TEXTUAL BORROWING ACROSS ACADEMIC ASSIGNMENTS: EXAMINING

UNDERGRADUATE SECOND LANGUAGE WRITERS'

IMPLEMENTATION OF WRITING INSTRUCTION

by

Zuzana Tomaš

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of

The University of Utah

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Linguistics

The University of Utah

August 2011

The University of Utah Graduate School

STATEMENT OF DISSERTATION APPROVAL

The dissertation of   **Zuzana Tomaš**

has been approved by the following supervisory committee members:

MaryAnn Christison	, Chair	**4/30/2011**
		Date Approved
Adrian Palmer	, Member	**4/30/2011**
		Date Approved
Rachel Hayes-Harb	, Member	**4/30/2011**
		Date Approved
Jay Jordan	, Member	**4/30/2011**
		Date Approved
Scott Jarvis	, Member	**4/30/2011**
		Date Approved
Stacey Katz Bourns	, Member	**4/30/2011**
		Date Approved

and by   **Edward Rubin**   , Chair of

the Department of   **Linguistics**

and by Charles A. Wight, Dean of The Graduate School.

ABSTRACT

Research that has examined how L2 writers write from sources and the extent to which these source-based texts differ from texts produced by L1 writers suggests that L2 writers copy more extensively and attribute information to original sources less frequently than L1 writers (e.g., Keck, 2006). This dissertation study set out to add to the existing body of literature on textual borrowing in undergraduate L2 writers with the additional goal of examining the extent to which these writers' textual borrowing is influenced by instruction on avoiding plagiarism. The study employed qualitative methodology and drew upon multiple data sources. Additionally, unlike much of the existing research on L2 writers' textual borrowing, this study examined three L2 writers' textual borrowing in the context of authentic source-based assignments produced in an ESL writing class and mainstream courses.

The findings showed that the three L2 writers in the study were able to avoid blatant plagiarism by implementing basic textual borrowing strategies, such as paraphrasing by substituting original words with synonyms. However, they continued to have difficulties with more nuanced aspects of source use, such as transparency and cohesion in attribution, integration of source-based material with their own voice, source selection and organization, and use of effective reading and writing strategies.

With respect to the observed instruction, the study uncovered several central themes: the instructor 1) tended to focus on the punitive consequences of plagiarism

(although her perspective shifted toward the end of the course), 2) frequently emphasized concepts of credibility and blame as main reasons for responsible textual borrowing, and 3) simplified instruction on textual borrowing to rephrasing of others' words and changing structure.

These findings highlight the mismatch between the complex difficulties that undergraduate L2 writers have with textual borrowing on one hand and the simplified instruction that ignores these difficulties on the other. I discuss this uncovered disparity in the realm of L2 writing teacher preparation and professional training for faculty across the curriculum, arguing for increased institutional support. I also outline a framework for providing such instructional support, which includes linguistic, textual, cognitive, metacognitive, and social support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. MaryAnn Christison, my committee chair, for her support with this dissertation project and for her guidance throughout my master's and doctoral programs. I feel very grateful to all my committee members, Dr. Adrian Palmer, Dr. Rachel Hayes-Harb, Dr. Jay Jordon, Dr. Stacey Katz Bourns, and Dr. Scott Jarvis, for their valuable feedback and mentorship that have not only shaped this work, but also my identity as a TESOL professional. Additionally, I thank the University of Utah Graduate Research Fellowship committee who awarded me the Graduate Research Fellowship, thus allowing me to focus on completing this work.

I am also grateful to my husband, Aleksandar Tomas, for his patience and encouragement and to my daughter, Amelia, for making me smile during the most difficult parts of the research process. I dedicate this dissertation to my parents, Viera Sarikova and Dusan Sarik, without whose many sacrifices I would not have had the opportunity to study it the United States in the first place.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The globalization of the academy has put increasing pressure on scholars in the sciences and humanities around the world to disseminate their work in English, rather than in their mother tongues (Ammon, 2001; Curry & Lillis, 2004). Because the ability to publish in English brings international scholars substantial cultural, academic, and economic advantages, institutions of higher education are feeling considerable pressure to create writing courses and programs for second language (L2) undergraduate students that help them develop strong academic writing skills. One of the key abilities essential in academic writing is the ability to use published sources in one's writing. However, L2 writers have been shown to have considerably difficulty in this area. Specifically, researchers have pointed to L2 writers' frequent copying of formulaic chunks of texts from published studies into their own work (Currie, 1998; Flowerdew & Li, 2007; Pecorari, 2001, 2003, 2006; Spack 1997).

For example, Flowerdew and Li (2007) discovered that Chinese doctoral students in the sciences copied and pasted large excerpts from published articles into their own papers, asserting that the provision of references to works from which they had drawn at the end of their articles justified this practice. Pecorari (2003) examined L2 writers' textual borrowing practices in nine master's theses and eight Ph.D. dissertations in the

sciences, social sciences, and humanities at three British universities. She concluded that over 40% of reused source were repeated in a word-by-word fashion without conventional markers of attribution (such as quotation marks).

It appears that L2 writers' developing linguistic competence and their lack of familiarity with Western values and conventions for academic practices, underscore the enormity of these writers' challenges to produce effective discourse within the Western academic context. In response to the challenges experienced by international writers, EAP scholars have called for more pedagogical support. Two main recommendations have been to design comprehensive academic writing curricula specific to the needs of L2 writers (Belcher, 2004; Currie, 1998; Currie & Lillis, 2004) and to develop instructional materials that facilitate the acquisition of relevant academic genres and skills (Barks &Watts, 2001; Swales & Freak, 1996, 2000).

However, recommendations, however useful, do not generally result from systematic research on the effectiveness of instruction and materials. Systematic study of instructional effectiveness is necessary in order to gain understanding into how to best support L2 academic writers. It is imperative that such research considers closely the opinions and writing behaviors of the L2 writers responding to various instructional approaches and materials.

A gap exists in the literature regarding availability of studies that seek to explain authentic L2 writers' textual borrowing. Studies investigating these practices are often based upon inquiries of controlled and often decontextualized tasks, such as timed writing tests (Campbell, 1990) or 100-word summaries (e.g., Corbeil, 2000; Johns, 1990; Keck, 2007; Moore, 1997; Shi, 2004, Tomaš, 2006; Yamada, 2002). When research is

conducted with authentic[1] written tasks, such as masters' theses and doctoral dissertations, it excludes undergraduate L2 writers who are also typically required to produce source-based writing. Additionally, the existing studies tend to employ predominantly textual analyses. What is also needed is a discussion of L2 writers' opinions and attitudes toward source-use and a description of L2 writers' actual use of other texts as they produce their academic written assignments. In other words, understanding strategies L2 writers use as they produce source-based texts could provide insights into how writing instructors and interested mainstream scholars can better assist these writers.

Research problem

The discussion above highlights two major deficiencies in the current research on relevant writing instruction and L2 writers' textual borrowing practices. First, the current knowledge about effective instructional approaches to writing from sources predominantly based on accounts of "lore" or best practices as observed or experienced by the writing instructors publishing recommendations about instruction on writing from sources. Few studies that directly investigate the effectiveness or usefulness of textual borrowing instruction have been conducted. Furthermore, discussions of instructional effectiveness tend to exclude the voices of L2 writers whose insights have the potential to add to our understanding of what is effective or seen by L2 writers as useful. Second, the information about undergraduate L2 writers' use of academic sources comes from empirical studies that are often too controlled and, thus, have limited implications to

---

[1] Authenticity is seen in this dissertation in the traditional sense of the word. For example, authentic texts are seen as similar to texts encountered in one's real, in this context mostly academic, life.

authentic academic practice or do not provide any information about actual strategies employed by L2 writers during their production of source-based assignments. Additionally, as Leki and Carson (1997) point out "we know little about how [L2 writers] experience the differing demands these [ESL and non-ESL] writing contexts make on their writing abilities" (p.42).

Given the gaps in research, additional studies that examine the nature of the instruction relevant to plagiarism and textual borrowing, including its efficacy and usefulness, are necessary. This dissertation study serves as an initial step toward providing a more comprehensive perspective on L2 writers' source use and the ways in which source use instruction is taught and subsequently implemented by L2 writers in their ESL and mainstream[2] source-based assignments. This inquiry builds on the results of an earlier pilot study (Tomaš, 2006) which examined the extent to which undergraduate L2 writers developed skills in using academic sources during an academic writing class. The results of the pilot showed a clear progression from copied or near-copied text to more substantially changed rephrases of the original. However, the nature of the actual instruction that may have contributed to students' improved understanding of source use practices was not the focus of this initial study and relied only on descriptions provided by the interviewed instructor. To improve the pilot study design, the current study employs a qualitative methodology that utilizes multiple data sources (e.g., interviews, observations, documents, texts), thus providing a more complete picture of the dynamics between the L2 writers, instructors, and texts. This study analyzes sources used in the texts produced by L2 writers, as well as the behaviors and strategies

---

[2] By ESL I mean university writing courses designed for international students to meet the institutional writing requirement. Mainstream courses refer to all other, non-ESL university courses.

employed during the text production for ESL and mainstream courses. It also investigates the nature of instruction relevant to plagiarism and textual borrowing and explores the extent to which this instruction is reflected in writers' texts, strategies, and beliefs. Finally, both perspectives—that of the L2 writers enrolled in the writing course and that of the instructor—are examined in relation to instructional usefulness. The analysis of current instructional practices and their perceived usefulness facilitate the development of a framework for improving the instruction of source use in academic writing curricula.

Research questions

The research questions for this study are divided into two main categories—one centering on the textual borrowing instruction and the other on the extent of L2 writers' implementation of the instruction.

1. What is the nature of ESL writing instruction on plagiarism and textual borrowing?
   a. How are the concepts of plagiarism and textual borrowing presented and practiced in the L2 writing classroom?
   b. What kinds of instructional characteristics does an L2 writing instructor and L2 writers consider useful in teaching L2 writers about plagiarism and textual borrowing?
2. What role does instruction that is focused on strategies for avoiding plagiarism and writing from sources play in L2 writers' source-based writing?
   a. What composing strategies do L2 writers use when writing from sources in their ESL and mainstream courses? Are these strategies consistent with

the instruction they receive?

b. What textual borrowing strategies do L2 writers use in their assignments for ESL and mainstream courses? Are these strategies consistent with the instruction they receive?

Chapter 2 offers a discussion of general trends in the research on plagiarism and textual borrowing practices, reviews studies examining L2 writers' textual borrowing as well as studies focusing on relevant instruction. Chapter 3 outlines the methodology employed in the current study. Chapter 4 centers on the instruction on textual borrowing and the instructor's and L2 writers' opinions about its usefulness. Chapter 5 examines textual borrowing in L2 writers' assignments produced in the ESL 1060 course as well as in their non-ESL courses. The specific focus is on the extent to which these writers incorporate the received instruction as they produce source-based assignments. Chapter 6 synthesizes the main findings from Chapters 4 and 5 and proposes pedagogical alternatives to writing instruction targeting textual borrowing. Chapter 7 provides a conclusion to this dissertation.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

<u>An overview of plagiarism in L2 writing</u>

Over the past three decades, a growing number of researchers working in the area

of L2 writing and educators with interest in L2 writers have written about the

complexities inherent in the appropriate use of academic sources in L2 writing and have

examined issues related to *plagiarism*. The main strands of the relevant research have

addressed the following issues:

1) definitions of plagiarism and the categorization of plagiarism as deliberate versus non-deliberate (Angelil-Carter, 2000; Pennycook, 1996; Scollon, 1994),
2) plagiarism as it relates to developing language proficiency and discourse expertise (Angelil-Carter, 2000, Dudley-Evans, 2002; Howard, 1995; Liu, 2005; Spack, 1997),
3) plagiarism as a cultural phenomenon (Bloch and Chi, 1995; Gu and Brooks, 2008),
4) plagiarism as a survival/ copying/ compensatory strategy (Bloch and Chi, 1995; Currie, 1998; Flowerdew, 2007),
5) L2 writers' understanding of and beliefs about plagiarism (Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2005), and
6) L2 writers' textual borrowing practices (Borg, 2000; Currie, 1988; Leki & Carson, 1995; Mayes & Johns, 1990; Keck, 2007; Ouellette, 2004; Pecorari, 2003, 2006; Shi, 2004).

I will briefly describe the main points raised in the research on the first five issues before

providing a more complete review of literature on L2 writers' textual borrowing. The

chapter will conclude with a discussion of the role of instruction in L2 writers'

development of source use practices.

Definitions of plagiarism and the categorization of plagiarism

as deliberate versus nondeliberate

Plagiarism appears to be a product of European modernism, especially the Enlightenment movement during which the notion of copyright emerged (Pennycook, 1994; Scollon, 1995). Although historically related, there is, however, a clear difference between the concepts of copyright and plagiarism. Copyright only deals with *words* as ways of expressing ideas so as to protect one's ownership of ideas or patents. Plagiarism involves a violation in borrowing others' words *and/or* ideas. In other words, while using others' ideas without crediting them could be considered plagiarism and copyright violation (should these ideas be protected under copyright), using others' words without appropriate citation constitutes plagiarism.

Angelil-Carter (2000) notes that proving ideational plagiarism is complicated. Besides the obvious difficulty in demonstrating that authors did not think of an idea on their own, what compounds this issue further are the often unaccountable influences and interactions between authors and the people, ideas, and texts around them. Additionally, Angelil-Carter (2000) argues that the definitions of plagiarism are further obscured because plagiarism can mean fundamentally different things to different people, working with different genres in different contexts. Buranen (1999) also points to the problematic nature of the term plagiarism. She likens the concept to a "wastebasket into which we toss anything we do not know what to do with" (p. 64). To illustrate, she lists the following actions, which could be perceived as plagiarism:

- o   outright cheating
- o   appropriating large blocks of text without attribution
- o   omissions or mistakes in citations
- o   paraphrasing an original too closely
- o   collaborating too closely. Buranen (1999, p.64)

It may be viewed as surprising that, according to Buranen (1999), "outright cheating" such as copying answers from a peer during an exam is considered equally inappropriate as "collaborating too closely" with a peer on a project or simply making an "omission or a mistake in citations." However, each of the actions listed by Buranen involves obscurity in establishing the originator's ideas and can consequently be considered plagiarism.

Regardless of which definition of plagiarism one adopts or which actions are considered to constitute plagiarism, L2 writers' nonstandard uses of sources can be viewed as deliberate and intended or nondeliberate and unintended—terms that have been used interchangeably in the literature. One additional set of terms has recently been introduced by Pecorari (2003) who referred to plagiarism as *prototypical* and *nonprototypical*. The *prototypical plagiarism* is considered as a severe form of misconduct by Western institutions of higher education; whereas, the *nonprototypical plagiarism*, especially in the case of L2 writers, is commonly viewed more as a result of lacking knowledge of appropriate use of academic sources and is characterized by a lack of intention in violating academic standards. It is considered to be a "complex problem of student learning, compounded by policy and pedagogy surrounding the issue" (Angelil-Carter, 2000, p. 2). As such, most L2 writing researchers and practitioners believe that the response to the problem needs to be pedagogical rather than punitive (Angelil-Carter, 2000; Buranen, 1999; Casanave, 2004; Chandrasoma, Thompson, Pennycook, 2004; Howard, 1995; Pecorari, 2001; 2003). Over the years, L2 writing scholars have coined and used many different terms for nonprototypical plagiarism as is demonstrated in Table

1 later in this chapter. It is important to review briefly the existing terminology in order to ensure consistency of usage throughout this dissertation project. Table 1 summarizes the reviewed terms.

According to Martin (1994), *paraphrasing plagiarism* occurs "when some of the words are changed, but not enough" (p. 37). In L2 writing literature, paraphrasing plagiarism is more frequently referred to as a *type of textual borrowing* (Shi, 2004; Keck, 2006), specifically, the types of textual borrowing from the less modified end of the spectrum (with substantially changed paraphrases being on the most modified end). The specific types of textual borrowing similar to Martin's concept of paraphrasing plagiarism include *near copies* (Campbell, 1990; Keck, 2006) or *paraphrases with minimal revision* (Keck, 2006). As with paraphrasing plagiarism, near copies and minimal revisions involve only minor syntactic or lexical modifications. Despite an attempt to make changes to the original wording, this form of source use is considered problematic by many as it echoes excessively the voice of the original author (Whitaker, 1993).

Howard's (1995) term *patchwriting* also evokes the concern of close approximation of the original source. It has been conceptualized as "copying from a source text and then deleting some words, alternating grammatical structures, or plugging in one-for-one synonym substitutes" (p. 788) and as "writing passages that are not copied exactly but that have nevertheless been borrowed from another source, with some changes" (p. 799). However, unlike the terms *near copies*, *paraphrases with minimal revision*, or *paraphrasing plagiarism*, Howard's term *patchwriting* implies a more rigorous attempt to integrate one's own words and ideas with the words and ideas of

other authors. Howard finds this process to be beneficial to developing writers, claiming that such "blending [of] the words and phrasing of the source with one's own word and phrasing may [help] …student[s] comprehend the source" (p.800). Similar to Howard's concept of patchwriting, though less widely used among L2 writing researchers, Krishnan and Kathpalia's (2002) term *plagiphrasing* captures the process of "combin[ing] words/phrases/sentences from published works with [writers'] own" (p. 193).

Although Pecorari's (2003) definition of *textual plagiarism* as "language and ideas repeated from a source without (sufficient) attribution" (p. 318) may suggest prototypical plagiarism, Pecorari is quick to point out that L2 writers' cases of textual plagiarism often "lack[] a standard feature of prototypical cases of plagiarism: the intention to deceive" (p. 318). As such, the term textual plagiarism is better understood as a case of nonprototypical than prototypical plagiarism.

One additional term used for nonprototypical plagiarism is *language re-use*. Flowerdew and Li (2007) coined this term in an effort to reflect better the textual conventions and needs of scientists and engineers whose professional writing the authors have examined in multiple research studies. The authors believe that language re-use commonly found in many scientific genres differs from prototypical plagiarism although it involves the "re-use of "phraseology," "sentence structure," "common phrases," or "previous (methodological) description" at the length of a line or so" (p. 444). Flowerdew and Li argue that even though such language reuse could be seen as problematic when produced by social scientists, it is accepted and should, therefore, be viewed as conventional in the fields like hard sciences and engineering.

