined both types of borrowing. There was only one instance of direct copying identified, which was a string of five words embedded in a closely modified sentence.

In her take home test essay, there were four instances of textual borrowing embedded in her own ideas about cultural adjustment and international students. All four were prototypical strategies, with two instances of extensive modification and two quotations identified in the text. Taken together, these instances of textual borrowing comprised 47.9% of the total word count of the assignment, signalling that Susana relied heavily on her own ideas for the essay as well as the source texts. Three of these instances of borrowing were referenced, although only one contained an attributive phrase.

In her research essay, Susana also chose the topic of violence in the media, for which she used five sources (one book, two academic journal articles, and two newspaper articles). There were 22 instances of textual borrowing identified in this essay, which made up 53.3% of the total word count. As with the test essay, there was no direct copying identified, and very little close modification of source texts. The main form of source use identified was prototypical source use - taken together, extensive modification and quotation made up 45.9% of the total word length. 4.2% of borrowed ideas were identified as taken from the sources.

As was the case with the other participants, several source use strategies (prototypical and non-prototypical) were often combined within a single orthographic sentence, as in the following example, which was largely extensively modified, in addition to being referenced and attributed explicitly to the source author, but contained a small degree of close modification (shown in bold):
### Table 6.18 Example of Paraphrase with Embedded Close Modification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susana’s Research Essay</th>
<th>Source Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finally, the study made by Brody (1977) points out that children can imitate some behaviours performed by adults or in the television, moreover, they can retain the images in their minds during long periods of time and aggressive behaviours that are seen by children, could be performed by children as a way of imitation (ll. 89-92).</td>
<td>From the experiments described so far, it appears that young children can readily imitate certain novel behaviours which they have seen performed by an adult of child models in the flesh or on the screen, that their memories of filmed actions may be quite long lived, and that watching particular instances of ostensibly aggressive behaviour can encourage children to perform a wider range of aggressive acts (Brody, 1997, p. 71).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, Susana used strategies of content word deletion (of readily) and synonym substitution (certain ➔ some), deletion of function words (by) but kept the main content words of children, behaviours, and performed.

A total of 59.1% instances of textual borrowing were referenced, and 50% contained attributing phrases, either explicit or implicit. Four of these instance of borrowing (two extensively modified strings, one quotation, and one close modification) contained secondary references to authors mentioned in the source text, but presumably not consulted or included with the other sources provided by Susana for the assignment. Summary tables for Susana’s textual borrowing, referencing and attribution strategies can be found in Appendix K.

#### 6.7 Zara

Zara began her education in Hong Kong, where she recalled that her English classes had been skills-based, with a strong grammar focus. Some writing had been done in these classes, but Zara remembered the assignments had been brief and that memorisation was a commonly used technique, noting, “we [memorised] a whole paragraph from the English book, and we do composition by memorising and copying” (Z Int. p. 8).

At high school in Wellington, she took ESL courses and NCEA English in addition to her other subjects. She said that the earlier focus on language and text memorisation made writing and speaking difficult when she started high school in New Zealand, noting that on her arrival that she “couldn’t speak a word” (Z Int. p. 8). At high school she gained some
experience with academic writing and reported having written discursive and argumentative essays as well as summaries. Zara also took an IELTS preparation course at high school, which, unlike Daniel, she found very helpful, and she credited this exam preparation with helping her in her Foundation Year.

Now at university, Zara was in the second year of a Psychology degree. She said that she had become accustomed to writing laboratory reports for Psychology, but that much of her assessment so far had been in the form of multiple-choice assignments, and that she was not expecting to do more extensive writing until her third year of study.

Zara had some experience in conducting research for her writing. She said that during her first year, for Psychology reports students were provided with two or three articles to discuss in writing, but that no further research had usually been required. During her second year, more research had been necessary and students were expected to find their own source material. She noted that she was familiar with using the digital catalogue and databases at the Library, but that unlike the previous case study participants, she felt that her instructors were not focussed on whether the students had consulted a wide range of source material, saying, “They do ‘tick, tick, tick’ but don’t really look at it [their bibliographes]” (Z Int. p. 13).

Zara preferred to use paraphrasing as a source integration technique, but she also sometimes found it difficult to rephrase source texts into her own words, noting, “Sometimes I just look at the sentence and I change the order if its too difficult, but I will try to find another word to replace that word” (Z Int. p. 15). Despite this difficulty, she was aware that adequate paraphrasing was an important skill in order to avoid inappropriate textual borrowing, writing, “sometimes it is really difficult to put other peoples’ opinions in my own words as English is my third language and I do not want to plagiarise” (ZJ6).

Zara initially learned about source incorporation and referencing during her Foundation Year, and she said that the fear of being accused of plagiarism motivated her writing and referencing practices: “I always double check...I’m scared I missed out a thing and that they say I plagiarised” (Z Int. p. 15). She sometimes incorporated quoted material in her writing but noted that in lab reports they were not permitted. She felt that the reason for this prohibition was to prevent plagiarism: “we can’t use quotation in our lab report, that’s what they said…they said it’s easier for us to read it and put it aside and type it. So no plagiarism, and no quoting” (Z Int. p. 14).

Zara had been unaware of plagiarism before she came to New Zealand and had frequently engaged in unacknowledged textual borrowing in her composition writing in Hong Kong. She stated, “Before I came to New Zealand, even though I wrote composition in English class all the time, plagiarism was not a matter at all” (Z J3). When she arrived in New
Zealand, this practice continued, but she attributed this to her lack of proficiency in English: “when I first came to New Zealand, I can’t really write at all, so I basically just copy, but I didn’t know it was plagiarism at the time” (Z Int. p. 18). However, she was now aware of the institutional prohibitions against plagiarism. She stressed that her instructors had made it explicit that plagiarism was to be avoided in student writing, and that they would be checking student work for this: “They say they have a way to look at it, and it’s very easy, so they ask us not to plagiarise” (Z Int. p. 17).

Like the other participants, Zara viewed plagiarism predominantly as an ethical issue and equated it with theft, saying, “For me, plagiarism is just like stealing things from other people…. That is not fair to those who have actually worked hard and done something that they are satisfied with” (Z J4). She was aware of several institutional and extra-institutional consequences of plagiarism. For example, she felt that plagiarism could undermine student work ethics and commented “the reason why the university treated plagiarism as an important issue, it may influence student attitude toward study and not treated homework as an important thing” (Z J4). She also suggested that plagiarism could encourage more plagiarism if left unchecked: “it’s not fair to those students who worked really hard and did not plagiarise and maybe they get the same marks as those who plagiarised, then why don’t they just plagiarise as well?” (Z J4).

However, some tensions were evident in Zara’s views on student plagiarism. On the one hand, she stated that student plagiarism was largely intentional, saying that it was easy to avoid through using correct source integration techniques and referencing (Z Int. p. 17). However, she also said that she had sometimes found it difficult to adequately transform her source material, which sometimes resulted in unintentional plagiarism in her own work: “In my previous assignment...a sentence came into my mind, I just kept it the same, but I just, I didn’t get penalties though...but I didn’t really get in trouble for plagiarism” (Z Int. p. 18). She felt that many international students had similar difficulties paraphrasing their source material adequately.

At first, Zara demonstrated some ability to use sources in her academic writing. In the paraphrase assignment, over half was identified as extensive modification, in which she retained the propositional content but did not borrow heavily from the language of the source text. Like the other students, she also used close modification as a strategy (in approximately a fifth of the assignment) and there was little direct copying identified.

In her second piece of course work, the take-home test essay, Zara again used a combination of strategies. In the six identified instances of textual borrowing, extensive modification was the most commonly used strategy (three instances making up 19% of the
total text), followed by close modification (three instances making up 10.3% of the total text), and direct copying (one instance of 20 words making up 6% of the total text). Again, that Zara was actively attempting to integrate source material into her own words is evidenced by the fact that strategies were often combined, as she used more than one strategy in each orthographic sentence.

However, she also provided both an attributive phrase explicitly (in italics below) referring to the author of the source text, and two in-text citations. This suggests that she was not intentionally trying to pass the ideas and language of the source off as her own, but rather attempting (albeit unsuccessfully) to use prototypical source integration strategies. The way in which Zara combined close modification and direct copying of borrowed text and direct copying is illustrated in the following table:

Table 6.19 Close Modification and Copying in Take-Home Test Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zara’s paraphrase</th>
<th>Original source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>According to Hannigan, T. P. (1988), it is important for students to know that the professors or lecturers who read and grade the papers so quickly unless the paper is clear and well-organised, because even though students understand the subject, they may get a lower grade (Hannigan, T. P., 1988) (ll. 17-20).</td>
<td>Since two or three questions are typically given in an hour exam, the student writing under time pressure must plan answers accordingly. It is important to tell the student that the professor or teaching assistant who reads and grades the papers does so hurriedly and unless the paper is clear and well organised, the student may earn a lower grade even though he or she understands the subject (Maxwell, ll. 51-55).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the strings of copied words illustrated in the sentence above, Zara also borrowed words from the essay prompt itself in the form of close modification to word form and deletion (difficulties⇒difficult; adjusting⇒adjust; deletion “living and study”), as illustrated in the following table:
Table 6.20 Close Modification of Prompt as a Strategy in Take-Home Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zara’s test essay</th>
<th>Original source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a result, it is so difficult for the international student to adjust and study overseas because they want to work hard, but no matter how hard they try, there will be barriers and difficulties (ll. 28-30)</td>
<td>the difficulties international students have in adjusting to overseas living and study (Essay prompt).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the six instances of source use identified in the test essay, two were referenced with in-text citations. Three of the instances were attributed to other authors, two explicitly (with the attributing phrase “According to Hannigan”) and one implicitly through the use of a passive construction.

In her research essay, Zara chose the popular topic of the effect of media violence on society. In her references list she listed four sources consisting of three books (including one edited collection of articles) and notes from her Psychology course. There were 17 instances of textual borrowing of ideas and language identified in her essay, which made up 38.5% of the total word count. Of these, the most common strategy was close modification of source language, and there were instances of close modification scattered throughout her essay, often in combination with direct copying. Taken together, these non-prototypical examples of textual borrowing made up 14.1% of the total word count. An illustration of the way in which Zara combined these two strategies in her sentences is given in Table 6.21 (closely modified text in bold and copied underlined):
Table 6.21 Use of Close Modification and Direct Copying in Research Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zara’s research essay</th>
<th>Original source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The National Television Violence Study (1997) believed that children are the most</td>
<td>the National Television Violence Study (1997) in the US assessed the types of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerned for violence in media and therefore, they divided four types of</td>
<td>media violence that were believed to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“good violence” (unpunished violence, happy violence, painless violence and heroic</td>
<td>particularly problematic where children were concerned. It identified four types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violence) to encourage children to underestimate the seriousness of real human</td>
<td>of media representations that are thought to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violence (Carter, C. &amp; Weaver, C., K., 2003) (ll. 47-51).</td>
<td>encourage children to underestimate the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>seriousness of real human violence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• unpunished violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• painless violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• happy violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• heroic violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Carter, C. &amp; Weaver, C., K., 2003, p. 3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example we can see that Zara was attempting to follow textual borrowing conventions when incorporating this material into her essay. She attributed the material to a source (The National Television Violence Study) and provided an in-text reference at the end of the sentence, but relied heavily on using the content words of the source language (believe, children, concern, media violence). The first part of the sentence was identified as a borrowed string modified by changes in function words (believed to be → believed that), and by deletion of the first clause of the source sentence.

The difficulty Zara had with transforming the first part of the sentence is illustrated by the way she altered the meaning of the verb “concerned” and its subject “children”. In the source text, “concerned” is used in the sense of relating to, which Zara changes by making children the subject of the verb and hence changing the meaning to “worried about”. It appears that in this example she gave up her attempts at transforming the text into different words, and directly copied the remainder of the sentence. She also copied directly from the source language in her bracketed list of types of violence (unpunished violence, happy violence, painless violence, and heroic violence). This perhaps could be explained by the fact that these are key concepts and hence difficult to paraphrase accurately, but this list is followed by a string of 10 copied words directly taken from the source. This combination of more close modification and direct copying occurs on another two occasions in the essay.
Zara again used the essay prompt as a source of language in her research essay, incorporating it through direct copying into her topic sentence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zara’s essay</th>
<th>Original source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This essay would argue if the exposure of violence in the media causes an increase in violence in society (ll. 10-11).</td>
<td>Does exposure to violence in the media, such as on television, in video games and on the Internet, cause an increase in violence in society? (Essay prompt)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zara attempted to incorporate ideas as well as language from her source texts into her essay, which were coded as borrowed ideas and were identified in five instances. None of these were referenced with an in-text citation, but four incorporated attributive phrases, which signal Zara’s attempt to provide acknowledgement of the source of the ideas, as in the following examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borrowed Idea with attributive phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some argued that media is a way of learning and gaining knowledge, without media, we cannot learn and know what is happening in the society (Z RE ll. 12-13).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the other hand, some are concerning about the effects of violent media on children because children observe and imitate and aggressive behaviour might occur which leads to unhealthy society in the future (Z RE ll. 14-16).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One more significant instance of textual borrowing was identified in Zara’s research essay, and was text coded as a common idea. As noted in the qualitative data (see section 5.2.2), one theme that arose in student discussions of plagiarism and source use was that concerning common knowledge and the epistemology of ideas (Mori, 1999). Zara was one of two students to explicitly refer to the domain of common knowledge:

There is an old saying in Chinese that “children are the masters of future”, which means that if children learn a lot, work hard at school when they were young, then there will be hopes for the future society as they will grow up as adults. (Z RE ll. 42-3)
In the use of this common saying, Zara is drawing on her own sociocultural background and knowledge in the construction of knowledge in her essay. Although it might be interpreted as an example of common knowledge, it is noteworthy that Zara still provided some form of acknowledgement via the initial attributive phrase, and was not appropriating the words and presenting them as her own. Patterns of textual borrowing, referencing, and attribution in Zara’s writing can be found summarised in tables in Appendix K.

6.8 Rowena

Rowena was from Brunei and had attended high school in New Zealand prior to enrolling at her current university. She felt that she had not developed her writing skills to a great extent at high school and therefore found the demands of writing academic English difficult when she began university, noting she “did not really care about the structure, or anything like this, and [that she] didn’t really know how to write properly” (R Int. p. 3). In the absence of formal instruction, Rowena utilised feedback given by her instructors on her assignments to improve her writing, noting that this is: “how you slowly learn to write properly and research properly” (R Int. p. 2). In addition, in order to supplement her writing skills, she had taken writing courses run by the University’s English Department, which, like Mei Li, she felt had improved her ability to write, teaching her “the basic principles of writing academic English” (R J5).

By the time she was enrolled in the EAP course, Rowena had gained experience with writing across several different disciplinary fields including Design, English, and Computer Science, and felt she was familiar with a variety of assignment types, including reports, summaries, and literature reviews. Rowena demonstrated knowledge of a variety of composition strategies and knowledge of essay structure and genre, and source integration techniques. She viewed successful academic writing as a vehicle to academic success, and was aware that in addition to content knowledge, skills in writing could convey a sense of academic ability to her instructors. For example, she felt that grammar could convey this, suggesting, “basic grammar is very important as it shows your ability through your writing in any academic writing you produce” (RJ5).

While she stated that she was familiar with a variety of essay genres, she was not always comfortable with expressing her opinion in argumentative writing. Rowena felt that a lack of content knowledge and an inability to judge the relevance of her source material contributed to a lack of confidence in expressing herself in her written work. This perception echoes that of Mariko who, like Rowena, felt uncomfortable about positioning herself as a
strong authorial voice in her writing, not because she did not see the importance of stance, but because she was unsure of the level of her content knowledge. Rowena expressed these views in the following excerpt from her journal:

I am not very comfortable about expressing my own opinion in my writing, as I am not very certain about what I know, because what I know may not be very important, as it could only be a small portion of the whole field of research. (R J5)

Rowena also described how her perceptions of institutional and disciplinary differences influenced her choices in researching sources for her written work. She noted that researching these assignments contrasted with her experiences at high school, where “reading material was given by the teachers” (R J6). She felt that for Design, students were not encouraged to use the university library catalogue or digital databases, but that in her other subjects, research had been encouraged. She stated that her usual procedure was to use the Internet for a preliminary search, before using more specialised resources such as Proquest. She expressed a preference for academic journal articles over books, which she described using “rarely” (R Int. p. 8).

Rowena noted that in addition to using source material for content, she looked upon published texts as models for her compositions. It is clear that as well as utilising the resources of written feedback and formal writing instruction, Rowena actively sought avenues in which she could extend her knowledge of academic writing and literacy. She utilised published writing not just at the levels of ideas and text (she commented that she liked to adopt the “key words and phrases” used in her source texts (R Int. p. 12)), but also at a higher level of critical thinking, and she hoped she could translate these critical thinking skills demonstrated in published writing to her own work: “[It is] quite important to read journals actually...you wanna write like them and think like them” (R Int. p. 9).

Rowena was aware of the need to provide adequate acknowledgement for the source materials she used in her writing. Referencing had not been required in her writing at high school, where she had “never been taught about referencing” (R J4). She had subsequently learned the importance of referencing, that “whenever you write your own thoughts using someone else’s idea you are expected to write reference after each idea” (R J4). She said that she always referenced her source material when using quotations, paraphrases, or summaries (R Int. p. 12), indicating an awareness that acknowledgment was required for ideas as well as language taken from source texts.
Rowena was aware of the convention that common knowledge did not need to be cited but appeared uncertain about how to define this. She suggested that common knowledge was considered “What you already know...really common sense things like childrens do learn bad behaviour on TV” (R Int. p. 12). This appeared to be an odd choice for Rowena to illustrate the concept of common knowledge, as prior to the interview she had completed her argumentative research essay on the topic of the influence of media violence, and therefore should have been aware that this was a debatable statement. Like many of the other participants in the embedded case study group, it appeared that Rowena had only a vague understanding of what general knowledge could be, and was unable to give adequate examples of this or exhibit awareness that the notion of general knowledge itself could be culturally or discipline specific.

Rowena perceived academic referencing as having several functions. Primarily, she viewed it as a way to protect students against charges of plagiarism, stating, “it is better to reference a whole lot more than to keep it minimal in order to keep ourselves from the possibilities of plagiarism” (R J4). However, she also demonstrated an awareness of the wider uses of referencing, commenting that referencing enabled the reader to do further research, “so everyone knows whose idea it was and everyone can go back and find that exact article to gain further understanding of what the author talked about” (R J4). She reported using references in this way in her own writing, using source material to follow up on matters of interest, commenting, “it is also much more helpful when there are a lot of sources for others if they are interested in doing any further research related to the topic” (R J5). Thus, Rowena demonstrated a more sophisticated understanding of the wider function of referencing, rather than seeing it as simply operating in a narrow binary relationship with plagiarism, as was the case with a number of the other case study and journal group participants.

Although Rowena felt that she now had a clear understanding of the referencing requirements, she commented that there was less understanding among other students (R Int. p.12). She claimed that referencing was not explicitly or widely taught in courses other than the English and Linguistics courses she had taken, and that sometimes the specific requirements were not clearly stated: “they don’t really tell you”, she said of her other instructors in the University. She felt that instructors should make referencing more explicit, suggesting that they “should highlight in every assignment” (R Int. p. 13).

As well as sound knowledge about referencing requirements in her academic writing, Rowena appeared confident in her own understanding of plagiarism and its importance in the institution. Like most of the other participants, Rowena viewed plagiarism predominantly through an ethical and moral lens, writing, “Plagiarism is about stealing someone else’s work
or ideas and using it as one’s own” (R J4). Extending the metaphor of theft, she suggested plagiarism deprived the original author of the recognition they deserved for their work, saying, “it could be a person’s twenty years of research and someone else may talk about it as his/her own in five minutes and get all the credit” (R J4).

Although she strongly expressed such views about the unethical nature of plagiarism, Rowena also recognised that in some instances plagiarism could be unintentional, illustrating this with an example in which her friends had copied a paragraph from the Internet and included it without acknowledgment in their essay due to what she felt was ignorance: “I’m pretty sure that they’re not sure...how to understand and take sources from the Internet, cite them and rephrase them” (R Int. p. 14). These students had been referred to the Head of the Department by their instructor, and given the opportunity to rewrite the assignment, with a 50% penalty for plagiarism. Rowena believed that this was a case of unintentional plagiarism resulting from her friends’ lack of knowledge of the rules and had advised her friends to tell the instructor that they had been unaware of correct paraphrasing and referencing requirements. She felt that this was partially due to inexperience, explaining, “Because they are just first year, and they are not so sure what plagiarism is” (R Int. p. 13-14).

When discussing possible additional causes of plagiarism, Rowena suggested that sometimes students might borrow texts which they felt they could not properly paraphrase, or because of a perception that the source text was more authoritative than their own voice, “because they just wanna write what’s right, like, based on someone who makes, sounds convincing” (R Int. p. 6). Like many of the other participants, she also felt that confusion over a student’s own ideas and already published material, or confusion over what constituted common knowledge, could contribute to unacknowledged textual borrowing (R J4).

Rowena was initially relatively successful in integrating her sources in her course work, and in her first two assignments demonstrated an ability to use largely prototypical source use techniques. In Rowena’s paraphrase assignment she combined several strategies in her attempt to modify the source language. The most frequently used strategy was identified as extensive modification, indicating that she was successful in transforming the source language into her own words the majority of the time. However, within this there was also a degree of close modification of the source text, and two instances of direct copying. Examples of the way in which extensive and close modification and direct coping can be embedded together in what is an otherwise successful assignment are given in the following table:
Table 6.24 Source Use Strategies in Paraphrase Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rowena’s paraphrase assignment</th>
<th>Source text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas students entering American University may experience difficulties in getting used to different education systems, new culture, and languages (ll. 1-2).</td>
<td>Although U. S. universities vary in entrance requirements and academic standards, all share certain academic rituals which may make adjustment difficult for students from other countries, depending on the students’ expectations, previous learning experiences and learning styles (Maxwell, ll. 1-30).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education system, especially the teaching strategies, professor’s expectations, assignments and examinations are different from what they are in their own countries (ll. 11-13).</td>
<td>Almost always, the foreign student finds the professor’s expectations, teaching strategies, reading assignments and examinations differ from those of teachers in his or her home country (Maxwell, ll. 10-11).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first sentence we can see how Rowena was able to express the content of the passage largely with language not taken from the source text, which was coded as extensive modification. However, in the second sentence the modifications that Rowena made to the source text were only minor (illustrated above in bold), including reordering of content words (the professor’s expectations, teaching strategies ➔ the teaching strategies, professor’s expectations), deletion (reading assignments ➔ assignments), and changes in word form (differ ➔ are different from). All of these changes are consistent with the strategy of minor modification (Shi 2004; Weigle & Parker, 2012), or what Howard (1995) terms patchwriting. In addition, there was one three-word string of directly copied text (underlined). This example is a clear illustration of how prototypical and non-prototypical source integration strategies can exist side by side in student texts.

In Rowena’s test-essay assignment, there were four instances of textual borrowing identified - together these comprised only 31.3% of the total word count, indicating that she relied less on source material and more on her own ideas in writing her composition. There were two instances of quotation, in addition to two instances of extensive modification. No direct copying was identified and only 2.6% of the source use was identified as close modification. Rowena’s reliance on the prototypical source use strategies of quotation and
paraphrase in her test essay and her ability to successfully paraphrase a majority of the time, as indicated in her paraphrase assignment, could suggest that she was developing well in her ability to successfully integrate sources into her writing and combine these with her own ideas.

However, it became clear on examination of her research essay that successful integration of source material still posed a challenge for Rowena. This is strikingly illustrated by the opening sentence of her research essay, the first words of which were copied directly from an uncited source (but included in her reference list), as is illustrated below in the underlined text:

Table 6.25 Direct Copying in Rowena’s Research Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rowena’s research essay</th>
<th>Source text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The influence of media violence is beyond discussion, and the problem of media violence is growing leading to social, developmental and behavioural problems in children (Goodale, 1997; Massey 1999; Hosay, 2001; Spitzer, 2005) (ll. 2-4).</td>
<td>The impact of media violence is beyond discussion (Jaffe, 2007, p. 26).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, this string of borrowed words introduces a thesis statement that is clearly stated in Rowena’s own words, and supported by with acknowledgement of her sources via an in-text citation that cites multiple authors. It seems surprising that a relatively sophisticated source use strategy can co-exist with overt direct unacknowledged copying, which is perhaps further evidence of the non-linearity of students’ development of appropriate and successful source use techniques.

There were seven other instances of direct copying in Rowena’s essay and in all of these instances the copying was embedded in sentences employing other strategies. In total, direct copying made up 4.4% of the total word count. Of the instances of textual borrowing that involved direct copying, four were referenced with in-text citations and two included attributive phrases. Although direct copying of source texts is perhaps the most overt form of non-prototypical textual borrowing, the fact that in Rowena’s essay four out of seven of these instances of copying were also referenced further complicates any theorising that can be done as to the role of intentionality and direct copying. While an argument might be made for inadequate paraphrasing being unintentional, it seems more difficult to accept that such overt
direct copying goes unnoticed by students. However, it would seem unlikely that Rowena was intentionally attempting to deceive her audience because she also referenced her direct copying more often than not.

In addition to direct copying there was also a small amount of close modification in which Rowena relied heavily on the language of the source texts (just over 15%). However, her main source use strategies were the prototypical strategies of paraphrase and summary, along with borrowed ideas. Together these strategies comprised 27.2% of the total word count of the essay.

An examination of the patterns of referencing and attribution in Rowena’s essay indicates that the majority of the time her textual borrowing was referenced. Of the 21 instances of source use identified in Rowena’s essay that made up 43.4% of the total word count, 14 were referenced with in-text citations and eight contained attributive phrases. Summary tables of textual borrowing, referencing and attribution patterns can be found in Appendix K.

6.9 Anna

Anna was a student from Thailand who had some experience with academic English and composition but had received no formal instruction prior to enrolling at the current university. She said that in her previous institution in Thailand, written work had consisted predominantly of memorisation and copying of texts provided by the instructors, and she noted, “Even though we got, we did written work, everything we given we just memorise and use that first…or just copying down” (A Int. p. 4). Anna felt that the focus on memorisation of texts detracted from the development of critical thinking skills: “They never teach you to think. They teach you to memorise their way and then apply into your life, which I don’t think is good (A Int. p. 2-3).