Finally, a number of value-free terms have been used to describe the use of

outside sources in academic writing. These include: *citing behaviors* (Shi, 2008), *intertextuality* (Chandrasoma, Thomson, & Pennycook, 2004; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2005), *writing from sources* (Wette, 2008), *citation practices* (Borg, 2000), *voice appropriation* (Ouellette, 2004; Scollon, 1997), and *source use* (Campbell, 1990; Pecorari, 2008). For the purpose of this dissertation, the terms *textual borrowing* and *source use* are used interchangeably to refer to the use of academic sources. The kind of academic writing which includes sources is referred to in this dissertation as *source based writing* or *writing from sources*. When referring to instances of nonprototypical plagiarism in general, the term *unconventional writing from sources* or *unconventional source-based writing* is employed.

<div align="center">Plagiarism as it relates to developing language proficiency

and discourse expertise</div>

Patchwriting has been suggested to occur as a result of a developing language proficiency and academic expertise (Angelil-Carter, 2000, Buranen, 1999; Currie, 1988; Dudley-Evans, 2002; Flowerdew & Li, 2007; Howard, 1995, 1999; Liu, 2005; Ouellette, 2004; Pecorari, 2003). It is seen as something inexperienced L2 writers do before they master the textual rules governing academic writing and sufficiently develop their linguistic proficiency. For example, Johns and Mayes (1990) conducted a cross-sectional study with L2 writers from two different levels of proficiency: one group from a lower level of an academic writing course and the other from a higher level course. They found that writers with low proficiency copied significantly more directly from the source than L2 writers in the higher levels of proficiency. Flowerdew and Li (2007a) suggest that "as

[L2 writers] write more papers and become more "fluent" in expressing themselves, they are likely to rely less on other' texts for language re-use" (p. 459). Reading comprehension is also believed to play a role in textual borrowing practices, as less proficient readers of the L2 are more likely to resort to patchwriting than more proficient L2 readers (Bloch, 2001; Currie, 1998; Howard, 2001; Johns and Mayes, 1990).

The acquisition of the academic discourse expertise relevant to textual borrowing practices is compounded by the occluded nature of citation (Pecorari, 2006). Pecorari claims that aspects of citation constitute occluded features because "citation involves a reference – and often a minimal one – to something external to the citing text," and, therefore, "the reader of a new text cannot, merely by reading the citing text, ordinarily know whether an idea, fact, etc. attributed to the earlier text is reported accurately" (p. 6). Pecorari's example of signal verbs (e.g., the author *claims*/*says*/*maintains*) demonstrates the concept of occlusion well. Less experienced academic L2 writers may not be fully aware of the evaluative distinctions present in signal verbs. Because these subtle distinctions may be occluded for novice L2 writers, their representation of others' work may consequently be perceived as lacking in accuracy and transparency.

The view of plagiarism as a developmental phenomenon, a "transitional strategy" (Howard, 1995, p. 788), or an "intermediary stage" (Flowerdew and Li, 2007, p. 459), reflecting one's developing linguistic and discourse competencies, has been corroborated in studies that examined progress in L2 writers' textual borrowing practices before and after relevant instruction (Tomaš, 2006; Wette 2008; Hsu, 2003). These studies showed that L2 writers moved from copied or nearly copied text at the beginning of an academic writing course or an academic unit on the use of sources toward more substantial

rephrases of the text at the end of the course or unit. These studies will be reviewed in greater detail later in this chapter.

The understanding of patchwriting as a developmental phenomenon assumes pedagogical benefits to this practice. As a stage to mastery of academic writing conventions, it may facilitate student learning. Currie's (1998) case study of an undergraduate student in business concluded that the reliance on copied text in the early stages of academic language acquisition is seen as useful by students and may be helpful in long-term acquisition. Other university L2 writers described in published works claimed to find the reuse of structures and words from outside texts as "useful" (Pennycook, 1996, p. 225), "correct and proper" (Sherman, 1992, p. 191), and "convenient", "time-saving", and "a safer route to a better finished product" (Yu, 2008, p. 538). Howard (1995) sees patchwriting as "an effective means of helping the writer understand difficult material; blending the words and phrasing of the source with one's own word and phrasing may [help] [] student[s] comprehend the source" (p.800). Flowerdew and Li (2007) also suggest a pedagogical benefit to patchwriting as they suggest that it serves as an L2 writer's "means of developing and appropriate disciplinary discourse" (p. 459). Studies that examine the specific linguistic and discourse benefits to patchwriting could yield important insights as to the benefits of this textual borrowing practice (Pecorari, 2008, personal communication).

Plagiarism as a survival or copying compensatory strategy

L2 writers may not see incorporating copied or near-copied text into their writing as only useful in terms of the acquisition of academic writing competence but also as a way to cope with the complexity inherent in writing from sources. As Borg (2000) points out, an effective use of sources involves "understanding of other writers' work, being able to restate that understanding, having the intellectual confidence to admit another's precedence, and … mastering the control of a variety of tools for the proper display of this recognition" (p. 27). Angelil-Carter (2000) claims that the difficulty of textual borrowing lies in the fact that it does not reflect seemingly straightforward rules, but rather, it manifests "a much deeper, elemental feature of academic writing, which is the analysis of and selection from sources, and subsequent integration and synthesis of knowledge and ideas into a coherent whole" (p.4). Clearly, L2 writers writing from sources often deal with a task that places more cognitive demands on them than they can manage at a given time (Campbell, 1990; Currie, 1998; Spack, 1997)[3]. Consequently, these writers compensate for their inability to deal effectively with the task at hand by using sources in non-standard ways in order to "conform to the linguistic standards of an academic community" and "produce high-quality research papers in a language they may have barely mastered" (Bloch & Chi, 1995, p. 238). For many of these writers, patchwriting is the only way to deal with the cognitive overload that they face.

Studies by Currie (1998) and Flowerdew and Li (2007) demonstrate how extensive patchwriting can be a way of academic survival for L2 writers. After experiencing a lack of success on assignments she produced for her university course,

---

[3] Research has not yet indicated whether the high cognitive demand is a result of L2 writers' lacking language proficiency and/or discourse expertise.

Diana, the case in Currie's (1998) study, increased her reliance on outside sources. Because this strategy allowed her to avoid what was previously perceived by her instructor as "awkward" language and include more appropriate terminology, her writing became more representative of the instructor's expectations of academic writing. Consequently, the instructor awarded Diana with considerably better grades, overlooking, or choosing to overlook, the extent of unconventional textual borrowing in her papers. Similar re-use of phrases and longer parts of texts as a strategy for academic survival is demonstrated in Flowerdew and Li (2007). The authors examined texts of doctoral students in a variety of science departments at a large university in China. In order to fulfill their graduation requirements, which involved a publication of their work in English, these writers copied excessively from outside sources, often without conventional attribution. The interview data in Flowerdew and Li's study suggested that these L2 writers considered this practice acceptable in the realm of scientific writing. Their justification for the controversial practice rested on two beliefs. First, these scientists claimed that they were not stealing ideas, only borrowing language of experts to describe knowledge, already widely accepted in their field. Second, they argued that concluding their paper with a list of all the references from which they drew validates their practice. L2 writers' close reuse of sources for the purposes of academic survival highlights the tension inherent in academic expectations of L2 writers. On one hand, administrators and faculty acknowledge that these writers need time and support in order to transition into their disciplinary communities as they begin to disseminate their work. On the other hand, the tacit expectation of the academy is that they need to be able to adapt the language and ideas of their communities appropriately, using original words

(Bloch & Chi, 1995; Currie, 1988).

<p style="text-align: center;">Plagiarism as a cultural phenomenon</p>

Scholars interested in L2 writing have suggested that plagiarism may be a result of the differences in L2 writers' understanding of this concept and their lack of familiarity with values and conventions of their academic institutions and the target culture in a larger sense (Buranen, 1999; Gu and Brooks, 2008). For example, Pennycook (1996) noted that plagiarism is a concept inherent only to the Western academy and that the view of authorship and protection of intellectual property is not shared in all cultures. Bloch and Chi (1995) demonstrate such cultural differences in the use of sources with a study examining variation in textual borrowing practices between published English-writing and Chinese-writing authors. They argue that source use of both groups of writers reflect their relevant rhetorical traditions. For example, the authors describe how the Chinese rhetorical tradition of Confucianism affects the Chinese-writing authors' use of citations—the texts written by Chinese-writing authors include less recent and less critical citations compared to English-writing authors, thus demonstrating the Confucian respect for classic texts and reluctance to directly attack others' arguments. Buranen (1999) also comments on the effects of Chinese rhetorical tradition's influence on source use by citing her Chinese colleague who asserted that "being able to quote or cite the work of 'the masters' is a way of demonstrating one's own learning or accomplishment" (p. 69). Sowden's (2005) explanation of how Confucian tradition may have affected the differing notion of plagiarism among Chinese writers of English rests on the statement that "the philosopher's words were known by and belonged to everyone, and being able

to reproduce them without citation in place of your own, was considered an appropriate, even laudable strategy" (p. 227). Given the above arguments, a non-traditional use of sources is to be expected in L2 writers who come from cultures with rhetorical traditions that view originality and textual borrowing practices differently than the Western rhetorical tradition does.

While we can expect some cultural trends among the L2 writers, it is important to avoid stereotyping based solely on cultural backgrounds. For example, even though Sowden (2005) asserts that "multilingual students are sometimes at variance with Western academic practice" (p. 226), he also warns against cultural stereotypes. He discusses a number of individual differences not related to culture that affect students' textual choices. Other researchers also caution against attributing plagiarism to cultural differences. Drawing on her own educational experience and an analysis of six composition books, Liu (2005) challenges the claims that uncited copying is acceptable in the Chinese academic culture. Similarly, Wheeler (2009) asserts that Japanese students "do not accept plagiarism as readily as has often been suggested" (p. 17). Future research may deepen our understanding of interaction of cultural factors and other personal and educational factors in L2 writers' textual borrowing practices.

L2 writers' understanding of and beliefs about plagiarism

Research has also been conducted with the purpose of increasing our knowledge about L2 writers' individual understanding of and beliefs about plagiarism (Deckert, 1993; Roig, 1997, Chandrasegaran, 2000; Rinnert and Kobayashi, 2005). Deckert (1993) examined first- and third-year Hong Kong University students' views on unconventional

source-based writing. He found that students with less academic experience were not adequately informed about plagiarism and related concepts, that they struggled to recognize instances of inappropriate source use, and that they generally did not view plagiarism as an academic offense in the sense that it infringes upon the rights of authors. The more experienced students in Deckert's study appeared to have more knowledge about textual borrowing practices, were more likely to recognize instances of plagiarism, and associated plagiarism more with the concept of originality.

Rinnert and Kobayashi (2005) compared university writers' beliefs about plagiarism in the context of their L1. Specifically, they compared a group of American university students studying at a university in the U.S. with Japanese university students studying at a university in Japan. Echoing Deckert's (1993) conclusions, Rinnert and Kobayashi found that Japanese students are less informed about the role of textual borrowing in academic writing. This fact, they believe, is a result of less explicit instruction in L1 writing, especially in the use of sources in supporting one's points. Additionally, the authors concluded that Japanese students did not consider direct copying from sources without appropriate attribution to be a serious academic offense, unlike many surveyed and interviewed American students. Similar to Deckert (1993), Rinnert and Kobayashi also found increased understanding of textual borrowing practices in students with more experience in academic contexts. For example, 22% more graduate than undergraduate students in the study considered correct textual borrowing to be somewhat or very important.

To summarize, scholars working in the area of L2 writing have examined a number of perspectives on plagiarism and textual borrowing practices. It is widely

accepted that the use of academic sources among L2 writers depends on a number of factors, including linguistic proficiency, discourse competence, cultural factors,[4] understanding and beliefs about plagiarism, and contextual influences (e.g., the perceived need to rely on sources for academic survival). Because an effective use of sources involves the mastery of language as well as many academic skills, L2 writing researchers and educators now view the use of sources as primarily a developmental phenomenon.

<u>Textual borrowing practices of L2 writers</u>

In this section, I will examine university L2 writers' textual borrowing in two types of contexts: 1) ESL/EFL courses and 2) mainstream coursework. When discussing the latter, I will further delineate the existing research on textual borrowing practices among graduate L2 writers and L2 writers in sciences, undergraduate L2 writers, and research conducted in mixed contexts (ESL and mainstream coursework). I will begin this section with an outline of published research in this area (see Table 2) and will conclude with a summary of main findings.

Textual borrowing practices of university L2 writers

in ESL/FL courses

Arguably, the rapid growth in the number of research studies examining the nature of textual borrowing practices in L2 writers is a result of the constantly increasing number of multilingual and multicultural university students, the lack of understanding of the challenges experienced by these populations in the context of academic writing, and

---

[4] As explained earlier in the chapter, the relationship between plagiarism and cultural background is contested in the literature.

the high stake consequences of plagiarism for L2 writers accused of plagiarism. Given their influence by the cognitive tradition of L1 writing research (e.g., Johns, 1985; Sherrard, 1986; Winograd, 1984), most early and a few current studies on L2 writers' textual borrowing practices frequently employ summary tasks or other time-restrictive, in-class tasks when investigating source use.

Johns and Mayes (1990) were among the first researchers interested in investigating textual borrowing in L2 university writers. The authors examined 80 undergraduate L2 writers with varying degrees of proficiency who were asked to summarize a 600-word text. Johns and Mayes found that undergraduate L2 writers with low English language proficiency resorted to patchwriting more than the proficient L2 writers. Specifically, these writers tended to produce "direct replications" of the text rather than rephrasing the text. Unlike the more proficient group, the L2 writers in the low-proficiency group were unable to combine ideas from different parts of the text and resorted instead to copying individual sentences into their summaries.

Corbeil's (2000) study corroborates Johns and Mayes' (1990) findings related to the effects of language proficiency on textual borrowing practices. Corbeil examined summaries of English-speaking university writers writing in French as a second language. The author found that writers who were more proficient in French used fewer direct copies in their writing than less proficient French writers. Additionally, writers who were more adept at summarizing in English (their L1) copied less than their less-adept peers.

Campbell (1990) examined textual borrowing practices in undergraduate L1 and L2 writers. Instead of using a summary, Campbell employed an in-class essay task, which required the use of background reading, focusing on the distribution of citations and

textual borrowing types. She found differences in the distribution of citations; L2 writers appeared to depend more on the source in opening paragraphs, many of which were near-copies of the original. Nonetheless, Campbell found no major differences in the amount of copying in students' texts or in attribution of the quotes and paraphrases to the original author. She concluded that both undergraduate L1 and L2 writers used copies and near-copies as major strategies for integrating a source text into their writing. To date, Campbell's remains the only study that did not find significant differences between the types of textual borrowing in L1 and L2 writers. It is possible that the restricted rather than authentic nature of the task is the reason for the lack of difference found between the two groups.

Moore (1997) focused on attribution (e.g., reporting verbs and signal phrases such as *according to*) in his examination of textual borrowing practices. He employed a task that required students to summarize a part of a lecture. Moore found that L2 writers used less explicit forms of attribution than L1 writers. For example, while L1 writers would attribute explicitly by using a variety of signal verbs (e.g., the author *claims*/*says*) and signal phrases (e.g., *according to*/*in the words of* the author), L2 writers relied more on implicit forms of attribution (e.g., *it is believed*) or did not attribute ideas to the original source at all.

In a study on Japanese L2 writers learning to write in an EFL academic context, Yamada (2002) examined textual borrowing practices in relation to the extent of inferential processes employed during reading. By inferential thinking, Yamada means the ability to abstract assumptions from a text, in this case, on the basis of information about clause relations and lexical patterns. L2 writers in the study were instructed on

clause relations (e.g., problem-solution, claim-counterclaim, and preview-detail) and lexical patterns (e.g., repetition and/or rephrase of important words throughout the text) and how understanding of these textual concepts can facilitate L2 writers' summary production (See more details about the instruction later in this chapter.) Following the instruction, L2 writers in the study wrote two summaries, each requiring an integration of two outside sources. However, the summaries differed in the extent to which they required the use of inference. Yamada found that L2 writers who engaged more in inferential thinking in the summary that required it, used sources more effectively. For example, students whose summaries suggested evidence of inferential thinking were able to reorganize the information from the original sources, thus avoiding too close a dependence on the wording of the original texts.

Shi (2004) examined the differences of textual borrowing practices between L1 and L2 writers as well as the effects of task on textual borrowing practices. She found that L2 writers, EFL University students in China, wrote more nonattributed near-copies (5% in the opinion task and 16% in the summary task) than L1 writers, University students in the US (1% in the opinion task and 3% in the summary task). The paraphrases in L2 writers' texts that Shi marked as near-copies were mostly nonattributed while the paraphrases in L1 writers' texts were mostly attributed to the original article or author. It is important to note that Shi's (2004) study did not consider "total paraphrases", only near-copies and lexically modified and syntactically reformulated paraphrases that were traceable to a sentence in the original text.

Unlike Shi (2004), Keck (2006) set out to examine all textual borrowing types, including "total paraphrases." She devised a taxonomy, which helped classify the

paraphrases into four categories: near copy, minimal revision, moderate revision, and substantial revision. She analyzed paraphrases in the summaries of 79 L1 writers and 74 L2 writers enrolled in writing courses at a large US University. Similar to Shi, Keck found that L2 writers tended to write more near copies (17% on average) than L1 writers (5% on average). Keck also reported that L2 writers' paraphrases contained fewer moderate and substantial revisions (8%) than L1 writers' paraphrases (15%).

Finally, Yu (2008) conducted a study with 159 L2 undergraduate writers in China summarizing an English article in English and Chinese. While the texts were not analyzed for textual borrowing practices specifically, the study's conclusions indicated that when summarizing in English, Chinese L2 writers relied on direct copying extensively. Furthermore, one half of the L2 writers in the study who expressed preference for summarizing in English, cited the ability to copy parts of the original text as the main reason for their preference. They claimed that while having to translate the main points into Chinese was difficult in that it required complete understanding of the text, the summary in English was easy in that it did not pose such a demand. Interestingly, reading abilities examined in the study were better predicted by summary in Chinese than in English. This led Yu to suggest that when summarizing in one's L1, writers can fully focus on reading comprehension, and, consequently, produce a summary that reflects a deeper understanding of a text. However, when writing in an L2, writers are so focused on the writing task that they may put less effort into understanding the reading. This conclusion lends support to claims that insufficient understanding of reading negatively affects one's textual borrowing practices.