In New Zealand Anna had attended an IELTS preparation course at the university Language Centre in order to fulfil the entry requirements to enrol at the university. However, like her writing instruction in Thailand, Anna felt that this course had not provided adequate preparation for academic study, noting, “IELTS didn’t teach you how to write a proper essay, how to think, and how to use, you know, reference, and how to do summary, or things like that (A Int. p. 21).

For Anna, it appears that critical thinking was an educational priority that had been lacking in the instruction she had received prior to her enrolment at the university. However, it also appears that in some respects she expected to be a passive recipient of knowledge
imparted to her by an instructor, and that the correct way “to think” was something that could be taught rather than something that she could bring to her writing, or that could be co-constructed between herself and an instructor.

The first time she had been required to do substantial written assignments was when she began her Commerce degree. This transition to formal academic English was a struggle for Anna. Not having encountered what was in her view “real” academic English before, she reported, “I was struggle for the first year, I was really bad. I almost got expelled from here” (A Int. p. 4). Anna reported failing the many written assignments that were required during her Commerce degree because of her lack of knowledge and experience with academic English: “I couldn’t do the essay. I [had] no idea that with the introduction, how much you have to write, what do you have to put in there and how do you do the opening sentence, and things like that” (A Int. p. 11).

Anna attempted to get help with her writing from the Student Learning Centre, but found this to be ineffective (A Int. p. 11), and she changed her major from Commerce to Chinese because this would require her to do less academic writing. She appeared to attribute these difficulties and failures not to a deficiency in her content knowledge of Commerce, but solely to her inability to master academic writing in English and she appears to have viewed success in writing as a vehicle to academic success more generally. She perceived that further knowledge of academic style could enhance her writing and thereby all her academic work. She seemed to be aware of the effect made by her writing on her instructors, suggesting that a more sophisticated academic style would create a better impression, reporting her desire to use academic style to make her writing “look a wee bit clever” (A Int. p. 12).

Although Anna still sometimes struggled to come up with ideas for her writing, she did comment that she now enjoyed writing and felt comfortable in expressing her own opinion, reporting: “I quite like the idea of express my own opinion in my writing. It makes my writing more fun and interesting” (A J5). She felt that her writing was steadily improving and aimed to develop her abilities further: “I am just a beginner of a process to be a good writer. I hope that one day I will be able to write something interesting that I can be proud of” (A J6).

Anna reported that she had had limited experience with academic research when she arrived in New Zealand, as she not been required to do source-based writing in Thailand (A Int. p. 4). At the Language Centre, research had been limited to newspaper articles that were used for language tasks such as summarising and paraphrasing, but not integrated into larger written tasks.
However, having attended the university for several years, Anna was now feeling more confident about the academic research process and writing from sources. She reported feeling comfortable with the Library’s digital databases and catalogue, and also used the Internet for research, although she felt that her instructors preferred book sources to Internet ones: “some lecturer like it when, you know, use books. They don’t like it much when you use the Internet” (A Int. p.13). She suggested that the reason for this was that her instructors were concerned about plagiarism, commenting, “with the Internet you just cut and paste but with the book you have to use your own knowledge and read through it and understand the topic and write it in your own words” (A Int. p. 13-14). This comment echoes a common finding in the questionnaire and qualitative data (see sections 4.1.2 and 5.2.1) that equated plagiarism with direct copying, suggesting that many participants felt that once the text had been transformed (via paraphrase for example), plagiarism had been successfully avoided.

Anna was also learning how to incorporate research sources and reference her work in more sophisticated ways. As mentioned earlier, she had previously attended the university Language Centre where she studied academic writing in addition to other subjects, however, she felt that referencing sources had not been required there (A Int. p. 6). Similarly, it was her perception that referencing had not been widely taught in the time she had spent studying writing at the Polytechnic, commenting that referencing had been required in only one of her courses: “they would teach you to say that you have to put a reference in” and she remembered the lecturer saying, “I want to know where the document source came from” (A Int. p. 18). However she said that in the other courses, referencing had not been mentioned or expected.

Anna felt that plagiarism had not been a significant issue in Thailand, and she noted, “From my previous understanding with the education system where I come from there is no such thing as Plagiarism” (A J3). Accordingly, she had felt that unacknowledged copying from texts and the Internet was acceptable in Thailand, saying, “In Thailand you can copy anyone else’s work. They don’t care, as long as you pass” (A Int. p. 18). When she arrived in New Zealand she had little understanding of attitudes towards plagiarism here, commenting, “I didn’t just know what it was” (A Int. p. 19).

While the above data illustrates Anna’s perceptions that textual borrowing had been acceptable in her home country, she also exhibited awareness that, in some contexts at least, it was possible to transgress boundaries when using sources in academic writing in Thailand. For example, she recounted an incident from her university in Thailand in which a faculty member had reportedly plagiarised from a student, but she felt that this case had not been treated as serious by the university authorities. “No, they don’t care” she replied, when asked
if there had been consequences in the recounted case (A Int. p. 19). She also suggested that in student work there was some degree of prohibition against plagiarism, saying, “It’s alright to copy other people as long as you don’t get caught” (A Int. p. 3). Her use of the word “caught” here implies that there was in fact some awareness that unattributed textual borrowing had been unacceptable to some extent during her time at university in Thailand, and illustrates a tension between her perception that there was “no such thing” as plagiarism in Thailand, and the view expressed here that unacknowledged textual borrowing is possible as long as it remains unidentified.

Anna described her current understanding of plagiarism as, “copying other people’s work or quoting other people’s work without reference, and even using method of cut, paste from the Internet to do assignment” (A J4), a definition which was somewhat fuller than some of the other study participants, who defined plagiarism as simple copying. Her first instruction into plagiarism avoidance had been at the Polytechnic, but she said that this had been cursory, and, as noted above, referencing had been expected “only in one class” (A Int. p. 18).

A lack of knowledge regarding the institutional position on plagiarism directly affected Anna in her first attempts at academic writing at the university and she recounted how a lack of knowledge of referencing and the stress of her workload contributed to her submitting an assignment that had been partially written by a friend (A Int. p. 12). When asked how much of the assignment was her work and how much was his she replied that he had written 70% and she had written 30%. She said that her instructors had not noticed that the assignment had been plagiarised, although she still did not pass. However, although she had been relieved that she had not been “caught”, Anna was ashamed of her involvement, describing her behaviour as “naughty” and the incident itself as stressful (A Int. p. 12). Again, a tension in her belief system is evident here - although she claimed to lack the knowledge and skill to successfully and independently write her assignment and integrate the source material adequately, it is clear from her comment that she knew the behaviour to be transgressive, despite the fact that in this instance, it went undetected.

When asked to consider the possible causes of student plagiarism Anna had conflicted views. On the one hand she felt that a lack of academic literacy and proficiency could contribute to plagiarism. Discussing student plagiarism in her Polytechnic class, Anna said, “Sometimes I [didn’t] understand…like the students who go to that class, they couldn’t even speak English, I don’t know how they do their essay” (A Int. p. 20).

She also suggested that confusion over common and source-specific knowledge could further contribute to student plagiarism, echoing the statements made by participants in the journal data discussed in the previous chapter (see section 5.2.2), which indicated that
conflicting epistemologies of knowledge (Mori, 1999) could contribute to unintentional plagiarism: “Some people might use their common knowledge to write an essay, unfortunate they read from the article somewhere else so these class as unintentional plagiarism” (A J4).

However, while Anna suggested that some plagiarism could be unintentional, saying, “most people are probably doing it without realising” (AJ4), she still conveyed a strong sense of moral judgment. Anna said, “People put their hard work in and it’s just not fair that you steal from someone else” (A Int. p. 19-20). Like Daniel, she also felt that intentional plagiarism could be a result of stress or lack of organisation of workload, “If you stress there is a temptation for you to cheat. Plagiarism is a cheating method that we can all avoid by being more organised” (A J4).

An analysis of Anna’s text data shows that she employed a variety of textual borrowing, referencing, and attribution strategies in her writing. In Anna’s first paraphrase assignment, the predominant source incorporation technique she used was extensive modification, which made up a total of 40% of the text. As can be seen in the following example in Table 6.26, in her extensive modifications Anna was able to represent the source content without a heavy reliance on its language, and the author of the source is clearly indicated through the use of the explicit attributive phrase at the beginning of the sentence (in italics):

### Table 6.26 Attribution and Extensive Modification in Paraphrase Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anna’s Text</th>
<th>Source Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>According to Martha J Maxwell, who works with foreign students in University of California, point out why foreign students find it difficult to adapt their life to meet college requirements (ll. 1-3).</td>
<td>Although U. S. universities vary in entrance requirements and academic standards, all share certain academic rituals which may make adjustment difficult for students from other countries, depending on the students’ expectations, previous learning experiences and learning styles (Maxwell, ll. 1-7).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, she also relied on non-prototypical integration techniques, and close modification made up 23% of Anna’s text. Only a small proportion of the text was directly copied from the original passage (7%), and the copied strings were embedded within text that had been modified in some way. The following example, from the last sentence of Anna’s paraphrase shows how she attempted to transform the first sentence of the source again, but
this time directly copied two strings (underlined) and close modification using addition of words (make the adjustment difficult) and changes to word form (depending), and number (students’ expectations→student expectation).

Table 6.27 Copying and Close Modification in Paraphrase Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anna’s Text</th>
<th>Source Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lastly, some certain academic rituals also make the adjustment difficult, however, it depends on student expectation, their previous learning experience and learning style (A PA ll. 9-11).</td>
<td>Although U. S. universities vary in entrance requirements and academic standards, all share certain academic rituals which may make adjustment difficult for students from other countries, depending on the students’ expectation previous learning experiences and learning styles (Maxwell, ll. 1-7).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anna chose to focus mainly on her own experience in writing her take home test essay, but six instances of textual borrowing were identified and the majority of these were legitimate: direct quotation was her main strategy, and she used two quotations (20 and 32 words), which comprised 14.3% of her total essay. Both the quotations were referenced and contained explicit attributive phrases. There were two instances in which she extensively modified passages of the source text using her own words, which comprised 6.9% of the essay total. Neither instance of extensive modification was referenced, although one contained an explicit attributing phrase. There was a small amount of non-prototypical source use in Anna’s test essay: two instances of close modification and one short (three word string) that had been directly copied from the source text. Taken together these strategies comprised only 5.7% of the total essay.

For her research essay, in which Anna wrote about the effects of violent media on society, 13 instances of source use were identified. In total, 22.8% of Anna’s research essay could be identified as coming from her source texts. Of the textual borrowing that could be identified in the essay, there were a small number of strings identified that were exactly copied from the source text, and also a small number of strings that were close modifications. Taken together, these two strategies comprised just over 5% of the total number of words in the essay. There were similar proportions of both extensive modification and quotation (just over 4%), with no summary identified. Almost 10% of the essay was coded as borrowed ideas.
which could be linked to source texts, but which could not be classified as paraphrase or summary.

An examination of the patterns of referencing and attribution contributed to the lack of transparency of authorship in her essay (Pecorari, 2006). Of the 13 instances of source use, Anna had only referenced five. Similarly, seven out of the 13 instances of source use used attributive phrases. Four of these instances had explicit attributive phrases acknowledging the author of the source, while three had implicit phrases which attributed the source to its author indirectly through the use of passive constructions. A summary of the textual borrowing, referencing, and attributive strategies used by Anna in her course work can be found in Appendix K.

6.10 Mei Li

The final student from the Interview Group, Mei Li, had a background in English teaching. She majored in TESOL and completed a diploma English teaching for primary schools at a university in China. Her English classes in China had focussed predominantly on reading and writing and she reported having written many types of academic writing during her time at university there, including essays, reports, journals, and reviews.

At her current university where she was majoring in Accounting she had continued to do a variety of academic assignments, in particular essay writing. Mei Li appeared to perceive writing as an important part of her academic development, actively taking steps to improve it. At the beginning of her degree she had taken a writing course in the English Department, and she reported spending significant amounts of time working to improve her writing, which she noted “requires long-time commitment to practice in respect of regular reading, vocabulary collection and writing exercises”. (ML J5).

Despite these efforts, Mei Li felt her proficiency level in English remained a barrier to her fully being able to express herself in her writing:

Writing in a second language sometimes confuses myself... I always feel like it is not what I mean to say, and often get lost as the points I put together seems not successive and the whole writing is a fragment. (ML J5)

She also sometimes felt that establishing a stance towards her source material or essay topic was difficult. Like Mariko and Xiao Yu, this was not because she did not recognise the importance of her own position in her writing, but because she lacked confidence about the
degree of her content knowledge and her ability to make judgments about her source material, commenting, “I am not quite confident whether I am right or wrong” (ML Int. p. 5).

Mei Li noted that during her education in China it had not been customary for her to create a strong stance in her writing. However, in this context, this had not been due to a lack of confidence in her content knowledge as described above, but because of her awareness that she should not include content in her writing that went against the prevailing political climate, commenting, “I don’t know whether its regarding the culture or the political issues, um, but you have to be very careful when you write…in order to gain a good mark you have to write what the teachers want” (ML Int. p. 12). Mei Li said that this cultural-political awareness had caused her writing in China to be formulaic and routine, adhering to her instructors’ expectations for content and structure (ML Int. p. 12).

When asked if she now felt more comfortable about expressing her ideas in her writing she observed that although she was aware that students were encouraged to have their own opinions here, they were still constrained to an extent by the expectations of their instructors, noting, “I don’t think the people here would, [say] when they write the essay...’I don’t like this lecture’, they wouldn’t say that - they still got to say, to write something the teachers want” (ML Int. p. 13).

Mei Li reported having done little research for her writing in China, stating, “there is not much research involved in the writing...we focus on our own thoughts” (ML Int. p. 3). However, for her assignments at her current university she felt confident researching a variety of sources, including journals, newspapers and magazines, interviews, and reference works (ML J6). As well as using the Library’s digital catalogue and databases, she also used source bibliographies for further research. Mei Li said that during her research process she was aware of her instructor’s expectations regarding her source use, and that she felt instructors preferred academic journals as “they think they are more reliable, yeah, more valuable” (ML Int. p. 9).

Although Mei Li had not been required to do significant amounts of source-based writing in China, she had been nevertheless required to acknowledge her source material and she believed that referencing was still a requirement there, commenting, “they do, um, quote. I mean, they do address who said this this, this, who said that that, that” (ML Int. pp. 10-11).

Mei Li was also aware that referencing was an important institutional requirement at her current university and noted, “The university provides guidelines for correct referencing which are quite helpful to avoid plagiarism” (ML J4). She commented that whenever she used sources she was careful to put in a reference (ML Int. p. 9). An awareness of plagiarism
mediated her referencing practice and she commented that if she was ever unsure whether to reference or not, she always did “for security” (ML Int. p. 9-10).

However, she sometimes felt that referencing disrupted the flow of her writing and felt that the system of using in-text referencing and placing references in a bibliography was excessive:

One thing I really do not like is the in-text reference. I am not saying that it is wrong by doing it, but it may sometimes be double referenced because the original sources will be placed at the end in the bibliography or references. Imagine what would an article contains lots of brackets with names and numbers be like. I, to be honest, would not want to read such article. (ML J4)

As noted above, Mei Li was always aware of plagiarism when she was writing, and referenced her sources often in order to avoid a charge of plagiarism. Of all the participants, she was able to provide the most comprehensive explanation of plagiarism, in which she demonstrated an understanding of several different types of non-prototypical textual borrowing:

The using of someone else’s work takes account of a wide range of behaviours, including direct copying, and indirect copying, such as using other’s ideas, changing wording, translation, quoting without references, and even making wrong references. (ML J4)

Mei Li had first become aware of plagiarism during her university studies in China, but stated that, in her experience, discussions of plagiarism there generally occurred in commercial rather than academic contexts (ML Int. pp. 5-6). Currently, she felt that while the University's emphasis on plagiarism was clear, institutional policy could be implemented differently between instructors and departments, saying, “they have common knowledge about plagiarism, but what they are looking for is different” (ML Int. p. 7). For example, she noted that in “Financial Accounting, the instructor probably do not care much about the plagiarism as long as you’ve got the answers they want. But for Management Accounting, which involves more, theoretical writing, yeah, they did, they do look for plagiarism” (ML Int. p. 7).

When asked if student plagiarism was generally intentional or unintentional, she stated that there were some students who used others’ work “without reference for their own benefit”, and that such students could “just go to the Internet and cut and paste some words” (ML Int. p. 8). She noted that while sometimes unacknowledged textual borrowing could be
accidental, more experienced writers should know how to avoid it (ML Int. p. 8). For such individuals she commented that the consequences could be serious, causing “not only harm to the academic field but the lost of their reputation in public” (ML J4).

It can be seen from the qualitative data that Mei Li was a relatively experienced academic writer who had knowledge of the research and writing process, and some understanding of referencing conventions and the different cultural, academic and disciplinary contexts in which those conventions operate, in addition to an understanding of both the contributing causes and possible consequences of breaching those conventions.

However, an analysis of Mei Li’s textual data revealed that in practice, she had continuing difficulties in integrating source material successfully in her writing, and that she employed the non-prototypical strategies of close modification and direct copying of source texts throughout her written work. In the paraphrase assignment 75% of the words used were either directly copied or only slightly modified. As can be seen in the following example, even when attempting to transform the source text into her own words, she relied heavily on superficial changes to word form (certain→certainty; difficult→difficulty; adjustment→to adjust), changes in number (certain academic rituals→American academic ritual) and synonym substitution (entrance requirements→entrance criteria). In addition, there were two strings of words that were directly copied (underlined below) from the source text and incorporated into her text. These non-prototypical instances were embedded in text that had been more extensively modified:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mei Li’s paraphrase</th>
<th>Source Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The certainty of American academic ritual may cause difficulties for foreign students to adjust even though they can meet the university’s entrance criteria (ML PA ll. 1-2).</td>
<td>Although U. S. universities vary in entrance requirements and academic standards, all share certain academic rituals which may make adjustment difficult for students from other countries, depending on the students’ expectations, previous learning experiences and learning styles (Maxwell, ll. 1-3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary reason often can be attributed to the different professor’s expectations, Almost always, the foreign student finds the professor’s expectations, teaching strategies,
teaching strategies, reading assignments and examinations differ from those of teachers in his or her home country (Maxwell, ll. 10-11).

In Mei Li’s take-home test essay, the patterns of textual borrowing were different and she appeared to rely more heavily on her own ideas in the writing of the essay. Of the three instances of textual borrowing that could be identified in the assignment, two were strings of words directly copied from the text. One of these was attributed and referenced with an in-text citation. There was also one example of extensive modification of a passage that was not attributed or referenced, despite clearly being a modification of the source text. This example is shown in the following table:

Table 6.29 Extensive Modification in Take-Home Test Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mei Li’s paraphrase</th>
<th>Source Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition, they may not be able to take accurate notes in the lectures because they can not catch full understanding about what the lectures talk about due to different accent or the lecturer is talking too quickly (ML TE ll. 22-4).</td>
<td>In large undergraduate courses the foreign student faces the problem of trying to follow the points of a rapid-fire lecture and, at the same time, take notes on what is being said. Professors who use academic jargon and idioms confuse the student who is trying to understand new technical terms and take notes in English (Maxwell, ll. 17-20).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In her final written assignment for the course on the topic of media violence, Mei Li used five sources: three articles from academic journals, two magazine articles, and the Bible. There were 19 identified instances of textual borrowing, making up a total of 37.4% of the total word count of the essay. The majority of these instances of textual borrowing involved the non-prototypical source use strategies of direct copying (22.1% of total word count) and close modification (7.8%). As with several other participants, the first instance of direct copying came from the essay prompt, which was incorporated in its entirety into Mei Li’s introductory paragraph, with the addition of one word, as can be seen as follows:
Table 6.30 Direct Copying of Prompt in Research Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mei Li’s essay</th>
<th>Source Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does exposure to violence in the media, such as on television, in video games and on the Internet, really cause an increase in violence in society? (ML RE ll. 5-6).</td>
<td>Prompt: Does exposure to violence in the media, such as on television, in video games and on the Internet cause an increase in violence in society?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to direct copying of entire sentences as illustrated above, Mei Li combined direct copying with text that she had modified slightly with patchwriting strategies such as synonym substitution and addition. However, although Mei Li had insufficiently transformed the text in this example, making only very minor textual changes such as changes in word order (a minority activity ➔ activity for the minority) and deletion (a few years ago), she did provide both a reference in the form of an in-text citation and an attributing phrase acknowledging the source of the information, as illustrated in the following table:

Table 6.31 Close Modification and Copying in Research Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mei Li’s essay</th>
<th>Source Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>According to the Economist Newspaper (2005), <strong>gaming is no longer an activity for a minority but the mass entertainment</strong> (ML RE ll. 29-30)</td>
<td>Gaming has gone from a minority activity a few years ago to mass entertainment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And <strong>video games increasingly look a lot like films</strong>, with photorealistic images, complex plotlines and even famous actors (p.66) (ML RE ll. 31-2).</td>
<td>Video games increasingly resemble films with photorealistic images, complex plotlines and even famous actors (The Economist, 2005, p. 66).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indeed, of the 11 strings of directly copied text in Mei Li’s essay, over half are were both referenced and attributed either directly or indirectly to a source author, which suggests that the direct copying was not an intentional attempt to deceive her reader but an unsuccessful attempt at correct source integration in her essay. Very little prototypical source use in her essay was identified in Mei Li’s essay - there was one lengthy quote, attributed and referenced, in addition to extensive modification (5.3%) and borrowed ideas (1.5%).
Summary tables of Mei Li’s source use strategies, attribution and referencing strategies can be found in Appendix K.

6.11 Summary

This chapter has presented the results of the analysis of the qualitative and the textual data of the 10 embedded case study participants. The results show that overall the participants were both aware of, and actively attempted to avoid, non-prototypical textual borrowing in their academic work. Many participants were aware of the different cultural and educational contexts of research and referencing, and were aware of the possible causes and consequences of plagiarism. Participants generally had a limited view of the range of possible behaviours that could be considered plagiarism, and most viewed it as a moral issue in student writing associated with attempts at intentional deception and direct copying. However, in many instances this awareness did not transfer to their written work, which exhibited a number of textual characteristics that in other contexts would likely be classed as extensively plagiarised. However, there was also evidence that this textual borrowing was not intentionally transgressive, due to the presence of attributive phrases or references, evidence that the students were actively attempting to legitimately incorporate their references into their work. Further evidence for this is the way in which the participants would combine strategies, such as embedding direct copying in text that had been either extensively or closely modified, suggesting that they were processing the text, albeit unsuccessfully, and attempting to transform it into their own words.

This evidence suggests that the development of the ability to successfully integrate texts is not a linear one, and the successful integration of one piece of text or idea, or the production of a successful assignment, does not mean that the next attempt will be a successful one. Rather, the ability to successfully incorporate text and ideas is dependent on a range of contextual factors, including the type of assignment, the type of source material used, and the students’ own perceptions about the nature of the information to be incorporated, and the institutional, disciplinary and learning context in which the composition is being produced. The next chapter considers the results in relationship to the literature on NESB plagiarism in the context of the research questions introduced at the beginning of the thesis.
CHAPTER 7 - DISCUSSION

7.0 Overview

This chapter discusses the key findings of the previous three results chapters and answers the research questions concerning NESB student textual borrowing introduced at the beginning of the thesis. In doing so, it situates these findings within the literature on L2 plagiarism and textual borrowing presented in the Literature Review, and also within the broader framework of sociocultural theory and activity theory.

7.1 Knowledge of Plagiarism and Textual Borrowing

This section discusses Research Question One - What knowledge do NESB undergraduate students studying at a New Zealand university have about plagiarism and source use? It includes key findings regarding forms of student knowledge from the open items in the questionnaire as presented in Chapter Four; from the reflective journal data analysed in Chapter Five; and from the interview and journal data discussed in Chapter Six. Data from these chapters is integrated and discussed thematically in relation to the literature on NESB student plagiarism and source use.

Two main themes were identified in the data on student knowledge of plagiarism and textual borrowing. The first concerns the extent to which student knowledge corresponded with the prevailing discourse of plagiarism as a rule-bound ethical discourse (Ouellette, 2008). As noted in Chapter One, the dominant discourse on plagiarism and textual borrowing foregrounds the moral and ethical character of the individual writer, and is built upon what some researchers argue is a Western concept of authorship and originality (Howard, 1999; Pennycook, 1996; Scollon, 1995). This discourse can be seen reflected in institutional definitions of academic plagiarism such as those found in university policies and in composition textbooks (Pecorari, 2001; Sutherland-Smith, 2008, 2011; Yamada, 2003). Transgressing these norms of acknowledgment and attribution can result in punitive measures that are applied depending on the perceived seriousness of the infraction (Howard, 1999).

To a large extent, the knowledge of the participants in this study reflected this prevailing discourse - students were aware of the rules against plagiarism as they are expressed at an institutional level and of possible causes of plagiarism, textual conventions surrounding its avoidance, and the consequences for breaking these rules. Moreover, they largely perceived plagiarism to be unethical and immoral conduct. Student knowledge
reflecting this was grouped under the theme of Upholding Conventional Views. However, while students demonstrated an acceptance of this conventional view of plagiarism, suggesting that to some degree they had internalised the dominant discourse, the participants also conveyed knowledge that challenged traditional viewpoints of plagiarism and source use. For example, many students questioned the role of intentionality in textual borrowing, problematising the issue of knowledge ownership and exploring the ways in which contextual factors could influence textual borrowing practices and beliefs. This theme was termed Problematising Conventional Views. It is argued that student knowledge of plagiarism exists on a continuum between these two poles, and both serve to inform student practice of source use, as is discussed in the following section.

However, it should be noted that the relationship between these two forms of knowledge was not a straightforward one, and oftentimes, individual students simultaneously held contrasting viewpoints. Rather than interpreting this discrepancy as evidence of a deficiency in student knowledge of plagiarism, such tensions may in fact be evidence of a developing and dynamic process through which students construct and reconstruct meaning (Negueruela-Azarola, 2011). As such, student knowledge on plagiarism and textual borrowing can be seen as part of a process of “debating, revising and legitimizing” (Canagarajah, 2002, p. 30) by which discourse knowledge can be reworked and transformed.