To summarize, the studies described in this section have contributed greatly to our

understanding of the textual borrowing practices employed by L2 writers. However, the results of these studies must be interpreted with caution, as many of them were largely done within the positivist and Postpositivist traditions (See Chapter 3 for a discussion of these traditions.), which tend to employ highly controlled tasks under strict test-like conditions with considerable time restrictions. This fact is increasingly viewed as problematic in the field of L2 writing. Several researchers have suggested that L2 writers composing under test-like conditions may not apply the same general writing and specific text-responsible strategies when they write to fulfill more authentic academic requirements (e.g., Campbell, 1990; Spack, 1997). In the words of Campbell (1990, pp. 221-222):

> In-class writing may be less of a measure of actual writing ability than of other factors, such as the student's ability to follow instructions. These students may have the ability to incorporate information from a background reading text without copying, but that ability may not emerge under the constraints of the classroom. When faced with the prospect of expressing information from the source text either by using "their own words", which may reflect a colloquial style, or by making slight syntactic or semantic changes in the wording of the background text (constituting Near Copies), thereby maintaining an academic style, the students may have opted for the latter for stylistic reasons. They have demonstrated their ability to adequately paraphrase, as well as summarize, and so forth; however, given the time constraints and classroom writing conditions, they may have lapsed occasionally, allowing Near Copies in favor of less colloquial, more academic style.

In addition to the claim that controlled, test-like tasks examining textual borrowing practices may not reflect L2 writers' true abilities to use sources nor credit their strategic use of sources, one can also challenge the results on the basis of operationalization of textual borrowing in academic writing. For example, it is possible that L2 writers producing summaries of texts (e.g., in Corbeil, 2000; Johns and Mayes, 1990; Keck, 2006; Shi, 2004), of lectures (in Moore, 1997) or texts in which they refer to

one particular chapter (Campbell, 1990), made the assumption that it was evident what the original source was upon which they based their texts. Afterall, the researcher provided them with the source and instructions to the task clearly referred them to it. Consequently, it could be argued that these L2 writers may have perceived the explicit attribution to the source throughout their summary to be unnecessary. However, if L2 writers were asked to write an authentic source-based text, meaning a text that resembles typical university assignments which often necessitate the use of multiple different sources, they may have considered it more important to refer to those sources in order to account for the different voices in their writing.

<center>Textual borrowing practices of L2 writers in the context</center>

<center>of university coursework</center>

Given the shortcomings outlined in the above section, researchers have increasingly begun to examine source use in authentic assignments and contexts than those employed in summary research studies, in order to gain a more complete picture of L2 writers' university experiences related to academic writing and source use. For example, Spack (1997) and Leki (2003) have called for more attention to L2 writers' literacy-related experiences in the mainstream curriculum, suggesting that an increased understanding of what L2 writers are required to do outside of ESL contexts can help shape the ESL instruction and make it more relevant to L2 writers' academic careers. The majority of studies in this group examine textual borrowing practices of advanced, graduate writers. Additional studies conducted mostly from the English for Specific Purposes (ESP) perspective provide information about authentic use of sources among L2

writers in sciences. Finally, the section will conclude with a discussion of a smaller number of qualitative studies that examine practices and experiences of undergraduate L2 writers.

Textual borrowing practices among graduate L2 writers and

L2 writers in sciences

Borg (2000) conducted a comparative study on L1 and L2 writers' ability to integrate sources in an out-of-class written assignment, which allowed a choice of five different topics and time for background research, writing, and revision (two weeks). Almost half of the L2 writers chose personal topics, which lent themselves to only minimal source use. Texts produced by the other half of the L2 writers yielded fewer citations than texts produced by the L1 writers in the study. When using citations, the L2 writers displayed a preference for extended quotations (40 words or more), which was not typical in the writing of the L1 writers. The L2 writers were also shown to have more problems understanding and expressing stance when integrating sources in their writing. For example, the L2 writers were shown not to be as sensitive to the different voices present in the readings. Consequently, they would often cite the original writer of the article in instances when credit should have been given to another author mentioned in the original text. In addition to the many differences between the sets of L1 and L2 writers, the study also revealed that both graduate L1 and L2 writers struggled with surface-level aspects of citations. Both groups made numerous errors, including "variations in the form of references within the text, the failure to include beginning and ending quotation marks, variations in bibliographic reference formats, and works omitted

from bibliographies" (Borg, 2000, p. 34). Finally, it should be noted that Borg considered only citations, which included a reference to another author. Consequently, he was not able to account for the possible textual borrowing strategies not appropriately attributed to an outside source.

Pecorari (2003) also examined textual borrowing practices in an authentic university context, comparing excerpts from master's theses and doctoral dissertations of 17 graduate students at three British Universities to the original sources they used. She uncovered considerable reliance on the original sources with inadequate amount of change or attribution. She found that 16 of the 17 writers violated the "transparency of language" (p. 324) rule, meaning their writing did not successfully distinguish their voice from the voice of other published researchers. In other words, these L2 writers failed to attribute their sources appropriately, which resulted in the reader's confusion as to who to credit for the ideas and words in the student produced texts. Sixteen of the 17 L2 writers in the study produced writing that contained 50% of copied words from the original sources without using quotations or any forms of attribution. Thirteen writers' passages shared as many as 70% of words with the original text. Contrary to some other research, Pecorari (2003) maintains that cultural differences did not play a role in extensive textual borrowing in this group of L2 writers; according to Pecorari, all of these writers had lived in Britain for at least a year and had a good understanding of what plagiarism was. In other words, they seemed to know the general idea behind appropriate textual borrowing as the desired cultural practice; yet, they failed to apply this knowledge to their writing from sources. Pecorari concluded that the misuse of sources demonstrated in the study was not intentional; L2 writers were forthcoming in providing the researcher with sources

they used in their writing and their explanations did not indicate prototypical intention to deceive.

Flowerdew and Li (2007) studied textual borrowing practices in manuscripts submitted for publication by Chinese doctoral students in the sciences, employing textual analyses and interviews as main methods for investigating these writers' use of sources. Like Pecorari (2003), Flowerdew and Li described these graduate L2 writers' textual borrowing as largely inappropriate with respect to the amount of direct copying from published sources. The tendency to copy from sources was evident in all sections of L2 writers' manuscripts and ranged from copying at the phrase level to the copying of multiple sentences in a row. Again, similar to L2 writers in Pecorari's (2003) study, the L2 writers in Flowerdew and Li's (2007) study were forthcoming in providing the researchers with the texts from which they copied. At the same time, they insisted that their work was appropriate. For example, L2 writers claimed that the provision of the reference to the source guaranteed appropriate use of that source, regardless of the amount of direct copying from this source. Additionally, several of the interviewed L2 writers claimed that copying sentences from other sources was acceptable "if [the sentences] refer to ideas that are common knowledge within the discipline" (p. 458), when "the experimental procedure is …the same or very similar to what has been done before" (p. 458), and "for reporting results of uncontroversial and relatively routinized phenomena" (p. 459). Flowerdew and Li (2007) concluded their article with a discussion of the widely acknowledged formulaicity in scientific writing. They argued that while standards of experienced scholars are more stringent than the reported standards of the novices in the study, professionals in scientific fields often judge the lack of originality in

wording less harshly than do scholars working in the humanities.

A similar openness to student copying from models in scientific writing resonated in the study by Jones and Freeman (2003), which focused on textual analyses of textual borrowing practices in physics reports. Participants in this research included L2 and L1 writers pursuing undergraduate degrees in a variety of science and technology fields at an Australian university. Jones and Freeman reported "inappropriate or ineffectual copying" (p. 174) as one of the two most prominent features of these reports in both L1 and L2 writers. Jones and Freeman stated that writers "frequently copied words, phrases, or passages that contained relevant facts and/or figures (values, etc.), that described relevant aspects of the experiment, and/or that contained superfluous information" (p. 180). However, while they denounced the last type of copying, attributing it to "poor understanding of the goals of the report" (p. 180), they claimed that the first two types of copying in the sciences can, in fact, be considered effective, if used successfully.

Krishnan and Kathpalia (2002) studied final year project reports of L2 undergraduate writers majoring in engineering in Singapore. While the extent of direct copying was not clear from the results of the study, the authors examined several coping strategies employed by the L2 writers trying to avoid plagiarism. For example, they described instances of "plagiphrasing" in which L2 writers' own voices are intertwined with unattributed parts of other texts. The authors also discussed "shadowing" which involves heavy dependence on other sources and results in a lack of author's own voice, especially evaluative commentary of others' work. Finally, Krishnan and Kathpalia addressed L2 writers' difficulties in selecting quoted information and synthesizing it effectively.

Textual borrowing practices among undergraduate L2 writers

Shi (2008) also relied mostly on interview data in order to examine explanations for citing, not citing, and ways in using sources (e.g., quotes, paraphrases, and summaries) provided by 16 undergraduate L2 writers, discussing their recent research papers. She found that reinforcing L2 writers' arguments by providing strong support was the most frequently mentioned function for L2 writers' citing. Additionally, a large number of students claimed that they cited "when they saw source texts as *others' words and ideas* that were worth quoting directly" (Shi, 2008, p. 13, emphasis in the original). Shi uncovered disagreement among students with regard to citing facts and new information, which she attributed to differences in disciplinary conventions. L2 writers in the study chose not to cite when the information could be viewed as common knowledge. Some L2 writers claimed no need to cite information mentioned earlier in the paper or later in the reference list, both common practices in academic writing. Shi suggested that students were strategic in their choice not to cite certain information. For example, she described comments by one of the L2 writers in the study who felt justified not citing certain information because he considered it to be "part of [his] vocabulary" at that point in his academic career. At least two other L2 writers in her study made similar comments in which they appeared to claim ownership of the textual information. Finally, L2 writers provided relatively consistent reasons for using summarizing as one way of source use, but differed in their reasons for paraphrasing and quoting. For example, some L2 writers paraphrased because they viewed it as a preferred way of using sources, others because they were unsure whether they could quote secondary sources, still others because they did not consider quoting appropriate in certain parts of their paper.

Several L2 writing scholars examined the textual borrowing practices of undergraduate L2 writers using qualitative methodology, specifically case studies. For example, Spack (1997) examined one student's use of academic sources as part of a larger number of reading and writing issues during a three-year long case study of Yuko, an undergraduate L2 writer majoring in political science. She found that the student's writing in the disciplines involved extensively copied passages without quotation marks and passages that were, to a large extent, based on quotations without adequate interpretations. Furthermore, she noted that professors ignored this practice or failed to grade assignments that employed such inappropriate use of academic sources consistently. Even though source use is only a small aspect of Spack's study, the findings in the study reinforce the claims that the process of internalizing rules for L2 writers takes considerable time. It was not until the third year in her academic career that Yuko, the case in Spack's study, appeared to grasp the effective use of academic sources: she was able to "[use] sources to support her own views and [shape] others' ideas into a coherent argument" (Spack, 1997, p. 46).

Similar to Spack (1997), Currie (1998) found that the inappropriate use of sources in the writing produced by the undergraduate L2 writer in the center of her own case study also was largely unnoticed or ignored by her instructors. Currie observed that ignoring the issues on the side of the instructor, even awarding her with significantly better grades for assignments with unconventional source use, encouraged Diana to continue using this strategy as a way of coping with the more complex academic assignments.

Finally, Leki (2003) studied the case of Yang, a health professional in China, who

upon moving to the United States chose to pursue an undergraduate nursing degree. Although Leki's study was not focused specifically on source use but on Yang's overall experience related to literacy, parts of Leki's study suggest that Yang, just like Diana, resorted to copying as a result of a professor's unfavorable feedback on a written assignment in which she tried to adapt the original language. Following negative evaluation of this assignment, Yang came to a conclusion that "if you change, you are wrong.... If I copy correctly, there is no error" (Leki, 2003, p. 91).

It is important to assert that Diana's and Yang's use of direct copying did not result from a desire to cheat or lack of effort, but from a sense of survival in an academic setting. Even when copying directly from some of their readings, both cases spent substantial time reading and writing for their courses. Because of Diana's and Yang's commitment to academic survival, they resorted to copying only after other strategies failed them. Pecorari (2008) recommends that such instances of unconventional source use be viewed as patchwriting, and not prototypical plagiarism. Given the frequently raised issue of the high-stakes of plagiarism, the results of the case studies by Spack (1997), Currie (1998), and Leki (2003) are somewhat surprising. Further research is needed to examine whether and how the majority of ESL and mainstream professors respond, or perhaps fail to respond, to instances of unconventional source use.

Textual borrowing practices of L2 writers in the mixed contexts

To date, only Leki and Carson (1997) have examined L2 writers' use of sources in both ESL writing courses and mainstream university courses. The authors based their inquiry on interviews, mostly with graduate L2 writers. Undergraduate L2 writers in the

study were less involved with "text responsible" writing than the interviewed graduate L2 writers (p. 59), although both groups often produced source-based assignments. The L2 writers in the study were concerned about acquiring the language that would allow them to refer effectively to the outside information (e.g., new vocabulary and signal phrases). Both groups found writing from sources to be beneficial. Unlike other studies that suggest source-based writing poses great difficulties to L2 writers, several L2 writers in this study actually considered writing from sources to be easier than producing writing based solely on personal experience. They essentially viewed the outside sources as scaffolding in that these texts "provided [them with] vocabulary items, sentence structures, and rhetorical forms that could be utilized in the writing assignment" (p. 56). Finally, Leki and Carson found that overall, L2 writers in the ESL academic writing context have been exposed to considerably fewer source-based assignments than when writing for their mainstream courses.

<u>Summary of studies on textual borrowing practices in L2 writers</u>

The studies on L2 writers' use of sources reviewed in the previous sections and synthesized in Table 2 add important knowledge to a growing body of research on the acquisition of L2 literacy. With the exception of Campbell (1990), the conclusions resonating in the examined studies suggest that while textual borrowing practices are by no means intuitive for L1 writers, they are even more challenging for L2 writers. The studies have offered several explanations for why L2 writers may be experiencing difficulties with written assignments that require the use of outside sources. For example, Johns and Mayes (1990), Corbeil (2000), and Keck (2006) have suggested that language

proficiency plays a role in L2 writers' effectiveness of textual borrowing practices – the higher language proficiency the L2 writer has, the more conventional his/her textual borrowing practices will be. The uncovered lack of conventionality in textual borrowing practices among developing L2 writers has been shown to lie in 1) the high number of direct copies or near copies (Corbeil, 2000; Currie, 1998; Flowerdew & Li; 2007; Jones & Freeman , 2003; Johns & Mayes, 1990; Keck, 2006; Krishnan & Kathpalia, 2002; Pecorari, 2003; Shi, 2004; Spack, 1997; Yu, 2008) and 2) the lack of explicit attribution to the original author or source (Moore, 1997; Pecorari, 2003; Shi, 2004).

Additionally, studies have shown that L2 writers' understanding of what constitutes appropriate or acceptable textual borrowing practices is problematic. To illustrate, Flowerdew and Li (2007), Pecorari (2003), and Shi (2008) have shown that L2 writers often used sources in their writing unconventionally; yet, these L2 writers defended their textual borrowing practices, refereeing to a variety of self-invented rules. Yu's (2008) study also suggested conflicting understanding of textual borrowing practices among Chinese L2 writers who cited the ability to copy parts of the original text as the main reason for their preference for summarizing in English (rather than in Chinese). However, it must be said that the arguments in defense of their textual borrowing practices made by some L2 writers reflect these writers' high level of strategic competence. For example, the three cases in Shi (2008) did not cite; however, this failure to cite was not as a result of a mistake or an intention to cheat, but from an attempt to be perceived as a member of the relevant discourse community. These L2 writers claimed ownership of the textual information, arguing that they had learned it and. consequently, internalized it as a part of their own knowledge to which they felt entitled. They believed

that not citing the original source and instead, claiming ownership of the ideas, made them appear more sophisticated to their readers (i.e., professors). Similarly, Currie (1998) and Leki (2003) showed that their case study participants' misuse of sources was a result of a careful, strategic decision to complete their coursework successfully. The L2 writers in these case studies were able to realize that when using sources in less conventional ways, they were able to receive higher grades on their written work than when relying solely on their own words. In sum, while unconventional sources use in some L2 writers' may reflect deficiencies in their understanding of the rules, in others, it may be a result of a carefully considered contextual decision.

Despite the uncovered common themes in L2 writers' use and understanding of sources in academic writing, several issues remain controversial or require future research. One such area is L2 writers' preferences in ways of using sources. For example, while Borg (2000) found that L2 writers produce significantly more extensive quotations (40 words or longer) than L1 writers, Keck (2006) reported that both L1 and L2 writers use more paraphrases than quotations or copies. So, while there appears to be consensus in that L2 writers use more copies and near copies than L1 writers, it is unclear how they compare in their use of quotations and paraphrases. Another area of research on textual borrowing that has not been adequately examined yet is L2 writers' development of textual borrowing practices. While some cross sectional studies (e.g., Corbeil, 2000; Johns & Mayes, 1990) showed that proficiency plays a role in L2 writers' textual borrowing practices, it is unclear how writers' source use and understanding of source use change as L2 writers acquire language and discourse expertise. Finally, research has not adequately investigated what composing strategies L2 writers employ as they

construct source-based texts, how these strategies may facilitate or hinder their ability to use sources effectively, and to what extent L2 writers employ strategies in source-based assignments in ESL and mainstream courses. More research in this area has the potential to contribute to our understanding of strategies that may be critical in producing source-based assignments, thus providing us with important information about effective instructional practices relevant to the teaching of textual borrowing practices.

Finally, the reviewed studies provide an array of methodological choices in examining textual borrowing practices in L2 writers, ranging from studies employing controlled, time-restricting tasks to studies that triangulate different data sources (e.g., authentic L2 writers' texts and interviews). Researchers working in the field of L2 writing have increasingly advocated for employing multiple data sources in order to produce findings that situate the experiences of university L2 writers. However, the existing studies demonstrate an imbalance, favoring research on graduate L2 writers. Only case studies by Spack (1997) and Currie (1998) and a qualitative, interview-based study by Shi (2008) directly examine textual borrowing practices in undergraduate L2 writers, with only the last two studies focusing exclusively on source use. While source-based assignments may be more frequent and relevant in graduate coursework, it is important that future studies add to the body of research on undergraduate L2 writers' use of sources. Finally, given that only one study (Leki and Carson, 1997) has examined textual borrowing practices in both, ESL and mainstream university contexts, the future research should continue to explore the nature of source-based writing of L2 writers writing for both ESL and non-ESL academic audiences.

<u>Composing strategies used by L2 writers</u>

<u>producing source-based assignments</u>

Although studies have examined reading strategies used by L2 learners (Fitzgerald, 1995; Sheorey and Mokhtari, 2001; Song, 1998), little research has investigated reading strategies in combination with composing strategies used by L2 writers who are writing from sources. Two of the few existing studies will be reviewed here—the research by Connor and Kramer (1995) and Riazi (1997)—as they both informed the current research.

Connor and Kramer (1995) examined the process of writing a report paper in three graduate L2 students in business. They identified several cognitive and metacognitive strategies[5] employed by these L2 writers. For example, they found that all three writers engaged in the following strategies: re-reading the text, outlining, and revising. Two of the three writers also took notes (one on the actual text and one "in the head") and underlined or highlighted portions of the text during reading. Connor and Kramer also noted several differences in strategy use among the three L2 writers. For example, they pointed out that L2 writers in their study depended on the source text to different extents. Chung, the L2 writer who appeared to rely the most on the source text, "transfer[red] facts and phrases from the case text to his report" (p. 163). Connor and Kramer found 14 instances of direct copying in this L2 writer's first draft.[6] Bernard, a writer who appeared to be dependent less on the source text and more on his peers' ideas,

---

[5] The authors adopted O'Malley and Chamot's (1990) definitions of strategies—*cognitive strategies* are defined as strategies in which the learner "interacts with the material to be learned by manipulating it mentally or physically" (O'Malley & Chamot, p. 51) and *metacognitive strategies* as "higher order executive skills that may entail planning for, monitoring, or evaluating the success of a learning activity" (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990, p. 44).
[6] It is unclear from the study whether this L2 writer was able to rephrase the directly copied parts in his later drafts.

borrowed original words when copying headings and subheadings from the text into his outline. However, unlike Chung, Bernard did not copy directly from the text into his draft, but instead "generated his own prose, occasionally coining phrases" (p. 166). Bernard's attempt to use original language is presented as problematic by Connor and Kramer who note that such coinage "could confuse or mislead the reader" (p. 166). This observation echoes the tension frequently experienced by L2 writers – if they use phrases from the original text they may come across as more clear, but risk being accused of plagiarism while if they try to avoid plagiarism by being original, they risk having their writing evaluated as "confusing or misleading." Finally, like Bernard, Pablo, the third L2 writer in the study, was also able to avoid direct copying from the original text. However, unlike Bernard, Pablo was considered to be more successful in the report task as he was able to support better his points with the evidence from the reading. Table 3 summarizes the described composing strategies of the three L2 writers in the study.

Like the three writers in Connor and Kramer (1995), the four L2 writers[7] in Riazi's (1997) research frequently drew upon cognitive composing strategies such as reading texts carefully, preparing notes based on what they perceived to be the most salient parts of the texts, and outlining or highlighting portions of texts. They also reported revising and editing their work as they wrote. With respect to textual borrowing, Riazi commented that during note-making, L2 writers "cop[ied] some pages, summarizing and paraphrasing materials they considered useful in their writing their papers" (p. 123). Because Riazi did not further elaborate on these writers' textual borrowing, it is not possible to conclude whether the four doctoral students in his study

---

[7] The L2 writers were doctoral students in education. They all came from Iran.

used cognitive strategies effectively from the standpoint of avoiding plagiarism. Likewise, it is not clear whether these writers were able to produce appropriate textual borrowing strategies and integrate them successfully with their own ideas. For example, Riazi commented on the case of Ali, one of the four L2 writers, whose proposal was perceived by his committee members as consisting of individual parts, not coherently linked together. This suggests potential problems with source selection, understanding of the reading, or analysis of reading material.

With respect to metacognitive strategies, the L2 writers' in Raizi's study reported planning, monitoring, and evaluating their reading and writing. Goal setting and outlining were among the most frequently reported metacognitive strategies. Riazi suggests that their use of metacognitive strategies was done in the context of source-based assignments, but it is again unclear how these strategies influenced L2 writers' writing from sources or their perception of success in these kinds of assignments.

Riazi also interviewed the writers about their use of social strategies such as when clarifying tasks or discussing feedback on their writing. Riazi found that the three L2 writers were interacting quite intensively with their professors and peers. Finally, Riazi examined the three L2 writers' use of search strategies—directly related to early stages of writing from sources such as identifying relevant sources. In fact, Riazi suggested that searching sources was "one of the strategies participants used most extensively to prepare their written texts" (p. 128). Table 4 summarizes the different cognitive strategies that writers in Riazi's study employed, including the phases during which they used them.

Given the scarcity of studies that have examined composing strategies of L2 writers producing source-based assignments, the above-described research provides

critical insights for the current study. However, it should be pointed out that both of the above described studies discussed composing strategies employed by L2 writers on the basis of self-reports collected during interviews, rather than on the basis of direct observations. Additionally, both considered graduate L2 writers, thus providing no additional clarification on strategy use in less proficient undergraduate L2 writers.

<div align="center">

The role of instruction in developing L2 writers'

textual borrowing practices

</div>

With an increasing understanding of what writers do as they write, attention is beginning to shift to how writers acquire the skills necessary to function in a variety of academic genres (Cheng, 2006). Discussions concerning the effective learning and teaching of textual borrowing practices are gaining prominence in the literature. Many L2 writing scholars involved in researching L2 writers' textual borrowing practices have discussed the instructional implications of their studies or have put forward suggestions for the improvement of current instructional practices. However, less attention has been paid to a systematic inquiry into the effects of instruction on the avoidance of plagiarism and unconventional academic source use. In other words, existing discussions of teaching are primarily a by-product of studies on L2 writers' textual borrowing practices rather than resulting directly from research relevant to instruction. While future research should focus more directly on instructional effectiveness and usefulness, the current implications merit review. Many researchers who have examined textual borrowing practices have taught academic writing alongside their research investigations and have important insights to share.

In this section, I review studies that address teaching implications indirectly, such as in the implication sections of research otherwise focused on examining textual borrowing in L2 writers' texts. I also describe studies whose sole focus is the instruction of textual borrowing practices for L2 writers. Given that the second type of research is more relevant to my first research question, I will examine the relevant findings in this work in more depth. Specifically, I will discuss them in two sections – one employing quantitative and the other qualitative methodology. Table 5 provides a summary of all reviewed studies.

Implications for teaching from the literature on L2 writing

Given the frequency of source-based academic writing assignments in university contexts (Horowitz, 1986; Leki and Carson, 1990), a large number of L2 writing scholars have recognized the importance of instruction on textual borrowing practices and have offered suggestions for instruction on textual borrowing practices to L2 writers. A majority of proposed pedagogical implications favor an explicit approach to the instruction of textual borrowing practices. However, L2 writing scholars who address instructional issues related to source use tend to differ in establishing instructional priorities. This tendency is reflected in the large number of different pedagogical proposals reviewed below.

Arguably, the most frequently echoed teaching recommendation that has resulted from a review of the literature on textual borrowing practices is that L2 writers understand the concept of text ownership in North American culture and the related concept of plagiarism. Additionally, many believe it is critical that L2 writers are aware

of the punitive measures taken frequently by academic institutions in response to the act of plagiarizing; students accused of plagiarism can face lowered or failing grades on assignments or courses, expulsion from their respective institutions, or a denial or repeal of their degrees (Pecorari, 2001). Institutions are believed to be responsible for providing plagiarism-related definitions and resources as well as implementing transparent guidelines relevant to textual borrowing practices and dealing with plagiarism to both student writers and instructors. The provision for clear and easily accessible institutional policies on plagiarism sets institutional expectations and facilitates fair and consistent response to instances of plagiarism across disciplines (Pecorari, 2008; Price, 2002; Sutherland-Smith, 2005). Of course, writing instructors are expected to draw L2 writers' attention to the institutional policies and refer them to any relevant resources (e.g., writing center, reference books). They also need to address issues of plagiarism in the course, preferably early in the semester (Whitaker, 1993). It is debatable whether such a brief introduction to the complex issue of citation is truly effective given the longstanding assumptions L2 writers may have about source use.

Once L2 writers have a basic understanding of what plagiarism is, they need to learn how to avoid it. Several L2 writing scholars have addressed the issue of basic paraphrasing as one way to instruct L2 writers on citation practices and thus help them avoid plagiarism. Johns and Mayes (1990) discuss the "need to provide continued paraphrasing practice at the sentence level" (p. 265). Similarly, Corbeil (2000) recommends that L2 writers practice paraphrasing by employing both lexical and grammatical changes. In her words, "[L2 writers] could try to use superordinates for the collection of nouns or verbs, find synonyms, and reduce text by transforming long

clauses into short phrases or even single modifiers (adjective/adverb)" (p.51). Along with sufficiently transformed paraphrases of an original, L2 writers may benefit from engaging in discussions of near copies as this particular way of using sources has been shown to be common in L2 writers' texts. Therefore, it has been recommended that writing instructors discuss in detail the implications of using near copies in academic writing, including their potential for accusations of plagiarism (Keck, 2006; Whitaker, 1993). For example, Whitaker (1993) notes that rather than allowing her students to use near copies, thus echoing the original author too closely, she encourages them to revert to the original wording and use quotations.

In addition to learning how to rephrase words of others, writing instructors are expected to help L2 writers learn how to attribute ideas by appropriately using signal verbs and phrases. For example, Moore (1997) suggested that instructors 1) "encourage[] students to focus on author intentions when they appraise the propositional content of a text, 2) foster[] in students a more circumspect attitude towards this propositional content, and 3) provide[] a coherent framework for the teaching of citation conventions" (p. 62).

In order to help L2 writers master the conventions of attribution, it has been suggested that improvement in existing instructional materials (e.g., textbooks) is necessary. Campbell (1990), Moore (1997), and Shi (2004) agree that the current instructional materials often fail to prepare writers for source-based written assignments, especially in the area of attribution. In the words of Shi (2004), "classroom instruction along with new textbooks need to address cross-cultural attitudes to attribution practices and, at the same time, provide explicit instructions on the citation conventions accepted in English academic writing" (p. 191). Given the research findings (e.g., Moore, 1997;

Tomaš, 2006), which suggest that L2 writers use significantly fewer explicit markers of attribution than their L1 counterparts, it is critical that writing instruction and pedagogical materials address this important area of textual borrowing.

While understanding the basic principles behind linguistic modifications in paraphrases and textual attribution devices is by many L2 writing scholars and writing instructors believed to be an essential first step in learning how to avoid plagiarism, some researchers raised concerns about this practice (Chandrasoma et al., 2004; Jones and Freeman, 2003; Ouellette, 2004; Thompson, 2009; Pennycook, 1996). Jones and Freeman (2003) refer to such basic mechanics for referencing as "preparaphrasing" (p.180) and they criticize the fact that L2 writers are often not pushed beyond such "very simple paraphrasing techniques" in their university courses. Ouellette (2004) also recommends that writing teachers instruct L2 writers on "a wider variety of strategies for voice appropriation, above and beyond the standard conventions for paraphrase, quotation, and citation" (p. 260). Pennycook (1996) goes even further, calling such simplified practice "intellectually arrogant" (p. 227). Chandrasoma et al (2004), also ask that instructors require more of L2 writers when it comes to textual borrowing practices. They argue for an examination of whether and how "[basic] exercises can help students engage with issues of identity, knowledge, and interdisciplinarity" (p. 188), which they find critical in understanding intertextuality. Others (e.g., Deckert, 1993; Currie, 1998) have suggested that L2 writers' personal and educational backgrounds as well as their beliefs about plagiarism should be included in discussions of plagiarism. The assumption behind this pedagogical belief is that if L2 writers can relate the concept of plagiarism to their own lives, they may become more sensitive to how this concept is constructed in North-

American culture and more observant of the required conventions.

Researchers recommend small group and pair discussions as a way to engage L2 writers with issues relevant to plagiarism and textual borrowing at more depth (Barks and Watts, 2001; Dudley-Evans, 2001; Ouellette, 2004). In fact, some consider discussions, especially when accompanied by discourse analysis, to be more valuable to L2 writers than practice in paraphrasing (e.g., Dudley-Evans, 2001). However, for discussions to work, it is recommended that they be supported by specific discussion prompts or questions. Barks and Watts (2001) describe how they structure discussions about plagiarism with graduate L2 writers. First, they provide L2 writers with a set of statements that revolve around plagiarism and ask them to indicate whether these statements are true about their own country and the United States. Second, they present L2 writes with a set of five specific questions that are likely to generate controversial opinions. Third, Barks and Watts (2001) as well as Dudley-Evans (2001) recommend an activity from a textbook by Swales and Feak (1994, p. 126) wherein L2 writers are presented with six scenarios revolving around copying and are asked to draw a line separating acceptable and unacceptable use of sources. Barks and Watts (2001) warn that not preparing questions or prompts in advance and instead asking general, open-ended discussion questions such as *Tell me about your experience with plagiarism*, may be counter-productive in that this approach can "move both student and instructor beyond their personal comfort zone and, thus, away from, rather than closer to, the instructional goals being pursued" (p. 254). Using this approach may mean that L2 writers could be reluctant to share personal experiences with plagiarism and, despite their best efforts, instructors may find themselves feeling judgmental toward their students' past actions.

Finally, discussions can also be based on L2 writers' texts, especially if such the texts have been produced collaboratively (i.e., when two or more writers produce a paper together) (Whitaker, 1993).

In addition to discussions of concepts related to plagiarism, Flowerdew and Li (2007) recommend engaging with source use at a complex level by pushing L2 writers to examine "the relationship between "form" (language) and "content" (the work reported) in the natural sciences, preferably working closely with the students' disciplinary supervisors (pp. 461-462). Hyland's (1999) study of a large corpus of research articles and interviews with faculty from eight disciplines corroborates Flowerdew and Li's claim that textual borrowing practices in social sciences and hard sciences and engineering differ from one another. However, it may not be a realistic expectation for writing instructors working in the university ESL programs to have the professional knowledge or class time to explore the differences in textual borrowing practices in multiple disciplines. It may, however, be possible for instructors to engage L2 writers in genre analysis of textual borrowing practices in academic majors. Specifically, writing instructors could assign homework tasks that would encourage L2 writers to notice features of source use in the context of articles or book chapters in their disciplines and report their findings back to the class. This approach is also referred to as the ethnographic approach (Barks and Watts, 2001; Johns, 1997). It should be noted that the process of learning about textual borrowing practices informed by such ethnographic approaches to studying discipline specific genre features takes considerable time. However, it can, eventually, "become a self-help tool to be transferred and applied, by the students themselves, to their own language development" (McGowan, 2003, p. 5), thus

"expedit[ing] students' socialization into the professional literacy practices of their discourse communities" (Abasi and Akbari, 2008, p. 279). In line with the noticing hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990), it is possible that encouraging L2 writers to pay attention to source use as they read and write outside of their ESL classes, may positively affect their acquisition of disciplinary discourse expertise.

In addition to discussions and disciplinary genre analysis, yet another way of engaging with textual borrowing practices at a less mechanical level is by studying the functions of paraphrases, an area of textual borrowing that has been neglected in writing instruction (Dong, 1996; Keck, 2006; Yamada, 2003). Research has indicated that functions involved in paraphrasing include 1) interpreting and manipulating source material; 2) restating, information in such a way as to support the authorial voice; 3) the expression of the paraphrase writer's ingenuity via personal assumptions; 4) connecting information in the text with the writer's reality; 5) developing a new perspective on the source information; 6) prioritizing aspects of the source that the paraphrase writer feels are more significant. It is clear from the listed functions that authentic paraphrasing is not simply a faithful re-expression of others' words (as is often suggested by writing textbooks and reference books), but a nuanced and complex "combination[] of source text information and the assumptions or points of view writers bring to the text" (Yamada, 2003, p.250). However, despite the importance of this topic, most university L2 writers may not yet have developed sufficient background knowledge in academic fields (Barks and Watts, 2001) to fully understand some of the above-mentioned functions or effectively integrate information from outside texts with their own assumptions. Still, in order to avoid oversimplification of textual borrowing practices, it

is important for writing instructors to communicate to their students the authentic purpose of rephrasing others' words in writing, even if by initially addressing only some of the functions. Additionally, it is also necessary for writing instructors to address "the inferential thought processes that may go into writings of experienced academic writers, whose skills inexperienced writers can learn from" (Yamada, 2003, p. 251). One practical way of making L2 writers aware of these inferential thought processes inherent in source-based writing is by in-class modeling of the exact thinking processes in which the writing instructor -an advanced academic writer- actually engages as he/she is integrating the voices of others in his/her own writing (Pecorari, 2008).

Above-mentioned pedagogical activities that revolve around genre analysis and paraphrase functions as ways for L2 writers to engage in source use at authentic, meaningful levels require L2 writers to be competent readers of academic English. When L2 writers do not comprehend the sources they are reading, they fail to find "alternative ways for talking about its ideas" (Howard, 2001, p.1), which are necessary in avoiding plagiarism. Therefore, it has been suggested that writing instructors must be willing to spend class time on teaching effective reading strategies rather than viewing the role of reading in the writing courses passively, as a skill that should solely be acquired in separate reading courses (Connor & Kramer, 1995; Leki, 1993). One strategy recommended by Whitaker (1993) involves the writing instructor in modeling of the process of selecting and highlighting relevant information from a source and subsequent note-taking about the highlighted passage as preparation for later source integration. However, research is needed to identify which specific reading strategies are particularly effective and likely to lead to successful writing from sources.