7.2 Upholding Conventional Views

As discussed in Chapters One and Two, the dominant view of student plagiarism within the academy has been demonstrated as one which is dominated by moral and ethical considerations that serves to uphold the ideal of autonomous authorship (Howard, 1999; Pecorari & Petrić, 2014; Pennycook, 1996; Valentine, 2006). Within this discourse students may be informed of or instructed in the conventions of appropriate acknowledgment and attribution, but in addition, individuals may be influenced by a moral and ethical emphasis which leaves them with what Abasi and Graves (2008) term a “heightened sense of wrongdoing” (p. 228) if they struggle with or transgress textual borrowing conventions. A key finding of this thesis is that to a significant extent the students themselves had internalised this discourse and participant knowledge of plagiarism reflected, at a surface level at least, this perspective, as is explored in the following sections.
7.2.1 Describing plagiarism.

The degree to which students accepted the conventional discourse can be demonstrated through an examination of the definitions of plagiarism provided both in the questionnaire and in the qualitative data, which clearly reflected prototypical views of plagiarism as given, for example, by educational institutions and composition textbooks (Leight, 1999). As discussed in the Chapter One, researchers such as Abasi and Graves (2008), Li and Casanave (2012), Pecorari, (2001) Pecorari & Petrić, (2014), and Yamada (2003) have argued that the ways in which universities represent plagiarism remain largely uniform. For example, Pecorari (2001), in her examination of 53 university definitions of plagiarism found consistent definitions and developed a six-part taxonomy to describe them, consisting of descriptions of “(1) material that has been (2) taken from (3) some source by (4) someone, (5) without acknowledgement and (6) with/without intention to deceive” (p. 234).

The descriptions of plagiarism given by the participants in this study closely reflected Pecorari’s (2001) taxonomy. Out of the 38 descriptions in the questionnaire data, 87% described a plagiarised object or source, such as ideas, theories or opinions, work, or words, while the same percentage of descriptions described the way in which objects could be plagiarised (for example without reference or citation, submitting as one’s own or without acknowledgement or credit). Eighty-two percent of the descriptions given also noted the indirect object of the plagiarising action (e.g., another person, author or writer). Moreover, the verbs used to describe the action of plagiarism suggest that to a large extent the students had assimilated the moral or ethical nature of the discourse, as they described plagiarism as an act primarily of “copying”, “stealing”, “cheating”, or “taking”, verbs that imply intention on the part of the agent.

These short descriptions were expanded in the journal data, which contained similar emphases on copying, cheating, and stealing of work, ideas, or language. This can be seen in the following example from Xiao Wen, who wrote that plagiarism is “Immoral, unethical…if people plagiarise at academic environment, it means they are stealing, that is an illegal behavior in academic side” (XW J4). The majority of the descriptions of plagiarism in the journal data provided four-part definitions, including a verb, direct object, description of manner, and an indirect object. While the descriptions varied in the degree of specificity with which they explained the concept, the majority of them followed standard institutional definitions of plagiarism (Pecorari, 2001).

Also in agreement with the conventional views of plagiarism is the finding that the majority of participants viewed plagiarism as a significant issue and one that was and should be treated seriously at an institutional level. For example, 85% of survey respondents and the
majority of the journal participants were aware that correct source use carried a strong emphasis at the university. This finding corresponds with that of Maxwell et al. (2008) who found that the majority of students in their study (interestingly both ESB and NESB groups) considered plagiarism to be a “moderately” or “very” serious issue at university.

These results also echo similar findings by studies such as Abasi and Graves (2008) Li and Casanave (2012), Evans and Youmans (2002) and Wheeler (2009). For example, Li and Casanave’s (2012) participants could “recite the basic policy of plagiarism and recognize that plagiarism was an unacceptable practice in university writing assignments” (p. 170). Abasi and Graves (2008) found a familiarity with institutional rules about plagiarism among the participants in their study, who were able to reflect language of the institutional policies of their universities and were very aware of the “authoritative stance” (p. 228) with which the institutions framed the issue.

Student knowledge of the institutional definitions and importance of plagiarism demonstrated in the questionnaire data was enriched by the more detailed journal data, which showed participants’ understandings of plagiarism and its importance had emerged and developed over time. Many students had not considered plagiarism to be significant before coming to the university and had understood it predominantly as an act of unacknowledged copying, as can be seen in the following comment from the journal data:

At very first time I didn’t take plagiarism seriously because I didn’t think it is very important and I didn’t care very much. I only thought ‘who would know’ and ‘why I have to do those kinds of things to write academic essays?’ (B2, D4)

By contrasting the present understandings of plagiarism and its importance with students’ emergent understandings, evidence of the development of knowledge and the degree to which the students had internalised the conventional discourse can be seen.

Participants’ knowledge of the range of possible consequences associated with non-prototypical textual borrowing also demonstrated their engagement with the discourse of plagiarism and their understanding of plagiarism and textual borrowing as primarily an ethical issue. As discussed in section 5.2.3, participants were very aware of the consequences of violating the rules of textual borrowing at a variety of levels, with suggested consequences ranging from “reprimand” by instructors and loss of marks, to being expelled from the institution, to wider social effects. Their comments echoed the findings of Pecorari (2001) who found emphasis on the unfairness and negative pedagogic impacts of plagiarism among the reasons given against it by institutions. For example, a number of students indicated that plagiarism could have a negative impact on learning, implying that the act of copying texts
runs contrary to learning and may affect a student’s cognitive abilities. Extra-institutional consequences students identified, such as damage to productivity, careers, and reputations, suggested that the act of copying, or cheating through copying was viewed a threat to creativity and originality at a wider social and cultural level.

These findings were similar to those in Evans and Youmans' (2000) study, in which participants also perceived plagiarism as “interfering with learning or skill development” (p. 118). Consequences such as loss of marks or possible expulsion were also noted in their study. Currie (1998) discussed the importance of informing students about such possible consequences of plagiarism, such as “reprimands, course failure and even expulsion, depending on the policies of the particular institution” (p. 12), as part of a strategy to help learners develop their abilities to write successfully from sources, and it is clear from the data in this study that many of the participants were already aware of a number of possible consequences of unacknowledged textual borrowing.

7.2.2 Plagiarism and the “triadic model” of source use.

Another aspect of student knowledge of plagiarism and textual borrowing which reflects a conventional approach concerns the relationship between student knowledge and the role of referencing in academic writing. As Chandrasoma et al. (2004) noted, within the discourse on plagiarism there is, understandably, a strong emphasis on referencing and citation. The participants in this study were generally aware of the importance of referencing and proper citations in their academic writing. Almost three quarters of the students surveyed indicated that attribution was required when using source material (including facts, theories, quotations, paraphrases, and summaries), and in the journal data, a number of students were aware of referencing and its relationship to textual borrowing and plagiarism avoidance, as shown in the following example: “I know that if I am using the words or even ideas of other person I should give this person the credit and write it down in my references” (B1 D4). Case study participant Susana said in her interview that she always attempted to reference her work adequately because she did not want to do “anything illegal” (S Int. p. 6), while Mei Li noted that she always used references “for security” (ML Int. p. 9-10). Again, the extent to which students had internalised these conventions can be seen by examining the data on their past referencing understandings, and a number of students in their journal data noted that in their past experience they had not been required to use referencing in their academic writing.
7.2.3 Awareness of instructor and institutional expectations.

So far the key findings have concerned students’ knowledge of the institutional definition of plagiarism, the moral aspects of the discourse, its consequences, and prevention through referencing. This data is taken as evidence of the extent to which the students had internalised the dominant discourse of plagiarism. This view can be further supported by the fact that many of the participants were actively aware of the expectations of their instructors concerning textual borrowing, and attempted to use this awareness to mediate their own textual borrowing practices. This came through in both the journal and interview data. Yue Yan, for example, felt that instructor expectations of international students were the same as their expectations of ESB students when it came to understandings of plagiarism. She said, “before they mark us they already told us how to do it, so they will have, maybe, very similar expectations from the native English speaker or Western people” (YY Int. p. 21). Mei Li and Daniel noted disciplinary differences in their instructors’ expectations concerning plagiarism and referencing and textual borrowing. For example, Daniel suggested that while in Accounting it was difficult to copy, in Management it was “easy” (D Int. p. 11). These comments suggest that in their academic writing and source use practices, participants were aware of the prohibitions against plagiarism and unacknowledged textual borrowing. This finding corresponds with that of Thompson (2005) who observed that the participants in her study shaped their perceptions of themselves as writers by their understandings of their instructors’ expectations.

It appears that students conceptualised plagiarism as an important set of institutional rules that could be avoided if proper procedures are followed (source use conventions). They felt that violation of these rules was likely to be an intentional act, resulting in damage at an individual, institutional, or socio-cultural level. This finding corresponds with that of Abasi and Graves (2008), whose student writers viewed appropriate textual borrowing as a matter of “strict adherence to established rules and guidelines” (p. 227). It is important to note that the forms of knowledge outlined above were by no means complete or total - descriptions of plagiarism varied from student to student in terms of the specificity of the definitions, and in the qualitative data many of the students expressed doubts over the correct ways in which to use references and the different source integration techniques. However, in terms of an understanding of the discourse of plagiarism and the characteristics of this discourse as it has been presented in the literature, student knowledge clearly reflected these aspects.

Such knowledge implies that students had, to varying extents, internalised many aspects of the dominant discourse of plagiarism, framing it as an issue of morality and originality threatened by dishonest and unethical conduct. This result appears to contrast with
suggestions by researchers that non-prototypical textual borrowing can result from an ignorance of Western conventions regarding plagiarism and textual borrowing. This argument, as advanced for example by Hayes and Introna (2005b), Gilmore et al. (2010), Marshall and Garry (2006), and Lund (2004) corresponds with the deficit model discussed in section 2.1.2, in which student knowledge and practice can be thought of as a gap which instruction can fill. However, the results of this thesis show that students were very aware of plagiarism, its consequences, and the need to reference in order to avoid it.

Unfortunately, as Abasi and Graves (2008) noted, the forceful anti-plagiarism message perpetuated by this discourse may obscure the complexities associated with using sources in academic writing. If student writers view plagiarism largely as an ethical issue that can be avoided simply by correct referencing, then as long as they view themselves to be ethical, and as long perceive that they are referencing their sources correctly, they may believe themselves to be following the conventions adequately. Yet, as is clear from the data on student practices of textual borrowing presented in Chapter Six and discussed in the next section, this is not the case in many instances, as normative use of sources involves more than correct referencing. As Chandrasoma et al. (2004) argued, many institutional policies on plagiarism, which focus solely on moral and punitive aspects of unacknowledged textual borrowing, obscure the complex and multifaceted nature of academic knowledge production and text construction. Thus, although the students had assimilated this discourse to a large extent, as argued in this section, the question remains whether such knowledge facilitated or impeded their academic writing.

Indeed, researchers such as Chandrasoma et al. (2004) and Thompson (2011) question the degree to which such knowledge is actually helpful to students, noting that approaches which present plagiarism avoidance as a set of rules fail to capture the complexity inherent in incorporating sources into academic writing. Thompson (2011), for example, argued that such approaches do not recognise the “contradictory and ambivalent aspects of authorship and textual ownership that are inherent in the kinds of subtle intertextual and linguistic manipulations that writing for the academy demands” (p. 173).

Yet in addition to the aspects of knowledge addressed above, other forms of student knowledge challenged these views and conveyed a more nuanced understanding of the issues surrounding NESB student textual borrowing and an awareness of some of its more “ambivalent aspects” (Thompson, 2011, p. 173). Such knowledge may be seen as evidence of the tensions operating between competing understandings of knowledge and practices of textual borrowing that exist between individuals, institutions, and cultures. These views are explored in the following section.
7.3 Problematising and Challenging Conventional Views

As demonstrated above, while student knowledge to an extent reflected conventional views on plagiarism that researchers have identified in academia, a key finding of this thesis is that these views were by no means consistent or absolute. Rather, the perspectives of the participants in this study also foregrounded what Thompson (2011) terms “tensions inherent in all academic writing” (p. 155) that run counter to accepted views which privilege originality and the autonomous author. These challenges to accepted discourse included a belief of some of the students that there was too much institutional emphasis on plagiarism which detracted from the business of teaching and learning at the university, contrasting views on the ownership of knowledge, and knowledge of different conventions and practices across cultural, institutional, and disciplinary contexts.

7.3.1 Plagiarism vs. pedagogy.

While the majority of participants agreed with the institutional perspective on the importance of following textual borrowing conventions and avoiding plagiarism, several students challenged what they felt was the overemphasis on plagiarism in their courses which they believed distracted from their actual coursework and learning. This point can be illustrated by the comment of one student who wrote, “in university academic writing is used for testing of students’ learning, not for testing of someone’s cheating” (B5, D4). For another student, this perspective resulted in an accusation of plagiarism and failure of an assignment due to lack of referencing. She wrote in her journal that after this incident, “I accepted this ‘silly rule’ because I did not want to fail (B4, D4)”. For this student, it is not clear whether this incident resulted in internalisation of the “rules” or whether she maintained her viewpoint but simply changed her practice. However, the comment does serve to illustrate the tensions that arise when what Canagarajah (2002b) terms “discourses of the vernacular community” can be seen coming into contact with the “discourses and cultural practices of academic communities” (p.30).

This finding corresponds with that of Angélil-Carter (2000) who found similar views held by her student writers in South Africa. They resented the emphasis placed on plagiarism by academic institutions and the implications carried by the conventional discourse about the potential dishonesty of students who engage in unacknowledged textual borrowing. Similarly, Thompson and Pennycook (2008) found that while the participants in their study did not overtly challenge the rules surrounding source incorporation in academic writing, they
demonstrated “frustration and minor forms of resistance” (p. 134) in their questioning of conventions and strategies such as referencing and paraphrasing. Such perspectives appear to support Canagarajah’s (2000b) argument that in the process of developing academic literacy, NESB students are not passive recipients of knowledge, but rather may struggle against what they perceive to be unreasonable restrictions, either overtly or covertly.

7.3.2 Knowledge ownership.

Another area in which traditional notions of authorship were challenged was in students’ perspectives on the possible contributing factors to student plagiarism. While straightforward reasons such as error and forgetfulness were common, another frequent response was the suggestion that conflicting epistemological beliefs, such as contrasting views of knowledge between individuals or cultures, could result in inadvertent plagiarism. This theme appeared both in the questionnaire responses and in the journal and interview data (see sections 4.2.2 and 5.2.2). In particular, a number of students suggested that contrasting perceptions about what constituted common knowledge could result in unacknowledged textual borrowing, arising from the belief that certain knowledge was in the public domain, and there were a number of responses such as, “there is common knowledge that we do not know who stated originally. What happens to these common knowledge do we still be accused of being plagiarised?” (C1, D4). The issue of common knowledge and its significance in textual borrowing practices has also been identified by other researchers working on NESB academic writing, including Angélil-Carter (2000), Chandrasoma et al. (2004), Thompson, (2011), and Shi (2011, 2012). For example, Thompson (2011) found that participants in her study identified the importance of disciplinary and cultural contexts in determining what is common knowledge, and hence when attribution is necessary. This finding is significant because, as noted in section 2.3.3, an understanding of common knowledge in textual borrowing is essential as it is one form of knowledge that is not necessary to cite in academic writing. While this is often assumed to be standard across the academy in pedagogical writing texts available to students (such as Hacker, 2008; Troyka, 1993), researchers working on academic writing and literacy have shown that common knowledge is highly-discipline specific (Pecorari, 2008; Shi, 2011), thus making what is necessary to cite in one context unnecessary in the next.

Other perspectives on knowledge ownership that challenged the traditional model included those of several participants who questioned whether ideas that occurred simultaneously to different people could cause plagiarism, or whether collaboration on group projects would be judged as plagiarism. Shi (2006) found similar results among her
participants, who considered that words or ideas could be shared in certain contexts. Shi’s participants viewed student collaboration as a special case of borrowing that was crucial in the learning process, and therefore not equivalent to plagiarism. Similarly, Evans and Youmans’ (2000) study found that a number of participants felt that institutional prohibitions on plagiarism affected their abilities to work collaboratively. Pennycook’s (1996) participants were also ambivalent about the imposition of what they felt were foreign cultural values through the English language.

7.3.3 Perceptions of cultural influence.

Within the conventional view of plagiarism the prohibition against unacknowledged textual borrowing and the textual conventions used to prevent it are often presented as if they are universal (Howard, 1999). This has the homogenising effect of potentially erasing differences in knowledge about textual borrowing and plagiarism that may exist across different cultural, institutional, or disciplinary contexts. As noted in the Literature Review section 2.1.1, while a number of studies have attempted to demonstrate differences between cultural groups’ knowledge of plagiarism, others have challenged what has been termed the “cultural deficit approach” (Baurain, 2011, p. 130), suggesting that research which ascribes differences in knowledge of plagiarism to cultural causes can perpetuate damaging stereotypes about NESB students.

While the questionnaire data showed no significant differences between the ways in which different cultural groups perceived plagiarism and textual borrowing (i.e., between the Chinese and non-Chinese groups), a key finding of this thesis is that many of the students themselves perceived these differences to exist. For example, a number of journals contained comments such as: “we do not have such restriction on copying in my country” (C10, D4), and “China don’t have the terms of plagiarism. Students don’t need to worry about this issue...plagiarism does not taken seriously in my country” (B11, D4). These participants were from China, and their observations echo those in a number of studies which claim that there are contrasting academic citation conventions and views on plagiarism in Chinese and other Asian cultures (for example Dryden, 1999; Hayes & Intron 2005a, 2005b; Lund, 2004, Sowden, 2005).

Another participant wrote that while his university (in Spain) did have conventions regarding source use and referencing, the punitive tone that characterises conventional discourses against plagiarism was lacking. He noted, “the term is not used at my university...to give good references is also basic and evaluated, but the warnings about cheating or using others’ writes are not always present” (B1, D4). This perspective is similar
to that noted by some of Shi’s (2006) participants who had attended academic institutions in their home countries where plagiarism “was not treated as a crime but as a problem of style” (p. 272).

Thus it appears that some students were in possession of knowledge about source use practices in other cultural contexts, knowledge which challenged the conventional view of plagiarism which de-contextualises knowledge and practice (Pennycook, 2006). Whether or not the participants’ perceptions were accurate reflections, it is with this knowledge that the students approached their academic writing and through which they developed their understandings of textual borrowing within this academic context. Such perspectives, according to Chandrasoma et al. (2004), highlight the constructed nature of knowledge and pose a challenge to “dominant ideologies in the West of the autonomous creator and owner of individually produced texts” (p. 174). This is significant because, as Chandrasoma et al. (2004) note, it is important to understand how “student epistemologies” (p. 189) and their understandings of contrasting contexts of knowledge production, intersect and influence the dominant epistemologies of the academy, specifically in this case, those concerning the construction of academic knowledge through source-based academic writing.

Yet although such understandings challenge the conventional discourse, they also may serve to uphold cultural stereotypes about NESB students and textual borrowing. As noted in the Literature Review, section 2.1.2, a number of scholars have challenged this view (e.g., Gu & Brookes, 2011; Liu, 2005), and suggested this perspective reduces a complex phenomenon to simplistic generalisation. Bloch and Chi (1995) suggest that the differences they observed in the ways that NESB (Chinese) and ESB researchers used citations may be due to a number of factors such as availability of resources or political concerns. However, it appears that some of the students may have internalised what have been characterised as cultural stereotypes, as can be seen in the following comment from Mariko: “Japanese people like to follow other people…so I think many people plagiarise” (M Int. p. 15). As already noted, while these views may not be an accurate reflection of the status of textual borrowing in the participants’ home countries or cultures, the fact remains that they are the lens through which the students approach knowledge construction and academic composition in this culture, and are thus significant factors to consider when examining their beliefs and practices regarding source use and academic writing.

7.3.4 Perceptions of institutional and disciplinary requirements.

As well as knowledge of the cultural specificity of textual borrowing conventions, a number of students were also aware that what could be considered plagiarism was to a certain
extent dependent on disciplinary and institutional contexts. While in the questionnaire data there was no significant difference between disciplinary groups in their knowledge of an attitudes towards plagiarism, in the qualitative data a number of students indicated an awareness of the differences in rules against plagiarism at different institutions (e.g., between high schools, the Polytechnic, and the university) and departments (e.g., between departments such as Computer Science and Accounting - see section 6.4). For example, Xiao Wen from the embedded case study group noted, “The University’s more serious [about plagiarism] than the Polytechnic. The Polytechnic is sort of like a small family and a few plagiarism is ok…it wont get you really, um serious penalty” (XW Int. p. 18). These findings correspond with that of Shi (2006) who found in her study that students had different experiences with learning about and using textual borrowing conventions depending on their institutional backgrounds. Similarly, Hu and Lei’s (2012) study identified disciplinary differences in NESB students’ ability to recognise textual borrowing and their perceptions of plagiarism.

7.3.5 Contrasting pedagogies.

Also running contrary to the traditional discourse of plagiarism was the observation made by several participants in the embedded case study group that pedagogical strategies such as copying and memorisation could sometimes be used as a writing strategy. Possible reasons given in the data for using this strategy were a desire to emulate the source text, or admiration of it. As Yue Yan put it in section 6.3, discussing students who copied other’s texts, “maybe they just think the sentence itself is really good, cos they think its a fantastic essay” (YY Int. p. 12). Case study participants Yu Ming and Rowena made similar observations.

The suggestion that textual borrowing may be an intentional act not of deception or dishonesty, but arising out of a motive such as the desire to emulate or model, has also been found in the literature on L2 textual borrowing. Studies by Lackie and D’Angelo-Long (2004), Shei (2005), and Sowden (2005) suggest that by emphasising traditional approaches to teaching and learning, Asian cultures in particular may influence students to memorise or copy texts. However, researchers such as Pennycook (1996) Bloch and Chi (1995) warned that this influence can be overstated as a cause of student plagiarism. Certainly in this study, these students were very aware of Western conventions of plagiarism and textual borrowing, but as has been shown, this knowledge existed alongside alternative pedagogies and strategies that they did not themselves consider as falling under the umbrella of plagiarism. Pennycook (1996) argued that alternative pedagogies such as memorisation should not be considered inferior (and thus as part of the deficit model of source use), but should be seen as valid
learning approaches that can complement, not disrupt, accepted approaches. He noted that
textual borrowing was often viewed by his students as “an underappreciated approach to
learning or an act of resistance” (Pennycook, 1996, p. 226).

More practical motives appeared to be behind the copying and memorisation practices
of some of the students in this study, who noted that they had used memorisation as a learning
technique when preparing for their IELTS examinations. Daniel and Yue Yan both mentioned
that they had studied and memorised old essay topics when studying for IELTS examinations.
However, their motivations for this practice seemed to have been mediated by the nature of
the examination itself, which they felt “recycled” topics from year to year. As Yue Yan wrote
about the topics, “people have been writing again and again and again” (YY Int. p.3). This
suggests that in examining memorisation and copying as pedagogical strategies it is necessary
to consider the background contexts of the practice, rather than ascribing it to cultural
influences alone.

Thus it appears that NESB student knowledge of plagiarism and textual borrowing can
be seen as existing on a continuum between two poles - between knowledge which conforms
to the conventional descriptions of plagiarism and plagiarism avoidance (through appropriate
textual borrowing practices), and that which challenges or problematises these conventions.
NESB student academic writing is constructed in the space between the ends of the
continuum, in a site of tension and sometimes of overt contradiction. Students are expected to
assimilate knowledge of plagiarism and textual borrowing conventions at an institutional
level, and the results show that to an extent the participants in this study had achieved this
level of knowledge. This was demonstrated by their awareness of the institutional importance
of plagiarism, the way in which their view reflected the punitive nature of the discourse of
plagiarism, and their understandings of referencing as the main way to avoid transgressing the
rules against plagiarism. It has also been shown that in many respects this knowledge
operated at a superficial level, for example, in the data on definitions of plagiarism. However,
as Shi (2006) noted, the prevalent discourse against plagiarism itself operates at a somewhat
superficial level. She wrote that this institutional discourse “represents only one simplistically
construed facet of the larger issue of textual appropriation and the sociology of knowledge”
(p. 276).

Yet at the same time, some students were aware of and sometimes actively questioned
what they saw as problems inherent in the conventions, or what others perceived as their own
difficulties conforming to the conventions. This suggests that, as Ivanič (1998) argued, the
students were not passive recipients of this discourse but were involved in, and were
sometimes aware of, the tensions inherent in the relationship between themselves as individuals and the institutions and disciplines within which they were working.

7.4 Textual Borrowing Practices

This section discusses Research Question Two: How do NESB undergraduates use sources in an EAP writing course? It is divided into two main sections - the first section summarises the key findings from the questionnaire data in which students’ reported practice of source use is discussed. The second section discusses the key findings of Chapter Six, which analysed the coursework of the ten embedded case study participants. The results are discussed and placed in the context of the literature.

7.4.1 Reported source use.

This section reports on key findings from the questionnaire data in which the respondents reported on their textual borrowing and referencing practices. The most significant result from this data concerned the perceived difference between the use and referencing of quotations, and the use and referencing of other forms of source use such as paraphrase and summary. The majority of the students indicated that they frequently or always made major changes to source texts when incorporating them into their writing, either through significant changes or total paraphrase of textual material. Over half also indicated that they never or seldom engaged in verbatim copying of source texts. This contrasts with the findings of Hayes and Introna (2005a) who found that the majority international students from various backgrounds reported having engaged in some kind of verbatim copying.

Over half of the students responded that they never or seldom incorporated unreferenced quotations in their writing. However, at the same time almost three quarters indicated that they used unreferenced paraphrases in their writing, and over half reported that they used unreferenced summaries in their work. The reported practice of using unreferenced paraphrasing in academic writing is similar to that observed by Maxwell et al. (2006) who found this to be the most common form of non-prototypical textual borrowing reported by students in their comparative survey of ESB and NESB undergraduates.