Regardless of employed strategies, it is important to note that the reading required of L2 writers must be manageable so that it allows students "more time to re-read, think through, and perhaps link those readings to what they already know" (Abasi and Akbari, 2008, p. 279). Requiring L2 writers to incorporate a large number of outside texts in their assignments or allowing them to select texts that they may not fully understand may lead to increased copying (Howard, 1995, 2001; Masson and Waldron, 1994; Whitaker 1993).

In addition to a manageable reading difficulty, the difficulty of actual source-based writing assignments must correspond with L2 writers' skill level. As Pecorari (2008) points out, certain source-based writing tasks (e.g., summary) place fewer demands on L2 writers than other tasks (e.g., synthesis of multiple sources). Consequently, writing instructors and course developers are advised to design curriculum that aligns source based writing tasks with gradually increasing difficulty. In addition to the consideration of cognitive difficulty involved in the writing task, it is also important to consider the number of written source-based assignments required of L2 writers in a course. Given the earlier mention of the importance of multiple readings and careful thinking about readings before writing, requiring students to write a manageable number of source-based assignments is essential. Finally, as with reading strategies, research into composing strategies necessary for effective use of sources is essential. Available non-research based recommendations include summarizing texts without looking at the original source being summarized (Howard, 1995) and many additional strategies recommended by textbooks (e.g., outlining the text to be summarized).

Writing scholars tend to agree that an extensive textual borrowing practice in supported environments is key for L2 writers. For example, Campbell (1990) says that

writers must be provided "ample opportunity to practice this type of writing in order to train themselves to edit out instances of copying" (p. 225) and "more assignments that require source use" (p. 227). As a result of her study on an effectiveness of unit on source use, Wette (2008) also recommends allowing more class time devoted to textual borrowing practice.

The practice activities that are believed to be of particular benefit to L2 writers require students not only to judge paraphrases as acceptable or unacceptable (as is often common in textbooks) or rephrase an original sentence with a paraphrase, but also to integrate the outside text into their own writing (Barks and Watts, 20011, 2010a; Whitaker, 1993). Students need to be engaged in tasks such as a *Paraphrase Integration Task* (Tomaš, 2011), which, unlike many existing textbook exercises, engages student writers in the type of practice that closely resembles what writers actually do in the process of making use of academic sources in their writing—instead of simply asking student writers to rephrase isolated sentences, they are required to use a specific academic source in a task that is contextualized in real discourse. This task is more challenging than rephrasing a single sentence or paragraph, but less complex than having to use multiple sources in an academic essay. In other words, the *Paraphrase Integration Task* serves as a bridge between the initial, consciousness-raising approach to textual borrowing practice and the fully authentic composing of source-based academic assignments. I find that this often-omitted learning phase is a necessary step to the mastery of conventions set forth by academic writing genres. Finally, the value of the *Paraphrase Integration Task* lies not only in its increased authenticity, but also in that it forces students to be critical about academic sources. The task requires student writers to use critical thinking skills as they

match the source-based evidence with a corresponding idea in an academic paper. They are further challenged to rephrase and integrate this evidence effectively in the paper. Finally, L2 writers evaluate the effectiveness of their text integration, using a specific assessment tool.

Although pedagogical discussions on textual borrowing tend to emphasize the preemptive instructional practice of source use, providing L2 writers with feedback on how successfully they are using sources in their written assignments has also been recommended (Hyland, 2001; Pecorari 2008; Tomaš, 2006; Whitaker, 1993). In the words of Pecorari (2008), "students' attempts to write from sources must be assessed, and on formative assessment activities in particular students should receive feedback which comments directly on their source use" (p. 145). Pedagogical recommendations in the existing literature (not directly resulting from research on feedback) include: a) asking L2 writers to produce written assignments based on sources known to the writing instructor (Whitaker, 1993), b) requesting that writers submit all sources used when producing the written assignment (Wilhoit, 1994; as cited in Pecorari, 2008), and c) commenting on successful source use instead of only focusing on problematic source use (Pecorari, 2008). A study by Tomaš (2006) suggests that frequent feedback and request for revisions of inappropriately used sources may also be effective.

In addition to the above-mentioned recommendation on feedback that comes from discussions of general pedagogical issues, a study by Hyland (2001) directly examined writing instructors' feedback specific to textual borrowing. It is the only research to date that addresses the nature of instructors' commentary on students' source use and students' ability to revise their written work based on such feedback. In this research,

writing instructors' feedback was concluded to be largely indirect, which lessened the L2 writers' ability to incorporate this feedback in subsequent drafts. Hyland argued that more direct and specific commentary on L2 writes' use of sources has a potential to contribute to their developing academic expertise.

Pecorari (2008) writes that instruction on source use can only be successful if "students and teachers […] work together on writing from sources, and collaborate to identify and fix problems" (p. 146) and if they share the basic assumption that plagiarism should not be viewed as "a mark of moral failure" (p. 146), but rather, as an opportunity to provide student writers with pedagogical tools necessary for academic success. Pecorari also notes that writing instructors must strive for a trusting classroom environment in which dialogue and questions are encouraged.

Echoing work by English for Specific Purposes (ESP) writing scholars, Pecorari concludes her section on teaching implications by encouraging writing instructors to find ways of brining discipline-specific knowledge into their classrooms: "an approach to teaching writing, and source use, that relies exclusively on a Freshman Composition course, or sending students off to the writing center […] will give students only limited help in learning how writing is done in their discipline" (p. 147). To do so, writing instructors must be willing to get training on textual borrowing practices in other disciplines and institutions must be willing to provide such training. If this is an unrealistic expectation on either side, instructors can try to find innovative ways of addressing textual borrowing practices in other disciplines in their writing classes. As was mentioned earlier, writing instructors could encourage L2 writers to analyze source use in their readings for mainstream courses. Alternatively, writing instructors could

organize a panel discussion with professors from different departments who would share examples of "typical" source-based writing in their disciplines and discuss disciplinary norms relevant to source use. Collaboration between the writing instructor and the institutional writing center may be facilitative in this effort.

Finally, researchers have pointed to the problematic nature of existing instructional materials relevant to textual borrowing practices (e.g., Barks and Watts, 2001; Campbell, 1990; Keck, 2006; Moore, 1997; Shi, 2004; Tomaš, 2011, b; Yamada, 2002, 2003). In order to improve instruction, it is necessary for material developers to design instructional materials that will reflect research findings. At present, this is not possible given the paucity of studies investigating the effectiveness of instruction or materials relevant to source use. Before more research is conducted, it may be advisable for material developers to consider writing instructors' needs for pedagogical materials. For example, in a survey of 113 writing instructors, Tomaš (2010) found that one half of instructors were not satisfied with the quality of existing published materials used for teaching about plagiarism and textual borrowing. The surveyed writing instructors voiced the need for materials to include more examples of plagiarized and nonplagiarized texts, as well as examples produced by L2 writers themselves. Additional suggestions included: providing activities, definitions, explanations as to the functions of paraphrases, step-by step transformation of plagiarized texts, textual and learning strategies for avoiding plagiarism and others.

Studies investigating instruction of

source use practices and strategies

<u>Quantitative studies</u>

As noted earlier, while there are ample teaching implications in the literature, few directly result from an inquiry into the effectiveness or usefulness of instruction on textual borrowing. Even studies that do claim to have investigated instructional effectiveness appear problematic in several respects, mainly in their lack of description of the pedagogical intervention—the actual instruction claimed to have led to the positive instructional effect reported (an exception is Wette, 2010). Another problem in many of the quantitative studies that report effects of an instructional intervention lies in the absence of control groups. Consequently, one may wonder whether it is indeed the instructional intervention, or simply being exposed to additional reading and writing practice that has led to the improvement in L2 writers' source use practices. I believe a more ethnographic approach to the inquiry of source use instruction is desirable. In addition to textual data showing development of L2 writers' source use during the course of an intervention (e.g., a course or unit on source use), an ethnographic approach would entail collecting data from classroom observations and frequent input from instructors and their students, thus illuminating what constitutes effective pedagogical practice on textual borrowing. Because to date only one qualitative study (Ouellette, 2004) has examined the role of instruction on L2 writers' use of sources, I review it with the existing quantitative studies as these provide an important springboard for investigating instruction on textual borrowing.

In a pilot study, Tomaš (2006) investigated whether L2 writers' textual borrowing

practices changed in a semester-long writing course as a result of instruction they had received in an academic writing course. The participants in the study were 13 L2 writers enrolled in a required ESL academic writing course and 12 L1 writers enrolled in an equivalent writing course for native speakers of English at a large US university. L2 writers summarized an academic article in the first week of the course and a comparable article at the end of the course. During the semester, L2 writers were exposed to instruction on academic writing skills such as paraphrasing, quoting, and summarizing and on skills they needed to write two lengthy papers—a summary/analysis and an argumentative research paper. The results of the study indicated that the semester-long course was sufficient for developing L2 writers' source use practices. L2 writers improved significantly in the amount of lexical, syntactic, and attributive change in their writing. Specifically, they examined textual borrowing in L2 writing texts that involved less direct lexical and syntactic reliance on the original text and more markers for explicit attribution. While there were significant differences between L2 writers and a base group of 12 L1 writers at the beginning of the semester, these differences disappeared at the end of the semester. However, the discussion of instruction relied solely on a report by the instructor, who attributed her students' success to required revisions of unconventional source use. She said that L2 writers in her class produced eight smaller-scale summaries in the course of the semester, the source use in which she consistently addressed. The instructor reported highlighting every instance of plagiarism or patchwriting. Subsequently, she would ask her students revise source use in their summaries until they were appropriately cited. Future research needs to examine the extent to which feedback and revision play a role in L2 writers' improvement in source-based writing.

Wette (2010) conducted a study on 78 undergraduate L2 writers from a variety of language backgrounds studying at a university in New Zealand. The focus of the study was on the effectiveness of a seven hour-long unit on plagiarism and source use. The instruction of the unit was accompanied by numerous original materials that engaged students in 1) discussing plagiarism, 2) learning textual borrowing rules (e.g., deciding on when to cite), 3) identifying appropriate and inappropriate paraphrases, 4) learning common formulaic phrases, 5) analyzing authentic sources use in longer discourse, and 6) integrating sources into provided texts. Among other modest gains, the post-test following the unit showed improvements in L2 writers' knowledge of rules and general ability to use sources in their writing, as well as a decrease in direct copying.

Hsu (2003) reported examining instructional effectiveness of a graduate course for 20 L2 writers in the US context. She found significant improvement in source use between pretest and posttest essays conducted at the beginning and end of the course. Specifically, she reported gains in L2 writers' inclusion of more sources and reduced amount of copying and number of undocumented sources in their writing. Additionally, she found L2 writers demonstrated an increased understanding of concepts related to plagiarism and were even able to recommend strategies for avoiding plagiarism in the end-of-the semester interviews. However, Hsu's discussion of what instructional practices may have contributed to L2 writers' improvement was limited. In her words, "throughout the semester, students were taught that they should incorporate information from the reading text to support their arguments in academic writing" (p. 36). It remains unclear 1) how much time per course was spent on issues related to source use, 2) what instructional materials were used to help L2 writers understand how to use sources in

their writing, 3) how much source-based writing L2 writers produced during the course, and 4) how much source-specific feedback they received on their writing. Although this study is exceptional in that it attempts to describe L2 writers' improvement in both, actual source use and L2 writers' understanding of source use, it lacks in rich descriptions of the course, something other writing instructors and researchers could benefit from.

In a study on Japanese L2 writers learning to write in an EFL academic context, Yamada (2002) examined the effects of teaching about inferential processes on source use. Specifically, L2 writers in her study were engaged in a discussion of clause relations (e.g., problem-solution, claim-counterclaim, and preview-detail) and lexical patterns (repetition and/or rephrase of important words throughout the text) and how understanding of these concepts can facilitate L2 writers' summary production. Instruction on inferential thinking processes involved three stages. First, L2 writers were asked to find "signaling" clause relations and lexical patterns in texts. Second, L2 writers analyzed similarities and differences in the use of these devices across texts. Third, L2 writers were challenged to generate paraphrases of parts of texts. Yamada (2002) found that L2 writers who engaged more in inferential thinking in the summary that required it, used sources more effectively. For example, L2 writers whose summaries suggested evidence of inferential thinking were able to reorganize the information from the original sources, thus, avoiding too close of a dependence on the wording of the original texts. Yamada argued that paraphrase acceptability tasks, which are frequently used in instruction and instructional materials, may not be effective while the inferential thinking processes, which are scarcely discussed have the potential to contribute to L2 writers' understanding of effective source use. Yamada (2003) explains that L2 writers commonly

use inferential processes when reading and writing in L1 and an emphasis on inferential processes when reading and writing in English as their L2 could foster an effective transfer of their literacy skills.

Qualitative study

Using qualitative methodology in his investigation of L2 writers' textual borrowing practices and the role of writing instruction relevant to plagiarism and source use, Ouellette (2004) greatly informed the present study. The author examined a range of discourses upon which L2 writers draw in their source-based compositions. In this process, writers "index" different voices, including voices from *primary discourses* (e.g., writer's own voice represented by pronouns such as "I" or "my") and voices from *secondary discourses* (e.g., institutional voices, voices of experts, teacher, tutor etc.). L2 writers dynamically negotiate the voices from these two sets of discourses in a unique space that Ouellette refers to as *emerging discourses* (e.g., the voice of the reader, of the inside editor). This space allows these different voices to "come together, merge, diverge, and repel against one another, all creating the unique shape to the student essay in its development of academic competence with regard to voice and voice appropriation (Ouellette, 2004, p. 131)." As such, the process of writing from sources appears to be considerably more dynamic than suggested by the previous literature on plagiarism and textual borrowing.

Thanks to an ethnographic approach to data collection and analysis, Ouellette was able to trace a number of the voices described above to specific classroom literacy events. This allowed him to comment on the nature and usefulness of a variety of pedagogical

behaviors and practices[8]. For example, he found that Leslie, the instructor in his study, tended to be teacher-centered in most of her instruction on plagiarism and textual borrowing. However, Ouellette claims that group and pair discussions, peer review sessions, and other learner-centered literacy events are more conducive for negotiations of the different voices relevant to voice appropriation. Ouellette also found a "macro-micro" mismatch between the instructor's and L2 writers' perspective on plagiarism and textual borrowing. While the instructor was trying to convey the message that source responsible writing allows writers to claim membership to a broader academic community (one with Western values such as individual property), L2 writers appeared to be more preoccupied with viewing textual borrowing strategies as a set of concrete rules, the mastery of which leads to tangible outcomes such as good grades.

Summary of literature on source use instruction

The review of literature has yielded several instructional recommendations. As has been noted previously, many of these recommendations result from implications of studies done on textual borrowing practices, rather than direct studies on instructional effectiveness of source use practices. However, they facilitate a focused inquiry into the observations of classroom practices that are central to this study. The above-discussed recommendations for instruction on textual borrowing practices are summarized in Table 4.

---

[8] While generalizability is limited given the highly contextualized nature of Ouellette's (2004) study, his research has provided a great springboard and a way of comparison in the present study.

Conclusion

As demonstrated in the previous sections on textual borrowing practices, to date, research has greatly contributed to our understanding of complexities of textual borrowing in L2 writers. However, despite our increased understanding of the concepts related to plagiarism and sources use, few studies provide a balanced picture of textual borrowing by examining texts, opinions of student writers, and composing strategies they employ as they write from sources. Additionally, while almost all studies on textual borrowing practices offer pedagogical implications, few studies have investigated the interaction between instruction and L2 writers' texts or L2 writers' strategies in the process of producing writing from sources. Only one study has employed qualitative methodology in its investigation of the role of instruction in L2 writers' textual borrowing practices.

The aim of the current research is to add to the body of research on undergraduate L2 writers' use of academic sources in a variety of authentic and contextualized ESL and university mainstream written assignments. The study involved analyses of textual borrowing practices in the texts produced by L2 writers as well as the strategies employed during the actual (observed) text production. Additionally, it explored the nature of instruction on textual borrowing and the extent to which this instruction is reflected in participating L2 writes' texts (produced for both ESL and mainstream courses), strategies, beliefs, and explanations. Similar to Ouellette (2004), this dissertation employed qualitative methodology in order to provide a more in-depth, situated picture of a specific ESL class.

Table 1. Common terminology for nonprototypical plagiarism

Terms	Definitions	Scholars using the term
Paraphrasing plagiarism	"…some of the words are changed, but not enough"	Martin (1994, p. 37)
Textual borrowing	Types (according to Shi, 2004): words that are " a) exactly copied, b) modified slightly by adding or deleting words or using synonyms for content words, or c) closely paraphrased by reformulating syntax or changing the wording of the original text" and come "a) with no references, b) with reference to the author or the source text, and c) with quotations".	Shi (2004, p. 178) also: Currie (1998), Casanave (2004), Keck (2006)
Textual plagiarism	"language and ideas repeated from a source without (sufficient) attribution"	Pecorari (2003, p. 318)
Patchwriting	"copying from a source text and then deleting some words, alternating grammatical structures, or plugging in one-for-one synonym substitutes" (p. 788) "…writing passages that are not copied exactly but that have nevertheless been borrowed from another source, with some changes". "…an effective means of helping the writer understand difficult material; blending the words and phrasing of the source with one's own word and phrasing may [help] [] student[s] comprehend the source".	Howard (1995, p. 788 (definition 1), p. 799 (definition 2), and p. 800 (definition 3)
Plagiphrasing	"…combin[ing] words/phrases/sentences from published works with [writers'] own".	Krishnan and Kathpalia (2002, p. 193).
Language re-use	"re-use of "phraseology", "sentence structure", "common phrases", or "previous (methodological) description" at the length of so".	Flowerdew and Li (2007, p.444)

Table 2. Studies on textual borrowing practices in L2 writers

Study	Focus of analysis	Main findings relevant to textual borrowing practices
Johns & Mayes (1990)	Summaries of 40 low and 40 high proficiency L2 writers	Low proficiency L2 writers copied more from texts than high proficiency L2 writers.
Campbell (1990)	130 L1 and L2 writers' written assignments based on an anthropology chapter	L2 writers shown to depend more on the source in opening paragraphs, many of which were near-copies of the original. Both groups' attribution to the original author or text was lacking. Overall, no major differences in textual borrowing practices between L1 and L2 writers.
Moore (1997)	L1 and L2 writers' lecture summary	L2 writers' attribution was less explicit than L1 writers' attribution.
Corbeil (2000)	Summaries of French as a L2 English speaking university writers	Writers more proficient in French used less direct copies in their writing than less proficient writers. Additionally, writers who were more adept at summarizing in English (their L1) copied less than their less adept peers.
Yamada (2002)	Summaries of 27 L2 writers studying in the EFL setting in Japan	L2 writers who engaged more in inferential thinking in the summary that required it, used sources more effectively.
Shi (2004)	Summary or opinion tasks in 39 L1 writers in the US and 48 L2 writers in China	L2 writers wrote more non-attributed near-copies than L1 writers, University students in the US. L2 writers employed non-attributed near-copies. L1 writers tended to produce more modified paraphrases, most of which were attributed to the original article or author.
Keck (2006)	Summaries of 79 L1 writers and 74 L2 writers enrolled in writing courses at a large US University	L2 writers produced significantly more near copies than L1 writers. L2 writers' paraphrases contained fewer moderate and substantial revisions than L1 writers' paraphrases. For both groups, paraphrasing was more frequently used than quotations or exact copies.

Table 2. Continued

Study	Focus of analysis	Main findings relevant to textual borrowing practices
Yu (2008)	159 L2 undergraduate writers in China summarizing an article	When summarizing in English, Chinese L2 writers relied on direct copying extensively.
Borg (2000)	Analysis of 16 L1 and L2 writers' 3000 word essays in the first year of MA program at a British University. Interviews with L2 writers	Almost half of L2 writers chose topics which lent themselves for only minimal source use. Texts produced by the other half of L2 writers yielded fewer citations than texts produced by L1 writers in the study. When using citations, L2 writes displayed preference for extended quotations (40 words or more), which were not typical in the writing of L1 writers. L2 writers were also shown to have more problems with understanding and expressing stance when integrating sources in their writing. Both graduate L1 and L2 writers struggled with surface-level aspects of citations.
Pecorari (2003)	Excerpts from MA theses and Ph.D. dissertations of 17 L2 writers at three British Universities. Interviews with L2 writers and their supervisors.	Sixteen of the 17 L2 writers failed to attribute their sources appropriately, which resulted in the reader's confusion as to who to credit for the ideas. Sixteen of the 17 L2 writers in the study wrote excerpts that contained 50% of copied words from the original sources without using quotations or any forms of attribution. 13 writers' passages shared as many as 70% of words with the original text.
Flowerdew & Li (2007)	Manuscripts submitted for publication by Chinese Ph.D. students in science Interviews with L2 writers	L2 writers' copied extensively from sources in all sections of manuscripts, ranging from copying at phrase level to copying of multiple sentences in a row.
Jones & Freeman (2003)	Physics reports	Writers "frequently copied words, phrases, or passages that contained relevant facts and/or figures (values, etc.). that described relevant aspects of the experiment, and/or that contained superfluous information" (p. 180).

Table 2. Continued

Study	Focus of analysis	Main findings relevant to textual borrowing practices
Krishnan & Kathpalia (2002)	10 final year project reports in engineering	L2 writes shown to employ textual borrowing types in problematic ways. Authors described 1) stringing abstracts/summaries, 2) plagiphrasing, 3) shadowing, and 4) quoting directly from sources.
Shi (2008)	Interviews with 16 undergraduate L2 writers in a US university, discussing their recent research papers, specifically their reasons and explanations for using sources. Textual analyses of L2 writers' papers.	As the most frequently mentioned reason to cite, L2 writers mentioned providing support for their arguments. Additionally, a large number of students claimed they cited "when they saw source texts as *others' words and ideas* that were worth quoting directly" (Shi, 2008, p. 13). Disagreement among L2 writers was uncovered with regard to citing facts and new information, suggesting differences in disciplinary conventions (Shi, 2008). L2 writers in the study chose not to cite when the information could be viewed as common knowledge. Some L2 writers claimed no need to cite information mentioned earlier in the paper or later in the reference list.
Spack (1997)	Longitudinal case study of an undergraduate Japanese L2 writer studying in the US (text and document analyses, interviews)	An L2 writer's writing in the disciplines involved extensively copied passages without quotation marks and passages that were, to a large extent, based on quotations without adequate interpretations.
Currie (1998)	Case study of a Japanese L2 writer studying at a US university	An L2 writer's attempts in conventional textual borrowing practices resulted in poor grades and threatened the writer's academic survival. When she increased the extent of copying, she received better grades on her assignments and was able to complete her coursework.
Leki (2003)	Case study of a Chinese L2 writer studying at a US university	An L2 writer's attempts in conventional textual borrowing practices resulted in poor grades and threatened the writer's academic survival. When the writer resorted to patchwriting, she received better grades on her written assignments.

Table 2. Continued

Study	Focus of analysis	Main findings relevant to textual borrowing practices
Leki & Carson (1997)	Interview study with 27 L2 writers studying at a US university	L2 writers produce considerably less source-based writing in writing classes than mainstream classes.
Ouellette (2004)	Ethnography of one writing course	L2 writers are actively constructing writing from sources, drawing upon a range of primary and secondary voices in doing so.

Table 3. L2 writers' composing strategies in Connor and Kramer's (1995) study

Student's name	Uncovered strategies
Chung	o read text five times o after reading 2 he underlined text o after reading 3 he took notes and produced an outline o after reading 4 he produced a draft, "transfer[ing] facts and phrases from the case text to his report" (p. 163), engaged in revisions (mostly language related) o after reading 5 he produced second and a final drafts, "transfer[ing] facts and phrases from the case text to his report" (p. 163), engaged in revisions (mostly language related)
Bernard	o produced an outline in which he summarized the case. The outline contained copied headings and subheadings from the text, but also added ideas from group members o following a meeting with peers, he revised the outline, changing organization and analyzing ideas discussed in the meeting o produced a draft, which was a "section-by-section elaboration of [his] most recent outline" (p. 165) o typed a second draft, engaging in small-scale revisions, avoiding transfer of phrases from the original text
Pablo	o after reading 1, he "[took] notes in head and ask[ed] questions" (p. 167) o after reading 2, he used different colored markers to underline parts of the text o after a discussion in class that occurred two days following his reading, he produced an outline revolving around a central idea/problem o he wrote and revised his draft seven times (produced seven drafts), each time adding details to his outline to illustrate his central idea/problem

Table 4. L2 writers' composing strategies in Riazi's (1997) study

Composing Strategies	Constituents	Phase of Composing Process
Cognitive Strategies	Note-taking	Reading & Writing
	Elaboration	Reading & Writing
	Use of mother tongue knowledge and skill transfer form L1	Reading & Writing
	Inferencing	Reading
	Drafting (revising and editing)	Writing
Metacognitive Strategies	Assigning goals	Task representation & reading
	Planning (making and changing outlines)	Writing
		Reading & Writing
	Rationalizing appropriate formats	Reading/Writing & task representation
	Monitoring and evaluation	
Social Strategies	Appealing for clarifications	Task representation
	Getting feedback from professors and peers	Writing
Search Strategies	Searching and using libraries (books, journal, Eric, etc.)	
	Using guidelines	Reading & Writing
	Using others' writing as model	

Table 5. Summary of instructional recommendations

Pedagogical suggestions/ recommendations	L2 writing scholars
Address the issues of plagiarism early in the course.	Pecorari (2001), Whitaker (1993)
Provide basic practice in types of textual borrowing to help L2 writers avoid plagiarism.	Corbeil (2000), Johns & Mayes (1990), Keck (2006), Ouellette (2004), Whitaker (1993)
Provide instruction on explicit attribution (reporting verbs and signal phrases).	Campbell (1990), Moore (1997), Shi (2004)
Engage L2 writers with issues of identity, knowledge, and disciplinary membership, specifically how these concepts impact textual borrowing practices.	Chandrasoma et al. (2004), Jones & Freeman (2003), Pennycook (1996)
Engage L2 writers in explorations of personal and educational backgrounds and how these may have affected their views of textual borrowing practices.	Currie (1998), Deckert (1993)
Provide L2 writers with opportunities to discuss issues surrounding plagiarism, relying on specific discussion prompts and/or writers' collaboratively produced texts.	Barks and Watts (2001), Dudley-Evans (2001), Ouellette (2004), Whitaker (1993)
Address the differences in textual borrowing practices in social sciences, hard sciences, and engineering, perhaps with an *ethnographic approach* first promoted by Johns (1997).	Flowerdew & Li (2007), Hyland (1999)
Discuss the functions of citation, especially paraphrasing.	Dong, (1996), Keck (2006), Yamada (2003)
Support L2 writers' development of reading and reading strategies.	Abasi & Akbari, (2008), Howard (1995, 2001), Leki (1993), Whitaker (1993)
Gradually increase the difficulty of written tasks requiring source use.	Pecorari (2008)
Instruct L2 writers on strategies that may facilitate effective source use.	Connor and Kramer (1995), Howard (1995)

Table 5. Continued

Pedagogical suggestions/ recommendations	L2 writing scholars
Provide many varied opportunities and sufficient time for source use practice.	Campbell (1990), Wette (2008)
Provide practice that requires L2 writers to integrate types of textual borrowing with their own writing.	Barks & Watts (2001), Tomaš (2011); Whitaker (1993).
Provide L2 writers with formative assessment and feedback on their textual borrowing practices.	Hyland, (2001), Pecorari (2008), (2011), Whitaker (1993)
Instruct L2 writes on inferential thinking processes and involve them in relevant practice.	Wolf (1999), Yamada (2002, 2003)
Approach non-prototypical plagiarism in non-punitive terms and create a non-threatening, open classroom environment in which questions and concerns are freely discussed.	Pecorari (2008)

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

This chapter describes in detail the methodology, including the participants, research site, data collection, and methods of analysis. The following are the research questions and sub-questions that guided the study:

Research questions

1. What is the nature of ESL writing instruction on plagiarism and textual borrowing?

   a. How are the concepts of plagiarism and textual borrowing presented and practiced in the L2 writing classroom?

   b. What kinds of instruction characteristics does an L2 writing instructor and L2 writers consider useful in teaching L2 writers about plagiarism and textual borrowing?

2. What role does instruction that is focused on strategies for avoiding plagiarism and writing from sources play in L2 writers' source-based writing?

a. What composing strategies do L2 writers use when writing from sources in their ESL and mainstream courses? Are these strategies consistent with the instruction they receive?

b. What textual borrowing strategies do L2 writers use in their assignments for ESL and mainstream courses? Are these strategies consistent with the instruction they receive?

Research design

This research project adopted a case study design. Case studies are becoming more and more frequent in Applied Linguistics research (Duff, 2008; Parks, 2005) because they lend themselves particularly well to various topics concerning academic literacy acquisition. Braine (2002) claims that investigations of L2 (graduate) students' academic literacy "must be in the form of case studies" (Braine, 2002, p. 66). He views case-studies "most appropriate for studying the acquisition of academic literacy" because they "provide rich information about learners, about the strategies they use to communicate and learn, how their own personalities, attitudes, and goals interact with the learning environment, and the nature of their linguistic growth" (p. 66). Although Braine advocates the use of case studies for investigating the literacy practices of graduate students, this type of qualitative research is undoubtedly also valuable in the research on undergraduate L2 writers.

The case study has been defined as "an intensive description and analysis of a phenomenon" (Merriam, 2002, p. 8) "within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (Yin, 2003, p. 13).

It sets out to examine the dynamics of "single settings" (Eisenhardt, 1999), also referred to as a "bounded system" (Creswell, 2005). The bounded system of a particular case is investigated over an extended period of time via multiple sources of data (e.g., interviews, observations, documents, etc.), which "converge in a triangulating fashion" (Yin, 2003, p.14). The outcome is rich, comprehensive, and systematic information about this specific bounded system, which typically results from the identification of themes generated during the data interpretation process.

A bounded system can be an individual, event, or an organization. In this study, the bounded system is a single site—a university writing course for undergraduate second language writers. Within this single setting, four individual L2 writers were identified for closer examination. Of these four students, three completed the project. The course instructor was another important factor in this case study. One of five rationales outlined by Yin (2003) for selecting a single-site case design is particularly relevant for this research: the case can be considered "representative" or "typical" (Yin, 2003, p. 41) since a majority of universities with a high number of international students offer writing courses specific to this population.

A case study is considered to be a methodological research strategy for conducting qualitative research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2003), the object of study itself (Stake, 2005), or both (Creswell, 2007). A case study can also approach the analysis of data qualitatively, or it can employ both qualitative and quantitative research analyses. Following Creswell (2007), this dissertation adapted the view of case study as both a methodology and as an object of inquiry: it employed qualitative and quantitative data analyses.

This case study is *practice-oriented.* According to Haverkamp & Young (2007), case study is considered practice-oriented when it "pursues understanding to illuminate specific problems or improve specific practices" (p. 274). Its main goal is to inform practice. This case study is practice-oriented in that it sought to provide information about how a writing instructor and her L2 student writers construct their notions of usefulness of instruction on textual borrowing and how this instruction is strategically implemented in written assignments by L2 writers in the bounded system of a university writing course. The study also informed current practice by exploring alternative instructional options, which will be discussed in detail in Chapter 6.

This case study is also *instrumental*. An instrumental case study starts with an issue or a concern and then chooses a case or cases that lend themselves to the examination of this concern and are likely to "provide insights into [this] issue or to redraw a generalization" (Stake, 2005, p. 445). As such, the case is somewhat secondary; it "plays a supportive role, and it facilitates our understanding of something else" (Stake, 2005, p. 445). For example, this case study is considered secondary to the manifestation of textual borrowing either via the instruction of textual borrowing (in the case of the writing instructor) or via its implementation in the L2 writers' own work.

In summary, this dissertation study is a practice-based, instrumental case study of one bounded system—a university writing course for L2 writers. It serves to facilitate the investigation of the academic source use phenomenon; specifically, the instruction by the writing teacher, the implementation of the instruction by the L2 writers in the course, and the interactivity between these two sets of participants and any produced documents or course artifacts. Multiple sources of data provided rich descriptions of the case. Similar to

other instrumental case study research, this case study sought to "represent the case" and extend the experience from the case to current textual borrowing instructional practices (Stake, 2005, p. 460). However, the generalizability of a qualitatively-oriented case study research was not the goal of the study. Rather, the study aimed to provide a deeper understanding of the dynamics between the typical academic writing course participants, course materials, documents, and texts and to explore the options instructors have for teaching about avoiding plagiarism.

<u>Paradigmatic underpinnings in the research</u>

Pragmatism as a paradigm in social and behavioral sciences, also referred to as the *Pragmatic Approach* (e.g., Benesch, 1993; Harwood and Hadley, 2004) in the English for Academic Purposes (EAP) subfield of applied linguistics, provides a foundation for this study (see Figure 1 for a comparison with other common paradigms). Pragmatism accepts that complete neutrality and objectivity cannot be achieved in research as the researcher's presence and contextual factors always affect the phenomenon under investigation. In the words of Dickstein, "…truth [as seen by pragmatists] is provisional, grounded in history and experience or context, not fixed in the nature of things" (Dickstein, 1998, p. 5). However, researchers working within this paradigm see a limited value in discussing reality and underlying philosophical issues, and are, instead, action-oriented and implication-driven in their inquiry (Dillon, O'Brien, & Heilman, 2000; Creswell, 2007; Patton, 1990; Seale, 1999). Silva (2005) talks about a pragmatic approach to inquiry as a "pluralistic" approach, which "accommodates different worldviews, assumptions, and methods in an attempt to address and solve

specific problems in a particular context" (Silva, 2005, p. 9). Pragmatists working in the field of English for Academic Purposes focus their research agenda on the practical problem of helping L2 learners acquire the norms of academic writing in higher education and thus facilitate their initiation into the North-American academic culture.

The epistemology adopted by pragmatists provides a middle-ground for researchers who do not subscribe to either post-positivism, which accepts true-like reality or to constructivism, which embraces the subjective point of view and emphasizes the complete inseparability between the knower and the known. Instead, pragmatism endorses both objective and subjective viewpoints via an "intersubjective" approach (Morgan, 2008) which accepts the premise that there is "a single *real world*" as well as the idea that "all individuals have their own unique interpretations of that world" (Morgan, 2008, p. 72).

Because pragmatists reserve the right to view the world as *a single world*, and at the same time, a world comprised of multiple individual interpretations, they need to access any methods that work for a particular research problem instead of allowing their worldview to confine their data collection and analysis methods (Cherryholmes, 1992; Dillon et al. 2000; Patton, 2002; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998, 2003). Pragmatists' "intersubjective" epistemology translates into methodology via *abduction* (Morgan, 2008) rather than pure *induction*, dominant in qualitative inquiry or pure *deduction* central to quantitative research. In other words, research based purely on quantitative methodology beings with it a theory or hypotheses and then employs deductive reasoning to verify the theory or hypotheses by examining evidence. On the other hand, qualitative research begins with evidence (e.g., observations) and employs inductive reasoning to

arrive at a theory. However, pragmatists prefer "a choice of inductive and deductive logic in the course of conducting research" (Taskhakkori & Teddlie, 1998, p. 25) because they believe that "mov[ing] back and forth between induction and deduction…" allows the "…inductive results from a qualitative approach [to serve] as inputs to the deductive goals of a quantitative approach, and vice versa" (Morgan, 2008, p. 71). In the context of this study, I have achieved abduction by inducing patterns from available data to arrive at themes. Following the identification of themes, I considered further data to verify the existence of the themes (deduction).

In line with the above-mentioned tenets of Pragmatism, this study is driven by the pressing practical problem of plagiarism among university L2 writers. Without a doubt, the issues of source use in L2 writers' texts and the instruction relevant to source use, could also be addressed via Critical or Critical Pragmatic paradigms. However, many EAP researchers and practitioners believe that before one can effectively challenge the established discourse of the community in power, one must gain access to the discourse community by mastering its conventions (Johns, 1993; Harwood and Hadley, 2004). In the words of Harwood and Hadley (2004), "a pragmatic approach can provide a helpful framework for undergraduates beginning to come to terms with the practices of academic writing" (p.360). Additionally, the purpose of this study is exploratory rather than transformative, which I believe is another reason to assume a less critical approach. We first need to fully understand the dynamics of how issues like source use and plagiarism are addressed between instructors and their students before we can move to more empowering and transformative practices. Table 6 compares Pragmatism with other common paradigms in Social and Behavioral Sciences.