It appears from this data on participants’ reported textual borrowing practices that while the students appeared to believe that making sentence-level changes to source texts in writing was important, they attached less significance to the need for referencing this incorporated textual material. This finding also corresponds with that of Chandrasegaran (2000) who found that participants in her study viewed unattributed quotation and
unattributed paraphrase differently. While they regarded the former type of source use as dishonest, they regarded the latter form as acceptable. Similarly, Chen and Ku (2008), who conducted a survey into Asian students’ understandings and beliefs about plagiarism, found that the majority of students (over 80%) considered verbatim copying as plagiarism, but did not consider copied text that had been altered by the addition of their own ideas to be plagiarism. This indicates that students may perceive textual transformation to be the main requirement for appropriate source use, and that the need to provide references for the sources transformed in such a way is less important than when using text that is directly copied via quotation. It also suggests that students perceive quotations in a different way than other types of source use such as paraphrasing and summary - when incorporating a quotation into a text, the ownership of the material is signalled by the presence of the quotation marks, and hence the need to provide a reference is clear. However, once the text has been altered, the question of ownership perhaps becomes less transparent - that is, once students have, in their view, paraphrased the text, does it then become their own words? It is possible that once students have attempted to paraphrase or summarise a source text by putting it in “their own words”, as injunctions against plagiarism require (Price, 2008), do they believe that they have fulfilled that requirement? However, when quoting directly from the text, the need to acknowledge “ownership” may be more transparent to students.

It was reported in the previous section on student knowledge of plagiarism that the majority of students expressed an understanding that referencing was necessary to avoid plagiarism. However, it becomes clear on further examination of the data on reported practice that when it came to use, students found distinguishing between correct and incorrect source use more difficult. These difficulties become even more apparent when considering the data on students’ actual practice of source use, as described in the following section.

7.4.2 Actual source use.

Whereas the previous section discussed the key findings on students’ reported source use and referencing, the following section discusses the ways in which students actually used sources and referencing in their written work. The data discussed in this section comes from the participant embedded case studies presented in Chapter Six.

7.4.2.1 Patchwriting.

The results of this study seem to confirm what has been widely suggested in the literature about NESB student textual borrowing strategies, in that there were large amounts of patchwriting, (defined by Howard, 1995 as textual copying with minor changes in syntax
and vocabulary at the sentence level, such as synonym substitution) in all the task types and among all the ten participants (e.g., Davis, 2013; Howard, 1995; Howard et al, 2010; T. Hyland, 2009; Keck, 2006, 2007; Shi, 2004; Weigle & Parker, 2012). From a pedagogical point of view, this is problematic for the students because patchwriting is considered as a non-prototypical textual borrowing strategy that may not easily be distinguishable from intentional textual appropriation (Shi, 2004). Accordingly, Pecorari (2003) calls for patchwriting to be “recognised as a neutral rather than a stigmatizing error” (p. 342). The following points may be made about the nature of the students’ patchwriting in their written assignments.

**7.4.2.2 Inconsistency.**

The amount and type of textual borrowing varied between individuals and there appeared to be little consistency in the ways in which the individuals in the study used sources during the course. In Mariko’s paraphrase assignment, for example, 48.7% of the total number of words was coded as close modification of the original text, while in her research essay, 26% was directly copied from her source texts. Rowena, who successfully paraphrased the source text in her first assignment (44.9% of the total word count was coded as extensive modification, making it a prototypical paraphrase), was less able to successfully integrate sources in her research essay, which contained 15.5% closely modified (or patchwritten) text. Daniel, whose first paraphrase assignment contained 81% closely modified text, produced a research essay which used summary as its primary method of textual borrowing.

Another key finding was that in addition to there being no clear preferred strategy, the participants tended to combine strategies - that is, rather than incorporating discrete paraphrases or summaries, or strings of copied and strings of modified words in their texts, their source use combined strategies and prototypical source use existed in many cases directly alongside non-prototypical use. This occurred both at a sentence and a paragraph level. For example, direct copying was embedded in strings of closely modified or extensively modified text at sentence level in the writing of Mariko (see section 6.2), Yue Yan (see section 6.3), and Yu Ming (see section 6.5). At a paragraph level, extensively modified sentences followed by direct copying were common in Rowena’s research essay (see section 6.8).

This finding corresponds with that of Keck (2010) who found in her comparative analysis of L1 and L2 paraphrasing strategies that the writers in her study (both NESB and ESB) used a variety of forms of textual modification within a single paraphrase, and that extensive revision (hence prototypical source use) was often incorporated right next to direct copying or closely modified text (hence non-prototypical). This is significant from a
pedagogical standpoint because often paraphrase, summary, and quotation are treated as if they are discrete entities that exist in isolation from each other. It might be more fruitful to recognise the diverse and fluid ways in which students use sources in their writing, and help students identify the ways in which different types of source use strategies interrelate with each other.

Thus, one of the key findings of this study is that while, like other studies, patchwriting was a characteristic of the participants’ texts, there was a great deal of individual variation in the ways the students attempt to integrate their sources into their written work, as well identifying a complex relationship between the different forms of source-incorporation strategies. This finding corresponds with that of T. Hyland (2009), who noticed a wide variation in the ways in which the individuals, both ESB and NESB, appropriated sources in their writing. The results suggest that, as the above researchers have argued (e.g., Howard, 1995; Howard et al, 2010; Keck, 2006, 2007; Shi, 2004; Weigle & Parker, 2012), patchwriting is a developmental phenomenon. However, it is important to recognise that the nature of that development may not be linear, and students may appear not to acquire the ability to use sources in a unidirectional manner.

This view on the trajectory of the development of textual borrowing ability is similar to that made by Davis (2013). This longitudinal study, which analysed textual borrowing in student writing in an EAP course and a following Master’s programme, found that while the students progressed during the EAP course, as they went on in their Master’s programme, in which conventions for source use became more discipline-specific than in the generic EAP programme, the students developed more problems with non-prototypical textual borrowing. Such problems included over-citation, limited and repetitive attribution strategies, direct copying, and insufficient attribution. Davis (2013) discussed the importance of considering the specific nature of the development of source use, arguing, “the development of source use is an individual period of learning” (p. 133).

Ouellette (2008) made a similar argument regarding the nature of the development of source use in his discussion of NESB student textual borrowing. Also utilising a case study methodology, Ouellette (2008) combined qualitative and text analyses to examine the ways in which one NESB university student constructed authorial identity in her academic writing. Like the results discussed above, Ouellette identified a number of instances of non-prototypical textual borrowing (including close modifications of source texts, direct copying, and inadequate referencing and attribution) and noted that improvement occurred only after many cycles of feedback and redrafting. Ouellette (2008) suggests that in the development of writer identity (and by implication, the ability to incorporate sources more successfully),
students may follow a pattern akin to the development of interlanguage. Making a parallel with Ellis' (1995) discussions of second language acquisition he suggested that, language learning does not proceed in incremental stages such that one linguistic feature is fully acquired before moving on to acquire the next. Rather, language learning proceeds qualitatively such that learning stages are characterized by qualitative shifts in errors that may superficially suggest lack of learning but may actually represent necessary behavior for development to proceed. (Ouellette, 2008, p. 268)

Ouellette (2008) argued that this pattern of development is U-shaped - that as students develop more ability to appropriate sources and incorporate them in their texts, and as they acquire more sophisticated ways of establishing their authorial identity in their writing, the more scope there is for error. However, he argues that viewing such non-prototypical textual borrowing as evidence of a deficit in knowledge or an ethical failure, is to overlook the fact that in making textual choices, even if they are not successful choices, the learner is “actively dialoging with texts and actively learning” (Ouellette, 2008, p. 268).

In section 2.1.2 the pitfalls of a deficit approach to second language writing were outlined (Bloch, 2008; Zamel, 1997), and Ouellette (2008) suggested that it is necessary to review perspectives on authorial identity and textual borrowing and consider them within the wider context of second language acquisition, rather than seeing non-prototypical textual borrowing as evidence of a deficiency in skill (or if viewed through the lens of the ethical discourse of plagiarism, as evidence of dishonesty). But importantly, it is not development that occurs in a linear and consistent way, but development that occurs unevenly and in an irregular fashion over time. This would accord with the view forwarded by Larsen-Freeman (2006) who argues that second language acquisition and development does not traverse through “discrete stages”, rather that there is much variation both between and within learners’ performances.

7.4.2.3 Quotations and ideas.

While there was extensive non-prototypical textual borrowing, the students also demonstrated their ability to use prototypical textual borrowing strategies through the use of quotations. As discussed in section 7.4.1, the data on students’ perceived practice of textual borrowing suggested that this is the least problematic type of source use, with the majority of questionnaire respondents reporting that they never incorporated unreferenced quotations in their writing. Also, in the text data the participants used quotations, which was the most
frequently referenced strategy overall (95% were referenced in total). However, there was a
good deal of individual variation in how they were used. For example, in Daniel’s take home
test essay, almost a quarter of his text was direct quotation, but it made up only 3.2% of his
research essay. Rowena’s take home test essay was 16.5% quotation but she did not use any
direct quotations in her research essay. In fact, overall the participants used relatively few
direct quotations in their research essay.

This finding contrasts with some of the literature on NESB textual borrowing which
has found, particularly in comparison to ESB writers, that NESB writers use direct quotes
more frequently due to, it is argued, an inability or unwillingness to paraphrase (e.g., Borg,
2000; Campbell, 1990; Davis, 2013). However, Storch (2009) found more infrequent use of
direct quotes in her study, while Petrić (2012) found that less proficient writers used direct
quotes less frequently than the more proficient writers.

The incorporation of quotations was not without difficulty in the student texts. One
transgressive feature of their quotation use was the use of secondary citations, in which they
referred to a source text or author of a quotation that they had not consulted, taking the
quotation and reference from another source (Pecorari, 2008). Xiao Wen, Daniel, and Susana
all used secondary references for quotations in their work. This feature of student writing has
also been identified by researchers such as Pecorari (2003, 2006, 2008) and Wette (2010) as a
problematic aspect of student source use. However, although it is a practice which runs
counter to academic convention, it is perhaps again evidence of students’ attempts, albeit not
successful ones, of creating a network of authorial voices within their writing, perhaps in an
attempt to gain membership to an academic discourse community (Petrić, 2012).

Another type of source use identified, particularly in the research essay, was what was
termed “idea borrowing”. This occurred in instances of source use that were neither examples
of the triadic model of source use of paraphrase, summary, and quotation (Barks & Watts,
2001), but neither were they examples of borrowed source text transformed through
patchwriting (direct copying or close modification). Rather, these appeared to be instances in
which students borrowed from the source texts at the level of ideas (termed global
patchwriting by Abasi & Akbari, 2008). Like direct quotations, they were considered as
attempts at prototypical source use due to the presence of a reference or an attributing phrase.
Yue Yan, for example, used a combination of textual borrowing strategies in her essay, but a
third of the textual borrowing was coded as borrowed idea. Idea borrowing was also
identified in the writing of Rowena, Susana, Anna, and Daniel. Abasi and Akbari (2008)
suggest that global patchwriting results in texts that are “bricolages of other peoples’
arguments” (p. 275). Indeed the student texts in this study were similar, however, at least in
the use of direct quotations and borrowed ideas, but for the most part, the students acknowledged, via reference or attributing phrases, that they were other people’s ideas that they were attempting to incorporate into their texts, which is, after all, what is required of them by institutional plagiarism policy.

It may be more fruitful, therefore, rather than viewing student textual borrowing practices as dichotomous, being either prototypical (and good) or non-prototypical (and bad), to see these practices as existing on a continuum from text to ideas - quotation, a form which requires no transformation would be on one end of the continuum, and borrowed ideas would be on the other end, with forms of textual modification to varying degrees between these poles.

7.4.2.4 Textual ownership through referencing and attribution.

Referencing and attribution are perhaps the most obvious of the textual markers which acknowledge that the material in the students’ texts has come from an outside source, and the absence of such markers can be the first sign of textual borrowing issues in student work which may be indicative of intentional or unintentional plagiarism. As discussed in sections 2.2.3 and 2.2.4, non-referencing and lack of conventional attribution strategies have been identified in NESB academic writing both at the undergraduate and graduate level (e.g. Campbell, 1995; Mansourizadeh & Ahmad, 2011; Pecorari, 2004, 2006; Shi, 2004; Storch, 2009; Weigle & Parker, 2012). One of the key findings of this thesis is that despite the extensive forms of patchwriting identified in the student texts, (as discussed above), many of the instances of non-prototypical source use identified in the student texts were also accompanied by a reference and/or an attributing phrase. For example, 25 directly copied strings of text were identified in Xiao Wen’s research essay, yet almost one third of these also contained references to the source texts. They were not incorporated as quotations but neither were they strings of text of which Xiao Wen was claiming ownership herself, because in many of the instances they were referenced through the use of in-text citations. This can be seen in the following example,

Although television has the potential to support development, but it often show negative cognitive lessons on children, individuals leaving the action movie had even higher levels of hostility than individuals prior to viewing the action movie (Black & Bevan, 1992). (XW RE ll. 78-80)

In this excerpt from Xiao Wen’s research essay, over half the words (underlined) are directly copied from a source text. Although academics do not agree on how many unacknowledged
words constitute plagiarism (Keck, 2006), such a proportion of directly copied words is clearly problematic. And yet it is clear that Xiao Wen was not claiming ownership of these words because she provided the in-text reference (although, as noted in section 6.1, Xiao Wen’s intentions in including this reference were not entirely clear, as it was a secondary reference for which she had not consulted the original text).

This pattern of providing references for non-prototypical source use (direct copies and close modifications) was also evident in the writing of the other participants, although the extent to which they provided references for borrowed text varied greatly. Yue Yan, for instance, in her research essay, incorporated three lengthy directly copied strings within the larger context of her own sentences, yet two of these were referenced, signalling her awareness that they “belonged” to another author and that she was not attempting to claim them as her own work. Mariko appeared to have more difficulty with referencing in her writing, and only 36% of the directly copied strings and 23% of the closely modified strings contained in-text references in her research essay.

For the most part, prototypical strategies were referenced more successfully among the participants (extensive modification, summary, and quotation). However, the results showed a high degree of individual variation in the ways in which the participants referenced these conventional aspects of source use. For example, in the case of extensively modified strings, the percentages of strings referenced ranged from just over half (for Susana and Mei Li), to 100% for Yu Ming.

As well as referencing, a writer’s awareness of ownership of textual material can be indicated through the presence or absence of an attributing phrase. Following Groom’s (2000) example, attributing phrases were coded as explicit if containing the name of the author, or implicit if the author was referred to indirectly (as discussed in section 3.6.1). Shi (2004) and Moore (1997) found that NESB students tended to use more implicit attributing phrases. However, analysis of attribution in the data from the case study participants found that students used a variety of attribution types, including explicit attribution, implicit attribution, and non-attribution.

These results are significant because they contribute to the discussion in the literature on student voice in academic writing. As noted in section 2.3.4, one factor that researchers have suggested may contribute to plagiarism in NESB student writing is the difficulty associated with constructing a strong sense of authorial voice (e.g., Borg, 1999; Groom, 2000; Moore, 1997). Like the results of these studies, the attributions provided by the individual students in this study were not always explicit, nor were they always present. However, the fact that they were there at all suggests two things. Firstly, the presence of an attributing
phrase, even in the absence of a reference, is further evidence that in many instances the students were not trying to appropriate texts but were, albeit in a sometimes indirect way, attempting to acknowledge the ownership of the source texts. Secondly, as Ouellette (2008) argued, these attributing phrases may be seen as evidence of the students’ engagement with the voices of the source texts in an attempt to construct their own authorial voices. While not always successful or adequate, these attempts should be taken as evidence of learning.

The argument has been advanced in some of the literature that students who engage in textual appropriation such as this are doing so because they have contrasting views on the ownership of knowledge. This is a viewpoint that has been prevalent in the literature that examines whether student textual borrowing has a cultural dimension. For example, researchers such as Shei (2005), Sowden (2005), and Lund (2004) have suggested that unacknowledged textual borrowing and extensive verbatim copying may be the result of the influence of non-Western educational cultures that have contrasting traditions of textual ownership. Borg (2000) suggested that the lack of referencing in NESB writing may be due to students’ difficulty establishing a stance towards their source material.

However, it is clear from the data analysed in this study that although the attempts at referencing and attribution were uneven and inconsistent, that students were at least making an attempt to signal textual ownership in their use of sources, even when engaging in what seems on the surface to be the most rudimentary attempts at textual integration through direct copying and close modification of source texts. The attempts may be, as Thompson (2005) argued, fluctuating and at times conflicting. However, there is clear evidence that despite the unstable nature of the attempts, students were attempting to work within the conventions of textual authorship.

We can see from the key findings presented here that the developing knowledge and practice of textual borrowing of the students in this study were neither cohesive nor consistent - while they replicated conventional views and accepted textual borrowing practices to an extent, they also challenged these beliefs and practices, sometimes in an attempt to develop their own idiosyncratic forms of knowledge and practice (Pecorari, 2006). Rather than viewing the individual student and his or her role in textual borrowing in the construction of academic writing, it may be more fruitful to examine student textual borrowing, its nature, causes, and consequences in an integrated manner (Hu & Lei, 2012). This would require using a contextually rich model that draws together the different and sometimes competing factors influencing and shaping student knowledge and practice of plagiarism and textual borrowing. Sociocultural theory, in particular, Engeström’s (1987) mediational triangle could provide such a model and this will be discussed in the following section.
7.5 Textual Borrowing - The Relationship Between Knowledge and Practice

This section examines Research Question Three: What is the relationship between student knowledge and practice of plagiarism and textual borrowing? As has been shown through the presentation of the themes in the preceding sections, student understandings of plagiarism varied between knowledge that conformed to conventional views and knowledge that challenged or problamatised conventional views. The results also showed a clear divergence between student knowledge of plagiarism and textual borrowing, and their abilities to use sources in their writing. In addition, the findings revealed contradictions not only between knowledge and practice but within aspects of individuals’ knowledge and within aspects of their practice. Such divergences have also been identified in the literature on textual borrowing across interpretative frameworks. However, where this thesis differs from existing literature is in the way that this relationship is interpreted and contextualised, and the way in which the individual is represented in relation to that context. This section examines the EAP class as a unit of analysis, returning to the primary methodological aim of the study, which was to conduct an embedded case study (Yin, 2006), and also considers the experiences of individual participants working within the larger classroom community (Fujioka, 2014).

Engeström’s (1987, 1999, 2001) triangular model is used as a framework to depict the interrelated factors that mediate behaviours of individuals within (and between) activity systems. As discussed in section 2.4.2, this model revises Vygotsky’s (1978) mediational triangle that depicted the way in which an individual subject’s goal directed actions are mediated by symbolic or material artefacts. Engeström’s (1987, 1999, 2001) model, in addition to depicting the subject, object and mediational means, expands the unit of analysis to include the rules inherent in the wider activity system, the community in which it operates, and the divisions of labour that shape the actions of the participants within the system (Swain et al., 2011).

7.5.1 The central role of contradictions within activity systems.

Within existing approaches to student textual borrowing, such as the cultural causes model and the developmental model, while the NESB students who engage in academic writing and textual borrowing are viewed as part of wider contexts (cultural, educational or disciplinary), they are seen primarily as individuals who are largely responsible for the knowledge they have and texts they produce. Their texts become self-representations, in
Prior’s (1998) words, “crystallizations of students’ intelligence, knowledge, skills, attitudes and effort” (p. 141). Viewed from this perspective, the tensions and contradictions evident within knowledge and between knowledge and practice as outlined in the first two sections of this chapter appear mainly as gaps, inconsistencies and deficiencies. Indeed, as Pecorari (2008) puts it, such interpretative approaches almost entirely view plagiarism as a result of writer deficiencies.

However, according to Engeström (1999), attempts to explain actions purely at the level of the individual can remain only partial. He argued that, “Actions are not fully predictable, rational and machine-like. The most well-planned and streamlined actions involve failures, disruptions, and unexpected innovations. These are very difficult to explain if one stays at the level of actions” (p. 32). Similarly, Lantolf and Thorne (2006) suggested that from an activity-theoretical perspective, in order to understand individual actions they must be seen within the broader context in which they occur.

Thus, examining individual actions within the context of an activity system could help to explain the inconsistencies and unevenness that characterise them (Engeström, 1999). Indeed the central role of such tensions and contradictions is one of the key principles of activity theory (Engeström, 1987, 1999; Engeström & Sannino, 2010; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Moreover, rather than viewing contradictions or tensions as inherently problematic, an activity-theoretical perspective interprets contradictions as potentially transformative. When the tensions and contradictions within systems reach a certain point, or when individuals begin to challenge “established norms” (Engeström, 2001, p. 137), new forms of activity and activity systems can be generated (Engeström, 1987)

Engeström (1987) outlined several different forms of contradictions that can occur. Primary or inner contradictions are those contained within nodes of the activity system, for example, within the subject, rules or division of labour. Secondary contradictions occur between the nodes of the system, for example between the subject and the rules. Tertiary contradictions arise when different activity systems come into contact, whereas quaternary contradictions may occur when activity systems interact and overlap with each other (Engeström, 1987). According to Roth (2004), the relationship between the individual actions and the contradictions inherent in the activity can be explained through the process of internalisation:

In the context of inner contradictions the link between individual and society is important for understanding individual experience. Thus, the individual subject may internalize the contradictions that exist at the level of society but be unaware of this process of internalization. (p. 6)
The next section considers both the individuals within the EAP class and the class as a whole as activity systems, in which the tensions within and between knowledge and practice found in the data are seen as properties of that system and its interrelations with other systems. In particular, it focuses on the primary, secondary, and tertiary contradictions that were evident in the data.

7.5.1.1 Subjects.

Within Engeström’s (1987, 1999, 2001) model of the activity system, the subject of the system is the primary unit of the analysis, which may consist of the individual or the subgroup, depending on the level of abstraction at which the model is applied (Engeström & Sannino, 2010; Swain et al., 2011). Thus, it is possible to move the focus of analysis between the entire EAP class, which was the focus of the overall case study, or the individual participants whose embedded case studies were presented in Chapter Six. Activity systems are also interconnected with and influenced by many other systems, as, according to Lantolf and Thorne (2006):

A particular educational context...is itself a part of a number of activity systems relevant to participating individuals...a single activity system is influenced by multiple other life events and communities, each of which can also be analytically described as features of other activity systems. (p. 225)

Thus, the individuals that made up the activity system of the EAP class, including the embedded case-study participants, were themselves subjects in multiple activity systems, both in their past experiences with learning and writing in other cultural, educational and institutional contexts, all with their own sometimes contrasting influences mediating their knowledge and textual production.

When considering the subject(s) of the activity system it is important not to conceive of the system as a homogenous entity (Engeström, 1993). Indeed Engeström (2001) suggested that “multi-voicedness” is a defining principle of activity systems, and that an activity system is “always a community of multiple points of view, traditions and interests” (p. 136), which can also be a source of contradiction and tension. In the case of the EAP class, this can be seen through participants’ sometimes complementary and sometimes contrasting points of view concerning aspects of plagiarism and source use, as discussed in the previous sections through the themes of Upholding and Problematising Conventional Views. It is possible for subjects to hold contradictory viewpoints simultaneously, which was also seen in the data for
this study, and from an activity theoretical standpoint, these contradictions can themselves be seen as evidence of transition and development in their understandings of plagiarism and source use.

7.5.1.2 Mediating artefacts.

The mediating artefacts of an activity system are those physical or symbolic tools with which individuals modify their environments, and which in turn serve to modify their own forms of cognition and behaviour (Vygotsky, 1978). The findings of this thesis demonstrated that mediating artefacts within the EAP course activity system were both physical tools in the form of materials used as sources (print and digital) and technologies used to search for sources (catalogues, search engines), in addition to writing technologies such as computer word processing programmes. One obvious source of secondary contradiction can be seen between contemporary digital technologies that allow access to a huge amount of source material, the facility of word processing programmes that allow the easy integration of digital source material, and the norms surrounding academic authorship and rules against plagiarism. The concerns within the academy over NESB student plagiarism and the Internet were discussed in section 2.3.3. This particular tension was not especially evident in the data for this study. Although several participants did perceive that plagiarism could be “caused” by individuals cutting and pasting text off the Internet (see section 5.3), this did not appear to be a strategy used by the participants in the case study data.

However, tensions were evident at the level of symbolic artefacts that were significant for mediating student textual borrowing. Symbolic artefacts are defined by Lantolf and Thorne (2006) as “conceptual (or ideal) aspects of human goal-directed activity that are not only incorporated into that activity, but are constitutive of it” (p. 62). In this study, such conceptual artefacts included, in particular, techniques for learning writing, and study and writing techniques used by the students to mediate their writing. While many of the participants shared the object of learning how to produce academic source-based writing, the tools, or artefacts which mediated this activity sometimes diverged with those accepted by EAP course and wider university systems. As noted in the previous section, participants had contrasting ideas concerning writing strategies, such as memorisation and copying, some of which had been learned as techniques in their home countries. Yue Yan, for example, noted that she liked to use “fantastic sentences” taken from source texts to “attract” people to her work (YY Int. p. 18 - see Section 6.3), and similar comments were made by Yu Ming (see section 6.5), and Rowena (see section 6.8). While such techniques do not necessarily lead to plagiarism per se, and while using sources as repositories for ideas concerning style and
structure is likely to be a strategy used by many learners, when such alternative pedagogies (Pennycook, 1996) come into contact with conventional pedagogies (such as conventional source use strategies such as quotation, paraphrase, and summary), and also with rules and norms concerning their use, contradictions within (artefacts) and between (artefacts and rules) the nodes of the activity system become evident.

Another symbolic artefact which mediated student textual production in this study was language. While this study did not aim to investigate the relationship between textual borrowing and proficiency levels (an avenue in the textual borrowing literature that has been explored in research into integrated tasks, e.g., Cumming et al., 2005; Plakans & Gebril, 2013; Weigle & Parker, 2012 - see section 2.2.6), the participants’ perceptions of their own language proficiency mediated their textual borrowing practices in several instances, both in the strategies they chose to integrate source texts into their writing, and in their abilities to establish a strong sense of authorial presence in their texts. Mariko, for example, expressed the difficulties that lack of proficiency could cause when paraphrasing: “if I change the words sometimes it doesn’t make sense” (M Int. p. 10 - see section 6.2). Xiao Wen, Mariko and Yue Yan indicated that they were not reluctant to express their own opinions in their source texts, nor did they feel that the voices in the texts could not be questioned or challenged, but rather that they saw proficiency as a barrier to their self-expression. Yue Yan, for example, commented that because of the language barrier she had lacked the confidence to express her own point of view in her writing (see section 6.3). Thus, although lack of a clear stance or expression of opinion in some NESB writing has been attributed by some researchers to the students’ cultural background and the influence of contrasting rhetorical traditions (see sections 2.1 and 2.2), the findings of this study suggest that other mediating influences can effect student choices in this regard.

7.5.1.3 Rules.

The rules for an activity system comprise the “explicit and implicit regulations, norms and standards that constrain actions” (Engeström & Sannino, 2010, p. 6). Key to an understanding of the rules that mediate NESB academic writing and use of sources is the fact that they exist on a continuum from the explicit prohibitions against plagiarism as outlined by the institutional plagiarism policy, to implicit and often opaque rules governing source incorporation, attribution and referencing, and academic authorship. The findings demonstrated that participants were very aware of the explicit institutional prohibitions against plagiarism and rules surrounding plagiarism and source use, as discussed in section 7.2.1. For many of the students, their understanding was limited to the most explicit of these
rules, namely, the prohibition against copying. This was clearly demonstrated in the questionnaire data and the student definitions of plagiarism discussed in section 7.2.1, in which plagiarism as direct and unacknowledged copying was the most commonly expressed understanding (see section 4.2.1). Thus a contradiction appears to exist between the way in which participants understood the rules against textual borrowing (plagiarism as copying) and the more varied ways in which the activity system of the wider institution understood these rules, namely, that direct copying is only one of many practices that can constitute plagiarism.

Engeström (1987) states that activity systems are dynamic and ever changing, and the findings also demonstrated evidence that the contradictions existing between the rules as understood by the individual participants and that of the wider system were producing change and development. For students in the journal and embedded case study groups, an awareness of the rules of the system directly mediated their writing and text construction, and in some cases, their interactions with peers. For example, Mariko was able to identify unacknowledged copying in the written work of friends who subsequently changed their work on the basis of her advice (see section 6.2). Rowena demonstrated an understanding of the role of intentionality in plagiarism when she encouraged friends who had failed an assignment because of plagiarism to explain to their instructor that their actions had been unintentional (see section 6.8).

For others, it was the experience of breaking these rules (either personally or observing the experience of peers) and the consequences that followed which mediated their activity. This is the case in the experience of participant B12, who, after receiving no marks for an unreferenced assignment started to “learn how to write and how to avoid it [plagiarism]” (B12, D4) - see section 5.1.1. For embedded case study participant Anna, although her plagiarism went undetected, she remained ashamed of her transgression, which continued to mediate her writing processes and her attempts at prototypical source use (see section 6.9).

Also mediating students’ use of sources and knowledge construction in their academic writing were the guidelines about the effective use of sources, such as Barks and Watts’ (2001) “triadic model” of quotation, paraphrase, and summary. These guidelines, although not as explicit as the institutional prohibition against plagiarism, were also available to the students in the form of instruction in lectures and tutorials and in composition guidebooks. The findings demonstrated that the students had a less than clear understanding of these “rules”. Quotation was the most successfully used form of source use identified in the text data and the majority of questionnaire respondents reported that they often or always used referenced quotations in their writing. Indeed it appears that for many participants, this action
was mediated by an awareness of and a fear of plagiarism. Susana, for example, noted that she employed a strategy of using quotations so she could be certain she was not “making anything illegal” (S Int. p. 6) - see section 6.6.

This was also the case for the other forms of source use, although to a lesser extent. Mariko, for example, noted that although paraphrasing was difficult for her, an awareness of the prohibitions against copying were forefront in her mind when she was writing, noting, “if copy too much its gonna be plagiarism” (M Int. p. 10) - see section 6.2. Other participants also reported attempting to follow referencing conventions out of a fear of plagiarism. Yue Yan (section 6.3), for example, reported referencing often out of a desire to be “safe” and not having to “worry” about plagiarism (YY Int. p. 20), while Rowena and Daniel made similar comments (see sections 6.8 and 6.4)

In addition to conventions surrounding source use and attribution are the norms surrounding academic authorship, in particular the convention that academic authors be autonomous, original, and foregrounded as a strong presence in the texts. As noted in section 2.3.1, these notions are widely considered to be what Howard (1999) termed uncontestable facts of academic authorship. From an activity-theoretical perspective, such “facts” can be seen as culturally constructed and situated rules that over time have assumed a normative status, and thus appear as natural (Russell, 1995). To a large extent it appeared that the participants had internalised these rules of academic authorship, and the respondents in the questionnaire and the embedded case study participants felt academic writing should involve expression of their own authorial voices as well as of those of the source texts (see section 4.1.6).

However, for some of the participants, other factors, such as language proficiency limited the extent to which they could follow this rule, and several of the embedded case study participants noted that while they did have opinions to express in their writing, they perceived that it was a lack of proficiency that prevented full self expression in their academic writing. For example, Zara commented, “sometimes it is really difficult to put other peoples’ opinions in my own words as English is my third language and I do not want to plagiarise” (Z J6 - see section 6.7).

While many participants accepted the rules of the wider systems, including the rules against plagiarism and conventions surrounding expression of voice, a number of students also challenged these conventions. As discussed in section 7.3, several participants questioned the institutional emphasis on plagiarism and accepted norms surrounding the epistemology of knowledge, such as understandings concerning common knowledge, knowledge ownership, and student collaboration. In these challenges to what Prior (1998) terms “dominant cultural
representations of academic work” (p. 19), primary tensions at the level of rules within the activity system can be seen articulated. These students were aware of the institutional prohibitions against plagiarism, but were able to identify tensions within the institutional discourse on plagiarism, as articulated in this comment from Susana (see section 6.6) when she wrote, “sometimes it is complicating to know when your common-knowledge finishes and starts the knowledge of the other people” (S J4).

Tertiary contradictions, or contradictions between activity systems (Engeström, 1987) can also be seen at this point, through participants’ understandings of rules against plagiarism and referencing conventions in their home cultures. As noted in section 7.3.3, a number of participants suggested that the rules against plagiarism did not exist in their home countries, or that they were different to those at the university. These students appeared to feel that it was their understandings of the rules surrounding textual borrowing in their own countries that influenced their writing activity and textual borrowing practices and those of their fellow students. Whether or not these perceptions were accurate (as discussed in section 2.1.2, one criticism that has been levelled at the cultural conditioning hypothesis is that it uncritically accepts NESB accounts of cultural textual borrowing conventions), these are the understandings with which the some students mediated their writing. One participant in this study, for example, commented that in China students had been encouraged to copy: “We did not have to reference at all. It did not matter if we copied some of existed work as long as it is not massive” (B5, D4 - see section 5.1.1).

Tertiary level contradictions can also be seen operating in the participants’ views that norms and conventions also differed across institutions, such as the Polytechnic or the university Language Centre. As discussed in section 7.3.4, many of the participants were aware that rules against plagiarism and textual borrowing differed not only between cultures, but between institutions and even within departments at the university. This was clearly articulated by Daniel who noted that in Management it was “easy” to copy, but in Accounting, it was more difficult to copy and not get “caught” (see section 6.4). It is doubtful that the activity system of the Accounting course did have prohibitions against plagiarism and the Management course did not. Rather, it seems likely that within Daniel’s own activity system he developed contextualised practices for his textual borrowing based on his individual understanding of the rules of the wider systems in which he operated.

7.5.1.4 Objects.

Another key aspect of the activity system concerns the object of the system, which Engeström and Sannino (2010) described as “the “raw material” or “problem space” (p. 6) at
which the activity is directed”. Lantolf and Thorne (2006) suggested that within educational contexts, the object can become “a nexus of power and resistance” (p. 223) because within such systems, the object may be interpreted differently based on the perspectives of the individual participants (Russell, 1995). This may result in tension within and between systems.

The findings demonstrated that differences in interpretation between activity systems at the level of objects were a significant source of tension and contradiction. The object of activity within the EAP course activity system was the acquisition of academic literacy, of which learning how to do source-based writing was a part. That the students themselves shared this general object can be seen in comments such as those made by Mei Li who said that she worked on her writing because it “require[d] long-time commitment to practice in respect of regular reading, vocabulary collection and writing exercises” (ML J5 - see section 6.10). Similar comments were made by Mariko, Yue Yan and Rowena, all of whom were committed to improving their writing skills and knowledge through their work in the EAP course, and also through taking extra writing papers or doing extra-curricular writing. In order to achieve this object, the students participated in exercises and activities designed to facilitate their learning and ability to conduct source based writing and to develop their awareness of the issues surrounding it. As discussed in section 2.2, many researchers working on the development of academic literacy believe this process to be a developmental one that takes place over time (Braine, 2002; Hedgecock, 2005; Snow, 2005; Spack, 1997). However, the object of the wider activity system of the university, which could be considered as the production of content-based academic knowledge, appeared to be in direct contradiction with the object of the EAP course, in that prohibitions against non-prototypical textual borrowing were institutionally universal. At an institutional level transgressions made by students were viewed as the result of intentional deception or student ignorance, which could be easily remedied by referring to the Dishonest Practice policy. Students appeared not to be allowed sufficient time or space outside of the EAP course to develop the skills inherent in academic literacy. Rather they were expected to partake in the object of the institution, the production of content-based academic knowledge.

7.5.1.5 Communities

Activity theory emphasises that actions are mediated by the social contexts in which they take place. Described as “individuals and subgroups who share the same general object” (Engeström & Sannino, 2010, p. 6), the community in which the EAP course was situated was the wider community of the university, comprised of individual departments and schools. It is
necessary to consider the role of community in activity systems, as the different communities in which individuals participate may contain different norms, conventions, and objects that can give rise to tensions and be a source of contradictions within the system. Such contradictions were evident in participants’ perceptions that norms concerning referencing and plagiarism differed across departments within the university. Several participants used these perceptions to mediate the writing they produced between various university departments. It appeared that the students themselves were aware of their membership in multiple communities across the university and used this awareness of community to mediate their textual production. This awareness of communities within the university with sometimes contrasting expectations and norms leads on to the next element of analysis in activity systems, which is the division of labour.

7.5.1.6 Divisions of labour.

Another key aspect of Engeström’s (1987, 1999, 2001) conceptualisation of activity systems involves the ways in which “tasks, powers and responsibilities” (Cole & Engeström 1993, p. 7) are negotiated and distributed between members of the system. When forms of writing instruction are considered from an activity theoretical perspective, although the division of labour appears to be unproblematically divided into instructors and students, in reality the participants take on many roles within this division (Prior, 2006). According to Prior (1998), in writing instruction the writing teacher is the “prime mover” within the activity system; “the teacher motivates the writer, structures the writing (process and product) through assignment and monitoring, and then delivers a final judgment, evaluating student writers and their textual products” (p. 141). In the case of EAP class, a vertical division of labour (Engeström & Sannino, 2010) existed between myself as the instructor who controlled the course content and its delivery and the design and weighting of the assessment and the students. Horizontal divisions of labour (Engeström & Sannino, 2010) existed between the participants, who themselves assumed roles of individual producers of texts for assignments and collaborators within group tasks in tutorials run by tutors. Other potential participants in the division of labour within this activity system were figures higher up on the institutional hierarchy (such as the head of the Linguistics Programme) who would have become involved if any instances of plagiarism had come to the attention of the tutors who marked the course assignments.

The findings showed that participants themselves were very aware of the power held over them by those individuals higher up on the institutional hierarchy. As demonstrated in section 5.2.3, many participants were aware that plagiarism could result in loss of marks
(assessment related consequences) or in them being, in the words of one student, “kicked out from university immediately” (C10 D4). Indeed the findings showed that to a large extent, student perceptions of the expectations of their instructors concerning their textual production mediated their academic writing, and not just in terms of their expectations concerning plagiarism and textual borrowing. The participants’ perceptions of instructor requirements concerning appropriate sources, academic style, assignment structure, choice of content, and textual borrowing strategies influenced their writing to a greater or lesser extent. For example, Yue Yan noted that her International Business instructors demanded a “very, very strict academic style” (YY Int. p. 15), while Mei Li used academic journals in her writing because “they [instructors] think they are more reliable, yeah, more valuable” (ML Int. p. 9).

What is interesting about the division of labour in a writing class such as the EAP course, or in many situations in which the students produce assignments specified by instructors for assessment, is that the students must assume responsibility for the textual product and the consequences for any violation of textual norms that have taken place. However, they are given little power over their own textual production and as the findings show, work largely through their perceptions of what is required of them. Rather, it is the instructor who chooses the parameters of the assessment - the form of the assignment, the length, the topic, sometimes the sources and the assessment criteria. Prior (2006) notes, “The fact that students are typically held fully accountable as authors is thus an interesting cultural practice, pointing both to the power and the subject producing dimensions of writing in school” (p. 58).

This appears to give rise to a secondary contradiction in such activity systems between the division of labour, in which the student occupies a position at the bottom of the hierarchy and is expected to perform the tasks and produce texts assigned to them according to the explicit or tacit guidelines of the instructor, and the rules and norms surrounding academic authorship in which the individual author assumes full responsibility for the texts they produce (Howard, 1999). Another contradiction appears between the status of student writer as learner, and the more explicit institutional prohibitions against plagiarism, in which this learner status is not accepted as a valid reason for violating these norms. The university’s Dishonest Practice policy states that unintentional plagiarism is “usually due to lack of care, naivety, and/or to a lack of understanding of acceptable academic behaviour” (“Dishonest Practice Information for Students”, n.d.). However, while this position does recognise that transgressing textual conventions can be unintentional, it does not accept the remedy to the problem to be one of learning, stating, “This kind of plagiarism can be easily avoided” (“Dishonest Practice Information for Students”, n.d.).
According to Engeström and Sannino (2010), the object is turned into outcomes “with the help of instruments, that is, tools and signs” (p. 6). In educational contexts, the outcome of activity may be considered as greater knowledge and understanding of the object of the educational activity (Swain et al., 2011). As illustrated in Chapter Six, the texts produced by the participants remained uneven and in many respects violated the explicit norms of textual borrowing and rules against plagiarism. At the same time, the student knowledge and practice of textual borrowing did show evidence of development. This could be seen particularly in their use of attribution, even in instances of non-prototypical textual borrowing. As the findings demonstrated (see section 7.4.2.4) while the textual borrowing in the text data was in many instances non-prototypical, the fact that it was often referenced and/or attributed to the source author shows that to some extent the students were aware of and attempting to acknowledge outside authorial voices.

Traditional interpretative models might question if development has in fact taken place in the face of such transgressive textual borrowing. Within the moral discourse on plagiarism that, in the view of some researchers (e.g., Baurain, 2011; Leight, 1999; McGowan, 2008; Pecorari, 2001; Pecorari & Petrić, 2014; Sutherland-Smith, 2008, 2011), continues to dominate discussions outside the fields of applied linguistics and composition studies, the concepts of learning and development appear not to be relevant at all. Within this discourse, the student becomes morally responsible for the textual choices made in his or her writing and contradictions between knowledge and practice may be interpreted as not simply as deficits in knowledge, but as moral deficiencies. This is often true even when the student has unknowingly transgressed source use conventions, which in many institutions is treated under the same rubric of “dishonest practice” as intentional plagiarism (Leight, 2008; Pecorari, 2008; Valentine, 2006).

Within the cultural causes model, which was outlined in section 2.1, the individual students are seen as having internalised cultural modes of thought and practice that dominate their thinking and practice in the new educational environment, and there is little sense of individual agency on the part of the students and their textual choices. In this sense, the cultural causes model contrasts with the moral discourse model in that in the former, the individual is imparted with full responsibility for the act of plagiarism, whereas in the latter, they retain little agency at all. Similarly, the academic literacies model, as introduced in section 2.2, focuses on NESB students as individuals who are undergoing a process of the acquisition of academic literacy (Ferris & Hedgcock, 1998; Newman, 2002). While the ability to use sources effectively is, importantly, conceived of as a developmental phenomenon,
contradictions and tensions within and between knowledge and practice are seen as problems to be solved through the imparting of more knowledge, which, if mastered at the individual level, will alleviate problems with textual borrowing and lead to greater levels of academic literacy.

In both interpretative frameworks, the contradictions that are evident between student knowledge of plagiarism and textual borrowing and their practice are explained, in the first instance, as evidence of prior culturally informed knowledge that is “interfering” with the practice in the L2, and in the second instance, as evidence of the students’ position on a hierarchy of learning and development - when more knowledge is imparted, better practice will result. In both, understanding and practice are seen in a linear fashion, with movement proceeding in a unidirectional way from correct understanding to correct practice. In such models, learning is evident when changes are observed in the subjects and when there is qualitative change in both the “behavior and cognition of the learner” (Engeström & Sannino, 2010, p. 8).

These interpretative frameworks are also similar in the ways in which they represent the trajectory of learning and development. In this view of learning, development is depicted as a “vertical process aimed at elevating humans upwards, to higher levels of development” (Engeström, 2001, p. 153). While this learning trajectory may be true for some things, it may be that for others, the developmental trajectory is not always upwards. The danger inherent in a narrow view of learning is that when an individual’s development deviates from this trajectory, their knowledge/practice may become viewed as deficient, problematic, or absent. This is especially problematic when it comes to NESB student writing and the development of source use because the consequences of error can be serious, a fact which many of the students in the study were well aware.

However, from an activity theory perspective, learning is not linear or unidirectional, as Larsen-Freeman (2006) suggested. Prior (1998) argues:

Learning is not a one-way flow from external to internal, nor is action a one-way flow from internal to external. Activity is always an interpenetrated confluence of internal and external. Internalized practices are constantly being externalized, to be distributed among people, embedded in fleeting or durable artifacts, and (re)internalized. (p. 29)

This point is supported by Swain et al. (2011) who suggested that, “research and analyses through an activity theory framework challenge the linear cause and effect model of learning centered inside an individuals’ brain with a model that positions learning in the varied
interactions between individuals” (p. 111). Indeed the nature of development of the participants in this study may be described both as non-linear, in that the movement was not always in a forward direction, and asynchronous, in the sense that appropriate knowledge of textual borrowing and appropriate practice did not always occur at the same time. In some cases, appropriate knowledge preceded appropriate practice, and in some cases it followed students being made aware of inappropriate practice. For example, the case study participants were generally familiar with the idea of plagiarism, its possible causes and consequences, and its institutional significance, in addition to sometimes viewing the practice as unethical and immoral. However, such knowledge did not prevent them from incorporating substantial amounts of non-prototypical textual borrowing in their written work. For others, the practice of textual borrowing preceded the development of knowledge, as in the case of Anna (see section 6.9) who arrived in New Zealand with little knowledge of academic writing conventions and (in her view) handed in a plagiarised assignment for assessment, an experience which continued to affect her perception of herself as a writer and her practice of textual borrowing. Thus, it may not be effective to view learning about plagiarism and textual borrowing as a case of unilinear knowledge transmission from instructor to student.

Another challenge activity theory brings to discussions of student textual borrowing is that it requires the multiple contexts in which activity takes place and which mediate individual and group activity to be taken seriously, which has consequences for the way intentionality is viewed in relation to NESB plagiarism and textual borrowing. According to Swain et al. (2011), one of the key tenets of activity theory in particular and sociocultural theory in general is that “people are social beings who embody their contexts and are not merely influenced by them” (p. 111). Nardi (1996) supports this point, arguing that within an activity theory framework, “what takes place in an activity system composed of objects, actions and operation, is the context” (p. 76). She suggests that context is not an “outer container or shell” (Nardi, 1996, p. 77) but rather context (which is made up of the elements of Engeström’s (1987) model as outlined above) is internal to individuals as well as external. Such a view runs counter to the assumption, which is apparent in the approaches to NESB textual borrowing outlined above, that “although people operate in social contexts, for each individual knowledge is individually, psychologically developed and possessed” (Swain et al., 2011 p. 121).

This section has attempted to answer Research Question Three: What is the relationship between student knowledge and practice of source use? by demonstrating the ways in which students’ knowledge, belief and practice of source-based writing was mediated through interaction at a variety of levels within and between different activity systems. It has
been shown that the participants encountered the rules and norms, communities, artefacts, and others in the division of labour hierarchy, interactions that helped shaped their knowledge and their practice. It is therefore important to conceive of student textual borrowing knowledge and practice as operating within the interplay of these mediating influences. In addition, displacing the dichotomy between the individual and his or her context, as explained above, and approaching NESB student textual borrowing from an activity theoretical standpoint enables the divisions between knowledge, practice, and context to be conceived of in a different way, or indeed allows for the divisions to be dissolved entirely.

7.6 Summary

This chapter has presented the main findings of the thesis and presented them in relation to the key empirical literature in the field of second language textual borrowing and to the theoretical literature concerning sociocultural theory and activity theory. It has confirmed the findings of studies that show that NESB students are aware to a large extent of the meaning and significance of plagiarism within academic discourse. However, it has attempted to demonstrate that as well as views which conform to conventional norms surrounding plagiarism and textual borrowing, elements of student knowledge challenge these norms, which reveals contradictions within the discourse on plagiarism within the academy. It has also confirmed existing literature identifying patchwriting as a prominent feature of NESB student academic writing. It has suggested that rather than viewing these inconsistencies and problems within student writing solely as evidence of individual deficiencies, that they can be interpreted as evidence of developing and transforming activity systems, both at the individual and group level.
CHAPTER EIGHT - CONCLUSION

This chapter presents the conclusion to the thesis, summarising the aims, key findings and methodological approach of the study, and evaluating its contribution to the literature on NESB students' perspectives on plagiarism and source use. In addition, it will consider the limitations of the study, and suggest avenues for further research.

Extensive research has been done into the possible causes and features of NESB student textual borrowing in the applied linguistics literature. Such research has aimed to reframe NESB non-prototypical source use and move it away from conventional approaches to plagiarism within the academy that frame it as academic misconduct or dishonest practice. Some researchers have identified the influence of students' cultural or educational backgrounds as a contributing factor in NESB student plagiarism, while others have interpreted it as an issue of academic literacy and development. However, the extent to which these contributing factors continue to influence textual borrowing in NESB student writing is still under discussion.

This study aimed to further research into NESB student textual borrowing by investigating the relationship between NESB students' knowledge and beliefs about textual borrowing and their practice of source based writing. This naturalistic case study (Stacke, 2000) of an undergraduate English for Academic Purposes class at a large New Zealand university used both quantitative survey methods and qualitative analysis of journal data written by the students on the topic of plagiarism and source use. In addition, an embedded sub-case investigation (Yin, 2006) was made of the experiences, perspectives and writing practice of ten of the participants through textual analysis of their written course work and qualitative analysis of semi-structured interviews and journals. This embedded design enabled issues and areas of significance that were uncovered in the questionnaire and journal data to be examined in more detail and allowed a focus on the ways in textual borrowing practice intersected with knowledge and belief.

The study was underpinned by a sociocultural theoretical framework, drawing in particular on activity theory and Engeström's (1987) conceptualisation of activity systems, which enabled a detailed analysis of the ways in which social, cultural, educational and institutional contexts mediated student writing practice, belief and knowledge. In doing so, it was hoped that the study could identify relevant factors that have been said to influence NESB textual borrowing practice in the literature on L2 plagiarism (moral, cultural and developmental) and consider these from an integrated perspective (Hu & Lei, 2012).
The study found that while many of the participants had not been familiar with plagiarism and source-use conventions before coming to New Zealand, by the time they took the EAP course, the majority of the students had some degree of knowledge of the concept of plagiarism and academic referencing. Moreover, it appeared that many of these students had internalised the prevailing discourse of plagiarism as a moral as well as academic issue (Valentine, 2006), thereby viewing it predominantly as an act of cheating or stealing. This finding contrasted with some of the literature that has suggested that NESB students are largely unfamiliar with Western understandings of plagiarism (such as Lund, 2004 and Hayes & Introna, 2005a, 2005b). Moreover, the participants in this study felt that plagiarism was an important and relevant personal and institutional issue, one that they took seriously in their writing and actively attempted to avoid, confirming the findings of researchers such as Abasi and Graves (2008), Li and Casanave (2012), Wheeler (2009), and Thompson (2005), whose participants had similar understandings of the cultural and institutional significance of plagiarism.

Another significant finding was that the participants in the study were both aware of and agreed with the importance of expressing their own points of view in their writing, in addition to combining it with authoritative sources. This contrasted with the literature suggesting that NESB students engage in unacknowledged copying because they “exhibit particular homage to authority” (Lackie and D'Angelo-Long, 2004, p. 35). Thus overall, the findings of this study did not support the research that suggests that cultural background is a major factor contributing to NESB student plagiarism.

Another significant finding is that while some researchers have suggested that linking plagiarism to culture may perpetuate damaging stereotypes (e.g., Gu & Brookes, 2011; Liu, 2005), a number of the participants themselves in this study seemed to have internalised some of these stereotypes and understood plagiarism as a problem affecting “Asian” students in particular (a term used by the students themselves in the data). Some appeared to understand their own textual borrowing practices as being the result of their cultural background, even though elsewhere in the data these same students professed an understanding of the importance of plagiarism avoidance and conventional textual borrowing.

In terms of textual practice, plagiarism was conceived of largely as an act of copying and it appeared that some students felt that simple textual transformation was sufficient to avoid being accused of plagiarism. The majority of students were also aware at an abstract level of referencing requirements and viewed referencing as a protection mechanism against plagiarism.
However, despite these results, analysis of the text data revealed that there was a significant gap between student knowledge of plagiarism, its nature, causes and consequences, and their ability to use sources successfully in their written texts. The textual analysis demonstrated the presence of non-prototypical textual borrowing present in all of the writing samples which the case study participants submitted for analysis, including direct copying and minor textual modifications that have been termed patchwriting in the literature (Howard, 1995), thus confirming the results of many other textual analyses of student texts (e.g., Davis, 2013; Hyland, 2009; Shi, 2004; Weigle & Parker, 2012). In addition, text analysis revealed a complex relationship between referencing, attribution and textual borrowing. In many instances referencing was not always present making all these texts in the study open to possible charges of plagiarism. However, analysis of the patterns of attribution revealed that the absence of referencing did not necessarily mean that the students were attempting to appropriate the source text, but rather that textual ownership was signaled using non-conventional means.

The analysis also demonstrated that in some instances the textual borrowing was appropriate according to given conventions of prototypical source use such as quotation, paraphrase and summary, but that often this was combined with non-prototypical textual borrowing such as direct copying or close modification.