Context for the study

The University identified as the setting for the case study was selected for several reasons. First, it is representative of other large North American R1 universities[9] and enrolls a substantial number of undergraduate international students. The selected case is expected to illustrate the phenomenon under investigation particularly well since source use constitutes a major part of the instruction and writing in this course. Additionally, its location is convenient for me as the researcher whose current status as a doctoral student at the University is likely to result in access to University classes.

More specifically, the case study was conducted in the naturalistic setting of a university writing course for international students entitled Expository Composition for ESL (ESL 1060). A classroom is considered a naturalistic setting in the case when the researcher is not attempting to manipulate variables, do an intervention, or alter the naturally occurring activities in any way. My familiarity with this specific setting, not only at the institutional level but also at the course level, played a role in selecting this particular site. I have taught this writing course as well as the earlier courses in the ESL writing sequence several times in the past. Consequently, I was acquainted with the requirements and expectations for international undergraduate students in the University's credit-bearing ESL courses. I was also familiar with the materials and resources for teaching academic writing available to the instructors.

As mentioned above, ESL 1060 is the most advanced ESL academic writing course in the required sequence of three ESL courses and it satisfies the 2000-level

---

[9] R1 universities are "institutions [that] offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, [that] are committed to graduate education through the doctorate level, and [that] give high priority to research. They award 50 or more doctoral degrees each year and annually receive $40 million or more in Federal research support." (from http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/seind00/c4/c4s1.htm)

undergraduate writing requirement. It follows ESL 1040, focused on grammar and editing and ESL 1050 focused on basic paragraph and essay structure. International students take a writing placement test and are placed into either the ESL 1040 or ESL 1050 course. Direct placement into ESL 1060 is not possible. Only international students who pass the ESL 1050 course with a grade of C+ or higher are allowed to enroll in ESL 1060. The general expectation is that by the time students enter ESL 1060, they will have mastered a broad range of grammatical structures used in academic writing as well as the basic organization of Anglo-American discourse. As the generic syllabus indicates, the ESL 1060 course concludes the sequence of writing courses and sets out to accomplish the following objectives:

1. Develop skills of summarizing, analyzing, and synthesizing both academic and professional writing.
2. Learn various rhetorical and research strategies, especially as they relate to the construction of extended formal arguments.
3. Become familiar with the Marriott Library and learn how to gather information from a variety of sources, including books, journals, the Internet, and other reference material.
4. Develop a greater awareness of your own attitudes and learn to think critically about the world that surrounds you.
5. Learn to use proper citations (i.e., summarize or quote another author) and create bibliographies in the APA format.

The course emphasis on the use of sources manifests itself in Objectives 1, 3, 5, and indirectly in 2 as the use of sources is essential in developing effective arguments in writing. It is not completely clear what has led the course supervisors and teaching assistants who have constructed the course objectives to put considerable emphasis on source use in this course. My familiarity with the program, particularly my memory of an instructor who experienced extensive plagiarism in this course in 2002, leads me to

believe that it was in an effort to prevent future instances of extensive plagiarism. Also, the curriculum in ESL 1060 was recently (in 2006) aligned with the curriculum in the writing courses for L1 writers to ensure that the two types of offered courses fulfill the same undergraduate level University writing requirement. Following the alignment of the two curricula, many teaching assistants involved with this course have implemented genre pedagogy in their instruction. Because effective source use is a key characteristic of many academic genres, it is possible that the curricular alignment has affected the increased emphasis on source use in this course.

As for the academic assignments required in this course, the enrolled L2 writers are expected to master several academic genres, namely summaries of academic texts, a textual or rhetorical analysis paper, a report paper, and an argument paper. The difficulty level and the length of papers generally increase with each assignment. The required length for a summary is one page, for the textual/rhetorical analysis two-three pages, and for the report and argument papers four-five and six-eight pages respectively.

In order to get an insight into L2 writers' textual borrowing practices in the context of the mainstream courses they take, I also considered assignments produced outside of the ESL 1060 course. This additional component was implemented only in the case of the three selected writers because a more extensive inquiry of authentic writing practices across university genres would not be feasible in this dissertation study.

Participants in the case study

Participants in this study are one instructor of an undergraduate academic writing course for L2 writers (ESL 1060) and the students in this course. The instructor was

assigned the pseudonym *Deena* in this study. She was a native speaker of English in her late 20s and was pursuing her graduate degree in Linguistics.

All 35 enrolled students completed the summary task early in the semester. Based on the results of this task, five students were invited to participate in the qualitative part of the study. Four of these students were willing to allow me to observe them as they wrote and share the required written work with me. However, one student suffered an injury in the middle of the semester, which prevented him from completing his coursework and the study. The remaining three students participated in the study for its full duration. Two of these students were male and one was female, all in early 20s. They came from Korea, China, and Japan. Two were traditional international students, pursuing their undergraduate degrees while one was an exchange student who came to the U.S. for one semester. Table 7 summarizes their basic background information. The pseudonyms used are Deena (the instructor) and Aiko, Junmo, and Chaoren (the selected L2 writers).

In the discussion that follows, I will describe in detail each of the four participants (one instructor and three students), including their views of and attitudes toward plagiarism and textual borrowing, and in the case of the three L2 writers, on their backgrounds as academic readers and writers.

Deena

Deena, the course instructor, was a native speaker of English in her mid 20s. At the time of the study, Deena was a second-year M.A. candidate in TESOL with experience teaching skills-based ESL courses and composition courses for L1 writers.

The ESL 1060 course was the first course she was assigned to teach that involved L2 writers. When asked how the differences between L1 and L2 writers were likely going to affect her teaching, Deena explained that she expected having to spend more time on "fundamental writing skills" such as summarizing and paraphrasing:

> Um…, I think one big difference is that native speakers have a lot of experience writing in English in general. So, they've summarized and paraphrased for a long time, even informally. So, I just don't spend too much time on that. I just assume that they have those fundamental writing skills. Not the thinking skills, you know, critical thinking skills, I still work on that with them, but the fundamental writing skills…. I know that they already know how to do a lot of that. So, with this being the biggest difference, with ESL students, I really need to go into those fundamental details that otherwise I just assume that my native speakers already know.

Deena said she did not have experience dealing with plagiarism in L2 writers, but that she had handled "a couple of moderate cases [of plagiarism]" in the L1 composition courses she had taught. She said that after she identified such cases, she typically "sat down with [these students] individually and explained the consequences." As punishment, Deena claimed to have reduced their assignment grades. However, while she felt justified in taking off points from individual papers, Deena was reluctant to "take the next step":

> I did take a few points off from their assignments, because I knew that it was clear enough in class that it was not ok that they knew it would violate the rules of the assignment. However, I am not sure that they understood that it violated the whole concept of plagiarism. Which is why I felt it would be fair to take off points, but not go to the next step, which is like going to see the academic committee or whatever it is.

Deena said that she planned to approach the potential cases of plagiarism in her ESL 1060 class the same way although she acknowledged differences between L1 and L2 writers' textual borrowing practices: "….for ESL students, in a lot of cultures, it's ok to

not give credit." In addition to cultural differences, Deena viewed the difficulty of academic studies in a second language as another reason for plagiarism in L2 writers. "It's so difficult to write in a second language-there are so many things all at once so I think sometimes it can get overwhelming and then [L2 writers] try to get an easy way out."

Deena planned to emphasize teaching about how to avoid plagiarism in ESL 1060, devoting considerable class time to the relevant issues. In the interviews, she referred to instruction on plagiarism and textual borrowing as "really crucial" and "one of the core things that students need to make use of." She further explained:

> If an ESL student has a problem with grammar or vocabulary, it points them out as an ESL student, but they still can have fundamentally well-thought out ideas, which I think is the most important part. However, instances of plagiarism sort of undermine that whole, those ideas they are developing.

At a personal level, Deena appeared to be empathetic and confident in relation to her planned instruction on avoidance of plagiarism. As a language learner and a writer of a masters' thesis, Deena emphasized with the L2 writers enrolled in the course. She hoped to relay to them during the semester that effective textual borrowing does not "come easy" even to native speakers of English; that regardless of students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds, avoiding plagiarism is a complex academic skill. Deena displayed confidence that she was going to be able to help students improve their textual borrowing practices. She was satisfied with the available instructional materials, which she planned to adapt only in minor ways to reflect her own teaching style.

Aiko

Aiko is Japanese. She was 23 years old at the time of this research. She came to the United States as an exchange student majoring in German language and literature. She wanted to do the exchange program in order to improve her English and gain educational experience in a Western country. Aiko enjoyed learning and being at the university. However, she said she never thought she was a very good reader or writer regardless of whether she was reading and writing in Japanese or in English: "I am very audio person and I really like to talk even if I am not very good at talking in public and I really like to listen to the sound, but I really have difficulty in reading. It takes so much time."

Aiko reported first learning English in high school. She specifically focused on learning how to write in English for two years prior to taking the university entrance exam. During this time she would "write every day three or four essays a day day and turn it in to teacher and teacher would correct or reorganize the essays and [she] would revise and reorganize and it would go back to teacher." Aiko remembered doing up to six "cycles" of each essay she had written. However, despite such intensive preparation, Aiko did not feel that she learned a lot about writing in English. She said, "We just memorized the patterns of sentences. It was so short. Very easy, but not fruitful studying." She commented that preparation for the written part of the TOEFL test, which she had to take in order to study in the US, was more "fruitful" in terms of improving her writing, but that she still felt big gaps in her knowledge about how to write in English.

When asked which aspects of writing in English she continued to struggle with, Aiko indicated concerns related to textual borrowing. Specifically, Aiko said that she was

comfortable with "general researching and reporting," but had difficulties with writing more extensive "projects about literature." She said that the latter was hard for her because "it require[d] [her] to assimilate the content and thought of the author for [herself] and rethink again, put it in a more developed way." Aiko said she did not have any personal experience with plagiarism, which she defined as "cheating." She explained that the reason why plagiarism was "bad" was because it did not allow her as a writer "to think in [her] own way."

Despite her enthusiasm and commitment to work hard while at the American university, Aiko encountered difficulties in the majority of her classes. For example, she failed a philosophy course during her first semester and got an incomplete grade in a Linguistics course during her second semester. In order to deal with such situations, Aiko learned the value of reaching out to people around her. She has made multiple appointments with university administrators, professors, even a department chair. She surrounded herself with many friends, several of whom supported her in some of her writing assignments by providing feedback. Aiko also found an American boyfriend who helped her negotiate some of the academic issues such as petitioning for a change of grade. Aiko reflected on her new found "outgoingness", which she described as context-specific:

> I think I'm pretty shy in Japan. I feel I can be more brave here. Because people don't care about students asking questions. It's considered to be good here so I can do it freely. But in Japan I can't because it's just selfish, they judge us, they may think that student is just too outgoing.

Junmo

Junmo is South Korean. He was 20 years old at the time of the study. Prior to his university studies in the US, he spent most of his life in Korea, with the exception of tenth grade, during which he lived and studied in the United States as an exchange student. During this time Junmo enrolled in an ESL class in which he "read articles and chapters and summarized, wrote essays, did peer review, that sort of stuff". Junmo said that he did not receive explicit instruction on writing in his L1 until his last two years of high school, which he described as "an international school where they teach American style".

When asked about his evaluation of the writing instruction he has received at the American university he was attending for his undergraduate studies, he said he did not see much value in the two ESL classes he had taken prior to enrolling in ESL 1060:

> To be honest, for ESL classes, the instructors usually see the efforts we do. So, I would say I'm not really careful when I write. What I mean by not to be too careful, I don't do as much research as I'm supposed to do because I can come up with a lot of ideas without researching.

Similar to Chaoren, another participant in this case study, Junmo appeared to have more appreciation for explicit writing instruction he had received in his discipline. In an interview, he described a "format" that he found particularly beneficial and that had been given to him by teaching assistants in a biology course he was taking the previous semester.

> They [the TAs] give me instruction how to write this special scientific article. There are few steps that are very important for writing these articles. We are supposed to write some kind of observation, how we observe things. Then we do prediction, hypothesis that kind of thing. It's pretty challenging, but the format makes it more easier. Knowing how and what to write, rather than doing it by myself.

Because of the time spent at two different institutions in the United States and because of the type of instruction he received in Korea during his last two years of high school, Junmo felt more competent writing in English than in Korean. By the time of this study, he claimed to be "really used to American style of writing and format." However, he acknowledged his continued struggle with grammar and vocabulary: "I can't really make good sentences with fabulous vocabularies. That's still kind of hard for me." He said that he found himself having to read each article assigned in his biology course four to five times and that even after these multiple readings he still struggled to "get the whole thing because of all the vocabulary and terms."

In order to deal with the reading based writing assignments such as those in his biology course described in Chapter 5, Junmo said: "I copy some words from the article when I write." When asked to clarify what he meant by "copying," Junmo explained: "Like, how do scientists come up with those ideas? Or how things are going through. I kinda copy those processes. Then I write some of my ideas at the end." The analysis of his writing revealed that he did not "copy words" directly from the articles he was summarizing. Rather, he summarized texts, frequently referring to them via explicit attribution, and in the conclusion, he provided nonattributed summary of the ideas mentioned in his paper.

Junmo defined plagiarism as "stealing other people's ideas and making them as ours. Not in our own words, but just copying them and making them ours." He said he had a friend in Korea who was accused of plagiarism and consequently failed an assignment. He understood that in the United States plagiarism was "even a bigger deal," which is why he said he was careful to always include the sources he had used in a paper

at the end, in the list of references.

Chaoren

Chaoren comes from China. He was a junior at the time of this study, majoring in Urban Planning. Frequently sporting a Superman t-shirt around the campus,[10] Chaoren appeared to be a confident, outgoing person who made friends easily, regardless of whether they were his peers from classes or basketball court. He even befriended some of his professors. For example, one professor invited Chaoren to spend Thanksgiving with him and his family in California. He was perceptive and did not hesitate to speak out. For example, having noticed the waste of paper in computer labs on campus, he wrote a letter to the University president sharing his concern about the problem. Chaoren took advantage of different opportunities - he enrolled in the honors program, became a resident advisor at the university dormitory, and found an internship at the state office. Chaoren could also be described as particularly creative. For instance, he created a YouTube video in which he had adapted President's Obama's speech, using many of the original words and phrases and mimicking the tone of the speech, but sending a message that captured his enthusiasm about the University football team rather than the outcome of the presidential elections. His passion for football was evident; during some of the observations of his writing, he frequently checked scores or watched short parts of games.

Chaoren's sense of being grounded in the university community translated directly into his writing. Despite only being a junior, he frequently used the pronoun "we" when

---

[10] The pseudonym Chaoren means Superman in Chinese; he asked if I could use this pseudonym when I refer to him in my research.

referring to the discourse community of his major discipline (urban planning):

> I'm in urban planning, it's art of persuasive, you need to persuade others to accept your idea. The way **we** do this, is from speaking and writing. Sometimes **we** can't always speak to people face-to-face in public so we can publish or write some articles to persuade people [emphasis added].

Unlike many developing L2 writers who often find themselves preoccupied with lower level concerns and basic organization, Chaoren predominantly focused on meaning making: "I feel good writing when I have something to say" and "I just wanna make it my stuff" were the types of sentiments he shared with me frequently during the research process.

Chaoren was a responsible writer; he always began his writing assignments long before the due date and devoted considerable time to the writing process, especially when producing high-stakes papers. He read background readings carefully and spent extensive time thinking about his writing and mapping out his thinking processes onto informal outlines. His ability to set goals and work on a writing assignment for several hours a day allowed him to engage in substantial revising. His commitment to produce a high quality writing in his higher stakes assignments is reflected in Chaoren's collaboration with his father whom he asked for feedback on early drafts. However, as the analysis showed, Chaoren did not accept his father's recommendations mechanically. Rather, he was selective when making decisions about which of his father's advice to incorporate and which to omit in later drafts.

Despite the fact that he had a need to get feedback on his writing prior to submitting it to his professors, Chaoren considered himself a good writer of both Chinese and English. Chaoren's confidence in his writing ability was contrary to his dismissal of the received writing instruction. He claimed never to have received explicit instruction about

academic writing in Chinese. He was critical of the writing instruction in English that he received in China: "Basically, what I learned in high school was useless. Just grammar and stuff like that, but nothing helpful for my writing in English." Similar to Junmo, Chaoren also had hesitations about the ESL courses he had taken at the university in the United States. He compared what he learned in the two ESL courses that preceded ESL 1060 as "too easy," "too basic," and as "not very deep." The only courses in which he claimed to have learned a lot about academic writing were discipline-specific, again echoing Junmo. Chaoren reflects on the value of two of such courses in the quote below:

> I took one…, actually, two great classes that helped me with writing here. One class that had me write a four-page paper every week, which really helped me. And there was another class, Architecture. The professor was really nice. I always wrote three or four drafts and sent it to him and he can give me feedback about like you need a strong thesis statement, or you have to define you idea more clearly, and like that.

Chaoren reported that it had taken him about two years to feel like a "good enough writer in English." He reflected on his journey in the following way:

> My big problem used to be my ideas, my critical thinking. I've been trained in China for 18 years and then I came to States and these are two strikingly different languages and cultures so I have to switch my mind to the Western culture critical thinking way so sometimes it's kind of hard for me to write something for Americans. Sometimes, my professors didn't know what I was talking about because I was writing in the Chinese way so I think the most difficulty for me is to switch my idea into an American way.

Chaoren acknowledged that he continued to make mistakes related to the use of vocabulary and grammar, but he downplayed the importance of these lower-level concerns: "Vocabulary and grammar are underlined automatically. It's not as important."

While Chaoren spent countless hours working on high stakes writing assignments, he appeared pragmatic when approaching shorter, lower-stakes assignments and

assignments assigned in the ESL course. He spent considerably less time thinking about and producing these assignments. He did not consult his father. He utilized parts of texts he had previously constructed in other courses. Finally, Chaoren strategically reused his sources even when connections between the sources and topics were not obvious at first glance.