Such findings contribute to the empirical literature on NESB plagiarism and textual borrowing and support the view expressed in much of the applied linguistics literature that the ability to use sources in academic writing is developmental (e.g., Hyland, 2009; Pecorari, 2003, 2008; Storch, 2009). However, the findings of this study extend that idea by exploring what the nature of that development might be. Rather than viewing it as part of a “developmental ladder” in which learners ascend through discrete and consistent stages towards greater proficiency (Larsen-Freeman, 2006) it appears that development is uneven, non-linear and highly individual, features which may be obscured by larger quantitative studies into textual borrowing (such as Campbell, 1995 and Keck, 2006, 2007) which have the tendency to average out crucial difference between individuals and individual learner trajectories (Larsen-Freeman, 2006). This is significant because it is the writing of individuals which is subject to scrutiny in educational contexts, and to whom penalties are applied if the work is found to be problematic. It is therefore essential to understand the ways in which textual borrowing knowledge, belief, and practice operate at the level of the individual, in addition to understanding the commonalities and differences between larger cultural, disciplinary and proficiency level groups, as has been the focus in much of the existing literature.
Moreover, the results problematised the relationship between knowledge of and belief about source use and its practice, and revealed that in many instances there was an apparently contradictory relationship between the two which was not easy to resolve without considering the multiple contexts in which the practice of NESB undergraduate writing takes place. The results also suggested that rather than knowledge developing prior to practice, there is a bidirectional influence between knowledge and practice, with knowledge sometimes preceding and sometimes following practice.

The study further contributes to the empirical literature on NESB student textual borrowing in its use of activity theory as the primary theoretical framework. While activity theory has been used to explore other areas of second language writing, a specific activity theoretical focus allows an examination of what Pennycook (1994) has termed the “complex contexts of plagiarism” (p. 277), by considering the interrelationship between individual knowledge and practice and society. It was argued that the apparently contradictory relationship between knowledge, belief and practice need not be viewed as problematic, but rather as evidence of a developing and complex system, in which contradictions can lead to transformation and learning (Engeström, 1987; Negueruela-Arzola, 2011).

Viewing source-based writing not as an isolated act undertaken by individuals but one that is closely bound to multiple contexts, including cultural, institutional and disciplinary contexts has significant implications for plagiarism for second language writing pedagogy. It is important to recognise that the ability to use sources effectively in writing is developmental, and that instances of non-prototypical textual borrowing are not necessarily indicators of dishonest practice in student writing. Non-prototypical instances of text modification, referencing and attribution in student work may all be evidence of developing systems, rather than evidence of student deficiencies. However, another important pedagogical implication is that this process is not one of what Engeström and Sannino (2010) term as “vertical improvement along some uniform scales of competence” (p. 2) The relationship between knowledge and practice does not involve a one-way transmission from effective source use knowledge to effective practice, and the fact that students have been “told” about plagiarism and effective source use, or demonstrate an ability to successfully integrate sources in one instance, does not indicate that they will be successful in the next instance. Rather, as with all areas of learning, students need to be given the time and space to practice and develop these abilities without fear of punitive measures.

A further pedagogical implication concerns the content of source use instruction. As has been shown, plagiarism and source use knowledge is complex and highly context dependent, in ways in which instructional approaches that focus narrowly on the correct or
standard textual borrowing conventions may not recognise. Therefore, as researchers such as Canagarajah (2002a) and Pennycook (2006) have noted, source use instruction needs to go beyond a focus on the mechanics of referencing or the triadic model of source use (Barks & Watts, 2002) to explore the ways in which voice construction, common knowledge and knowledge epistemologies (Mori, 1999) intersect with referencing and source use convention.

At an institutional level, while recognising that plagiarism and dishonest practice occurs across and beyond educational contexts and that developing technologies create ongoing challenges for institutions (Bloch, 2012), this study emphasises the need to more clearly delineate intentional from unintentional textual borrowing, and a way needs to be found to separate these rather than treat them as the same at a policy level. Treating unintentional plagiarism as transgressive and “punishing” it in the same way as intentional transgression is to limit opportunities for students to learn and develop as writers. Increased awareness of these issues among the wider faculty and university administrators could result in revisions to institutional policies that would recognise source based writing as a vital area of learning and development within all areas of the institution and relevant to students in all disciplines and at all levels. Within the institution this study was based in, one obvious change in policy and practice would be to revise current institutional frameworks that conceptualise unintentional plagiarism within a language that represents such practices as both immoral and as a type of intellectual theft. This would be an important starting point for a broader reworking of institutional policy and a greater provision of support for the development of academic writing among all students.

Source use conventions, the concepts of authorship and originality and the discourse of plagiarism contain ambiguities that need not be problematic to students or institutions - rather pedagogical approaches which foreground these ambiguities and institutions which recognise them may be a springboard for NESB students to empower themselves as learners and writers. As discussed in Chapter Seven, sociocultural theory and activity theory contend that tensions and contradictions within activity systems can be powerful engines of change (Engeström & Sannino, 2010). Viewing NESB textual borrowing as a learning challenge (Engeström & Sannino, 2010) could result in dialogue and exchange between students, instructors, disciplinary and institutional groups (or from the perspective of activity theory, between these activity systems) and the creation of “a radically new, wider and more complex object and concept for their activity” (Engeström & Sannino, 2010, p. 2)

There were a number of limitations to this study arising out of the constraints of the design. The main data collection was limited to the length of the teaching semester. While the data suggested development both in students' knowledge and in their practice of source use,
the development of source use is clearly something that takes place over an extended period of time, and it is probable that more development would have been seen in the students’ knowledge and practices if a longer period of data collection had been possible. The limited period of data collection also meant that it was not possible to conduct text-based interviews with the students who participated in the semi-structured interviews. The research essays were submitted at the end of the teaching semester, and by the time I had developed a suitable coding scheme for the text data, and analysed the qualitative journal data to identify relevant themes, a number of the interview group participants were no longer able to be contacted to discuss their writing choices. Being able to further interview the students regarding their specific beliefs and practices concerning their texts would have added to the richness of the study.

Secondly, concerning the methods used, while every effort was taken to use data collection methods that were robust, some weaknesses may have remained. For example, in the questionnaire it is possible that some of the items remained ambiguous, either in their wording or in the choice of the response prompts, which means that the results obtained from the questionnaire had to be interpreted cautiously.

Another limitation concerns data analysis. The text matching was done by hand in order to identify nuances that may not be detected using computer-assisted coding (Soo, 2008). However, while all care was taken and a high level of inter-rater reliability was reached in the text coding, this method also meant that in some instances textual borrowing may have gone undetected, particularly in the research essays.

My dual position as researcher and instructor of the course may also have placed limitations on the research. While all possible steps were taken to limit the power differential between myself and the students, for example by conducting the qualitative interviews well after the course itself had finished, it is possible that my role as instructor influenced the freedom with which the participants felt they could discuss the sensitive issue of plagiarism and textual borrowing.

Plagiarism is an issue concerning instructors and institutions as well as individual students, and it is the instructors who read the student texts, who interpret the conventions and decide whether textual borrowing is transgressive, and whether further action will be taken. A further limitation of the study was that, because the EAP class was a bounded unit (Mackey & Gass, 2005; Merriam, 1998), the perspectives analysed were limited to the individuals within that unit, and those outside it, such as instructors in the wider context of the university, were not included. This would have been fruitful as in many cases the students made comments about the expectations and rules of other departments. Although these observations were
valuable in that they were understandings which mediated the students' own textual production, it was not possible to verify whether or not they were accurate observations.

A final limitation concerns the choice of activity theory as the theoretical framework of the study. The choice to use activity theory came out of analysis of the data, as the complex interplay of different contexts in the relationship between beliefs and practices became apparent. If activity theory had been chosen at an earlier stage in the study, different choices might have been made in the design of the data collection instruments that could have added a further layer of richness and nuance to the data.

Future research might address some of these limitations by conducting longitudinal analyses informed by activity theory that examine in more detail the exact nature of the development of source use knowledge and practice over an extended period of time. Indeed tracing the development of source use throughout students' undergraduate careers and beyond would be helpful in identifying the specific paths that this development takes.

Moreover, the aim of the present research was to conduct a naturalistic case study of one semester-long EAP class, which enabled a detailed examination of the beliefs and practices of a number of individual participants. Further research could take up the themes that have developed out of the data and conduct more a quantitatively-oriented study that could collect data from these larger groups to enable statistically significant differences to be identified among their knowledge, beliefs and practices.

Further research into pedagogical interventions would also be beneficial, to determine materials and tasks which would enhance student learning and contribute to writing development. As noted in section 2.2.5, a number of researchers have conducted pedagogical interventions into student textual borrowing practices. However, these have tended to focus on quoting, paraphrasing and summarising or the mechanics of referencing (for example Hsu, 2003; Wette, 2010). An investigation into the wider sociocultural contexts of student writing which focussed on raising students' awareness of their own cultural, institutional and disciplinary contexts, and on concepts such as authorship, originality and the epistemology of knowledge (Mori, 1999), could help NESB writers further develop their sense of agency and control in their academic writing. It would be interesting to see if such an approach, taken in conjunction with more traditional approaches on source use instruction could help to facilitate the development of appropriate textual borrowing practices in student work and reduce the gap between knowledge and practice.

In summary, this research has explored the relationship between knowledge, belief and practice in NESB student academic writing. In conducting a case study of an English for Academic Purposes class I have shown that in order to understand NESB textual borrowing it
is necessary to take a holistic perspective. Rather than viewing knowledge, belief and practice as separate entities, I have shown the ways in which, in the words of Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) the "individual and social merge into one and where use and knowledge are indistinguishable" (p. 229). Such a perspective may enrich our understandings of textual borrowing and source integration in L2 writing and help to empower NESB student writers within and beyond the academy.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A

Information and Consent Forms for Participants

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS AND ACADEMIC WRITING --
INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS

I am a PhD student in the Linguistics Programme, Department of English at the University of Otago. I am interested in approaches that international students have to academic writing and hope that the results of this study could make instruction in academic writing for international students more effective. I am using a questionnaire to gather information on what students know about issues to do with academic writing.

Participation in the study is entirely voluntary, and if you do choose to participate, your responses will be anonymous – you will not be asked to supply your name on the questionnaire form. You may withdraw from the study at any time and there will be absolutely no negative consequences.

If you do agree to participate you will be asked to sign a consent form that shows that you understand your involvement in the project. You will then be asked to complete a questionnaire in English about your views on academic writing and your educational background. This should take about 30 minutes.

At a later date you may also be asked to supply samples of your written work in LING 121 me to analyse, or to take part in interviews about your educational background and experience with academic writing - however this part of the study is also entirely voluntary. You may choose to take part in the Questionnaire but not to supply writing samples, or you may choose to supply writing samples but not take part in an interview.

Results from the study may be published at some stage in the future, but there will be no mention of individuals in the study. University regulations require that raw data used in the project be kept in secure storage for five years before being destroyed.

If you have any questions about my research, please feel free to contact me. Thanks for reading!

Sally Henderson (researcher) hensa183@studentmail.otago.ac.nz

Linguistics Programme, Department of English, University of Otago
International students and academic writing

CONSENT FORM FOR QUESTIONNAIRE PARTICIPANTS

I ………………………………………… (name in capital letters) have read the Information Sheet concerning this project. I understand the aims of the project and what my involvement will be.

I know that:

1. My participation in the project is entirely voluntary.
2. I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without any disadvantage.
3. I am not required to put my name on the questionnaire form.
4. No participants will be named in the study.
5. I agree to take part in this project.

...............................................................................

(Signature of participant) ...........................................

(Date)
International students and academic writing

CONSENT FORM FOR WRITING GROUP PARTICIPANTS

I ……………………………………… (name in capital letters) have read the Information Sheet concerning this project. I understand the aims of the project and what my involvement will be.

I know that:

1. My participation in the project is entirely voluntary.

2. I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without any disadvantage.

3. I will be asked to provide electronic copies of writing samples to for the researcher to analyse.

4. Any writing samples I supply to the researcher will be anonymous – my name will not on the sample given to the researcher.

I agree to take part in this project:

............................................................. .............................................
(Signature of participant) (Date)
International students and academic writing

CONSENT FORM FOR INTERVIEW GROUP PARTICIPANTS

I ……………………………………… (name in capital letters) have read the Information Sheet concerning this project. I understand the aims of the project and what my involvement will be.

I know that:

1. My participation in the project is entirely voluntary.
2. I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without any disadvantage.
3. I will take part in an interview about my educational background and experiences with academic writing which may take between half an hour to an hour.

I agree to take part in this project:

...............................................................................

(Signature of participant) (Date)
Appendix B
Questionnaire

Academic Writing Questionnaire

This questionnaire is designed to gather information on how students write and what they think about different aspects of academic writing. It is not a test – I am interested in what students actually do when they research and write assignments, not what their instructors think they should do! So please be as honest as you can in your responses.

Remember, you will remain entirely anonymous – you do not need to put your name anywhere on this questionnaire.

Section A: Academic Writing and Use of Sources

1. How often do you do the following types of academic writing in your studies here at Otago? Please use the following scale and write the number you choose in the box provided for each type of writing.

   Never=5     Not very often=4     Sometimes=3     Often=2     All the time=1

   i. Essays (e.g. argumentative, comparison and contrast or expository essays).
   ii. Reports (e.g. a lab report).
   iii. Summaries (in which you describe the main points of a reading).
   iv. Literature reviews (in which you analyse and assess a reading).
   v. Research papers (in which you report on data you have collected yourself).
   vi. Journals and/or diaries (in which you reflect on your own personal experience).
   vii. Essay tests or exams.
   viii. Do you do any other type of academic writing not listed here? Please specify.

   ___________________________________________________
2. **How often did you do the following types of academic writing in your studies in your home country?** Please choose one of the following options and write in the box provided.

Never=5    Not very often=4    Sometimes=3    Often=2    All the time=1

i. Essays (e.g. argumentative, comparison and contrast or expository essays).

ii. Reports (e.g. a lab report).

iii. Summaries (in which you describe the main points of a reading).

iv. Critical reviews (in which you analyse and assess a reading).

v. Research papers (in which you report on data you have collected yourself).

vi. Journals and/or diaries (in which you reflect on your own personal experience).

vii. Essay tests or exams.

viii. I did not do any academic writing in my home country.

ix. Do you do any other type of academic writing not listed here? Please specify.

_____________________________________________________

3. **How often do you use the following sources for your academic writing here at Otago?** Please choose one of the following options and write in the box provided for each type of source.

Never=5    Seldom=4    Sometimes=3    Often=2    All the time=1

i. Academic books or book chapters.

ii. Scholarly journal or periodical articles (either hard copies or electronic journals)

iii. Newspapers or magazine articles (for example *Time, The ODT*)

iv. Reference works, such as dictionaries or encyclopaedias

v. The Internet (e.g. Wikipedia)

vi. Other (please specify).  _____________________________________________________
4. **How often did you use the following sources for your academic writing in your home country?** Please choose one of the following options and write in the box provided for each type of source.

Never=5  Seldom=4  Sometimes=3  Often=2  All the time=1

i. Academic books or book chapters.  
ii. Scholarly journal or periodical articles (either hard copies or electronic journals)  
iii. Newspapers or magazine articles (for example *Time, The ODT*)  
iv. Reference works, such as dictionaries or encyclopaedias  
v. The Internet (e.g. Wikipedia)  
vi. Other (please specify). _____________________________________________________  
vii. I did not do any academic writing in my home country.  

5. **How many sources (for example journal articles or books) do you usually use when you are writing an academic assignment?** Please tick the box which best matches the number of sources you usually use.

i. 1-3  
ii. 4-6  
iii. 7-9  
iv. More than 10  

6. **When you are taking notes using sources (for example journal articles or books) how often do you do the following?** Please choose one of the following options and write in the box provided for each type of note taking.

Never=5  Seldom=4  Sometimes=3  Often=2  All the time=1

i. I copy the words exactly from the source.  
ii. I copy most of the words from the source but change a few/several words.  
iii. I copy from the source but change several phrases.  
iv. I write the ideas down from the source but use my own words.
7. When you are writing an academic assignment using sources (for example journal articles or books) which of the following do you usually do? Please choose one of the following options and write the number in the box provided for each type of writing.

Never=5  Seldom=4  Sometimes=3  Often=2  All the time=1

i. I copy the words exactly from the source.  

ii. I copy most of the words from the source but change a few/ several words.  

iii. I copy from the source but change several phrases.  

iv. I write the ideas down from the source but use my own words.

8. Referencing and academic writing – In your view, which of the following needs a citation/reference? Please put a tick in the box provided for the examples requiring a citation/reference, and a cross for those not requiring a citation/reference.

i. Facts or figures that you have taken from a source

ii. Your own ideas

iii. Theories or ideas suggested by other writers

iv. Quotations from a source

v. A summary of a source

vi. A paraphrase (put into your own words) of a source

vii. Common knowledge

9. Referencing and academic writing. How often do you do the following when you are writing an academic assignment? Please choose one of the following options and write the number in the box provided for each type of writing.

Never=5  Seldom=4  Sometimes=3  Often=2  All the time=1

i. Use a direct quotation from a source without reference?

ii. Paraphrase (put into your own words) of a source without reference?

iii. Summarise a source without reference?
10. How do you characterise yourself as an academic writer? Please tick the box that best applies to you.

i. 1 = excellent ☐

ii. 2 = good ☐

iii. 3 = adequate ☐

iv. 4 = less than adequate ☐

v. 5 = poor ☐

11. Understanding of plagiarism – please describe in your own words what you believe plagiarism is.

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

12. Understanding of plagiarism – please describe in your own words how you believe unintentional plagiarism (inappropriate source use that occurs without the writer realizing it) might occur.

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________
Section B. Beliefs about Academic Writing and Source Use

13. Below are some statements regarding academic writing and the use of sources. Please choose the number which best matches your feeling and write this number in the box provided.

1 = strongly disagree  2 = disagree  3 = undecided  4 = agree  5 = strongly agree

i. Otago University strongly emphasizes the importance of acknowledging the sources used in academic writing.  

ii. There is a not so much emphasis on using the correct documentation my school/university in my home country as here at Otago.

iii. My other courses do not emphasise plagiarism as much as this linguistics course.

iv. I was not taught about plagiarism before coming to Otago.

v. This linguistics course is the first time I have learned about plagiarism.

vi. There is more of a discussion of plagiarism in my linguistics course than in my other courses here at Otago.

vii. Plagiarism is something I don’t think a lot about when writing an assignment.

viii. Academic writing should focus on expressing my original ideas.

ix. Academic writing should focus on expressing the ideas of experts in the field.

x. Academic writing should combine my original thought with the ideas of experts.

xi. I prefer to express my own ideas in my writing.

xii. I prefer to express the ideas of others in my writing.

xiii. I prefer to combine my own ideas and the ideas of others in my writing.

xiv. My own ideas are important to me when I write.

xv. My own ideas are less important than authorities and experts in my fields of study.
Section C: Background

Please provide some background information about yourself.

14. Sex:  Male ☐  Female ☐

15. What is your country of origin? ____________________________________________

16. What is/are your first language(s)? __________________________________________

17. What subject do you major in here at Otago? __________________________________

18. What is your year of study this year (e.g. first year)? __________________________

19. How many years have you been in New Zealand? ______________________________

20. What was your educational experience before coming to Otago? Please choose from the following options (you may choose more than one option) and tick the box that best applies to you.

   i. I studied at high school in New Zealand or another English-speaking country. ☐
   ii. I studied at a tertiary institution in New Zealand or another English-speaking country (e.g. teacher’s college, polytechnic). ☐
   iii. I studied at high school in my home country. ☐
   iv. I studied at a university or another tertiary institution in my country. (E.g. a teacher’s college or polytechnic). ☐
   v. Other (please specify). ______________________________________________________

21. What was your experience with academic English before coming to Otago? Please choose from the following options (you may choose more than one option) and tick the box that best applies to you.

   i. I studied academic English at high school in New Zealand. ☐
   ii. I studied academic English university or another tertiary institution in New Zealand (e.g. teacher’s college, polytechnic). ☐
   iii. I studied academic English at high school in my home country. ☐
   iv. I studied academic English at university or another tertiary institution in my home country (e.g. teacher’s college, polytechnic). ☐
   v. Other (please specify). ______________________________________________________

Thank you for completing this questionnaire!

©

Sally Henderson.
Write a suitable paraphrase of the first paragraph of “Foreign Students and American Academic Ritual” (beginning “Although U.S. universities…”)

Follow the paraphrase with the correct APA in text citation.
Question 1 Paragraphing (15 marks)

Using the information in the two articles and your own experience, compose 2 paragraphs on the difficulties international students have in adjusting to overseas living and study.

Each paragraph must contain a quotation from the source material, correctly cited (APA style).

Question 2: References List (5 Marks)

Create reference list for the two articles in APA style. (NB- the references on the articles are not APA!)

Good luck!
Appendix D
Research Essay Specifications

LING 121 Research Essay
Due 4.30 pm June 1

This assignment is worth 25% of your final grade. The break down of this assignment is as follows:

Library research assignment (to be completed in the library research tutorial in the week of 30 April-4 May) 2.5%

Submission of essay topic and list of sources 2.5%

Essay due date – June 1 20%

Requirements:

• No websites or Wikipedia to be cited in the essay (although you may like to use these as background reading for your topic).
• You must use a minimum of five sources for the essay – these can be scholarly journal articles, books or book chapters from an edited collection.
• Use APA referencing style for your sources and include a list of works cited.
• You must include photocopies of the sources you have used for the assignment with the essay (these will not be returned when the essay has been graded)
• You must submit an electronic copy of the assignment to the lecturer in addition to the hard copy to your tutor.
Essay Topics (choose one of the following)

1. Should the death penalty be introduced in New Zealand for those convicted of murder?
2. Testing on animals is widespread in many fields, such as medical research, pharmaceutical research and the cosmetics industry. Argue for or against the continuation of animal testing.
3. Does violence on television and in video games contribute to violence in society?
4. Should smacking children be made illegal?
Appendix E
Reflective Journal Topics

Reflective Diary 4

Address the following points:

1. What is your understanding of plagiarism at the University of Otago?
2. Has your understanding changed?
3. Why do you think plagiarism is such an important issue?
4. Do you agree that it is an important issue?
5. Is there anything you still don’t understand re plagiarism and academic writing?
6. How is the way you are expected to use sources at the University of Otago different from your previous experiences with academic writing?

Reflective Diary 5

For this journal I would like you to compose a writing autobiography, addressing the following points:

1. What types of academic writing courses have you done in the past?
2. What forms of academic writing are you familiar with?
3. What forms of academic writing do you prefer and why?
4. What do you find difficult about academic writing?
5. What other types of writing do you do?
6. How comfortable do you feel expressing your own opinion in your writing?
7. How do you rate yourself as a writer?
Reflective Diary 6

For this journal I would like you to reflect on the research and writing process for your argumentative essay and for your university work in general. Please consider the following points:

1. What types of sources are you finding for your topic?
2. What search strategies are you using?
3. What do you find easy about conducting research?
4. What do you find difficult about conducting research?
5. How does doing research at Otago differ from research you have done in the past?
6. Describe how you go from research to writing – what steps do you go through to integrate the research you have done into your writing?
Appendix F
Sample Interview Schedule

Section 1 Academic background
Can you tell me about the sorts of study and writing you did in China?

• Describe the sort of classes you had.
• Describe the sorts of assignments you did
• Describe the types of sources that were available
• Were you expected to use a variety of sources?
• Describe what your instructors looked for when they graded your assignments.

Can you describe what the academic expectations are in China?

• Describe research and writing in China
• Did you write argumentative essays in China?
• Do you think that students are encouraged to express their opinions in their writing in China?
• Do you think it is important to express an argument in your writing?

Describe the sorts of writing you do here at Otago

• What do you think instructors look for when they grade papers here?
• Do you think expectations differ between fields and subjects?
• Are you expected to use a variety of sources in all your papers?
• Is there an emphasis on creating an argument and expressing your opinion in all your papers?
Section 2 Research and Writing
Tell me about the process you go through when you write an essay

• Describe the types of sources you like to use
• Do you think that some sources are valued more by instructors?
• How do you go from having pages of notes to having a complete essay?
• What do you find difficult about that process?
• Describe how you feel about the referencing and citation systems we use here
• Do you ever have any problems with these systems?
• Describe how sources are referenced in China

Section 3 Source Use
Can you describe what plagiarism is?

Can you tell me about how plagiarism is viewed in China?

• Why do you think plagiarism happens?
• Do you think that people always plagiarise on purpose?
• Describe how unintentional plagiarism might happen.
• Do you think that instructors always recognise that plagiarism can be unintentional?
• Would you say that instructors have a clear idea about what plagiarism is?
• Do you know of anyone here or in China who has had problems with plagiarism?
Appendix G
Sample Interview Transcript

Subject - Yue Yan
Transcription Conventions (adapted from Richards, 2003)

Pauses -
Overlaps [ ]
Rising intonation ?
Falling intonation .
Emphasis - in italics
Unclear words ( )
Non verbal features ( ( )
R = Researcher
S = Student

R: Lets start talking a little but about your academic background - if you could describe your background to me, and we’ll start firstly with your study in China.

S: Ah, yeah. I think after I (graduated) from high school, and I went to Beijing to some kind of Language Institute cos I needed, I, cos I would liked to study abroad. That’s why I took some kind of English class, and in the English department in the Second Language Institute in Beijing, and I also took some specialized class like IELTS sort of thing, cos I - I had to pass IELTS to, to enter University here. And so I stayed in Beijing for like, um, one and a half or two, two years. And them, and uh, and luckily I got my visa - cos I was waiting for my visa but the SARS was, it was the year for SARS - I was so lucky I just got my visa and then I came, could come to New Zealand, and I wasn’t in Beijing at that time I was in my home town which is really safe, cos I didn’t know because, er, when the semester starts and then I was like oh I have to go back to my home town.

R: That was lucky.

S: Yeah.

R: So the Language Institute you were studying at, what kind of courses did you do there.

S: Ah - in the English department, it was like a general course, like ah, we have reading class and ah, that sort of thing. I think it was pretty much very casual, like we just go to a small class and the teacher she just sort of demonstrate to you to talk, like, more like improving your reading while improving your speaking English sort of thing. And because they are all like, very - you know, kind of like students, ah who study really hard, so they, I think they, most of them have really strong English background, so they feel free to talk a lot of things during the class. So the teacher, basically she didn’t expect to teach a lot, but she sort of expect to, you know, demonstrate more, or ah ((laughs)), or even learn something from the students -

R: Yeah, ok good. And did you do much writing at the Language Institute?
S: Um, not really but I did some writing in the special IELTS class, sort of thing.

R: What kinds of writing did you do in your IELTS class.

S: Ah, I think they more concentrated on your ah, on how to teach you the techniques for the IELTS exam, so they, they, first ah for the writing at first they taught me how to do the structure, they were like, very similar to um, language, ah to like the writing classes that sometimes you taught us last semester, like, oh you have this structure for argumentative, or discussion or whatever - so, I don’t think for the exam you have to provide your support sentence, and you have to have your sentence at the first place, and they sort of encourage us to have, to write those topic sentence first, then, you know, sort of structure first and then a few more details like giving examples, or whatever.

R: And what kind of topics did you write about.

S: Actually I can’t remember - but I think, um some topics are, um, very classical topics for IELTS writing tasks, at that moments, like ah popular ones, and even some ones are, you know, people have been writing again and again and again - discuss like how you think about, ah, you know, maybe, ah like, have boyfriends or girlfriends in your high school, sort of thing - very old topics.

R: Yeah - some things you do over and over again ((laughs)). And did you do argumentative writing in your IELTS class?

S: Yes I think - but I ah, think it’s slightly different from the one I ah did here, cos I wasn’t very sure, actually I was a little bit confused at that time. And um, and I made a lot of notes, and ah, basically I think I did, most of the time I tried to improve my English by remembering some sentence from, like some kind of good and classical English writing, and it was like “oh I have to learn this structure or learn this sentence that I might use later or something”.

R: So would you say you were more concerned with remembering structural things than expressing your own opinion?

S: Ah yes, yes, cos even if I had my own opinion I don’t think I can express at that moment.

R: Why did you not feel that.

S: Cos I think, just, language barrier, cos I wasn’t very confident.

R: Right. And so those were the compositions you did in English, when you went to High School in China did you write lots of compositions then?

S: Ah - what do you mean compositions.

R: Like essays, for example.

S: Ah - in Chinese of course but not in English.


S: Um, I think we like um have small topics every week and ah big topics like, twice a week or something like that. And so I think the small topics, they were, pretty much very
[inaudible] it’s a little bit like a diary here...teacher encourage[s] you to write ah some kind of ah, like free topics, and then, um twice a week the big topics, it depends, sometimes just very classical topics, and some topics that ah, appear in the exam very often or something like that.

R: Would you say that there was an equivalent to argumentative writing in Chinese?

YYW No not at all. Cos in Chinese I think we have a different structure.

SJH Can you explain a little bit about that?

YYW I think its um...the only thing I can remember is, ah, our teacher used to tell, teach us ah, that first you have to have some kind of beginning, so at the beginning, you cannot, you know just, ah, like one sentence later you go to your main body or whatever, you have to have some kind of - I don’t know how to say in English, like, like, you know, demonstrate people to your topic [inaudible], like the background sort of thing, and then you have your body essay which contains some kind of process, sometimes (inaudible) to details or whatever, and then the most important things, you have to have an ending that, um, sort of, related to your beginning so you can have ending and a beginning - its like two structures, and you cannot finish like, a big head and a little tail or something, and she always say “a big head and a big tail”, or something like that.

R: Right. And so, um, in those essays you did in Chinese, did you write about your opinions and your own arguments?

S: Ah yeah. Well um yes, some of us we did, but I think sometimes I think the teacher more prefer you have, like, more kind of fancy language, or - I think the opinion was encouraged by the teacher - she was like, ah, you feel free to express your own ideas. I think some of us, because the are really good at, like, writing, ah some of my friends and my older classmates, and they wrote really really fantastic essay and they express a lot of you know, opinions, and also it’s just very outstanding that some times I don’t know why but they just very outstanding. I think, I think they actually they express their opinion at the first place and they have some kind of good language and structure sort of thing. And I couldn’t do very well at that time I think I just very neutral and sometimes I express my own idea and sometimes I just like - and it also depends on the topic, like if I am really not interested in the topic, say like “Do you think you should have a boyfriend or girlfriend in your high school” sort of think I was like “oh well, yeah I think maybe high school students should” but I don’t think my teacher wants to listen to this - I can’t be bothered [I just]

R: [Yeah]. So you were aware of what your teacher wanted, and you would write what your teacher wanted.

S: Yeah.

R: I think that’s probably the same everywhere ((laughs)). Ok that’s great. So that was in China, your Language Institute and your IELTS class.

S: Yeah.

R: And then when you came to New Zealand you got your visa and everything, did you come straight to Otago?

S: Ah yes, but I went to Foundation Year.
R: Ok, can you describe that a little bit? What did you do.

S: I think Foundation Year is really, ah, helpful, cos I think a Foundation Year is for some reasons very similar to University, cos I think, especially the English class, cos I found like, ah some of the teaching materials you told us like, you know how you write argumentative essay or how you structure essay, and how you, you know, you have to have a topic sentence and support sentence, and like very very similar, as the one they showed us in Foundation Year. Also, before I ah - came to Foundation Year the course is like, already half a year in between, so I didn’t enter the middle year of Foundation Years, so I actually spent half a year learning in the Language Center, so that’s why, ah -

R: The Language Center here?

S: Yep.

R: Mmhm. And what did you do in the Language Center.

S: Mm, very similar, like, just English. And I think I wasn’t very very, ah - I was a little bit shocked at the first place cos I came directly from China to here and I had a little bit cultural shock and I stayed in a home stay, and I, you know I didn’t know how to, you know, really communicate with people at that time, and the first day I was encouraged to go to some computer room and type an essay directly into a computer, and well, in China I had to spend a few days to think about it and write the structure and maybe do some research and say something like about the topic or whatever. And then, here I was encouraged to write the essay immediately, I mean, not an essay, it was just like, say how you feel, ah, what do you feel after you watch some certain movies, like little topics, and then directly into the computer in like, two hours and then the teacher will check it because you have to hand it in. It was like...and I wasn’t very good at it, the computer at that time, I was a little bit shocked.

R: This was at the Language Center? So you said you wrote the small topics at the Language Center without having done the research, when you did your writing in China in the Language Institute and the IELTS classes, did you use sources for those essays?

S: Um -

R: Did you have to do research?

S: I think I, I didn’t have to, but I did a lot of it, because I, I wanted to have, like, more ideas, because, ah, sometimes I just think, um, you know, like, even though I would, I might not even use the ideas, but I just wanna say, like, what other peoples’ opinions on those topics or whatever - something like that.

R: Other peoples’ opinions?

S: Yeah -

R: So, for those essays in China that you did at IELTS and the Language Institute, what kind of, um, sources were available to you? Books in the library, or -

S: I think ah, we have, we had a little library, but the don’t have like, they don’t, they have a lot of Chinese books of course, but the don’t have a lot of English books and even, I think I
didn’t go there to borrow English book very often because I didn’t, I couldn’t understand, like, I wasn’t very confident - what I did I think the most time, I think I just, ah, go to, went to Internet and ah, you know, search for some topics -

R: Right.

S: And also I think we had some kind of discussion room or some kind of, ah sort of...[inaudible] you know group that people um like sometimes they just like they share their topics and ah essays after they did IELTS and they were like “I did this topic recently” or something, and I said something, something, and ah, you know...so I was like, “oh yeah, this topic maybe appear very often, very popular, so...actually I had a wee book that I kept track of the most popular IELTS topics at that time, so I actually practiced all of them, because I just wanna have a little bit you know, mm, I just wanna be sure that I don’t wanna go there and say “Oh I haven’t seen this topic before, so I have to think about for, like an hour, and -

R: Yeah, so you had an advantage. For the IELTS essays, um, did you have to put any citations in your essays?

S: I don’t think so. I think, because, just like exam essay anyway - you are not expect to reference or whatever -

R: Ok so, Language Institute, IELTS, Language Center, Foundation. So describe to me the writing you did when you were in your Foundation Year.

S: Ah, I think very similar to the one that we - I think, um, we did three types of essay, discussion, argumentative, and ah, something like, I forgot, description or something - description or describe something - three types of essay, so ah, and we, like we had assignment and we have to hand in before the due day and it was, it was very similar to the, ah the one we did.

R: And did you have to use lots of sources for your IELTS, for your Foundations essays?

S: Yes, yes, and I think we had a really serious class - Plagiarism, and that’s the first time I actually hear the words very seriously from the lecturer, and she was like, she stand in front of the whole class, it was like, hundreds of people sitting in [inaudible] and she was like “Ok I know you international student you not, may not familiar with this, but today we’re gonna talk something maybe a little bit boring but very important “ and she just kept emphasise really really important, like a couple of times, like plagiarism. I was a little bit confused at that time so, because..ah...I think I knew it a little bit before she actually told us about that, but I wasn’t considered it was really really serious issue or whatever, so -

R: So when do you think the first time you heard about plagiarism was, if you had heard it before, where had you heard it. In China?

S: I think yes - I think its not something related to plagiarism, but, not really...its not really concentrated on those words or something - it’s like, people told me, he or she was like, they are very, if you go, if you are going to study abroad, and they are really really, they are very sensitive, Western people, they are very sensitive about you know, if you borrow some ideas from somewhere and you have to, to say where you have borrowed from or something like that, and I was like ok, ok and I just heard something and I didn’t really you know, think about, or something like that -
R: So how did you feel when this person came and talked to you about plagiarism in the Foundations class.

S: Um I think must be a really, really serious issue, ah however I was very confused -

R: Why were you confused.

S: Cos I was very confused that I couldn’t, I was a little bit afraid that I couldn’t distinguish the boundary that, which, which part I, you know, I borrow the ideas from someone else and which part is my own ideas, because I think, maybe you know that, like, when we, the education system in China and when we, we already observe a lot of ideas from someone else, so I think its really really hard for me to, to distinguish my own opinion and opinion from someone else, or - I was very very afraid that, and I was, every time I think I think I wrote a little bit and I went to ask my teachers I was like, ah I wrote those, I think like summary like those (inaudible) I think someone very similar so is it plagiarism? I think I asked some questions from my tutor and also the lecturer, cos I was, I was panicked at that time.

R: Mm. And what did they say to you, were they able to make you feel better about it?

S: Mm, ah I think they just gave me some kind of, um, basical guidance and also they give me advice, they say, they sometimes they give me detailed advice, they oh, oh I think, I think what they did it encouraged us, ah, they sort of like encouraged us to do research but try to reference, so its like, we are all kind of - so I think I was trying to escape, to you know, express a lot of my own ideas, to try to do more research and try to reference them, because I, that’s what I learned from Foundation Year.

R: So what would you say your understanding of plagiarism was now? If I asked you to describe plagiarism what would you say.

S: I think its much, much better - well if you really wanted me to give a definition, its like just copy something, someone elses’ idea and work without acknowledgement - but if you really wanted me to express the detail it’s just, I think maybe later if I write some essay and whatever, ah, I will do more research of course, and now I just try to reference all the ideas I borrow from the reference, ah, from the other work, whatever - mmm.

R: Do you think most plagiarism, student plagiarism, happens on purpose? Because they take an essay off the Internet, on purpose for example, or the sort of plagiarism you were worried about, people doing it by accident? What do you think is the most common?

S: Um, well I think in China maybe half half, maybe, like the people because sometimes they just lazy, they just wanna do something from the Internet, they just wanna copy, maybe they just think the sentence itself is really really good, cos they just think it’s a fantastic essay. If this essay can get, for example, they just saw some essay from the Internet about the IELTS topic, and they remember the IELTS topic essay, roughly ideas and they went to the exam and they have like exactly the same topic and they were like “Oh, I don’t have to think about it, I can just, you know, I memorise something and this is really good essay, I just wanna write it down. But I think here, especially international students because we are already, you know, studying at university will want take responsibility sort of, don’t want to, you know, involve in some trouble whatever -

R: So do you think international students are really aware of plagiarism?
S: I think, because we, you know, international, we don’t want to get kicked out from university for like, oh I dunno, no reason or whatever -

R: Ok, just talking a little bit now about, we have talked about Foundation and your Language Institute, um lets talk about now your study, your degree study, um, so what’s your major.

S: I major in Computer Science.

R: And when did you start. What was your first year.

S: Ah, my first, actually, after I finished my Foundation Year, I went university, ah, but I studied International Business, so in my first year I actually studied all the economics and accounting, marketing management sort of class, and I, after the first year I didn’t really get a good result in the first year, like a C or C+ sort of thing, and I, I was very disappointed cos I was really good student in Foundation Year, I got like a 9.3 out of 10. So I was so disappointed I was, I think maybe I’m not, not really good at Commerce, and I found myself I was not, I wasn’t very interested in that at all, so I talked to my parents and I changed my major. And I’m actually, I’m really interested in Design, cos I think I have some talent in this area, I always, like came up with new ideas and I like it, and, but I think computer science is very popular, and also I like challenge, and I, I go through all the list of the majors, and I think, cos in China I was, you know, concentrated on the Arts - Commerce, Arts sort of side, I never really into the science, because in High School we split up like two streams, Arts and Science and I chose Arts, so I was a little bit worried about it - but I took, so I start my Computer Science in Summer School, and they only have 1, ah 100 level compulsory level paper for (inaudible), actually they supplied in Summer School which was good, so I had my opportunity to catch up, so and I directly start my second year course, in second year, so that’s why I can continue.

R: So how much writing do you do in your computing courses. Do you write any essays and things?

S: Not really, but we do write something, um, for some assignment, ah, especially, like, some kind of programming that you have to have your own ideas and you have to express that, how you, why you think those ideas, or something, and you have to, sort of, explain, like short essay but its not really a essay, because, I try to write it, like, academic style, but, I, I really, actually I found most of my classmates, which they, most of them they are boys, and native English speaker, and they are, they didn’t, like they write really really casual like they didn’t explain and (inaudible) and it’s very very, so like sometimes I was thinking - it’s maybe not really really necessary to have - English style writing in Computer Science.

R: Right, right, so the standards are different from Arts and, and the other subjects you did.

S: Yeah.

R: Computer Science, are you required to put citations, [and]

S: [No, no] but if you borrowed some ideas from somewhere else, then you have to say it, otherwise it’s plagiarism -

R: Yeah.
S: To say, quote, someone says something else or something, I wouldn’t normally do that, because, er, it’s not -

R: Not required in Computer Science? What about International Business, did you, when you wrote essays for that -

S: Oh yeah, I think it’s very, yeah, actually I found that the English writing is really really useful for my marketing and management, because we have essays, like for assignment every two weeks or every week (inaudible)...

R: And were you expected to use a variety of sources in those papers?

S: Yes. Of course. And the very very strict academic style.

R: Right, with citations and - everything?

R: Yes yes.

R: Right.

S: Even in the exam, you expect to write essay, essay, essay, essay, like it was just, keep writing it ((laughs))

R: ((laughs)) Ok so I’d like to talk to you, just to finish off, we’ve got a couple of minutes, um, about your research and writing, and, um, the kind of process you go through when you are writing an essay, um, so, how do you go from notes to final essay.

S: Um -

R: What steps do you go through.

S: (inaudible) ideas, like brainstorm or something?

R: (22:17) Yeah, yeah, or notes you’ve taken from essays, from um articles -

S: Yeah, I think basically I just go through those notes and I restructure them, like say, I, I group the ideas like say, what ideas I actually can group them together, and it also depends on what kind of essay I write, like, if I write a argumentative essay, if I wanna say both sides, and I have to, you know, split up them in the first place, and I just start with the structure, and um fill the details, and I, if necessary I give example, or maybe just sometimes if I just cannot think about any example, I just try to explain -

R: Mm. And what do you find most difficult about that process.

S: I think the, the most difficult (inaudible) maybe, maybe ah, like two times in that process. The first time is actually, what ideas I really want to say, cos I couldn’t decide very, like, I was always changing and I couldn’t decide what ideas and sometimes my structure messed up or whatever, and the second time is, well I actually decide and I want to write in English, and that sounds, sounds academic, and I rewrite again, again, again, just you know, try to make it more academic, or -

R: To get the right style?
S: Yeah.

R: Would you say you were comfortable with expressing your own opinion in your writing? Do you like to argue your own opinion?

S: Yes I, I think I’m, become more confident now, cos, mm, I’ve been writing English essay for like, university -

R: Yeah, so you think it’s a confidence thing, being to express your own opinion -

S: Yeah, I think it’s really important for you to practice - if you’ve never done it before and you wanna be confident.

R: Yeah, true - and um, when you’re using your sources, um, are you clear on the differences between, say, quotation, summary and paraphrase. How would you define those three things.

S: The quotation is you directly copy the, ah, the text from the original work, and then sometimes you, some really really good sentence, like, fantastic sentences, like, people will be attracted by those sentences you want use it, it’s also related to your topic, and for the summarise, it’s like the, I think you, maybe you read a, like, one article, a whole article, and you know what the author try to say and you talk about, you know the ideas you just wanna, you know, write in your own words but the same ideas in the short, maybe just one paragraph, and, but of course you borrowed ideas from the author...and another one is just ah, you read, like you basically ah, you have the, ah, exactly the same ideas, and you just restructure the sentence and then ah, because you just wanna resay it again or something but use your own language.

R: Yeah, yeah, and um do you use all those in your own writing?

S: Yes I, I did.

R: What would you use the most do you think.

S: Ah, I think ah, mm, maybe the paraphrase -

R: The paraphrase, yeah?

S: Maybe summarise and paraphrase and probably just like, very basic -

R: Yeah, yeah, good. And which of those three needs a citation do you think.

S: What - do you - you mean.

R: The quotation, the paraphrase and the summary and the paraphrase, which one needs an in-text citation.

S: Of course the, like the, what do you call it? Ah the quote?

R: The quotation marks, yeah.

S: The citation one, because you copy the original - words.
R: Yeah, yeah, good. And um, so we’ve talked a lot about plagiarism, and putting citations in your writing, um how do you feel about all that, is it something you think is important to do, or is it just a formula that you have to go through when you are writing.

S: Well I think it’s a formula, express my own idea I just do some research, and I am comfortable to rewrite the sentence or, something, and I, you know, I think it’s important, and actually I like it ((laughs))

R: Just one last question, um, do you ever have any problems with, no, you said when you first came to NZ you were unfamiliar with plagiarism and citation but now you are familiar with it, do you still have problems with knowing what to do, or would you say you are confident now, with the issues of plagiarism and citation and everything?

S: Well, I cannot say that I am 100% sure, because I, sometimes when I write something I do (get) confused - should I or should I not, but I think, most of the time, I mean, maybe all the time I just, I reference it, because I think it’s a safe plan - ((laughs))

R: A safe plan ((laughs)) yeah, it’s a good plan.

S: And also I think - I think, actually sometimes I think I’d rather just reference it because, you know, you just, its not, its not just a lot of work, you just know how the style of reference it, and you don’t have to worry about it later, because later you might think maybe actually I should reference it but I didn’t, or something like that -

R: Yeah, and then you’ve forgotten and it’s too late yeah. And do you know anyone here or in China who has had problems with plagiarism? Got in trouble, or -

S: Well I don’t know anyone who has a lot of problem with it, maybe they do but I would never talk about that stuff maybe, but I think, um, most of students are very clear and they just try to avoid, like - ah, the just try to, not, you know, not be caught by teacher or whatever, but they not really, just not really clear about the boundary.

R: And why do you think they’re confused.

S: Cos sometimes um - um - I think it’s like an education background thing, cos I think I understand them, cos sometimes I talk with them and I feel them, they just very similar to, ah, like the process when I was begin to, ah, learn English essay and I had a similar, very similar thing.

R: What is it about the educational background do you think, that makes this difficult.

S: It’s um, ah, we don’t have to reference, and ah, we taught a lot, you know, a lot of ideas is taught by the teacher, so we were like, oh ok, if you told me so this, this is my own idea now, so I can use it, so, so - very, very confused.

R: And then when they come here and its so different its difficult?

S: Yeah, and sometimes I, I really think ah, for English people, how you actually - I think maybe its really really hard for you to trace back, because you write something, but someone else write it exactly the same, but maybe sometimes you have, you just have the exactly same idea, because it happens, the possibility’s like, higher than like 10% I reckon, because
peoples, peoples are different but people will have similar ideas (inaudible). There are a lot of people in the world, so how you actually, you know -

R: Yeah, yeah. Do you, would you say that your instruct, the instructors, the people who are marking your work are aware that it’s a difficult issue for international students?

S: Um, well I think, I think so, but I think they, before they mark us, they, they, already told us how to do it, so they will have, maybe, very similar expectations from the native English speaker or Western people.

R: So you don’t think they are very sympathetic?

S: No, but, well, maybe depends. Sometimes maybe just a little bit they will like, mm, ok, but sometimes you just, if it’s a lot, very obvious, they will, you know, give you a big cross - cos I think it’s also depends on -

R: On the instructor?

S: Yeah.

R: Yeah, no it must be really difficult. Well I think that’s all my questions. Did you have anything else you wanted to add?

S: No ((laughs))

END OF TRANSCRIPT.
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Sample Coded Interview Transcript
Participant ID – C1

R) So let’s start talking about your academic background, if you could describe in as much detail as you’d like, um, the sorts of studies that you did before you came to New Zealand.

S) OK – um, I was in Brunei, which is (inaudible) in Asia - we started around four or five, Kindergarten, um – do you want me to talk about what we learned?

R) Yeah, as much as you like, that would be great.

S) I guess the first language we had to understand with each other (inaudible) would be English, even though the main language, the native language is Malay, it's compulsory - and Chinese, even though Chinese - we - it's not compulsory unless you choose to go to the Chinese school.

R) Yeah, so, on PIMS you are down as ethnically Chinese, [so]

S) [Yeah].

R) But your from Brunei, so you’re from Brunei– good, ok.

S) It’s the same - it's just that - um - a lot of Chinese all over the place?

R) Yeah, yep – ok, so continue, that’s great.

S) Ok -so - ah - we learnt ABC, from four to five years old depending how old your parents want you to start, but normally at five, and that’s kindergarten for a year or
two - I can't remember, um I think, yeah, four to five,
that’s one year. And then five
you start primary one, which is the same as here,
I'm not sure what’s it called, um -

then we only learn English and maths, then Malay.
And then I think - we don’t do
those things like social studies, or drawing or
anything, um, so I was just there for
like, four years, but still we did a lot of work.

R) Yeah. So where did you go after Brunei, [you]

S) [Came to]

R) Came here? So you went to high school in
Christchurch?

S) Yeah.

R) Yeah? Ok, and what did you do, at - it was
School Certificate when I did it I don’t
know what they call it now ((laughs))

S) Yeah I - just Form Four, Form Four – I did Fifth
Form School Certificate, and then
it was just Sixth Form, and then Bursary.

R) Right – ok, so that would have been a few years
ago now?

S) Yes. Yep – it’s my fourth year at Otago.

R) Fourth year – right. So at high school in
Christchurch, what kinds of writing did
you do there, what kinds of assignments and things
in English class?

S) To be honest I took English Fifth Form, I mean,
three, four, five and Sixth Form, I
didn’t do any Seventh Form, cos we just had to do
the ones we wanted, a lot of people
did English but I didn’t choose to cos I didn’t, think -
it was quite hard maybe, if I wanted to get good mark.

Um, we, just did like - you know - poems, like, Shakespeare, but just did like one - Othello, just that play, and a bit of understanding its poem, or, much – I can't remember.

R) Did you write many essays?

S) No I don’t think so, I think high school is like, quite random sometimes, just do whatever the teacher feels like setting up, and it’s not that but I don’t feel like I learned a lot - of writing.

R) Right. So, and you didn’t do Seventh Form English [so]

S) [No] yeah.

R) And then, when you came to Otago, this is your fourth year - um - what did you study? What’s your major.

S) The first year I did, um Computer Science and Design, and Design was based on the history, so - a little bit of writing, but, did not really care about the structure, or, anything like this, and I didn’t really know how write properly.

R) Right, cos you hadn’t done it in high school?

S) Yeah, not really. I mean, I don’t think so. You sort of know how to write properly, but, not as, like, nominalisation, and the things we learned in linguistics is really good I thought, so -

R) So was it hard that first year having to write assignments but not really being sure
of the structure and things?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WKP SELF ASSESSMENT</th>
<th>S) Yes. I think LING 121 - everyone should take it in their first year. Compulsory.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R) Yeah, a lot of people take it in their last year and it would’ve been good if they’d taken it, yeah ((laughs))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S) I know, yeah, yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R) Um, so, how do you think you learned to write essays then.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WKE LEARN FEEDBACK</td>
<td>S) I think when you hand in something and its not so good, the feedback maybe?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R) Yeah?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WKE LEARN FEEDBACK</td>
<td>S) I think that’s how you slowly learn how to write properly, and research properly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R) Talking a little bit about the research, um, you didn’t write much at high school and you said you didn’t learn how to use sources and things, so how did you learn how to do that? Just gradually, or?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACEXP DISC COMP AND INFO SCI</td>
<td>S) I guess - ah - Computer Science is like you know, writing a science report, it’s not really English, but design we had to like, cite the sources - they are pretty strict with plagiarism, and um, where you get things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WKE TYPE REPORT</td>
<td>R) How did you do that if you hadn’t been taught it before, how did you learn?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACEXP DISC SCIENCE</td>
<td>PKE EXPECTATIONS DISCIPLINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RKP REQUIREMENTS</td>
<td>PKP LEARNING AT THE UNIVERSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S) I think just look at the requirements and then you sort of try and we also like learning, after first year, when everyone’s not so sure what’s going on sometimes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                      | R) Yeah, so you’d say that that’s common to most
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: RomenaEgCodedInterview copy.txt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PKE EVALUATION INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S) Yes- and especially Asian, when it’s not their first language, or when they didn’t take English in Seventh Form, it’s quite, random.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PKE EVALUATION NZ STUDENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R) Why do you think it’s a problem for Asian students. What do you think.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PKE CAUSE PROFICIENCY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S) I think first it’s the language, and most people go to university they don’t take any English papers, or, anything that’s sort of, &quot;be careful of what you write, and how you structure, and, you should have the body, the conclusion&quot; and stuff like that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PKE CAUSE LACK OF EXPERIENCE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R) Yeah – what are the expectations with using sources and things are there in those science subjects? Are they different from the Arts do you think?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RKE SOURCE INSTRUCTOR EXPECTATIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S) Um - I think it’s just how you prove your calculation is the same, like similar to, what other people have, or can just sort of roughly say how you end up with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R) Yeah – and do you have to cite sources in those reports?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACEXP DISC SCIENCE REF KE INSTRUCTOR EXPECTATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S) No – I think we never – in Design just cite, um, reference to source of the images, and some research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R) Mm – right, right. You said they were strict in Design about plagiarism, so how did you first hear about it, did they give you classes in avoiding it, or [a handout?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACEXP DISC COMP AND INFO SCI</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S) [No, no] – yeah – I think it was Computer Science with plagiarism, it’s copying someone without - they always put it in the lab book – you have to sign to, to say that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R (7:40) Do you think most people understand?

S) No ((laughs)) – not really, not until, not until second year. No one really knows what to do.

R) Mm. So it wasn’t something that was discussed in high school at all?

S) I don’t think so. Maybe just once, in some assignment, I don’t - like no one like know what that word really is.

R) Mm - so it must be difficult when you come to first year and people are saying plagiarism, and nobody’s really sure about what it is.

S) Yeah – you don’t know what type of copying you mean, but we know like exact copying of someone’s stuff and just, like, hand it in, that’s something like plagiarism, that’s what everyone thinks it is.

R) Mm, so now you are in your fourth year, what would you say your understanding of plagiarism is.

S) Ah - it’s copying content of someone’s material, without their knowing, their permission, and making into your own work, and depends on how much, how long they have done their research, I’m not sure, could be a day or a few years, then it’s, it’s yours straight away – I don’t think that’s very, fair.

R) Do you think it’s common among students?

S) Yeah – because they just wanna write what’s right – like, based on someone, who makes sounds, convincing.
R) What forms of plagiarism do you think are most common among students?

**PKE DESCRIBING ACTION**

S) What forms? Um I think Internet’s most common, because you just type the keywords and a bunch of things comes out and then you think whatever sounds right, you just copy and paste, and sometimes people, they never change, or maybe take the whole paragraph and then never really want to understand it and rephrase it, something like that.

R) Do you think people do that on purpose?

**PKE EVALUATION LAZY**

S) I think some are lazy, mostly lazy.

R) Do you - in Brunei, obviously you weren’t there for that long in school, but do you think it’s a well-known issue there?

**PKP LEARNING HOME COUNTRY SCI**

S) No I don’t think they really, never talked about it - I don’t know the university system there, but like in high school, cos I still talk to my friends, and you know what they care more, most is about the maths and your, you know those crazy things that you do.

R) Yeah – what about issues of copyright and um commercial plagiarism, do you think that’s discussed much, or is much of an issue?

S) You mean like images, [and]

R) Yeah, and -

**PKP IMPORTANCE IN HOME COUNTRY**

S) I think you just have to cite them, then - they don’t, they’re not that strict, cos, Malaysia’s just, not really focused on, like, writing English really well, for some reason.
R) Mm. What about um, writing in Chinese, um, or Malay or whatever, do you think it’s similar to writing in English with references and sources [and]

PKP IMPORTANCE IN HOME COUNTR

S) [I don’t] think so, unless you’re writing a newspaper article, they sometimes write it.

R) Yeah – can you describe a little bit about what those newspaper articles are like?

PKP IMPORTANCE IN HOME COUNTR

S) Um - when they taking images? Of somewhere, like Chinese newspaper, they will say a little link, or someone’s name, like where is it from, taken by who, something, but not exactly the report at all, or the writer.

R) Yeah, yeah. Ok, good – um, let’s talk then, a little bit about your writing process, and the way you go about writing an essay, um, or an assignment - what kinds of sources do you like to use most often.

S) Um, when writing any assignment? Um, first of all, depends which, Design, or, English, type of paper -

R) Are the expectations different with the type of sources you’d need?

RKE SEARCH INTERNET

S) I think so, I think mostly just research (inaudible) I will go straight to the Internet first to know exactly what I’m looking out for, and then when I want to go further I will look at Proquest for journals and articles, um, at the end it will be like books in the library – it’s quite rarely now that we take out a book and then, get something in the middle, and then, yeah.

RKE SEARCH DIGITAL LIBRARY RES

RKE SOURCE JOURNAL

RKE SOURCE BOOK

R) Yeah, good – and for Design, and English, and
Computer, um, Science, um, how – are they very different, the types of sources? Do they all want you to use academic journals and things, or -

S) Yeah, no – Design never encourage people to look in the catalogue and database.

R) So what’s a Design assignment like then.

S) Um, say, do a little bit of research of a chair, say, how’s chair made and why its structure, and you just find a designer, who thinks, who makes chair, and what does he think, and then, something like a theory thing, I’m not sure.

R) And it's important to acknowledge those, you know, where the design came from and those kinds of things?

S) Yeah, just designer, and then just a link to where you got the information from.

R) Right, right. And for your English papers?

S) Um - yeah - mostly online journals, articles, quite important to read journals actually, cos its same types of people that writes, and you wanna write like them and think like them.

R) How do you mean?

S) Like, um - the way they write say about, ah, what was our assignment, one of our assignments?

R) Um, the argumentative one?

S) Yeah, about, like, media -

R) Right – violence in the media.
S) On violence, yeah. So, just a lot of people and their perspective, they write a similar way, like a news article type.

R) Mm. So would you say you use, um, you looked at articles and journal articles as a model of how to write a good essay with prose and things, or do you mainly get ideas from your articles?

S) I think ideas, like key words and phrase, and depending on what, like, you require us to write, that we had to have a body – knowing the requirements first and then, key words and phrases.

R) Good – and um, so once you’ve done your research, what do you do then once you’ve got all your articles and things.

S) Um, I would like, sit down maybe, eventually, write a piece – it’s quite hard I think, it’s the hardest to start off, then you just write, you split the whole ideas into, you know, start, body, conclusion, then that slowly, fits in together. And you have to re-read it a few times.

R) And what do you find most difficult about that research and writing process?

S) I think like, sometimes, the introduction and conclusion is similar, right? But argument, can be quite hard, I think it’s hardest to argue, which, what you want your argument in your essay.

R) Mm – why do you find that hard?

S) Because you’re not sure which to go, sometimes.

R) Once you’ve decided on your argument are you
comfortable with putting your own opinion in your essay and arguing that?

S) Yeah – ah yes, but sometimes, you know your writing and your opinion’s not so important, so, it sort of say, whatever’s obvious I think, like media violence is, after reading quite a lot you know, some people not direct to say that it is on the media, but I do agree, after reading a lot and summarise.

R) Yeah, you did lots of research for your essay, it was really good. Um - that was for your essay, what about for Design and things, do you, do you write your opinion about what design is good, or, do you form an argument in those other essays to.

S) I don’t think we ever really do argument, but we just conclude what you agree with, sometimes, and what they want to say is, um, how your design developed into the final one, from like, why you went to it, you know?

R) Right, so you’re required to kind of - trace your thought process through?

S) Yeah, and you show sort of research to drawings to anything, that convince, yeah.

R) So those essays are kind of a combination of your own thought backed up with, with, with sources?

S) Yeah.

R) Ok, good. So you’ve got your notes, and you’ve got your essay, lets think a little bit now about the different ways you can use sources, um, would you say you clearly understood the difference between, say, summary, quotation and paraphrase?
WKE INCORP summarising

S) Um, before linguistics not really, I mean, paraphrasing and those, summary we know that, you know, or similarly, but not paraphrasing, cos, it's like re-doing the whole thing and having the same amount of number, that was, yeah, something new, I didn't know that.

R) Something new. Yeah – and which of those would you say you use most often in your own writing.

S) Ah -quotation is just, is it just like a quote and then you cite it? I think quote and summary, yeah.

R) Why do you prefer those two over paraphrase.

WKE INCORP paraphrasing

S) Um, sometimes quotation is just, I think it's like since high school you just want to, you know, prove that someone said something.

R) Yeah – so would you use quotations in your writing in high school as well?

WKE INCORP quoting

S) I think that was - mm - mostly, the only thing, sort of argument or proof.

R) And would you cite those quotations?

REF KP REQUIREMENTS

S) Yeah - oh - in the high school I don’t really think so, but just in the, the, whoever said it, not, like -

R) So, like Othello says bla, bla, bla, sort of thing?

S) Yeah.

R) And um, when you’re using those in your writing now do you always put a citation?
S) Um, you mean for the quotation?
R) Yeah.

S) Ah, I don’t use it very often in the university, cos, think in English type of paper, it’s more, um, useful to put those, need something, so yes, I would always put citation.
R) And for summary as well?

S) Ah, yes, only for English and Linguistics papers, and summary that you put, your, you know, conclusion and stuff, but in other papers it’s just your opinions.
R) So what do you think doesn’t need a citation when you’re doing your writing.

S) Um, what you already know, right? Um, really common sense things, like childrens do learn bad behaviour on TV, which is automatically, they like to copy, and -
R) Yeah- so things that are common sense – and do you think among students in general there’s a clear understanding of what they should put a citation for and what they shouldn’t?

S) Um, no, not really, until they take ling, Linguistics, or English papers, you, that’s your requirement, you know, if you want to pass the paper you have to eventually understand, which is really good.
R) Yeah, so you say there’s a difference between English and the other papers at the university, and students who don’t take English papers aren’t going to necessarily be exposed to that kind [of]
S) [No], I don’t think so.

R) But the expectation is still that they do it?

S) Yeah.

R) Do you think there’s much sympathy among instructors for international students and their writing? Do they, um - obviously you, you know, you’ve been writing English for a long time and your English is really excellent, but other international students, your friends that you talk to, do they find the instructors help them, or are sympathetic, or do they have high expectations of them?

S) Yeah, I think they, they like to look at requirements and requirement didn’t really say plagiarism, cos I don’t think some - they don’t really tell you, and then they will just do whatever they want, so, then you should highlight in every assignment maybe the first look, what’s the proper way to do your assignment – depends what type – essay, or report, or -

R) Um, do you know anybody who has got in trouble with plagiarism?

S) Um, I know a friend who did (inaudible) 101, and two of them was doing something about Taoism, and just then they wrote, I don’t know, they look like a paragraph out of the Wikipedia, Wikipedia yeah, so they got into trouble.

R) Right – and what happened to them.

S) I’m not sure but they told me that, yeah, they just explained, because they are just first year and they are not so sure what plagiarism
PKP LEARNING THROUGH EXPERIENCE
S) So I told them, you should explain to the teacher that you really, cos I’m pretty sure they’re not sure, how to do, how to understand and take sources from the Internet, cite them and the rephrase them, then understand, and rewrite them in your own words. So, um, yeah – they were, they explained to the teacher and then, it was quite a big problem they said, cos they were quite mad.

R) Right.

R) The teacher?

PKP LEARNING THROUGH EXPERIENCE
S) Ah, the Head, the Head of Department – it’s Japanese department in charge, something like that. So they were given a chance, to do it again, but only worth 50%, or something like that.

R) So you think it was confusion that resulted in them -

PKE CAUSE LACK OF EXPERIENCE
S) Mm, a little bit, like half half, but mostly, not sure exactly what they’re doing.

R) Yeah.

PKE CAUSE LACK OF EXPERIENCE
RL (22:31) Just wanna, you know, get assignment done, handed in, but…

R) And were they international students, or were [they]

S) [Yep].

R) They were international students. Do you think, um, having grown up, or having gone to school in New Zealand so you must have New Zealand friends and
international student friends, do you think both
groups are confused about the way to
use sources and plagiarism?

S) I think, um, local ones maybe (inaudible) who’ve
been here for a long time, but I
think Kiwi mostly, I think they know.

R) They do?

PKE EVALUATION NZ STUDENTS

S) They should, they know more than Asians I
guess, cos I think Asian, if they are,
major is English, maybe, they understand the
whole, writing idea – cos I think most of
them are, they’re not sure or don’t care, and just
wanna do an assignment and then
hand it in without any citation or much.

R) Yeah – so where do you think the Kiwi students
learn if it's not at high school.

PKE EVALUATION IMPORTANCE OF E

S) I think in high school they should teach people to
rephrase what they research, not
just go online, it’s just the Internet, like Wikipedia
now is people who just want to
contribute right? Anyone who can write it up so
that’s a bit, um, dangerous, if, I guess
in high school you’re just doing, you know, basic
research, it doesn’t really matter,
they should maybe teach Seventh Form.

R) Mm, and, and then at university it’s an issue –
and what about in the wider
community – do you think it's something that people should be concerned about?

S) Yeah, yeah. Um, like, after university and everything, you understand now, about published things, (inaudible) and then it belongs to someone and you should appreciate their work.

R) Yeah, yeah – good. Let me just look through my pages and see if I’ve got anything else I wanted to ask – no I think that’s about everything – have you got anything else you wanted to say?

S) No.

END OF TRANSCRIPT
Appendix I
Inferential Statistical Analysis - Results Tables

Table 11 Results of Mann-Whitney U Test for Chinese (N=28) non-Chinese (N=15) language background students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 Results of Kruskal-Wallis Test for disciplinary background (Commerce N=23, Humanities N=9, Science N=10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 Results of Kruskal-Wallis Test for year of study (1/2 years N=8, 2/3 years N=8, 3/4 years N=22, 5 years or more N=4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J

Source texts used for paraphrase assignments

Text A.

Although U. S. universities vary in entrance requirements and academic standards, all share certain academic rituals which may make adjustment difficult for students from other countries, depending on the students expectations, previous learning experiences and learning styles. Even native American students find the initial period of adjustment difficult, with from 30-50 percent expressing fears they will not be able to meet college course demands. The problem is compounded for foreign students who must adapt to different values, customs and language. The foreign student - even from English speaking countries - usually finds the American spoken idiom strange. Almost always, the foreign student finds the professor’s expectations, teaching strategies, reading assignments and examinations differ from those of teachers in his home country. How can foreign students be helped to adjust to the U.S. college demands?

The all-pervasive problem of foreign students is time. Students for whom English is a second language need to spend more time coping with study assignments, reading, thinking and writing. There is little time left to play or relax. Foreign students are also under a state of tension or anxiety during their initial adjustment period. They are constantly attentive and strive for the right way to express themselves and interpret what others say. Compounding these linguistic and emotional problems are the academic rules and rituals which must be learned.

In large undergraduate courses the foreign student faces the problem of trying to follow the points of a rapid-fire lecture and, at the same time, take notes on what is being said. Professors who use academic jargon and idioms confuse the student who is trying to understand new technical terms and take notes in English. Lecturers with idiosyncratic speech patterns (dialect speakers, mumblers and so on) are difficult even for native English speakers to understand.

Small group discussions and seminars pose a different kind of problem for foreign students. Here they are expected to contribute their ideas to the discussion, relate personal experiences and communicate feelings about a topic. In classes with highly verbal native students the foreign students may verbally withdraw because he or she does not have enough time to formulate a opinion or answer before other
students respond or discussion veers off to another point. In situations like this we recommend that students practice discussing topics with friends. We also have students role play the class discussions with our skills specialists so they can learn to express themselves spontaneously.

Professors expect college students to be fluent and proficient in reading and writing. At Berkley, reading lists in courses in social science humanities and the professional schools are lengthy. For example, students in advanced psychology courses are expected to read seventy-five pages per week of highly technical textbooks and journal articles. Political science instructors assign as many as 200 pages per night per course. Students soon realize they cannot read every word and must develop effective skimming and scanning skills to survive. Effective skimming requires critical reading; one must know how to select ideas, concepts or theories that are most relevant to their course goals. It is vital that the student set priorities in reading; to do this he or she must clearly understand what the professor expects and how the information and ideas acquired are to be used. This is one of the most difficult challenges for foreign students; even though they have completed a year of English for Foreign Students, they may still lack the reading vocabulary and confidence that is necessary for skimming.

A recent interview survey of study habits at Berkley found that students from Taiwan tended to devote almost all of their time to reading and studying, including weekends. Students from Hong Kong, however, took a more relaxed approach and tended to put off studying, socialize more, and like many U.S. students, crammed desperately just before the exams and papers were due. She attributes the differences to the fact that the Hong Kong students were more fluent in English and thus freer to socialize with American students.

Although most students have some experience with essay examinations the format for answers that an American professor accepts often differs radically from that accepted in other countries. Success on essay exams requires good writing skills - the ability to organize information clearly and express ideas precisely. Since two or three questions are typically given in an hour exam, the student writing under time pressure must plan answers accordingly. It is important to tell the student that the professor or teaching assistant who reads and grades the papers does so hurriedly and unless the paper is clear and well organized, the student may earn a lower grade even though he or she understands the subject.
Text B.

For as long as I can remember, I have been interested in exotic places. I remember that geography was my favourite subject in elementary and high school, and it was no surprise that I decided to study in Spain during my junior year in college.

But then why was I feeling so miserable as the elevator ascended the Eiffel Tower in late August of 1971? It was a hot, sticky day. Tourists were speaking German, Italian, and Swedish on that crowded elevator. I had flown from New York to Paris and had a layover of several hours before catching a flight to Madrid. Already, I was getting nervous being 3,000 miles from home. If I had travelled with another American, the conversation would have headed off the first pangs of homesickness. At that point however, I hadn’t even identified my uneasiness, and I filled the void with the plan of going into Paris to see the sights. That’s how I ended up on the Eiffel Tower elevator. On that slow ascent, a mixture of claustrophobia, body odour, and foreign languages overpowered my bravado. I felt miserable. Culture shock had struck, as it would dozens of times over the next academic year. Here I was feeling panicky and out of control, wanting to flee, not understanding why I was experiencing such an adverse emotional state.

Cross-cultural adjustment theory (Grave & Torbiorn, 1985; Lysgaard, 1955) tells us that sojourners usually bottom out after several weeks or months in their new environment. I hadn’t completed the initial 24 hours and I had already been wallopped. I experienced a more serious shock in Madrid several months later. By that time I had learned a great deal about Spanish culture. My language skills had gotten beyond the survival level and I could carry on simple conversations with a minimum of problems. I had learned to be self-sufficient in many ways but I was far from being adjusted.

At this point, I was sharing an apartment with a young man who had migrated from northern Spain to work in the capital as a civil engineer. Jose served as my window on Spanish society. His friends and I would visit the Spanish countryside, attend cultural events in Madrid and socialize in student bars. Jose, although he spoke of his two brothers and his sister, never invited me to meet them. Frequently, during the evenings, conversations would turn to politics, the injustices young people
suffered under the Franco regime, Vietnam and Nixon. Jose was unique in that he didn’t expect me to be responsible for America’s blunders in international politics. Eventually, Jose talked about his younger brother Celin, who had been assaulted by the Spanish Civil Guard and who harboured a great deal of anger about the repression in Spain. Celin showed up at the apartment one night when Jose wasn’t home. Conversation turned to politics, and every comment made by Celin was either an attack on America’s role in Vietnam, and dozens of other countries, or criticism of my limited ability in Spanish. He was even so outrageous as to ask me what business I had living in Spain.

The conversation was so filled with animosity that I began to understand why Jose had never introduced me to his brother. Again, culture shock had hit. The acidic conversation by this young political radical sent me reeling: Why was I in Spain? What about the political mistakes that my country had made? Why was all this anger directed at me? Once again I was confused, wondering about my motives, and disoriented by a different value system. Talking with Jose afterward helped me regain some of the perspective that had taken me months to establish. It was becoming clear that crossing borders was a whole lot more then adjusting one’s watch to a new time zone and changing money to the local currency. Suffering culture shock and then learning how to cope in a new culture, took time and energy. When a person develops skills in a new culture, it is as if a new sense of competency and confidence are part of the reward. In my case Jose was serving as a mentor and a cross-cultural counselor in the process.

As cross-cultural adjustment theory (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963) tell us, culture shock isn’t like the mumps. You get it repeatedly. I suffered from it on each trip out of the United States, but I also reaped rewards for working through the difficult stages.

My current position in the international student services is a natural outcome of experiencing first hand what it means to be an outsider, a foreigner. My experience overseas has heightened my sensitivity to cross-cultural adjustment, and my training as a counsellor has helped me learn how to counsel students who arrive here with limited or no English language skills, and no idea of how to negotiate our higher education system.

In summary, my critical incident was a year-long adjustment living in a foreign country, having arrived alone and without anyone to accompany me. As I look back on my personal and professional development, I feel my initial visit to Spain was
the first in a series of experiences that paved the road to my current professional situation - cross cultural counselling of international students in a college setting.

Appendix K
Summary Text Analysis Data Tables for Case Study Participants

1. Xiao Wen

Table K1 *Instances of Source Use Referenced and Attributed in Research Essay*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of source use</th>
<th>Number of strings identified</th>
<th>Strings Referenced</th>
<th>Strings Attributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close modification</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive modification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed idea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common idea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table K2 *Percentage of Source-use Types Across Writing Tasks*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Source Use</th>
<th>Paraphrase</th>
<th>Test Essay</th>
<th>Research Essay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close modification</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Mariko

Table K3. *Instances of Source Use Referenced and Attributed in Research Essay*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source use</th>
<th>Number of strings identified</th>
<th>Strings Referenced</th>
<th>Strings Attributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close modification</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive modification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed idea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table K4. *Types of Sources Used as a Proportion of the Total Assignment Word Count*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Source Use</th>
<th>Paraphrase</th>
<th>Test Essay</th>
<th>Research Essay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close modification</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive modification</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed idea</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common idea</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table K5 Instances of Source Use Referenced and Attributed in Research Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of source use</th>
<th>Number of strings identified</th>
<th>Strings Referenced</th>
<th>Strings Attributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close modification</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive modification</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed idea</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common idea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table K6 Percentages of Types Textual Borrowing Across Task Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Source Use</th>
<th>Paraphrase</th>
<th>Test Essay</th>
<th>Research Essay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close modification</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive modification</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed idea</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common idea</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Daniel

Table K7 Instances of Source Use Referenced and Attributed in Research Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of source use</th>
<th>Number of strings identified</th>
<th>Strings Referenced</th>
<th>Strings Attributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close modification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive modification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed idea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common idea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table K8 Percentages of Types Textual Borrowing Across Task Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Source Use</th>
<th>Paraphrase</th>
<th>Test Essay</th>
<th>Research Essay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close modification</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed idea</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common idea</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5. Yu Ming

Table K9 *Percentages of Types Textual Borrowing Across Task Types*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Source Use</th>
<th>Paraphrase</th>
<th>Test Essay</th>
<th>Research Essay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close modification</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed idea</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common idea</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table K10 *Instances of Source Use Referenced and Attributed in Research Essay*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of source use</th>
<th>Number of strings identified</th>
<th>Strings Referenced</th>
<th>Strings Attributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close modification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive modification</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed idea</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common idea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Susana

Table K11 *Instances of Source Use Referenced and Attributed in Research Essay*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of source use</th>
<th>Number of strings identified</th>
<th>Strings Referenced</th>
<th>Strings Attributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close modification</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive modification</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed idea</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common idea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table K12 *Percentage of Source-use Types Across Writing Tasks*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Source Use</th>
<th>Paraphrase</th>
<th>Test Essay</th>
<th>Research Essay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close modification</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed idea</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common idea</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Rowena

Table K13 *Instances of Source-use Referenced and Paraphrased in Research Essay*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of source use</th>
<th>Number of strings identified</th>
<th>Strings Referenced</th>
<th>Strings Attributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close modification</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive modification</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed idea</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common idea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table K14 *Percentages of Types of textual Borrowing Across Task Types*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Source Use</th>
<th>Paraphrase</th>
<th>Test Essay</th>
<th>Research Essay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close modification</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive modification</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed idea</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common idea</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table K15 Instances of Source-use Referenced and Attributed in Research Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of source use</th>
<th>Number of strings identified</th>
<th>Strings Referenced</th>
<th>Strings Attributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close modification</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive modification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed idea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common idea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table K16 Percentages of Types Textual Borrowing Across Task Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Source Use</th>
<th>Paraphrase</th>
<th>Test Essay</th>
<th>Research Essay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close modification</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive modification</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed idea</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common idea</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Zara

Table K 17 Instances of Source use Referenced and Attributed in Research Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of source use</th>
<th>Number of strings identified</th>
<th>Strings Referenced</th>
<th>Strings Attributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close modification</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive modification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed idea</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common idea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table K18 Percentages of Types Textual Borrowing Across Task Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Source Use</th>
<th>Paraphrase</th>
<th>Test Essay</th>
<th>Research Essay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close modification</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed idea</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common idea</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table K 19 Instances of Source use Referenced and Attributed in Research Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of source use</th>
<th>Number of strings identified</th>
<th>Strings Referenced</th>
<th>Strings Attributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close modification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive modification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed idea</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common idea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table K20 Percentages of Types Textual Borrowing Across Task Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Textual Borrowing</th>
<th>Paraphrase</th>
<th>Test Essay</th>
<th>Research Essay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct copy</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close modification</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed idea</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common idea</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix L

References Used by Case Study Participants in Research Essays


Ford, N. (2004, August 1). Sweet and sour upgrade: A stable political climate and sound economic policies have helped Cape Verde gain reclassification to the ranks of ‘medium developed countries’. However, as Neil Ford reports, this promotion is a mixed blessing. *African Business*, pp. 56-57.


Knickerbocker, B., & Grier, P. (1994, June 8). UN urges humanitarian use of ‘peace dividend’ In a special study, the United Nations’ development agency calls on governments in post-cold-war era to funnel military spending into more effective aid programs. *Christian Science Monitor*.


Appendix M

Results of Cronbach's Alpha Calculations for Questionnaire Likert Scale Items

Table M.1 Summary of Cronbach's Alpha Scores for Item Groupings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item numbers</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Alpha score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51, 52, 54</td>
<td>Perceptions of institutional emphasis on source use conventions.</td>
<td>0.7724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61, 64, 68</td>
<td>Importance of own ideas in academic writing.</td>
<td>0.8509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53, 56</td>
<td>Perceptions of disciplinary emphasis (Linguistics vs. other departments).</td>
<td>0.5657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65, 62, 60, 63, 59</td>
<td>Role of originality and authoritative sources in academic writing.</td>
<td>0.881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table M2 Perceptions of Disciplinary Emphasis on Plagiarism (N=47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SD/D</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>A/SA</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>My other courses do not emphasise plagiarism as much as this linguistics course.</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>There is more of a discussion of plagiarism in my linguistics course than in my other courses here at Otago</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S=Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, U=Undecided, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree, NA=No Answer