While he reused sources across assignments, he appeared to place a lot of emphasis on avoiding plagiarism, which he defined as cheating, "especially when you use others' work without giving them credit." He was aware of the harsh consequences that plagiarism entailed:

> You just don't do it in college because it's bad. But in college, you may be like kicked out from the university so it's too serious for us to do it. And from the moral issue, we shouldn't do it because if you're using other ideas you have to pay back, to give them some credit so it's natural.

Chaoren reported first learning about plagiarism in China. His view of how textual borrowing works in China is as follows:

> If I wrote a paper in China and I put someone's speech in it I don't have to put in notes after and it's not considered plagiarism. But if you wrote a novel and you borrowed a lot of other people's ideas, and you put them together, and you didn't give credit, it's plagiarism. So the definition of plagiarism is essentially the same, but the way to reveal that [sic] is different.

<u>Data collection</u>

To understand better the phenomenon in the center of this investigation, the present case study draws upon multiple data sources such as written academic assignments, in-class and homework assignments produced by L2 writers, readings from which L2 writers drew as they produced their writing, any relevant course artifacts (e.g., syllabus, slides, worksheets, textbooks), interviews, and observations. Triangulation of

these various sources of data produced rich, vivid descriptions, which are a key characteristic of case studies. The following section provides detailed descriptions of the different data sources utilized in this case study.

Written summaries of L2 writers

In order to collect the written summaries produced by L2 writers, I explained the research project in the class and asked students who where willing to participate to sign a consent form. I collected the 100-word summaries from the instructor and analyzed them during the first week of instruction. The specific focus of this analysis was on the amount of direct copying and the nature of attribution in the summary task analysis. Summaries by five students were initially selected. I strove to select summaries from a continuum of appropriate textual borrowing, although only one summary contained a large amount of directly copied original words. The author of this particular summary declined to participate in the research. The other four examples were patchwritten: they contained minor direct copying at the word and phrase level and were moderately successful in attributing the summary to the original author. All four authors of these summaries accepted the invitation to participate in the research although only three completed the study. I then arranged a meeting with the participating students and asked them to sign the initial consent form. I presented them with detailed requirements and an additional consent form. Next, I made appointments with the selected students to conduct the initial interviews.

Written assignments and documents

Textual analyses similar to those of the initial summary task were conducted on written assignments and documents throughout the study as the three L2 writers selected for closer observation completed a variety of writing assignments required in their courses. At least four major papers, as well as any prompts or instructions given to students for these papers by their instructors, were analyzed-two from the ESL course and two from other mainstream courses. I tracked and dated all drafts for all papers. Any reading materials used in students' papers as well as any notes and outlines they may have created were also collected and analyzed.

Additional assignments and documents were also considered. For example, in the ESL class, students were involved in peer review tasks, which I collected from the three selected students. Finally, all relevant course materials, including the syllabus, lesson plans, PowerPoint slides, worksheets, handouts, assignment prompts, copied textbook chapters, and articles implemented in the course were collected and analyzed.

Individual interviews

In addition to the written summaries, written assignments and documents, interview data were also collected from the selected participants. Interviewing is arguably the most important source of data in case studies as it "allow[s] us to enter into the other person's perspective" (Patton, 2002, p. 341). The study combined more and less structured approaches for interviewing to increase the chance of obtaining the most relevant information at different points in the study. For example, at the beginning and end of the study, a major interview was conducted with both the instructor and three L2

writers. Because it is important to compare the participants' opinions and experiences related to source use and plagiarism, I mostly relied on semistructured interview questions during these main initial and final interviews. Semistructured types of questions are designed to achieve a level of systematicity in the data. They are relatively broad and open-ended. When conducting a semistructured interview, the interviewer prepares the exact wording of the questions ahead of time but is flexible rewording, reordering, and even leaving out questions during the interview. This flexibility is essential in making the interview appear informal and in allowing the participant feel relaxed.

During the four to six shorter, less formal interviews conducted throughout the semester, I employed "informal-conversational interview approach" (Patton, 2002) also known as "unstructured interviewing" (Fontana & Frey, 2000), which is in no way predetermined, but rather results from the immediate context. This approach draws on "spontaneous generation of questions in the natural flow of an interaction, often as part of ongoing participant observation fieldwork" (Patton, 2002, p. 342). The reason why this less formal interview approach is preferable during the shorter mid-semester interviews is because most of the questions directly emerged from the observations. Many of the questions were clarification questions, for example, an L2 writer underlined parts of the readings as she was working on her written assignment. Following the observation, I asked the participant to explain the reason for engaging in a specific process such as underlining of information in reading. At least one interview was conducted to allow the three students to elaborate on their surveys in which they indicated the usefulness of classes on source use.

I followed several important steps in order to obtain effective interview data.

Specifically, I adapted interview techniques proposed by Creswell (1998) such as conducting interviews in quiet, confidential locations with adequate technology for digital recording. The questions I posed to participants were primarily open-ended, thus avoiding potentially biased lead-in types of questions. Finally, all interviews were transcribed immediately after the observations and copies of these transcripts were added to individual participants' files.

Participant observation

Finally, observations were also important components of data collection for this study because little existing research that examines academic source use and its instruction employs this type of data. In line with qualitative research, the observational data offer sufficient depth and detail about the setting, the participants, and the interactions between the participants and the phenomenon under investigation. As an observer, I adopted the role of onlooker rather than participant during the class observations and observations of L2 writers' text production and maintained a narrow observational scope, focusing only on the academic source use phenomenon (Patton, 2002).

I observed an ESL writing course for the duration of one semester. In total, the course met three times a week for 50 minutes for 15 weeks, yielding a total of 150 classroom observation hours. In addition to the observation of the classroom, I observed each of the three L2 writers in the case study as they wrote four major written academic assignments. Each L2 writer was observed for three to four hours, sometimes during the process of production of each paper, yielding about 12-16 hours of observations per

student. To target source use successfully in the paper production process, I asked each participant to outline informally his or her work plan before starting work on the paper. In instances where an observation failed to yield any relevant data on L2 writers' use of sources, I asked to observe each participant again during the later parts of their paper production.

Drawing upon a detailed observation protocol, I collected detailed field notes in order to record all data that could contribute to understanding the phenomena during each observation. The field notes were based on thorough descriptions of the setting and contain the "observer's own feelings, reactions to the experience, and reflections about the personal meaning and significance of what has been observed," as well as "insights, interpretations, beginning analyses, and working hypotheses about what is happening in the setting and what it means" (Patton, 2002, pp. 303-304). Consequently, I recorded careful notes on the process of observing instructors' teaching and L2 writers' text production during and after the interviews. The collection of data and relevant timelines in the study are summarized in Table 8.

<u>Procedures for conducting the case study</u>

I adapted procedures recommended by Stake (1995) in this case study. First, I identified the most appropriate cases to study. I invited the course instructor to participate but refrained from presenting the exact purpose of the study. Instead, the instructor was told this is a study on L2 writing and difficulties L2 writers face when producing academic written assignments. Next, I selected five students whom I invited to participate in the main part of the case study. Three of these students completed the study. The

participating L2 writers were told that this study focused on examining the challenges of L2 writers, rather than textual borrowing. The reason for designing this case study as a deception study was an attempt to avoid any forced changes in natural practices in which the instructor and student participants authentically engage.

Following the identification of the research site and participants, I engaged in further data collection, namely observations, interviews, textual analyses of writing assignments and tasks produced by students (e.g., papers, HW assignments, peer review sheets), and various course artifacts presented by the instructor (e.g., syllabus, presentations, worksheets, assignment prompts). The data collection generated a comprehensive description of the case. Throughout and subsequent to the data collection process, I performed data analyses, including identification of any key themes from the data. Finally, I produced a concise summary of the most important interpretations of the case.

<u>Data management and analysis</u>

Data management

Given the relatively large number of data collected in this study, effective data management was essential. I utilized several methods for managing the different types of data. I stored most of the collected data electronically on my password-protected computer. Specifically, my computer files consisted of the digital recordings of the interview data, transcriptions of interviews, and observation notes. I also stored my self-reflective journal entries electronically, which allowed for me to search efficiently for specific concepts in my reflection entries. To back up my electronically stored data, I also

stored all dissertation data on a flash drive.

In addition to the electronic storage of data, I created a folder for each of the participants in this research. The folders for the instructors contained field notes from observations of the classes, and all relevant course materials, including the syllabus, lesson plans, PowerPoint slides, worksheets, handouts, assignment prompts, copied textbook chapters and articles implemented in the course. Transcripts of the end-of-semester interviews were also printed and kept in the folders. In the case of the participating undergraduate students, folders contained all drafts of their papers written for their ESL course and other, mainstream courses at the university. All the drafts were dated. The student folders also contained the observation notes, interview transcripts, copies of articles used in their academic papers, and students' notes, outlines, and assignment prompts. Transcripts from the short interviews conducted immediately after the observations were copied to the observation notes file and printed out as one document. The beginning and end-of-the semester interviews were digitally recorded, transcribed, printed out, and included in the folders. The folders were kept in a locked file cabinet in my home office.

I took precautions to limit the chances of a breech in confidentiality. As mentioned above, I stored data in a password-protected computer and kept the folders in a home office. I was the sole transcriber of the interviews and therefore the only person handling the data. When I used other raters such as for the analysis of texts produced by the student writers, I made sure to assign pseudonyms to the participants.

Data analysis

Analysis of observations, interviews, and documents

According to Miles and Huberman (1994), qualitative data analysis involves the following processes: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. The reduction of data involves "reducing the data into meaningful segments and assigning names for the segments" (Creswell, 2007, p. 148). In other words, the process of data reduction can transform large numbers of data into a manageable form. In this dissertation study, the interviews were transcribed and the field notes and course documents consolidated in ways that allow for an examination of issues relevant only to source use and the instruction of source use. Both interviews and field notes were then inputted to Atlas-ti, the qualitative analysis software that was used to manage and organize the data. After all data were imported to Atlas-ti, the data reduction process continued in the form of coding, which involves "condensing the bulk of [] data sets into analyzable units by creating categories with and from our data" (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996, p. 26). After all observational, interview, and instructional data (e.g., course materials) had been coded, the focus was on data display, which has been defined as "an organized, compressed assembly of information that permits conclusion drawing and action (Miles, 1994, p. 57). Finally, conclusion drawing/verification involves abstracting meaning from data and constructing a logical presentation of evidence. I made an effort to present the conclusions, using the participants' voices and specific examples of documents frequently.

<u>Analysis of texts produced by L2 writers</u>

When analyzing students' use of academic sources in summaries and in papers produced for ESL and mainstream courses, I combined source use analysis methods proposed by Keck (2006) with my own recommendations developed to improve existing approaches to accounting for source use practices (Tomaš, 2006). Six main textual borrowing strategies were central to the analyses in the study: 1) quotations, 2) unquoted reproductions, 3) quote combinations, 4) near copies, 5) paraphrases, and 6) summaries. All six strategies were also coded as attributed (+A) or nonattributed (-A). This procedure allowed me to not only examine how L2 writers manipulate the language of original sources, but also consider how they view the crediting of the original author(s). With the exception of quotations, the remaining five types of textual borrowing strategies were also coded for meaning correspondence as supported (+S) and unsupported (-S). Research on textual borrowing has not yet considered this meaning-driven dimension, which I view as critical in understanding the development of L2 writers' textual borrowing practices. A textual borrowing strategy was coded as unsupported when the meaning implicit in the textual borrowing strategy did not correspond to the meaning of the original.

For the purpose of this study, *quotations* were defined as reproductions accompanied by conventional quotation marks and *unquoted reproductions* were defined as quotations without the conventional marks for quotations. *Quote combinations* were any sentences that were part quotes regardless of whether the quoted part was at the word, phrase, or sentence level. Following Campbell (1990), *near copies* were conceived as different from unquoted reproductions in that "syntax [is] rearranged, or synonyms

[are] used for one or two content words" (p. 216). In addition to structural adjustments, at least 50 % of words in a given sentence would need to be copied from an original source for the sentence to be coded as a near-copy.

The definition of paraphrase reflected more inherent complexity discussed increasingly in research (i.e., Campbell, 1990; Keck, 2006; Shi, 2004; Tomaš, 2006). The following criteria, developed by Keck (2006), provided tools for operationalization of the construct of paraphrase and consequently guided the identification of paraphrases in students' texts. According to Keck, for a phrase or a clause within the student's text to be identified as a *paraphrase*, it must:

1. "…be traced to a specific excerpt in the source text" and demonstrate this connection between the student produced text and the original text with "linguistic evidence in the form of shared lexical words, synonyms of words occurring in the original excerpt, and/or shared clause patterns".
2. "…be approximately the same length of the excerpt identified".
3. "…show evidence of the student's attempt to convey ideas expressed in the original excerpt…[including] (a) an accurate restatement of the original excerpts' main ideas, or (b) a close approximation of the original excerpts' main ideas".
4. "…show evidence of the student's attempt to make changes to the lexis and/or grammatical patterns found in the identified excerpt." Copied from Keck, 2006, pp. 51-52.

Finally, *summaries* were concise rephrases of larger sections of the original text. Unlike paraphrases they were not traceable to a specific sentence or a group of sentences in the original.

Trustworthiness in qualitative research

In this section I discuss how qualitatively oriented researchers account for the inherent quality of the work they do. Many renowned qualitative researchers have

reported pressure to address this issue from the dominant quantitative paradigm, namely by discussing reliability, validity, and generalizability. While these concepts can be applicable in qualitative research, qualitative researchers have proposed alternative terms that are more inherently appropriate for the qualitative types of inquiry (Janesick, 2003). One such term commonly accepted by qualitative researchers is *trustworthiness*, which has been defined as "the authenticity and consistency of interpretations grounded in data" (Yeh & Inman, 2007, p. 386). Following Lincoln and Guba (1985), my study achieves this trustworthiness by meeting four criteria: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

Credibility must demonstrate that the "inquiry was conducted in such a manner as to ensure that the subject was accurately identified and described" (Marshall and Rossman, 1999, p.192). It can be achieved in research by employing a "prolonged engagement with participants, persistent observation in the field, the use of peer debriefers or peer researchers, negative case analysis, researcher reflexivity, and participant checks, validation, or co-analysis" (Morrow, 2005, p. 252).

The dissertation study spans across four months, thus meeting the "prolonged engagement" aspect of the credibility criterion. Additionally, I asked participants to verify my conclusions by allowing them to read and comment on the relevant parts of my research. Having participants verify findings ultimately enriches them (Creswell, 1998; Morrow, 2005). After the interviews and four main observations, the participants were thanked and provided with my contact information so that they could contact me with any questions or concerns. I informed the participants that I would re-contact them for the final, end-of-the semester interview, which would be partly spent by clarifying

information that they have shared with me. During participant checks, I encouraged participants to provide opinions on the credibility of the findings and interpretations, "taking data, analyses, interpretations, and conclusions back to the participants so that they can judge the accuracy and credibility of the account" (Creswell, 1998, p. 203).

In addition to prolonged engagement with participants and participant checks, I also strove for credibility by engaging in a reflective process. This was achieved by maintaining a research journal in which I examined my feelings or reactions to participants, changes in myself as the researcher, and predispositions, selective perceptions, or biases (Patton, 2002). The journal also provided a tool for keeping track of informal observations, experiences, conversations and potential research ideas.

Although generalizability is not commonly assumed in qualitative inquiry, *transferability* is an important criterion of qualitative research and particularly research done within the paradigm of Pragmatism. For research to be transferable, the researcher "must argue that his [or her] findings will be useful to others in similar situations, with similar research questions or questions of practice" (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 193) and must provide "sufficient information about the self (the researcher as instrument) and the research context, processes, participants, and researcher-participant relationships to enable the reader to decide how the findings may transfer" (Morrow, 2005, p. 252). To achieve transferability, I provide sufficiently rich descriptions about every part of my study and, thus, allow my readers to draw relevant conclusions as to the applicability of the findings to their specific situations. Also, I describe in detail my background, potential biases, and the research paradigm with which I align, all of which may affect my interpretations of the data.

In order to achieve *dependability* a study must be "consistent across time, researchers, and analysis techniques" (Gasson, 2003; as cited in Morrow, 2005, p. 252), meaning the research process should be transparent, repeatable, conducive for an emergent design, and accompanied by a transparent audit trail. Morrow (2005) defines an audit trail as "a detailed chronology of research activities and processes; influences on the data collection and analysis; emerging themes, categories, or models; and analytic memos" (Morrow, 2005, p. 252). Following these recommendations, I monitored the research process carefully in order to avoid allowing my assumptions and biases to affect the process of identifying patterns and themes. My peer research team was also able to audit each step of the research process. Journals, participant folders, transcripts, field notes, course documents, and texts produced by students were organized and available for review throughout the process.

I also strove to achieve dependability by incorporating interrater agreement in my analysis of textual data, as is often common in the field of applied linguistics. Inter-rater agreement or interrater reliability is a research strategy that involves making data or parts of data available for others to analyze (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Because of the large amount of textual data generated in this study, I was unable to employ a rater for the analysis of all data. Instead, I first did preliminary coding of about 20% of the data. Following Keck (2006), I then coded about 10 % of data with another rater in order to assess the reliability of my coding. I then proceed to code the remainder of the data on my own.

In line with coding procedures outlined by Brice (2005), I conducted two training sessions to prepare the rater for the coding of the data. During the first session, I

explained the purpose of my project to the rater and provided her with my coding categories. We carefully reviewed these categories together, considering the multiple examples of the different textual borrowing strategies that I had previously identified and coded. I then asked the rater to code additional previously identified units. Following the first session, I assessed the interrater agreement on coding, which was 90%. During the second session, I presented the rater with texts not previously divided into units and trained her to establish the units prior to coding the units. Following the second training session the rater engaged in both processes—the unit identification and unit coding. After the rater provided me with the identified units and codings in the selected texts, I again assessed the inter-rater agreement, which was 88%.

In addition to focusing on achieving credibility, transferability, and dependability in my data analysis, I also strove for confirmability. Confirmability refers to the "traditional concept of objectivity" in scoring and the ability to confirm the study's scoring procedures by another (Marshall and Rossman, 1999). The main strategy that was in place to ensure that the proposed study assures confirmability was member checking. I conducted participant checks in order to verify my interpretations of the data, and I actively examined data that did not corroborate my conclusions.

In summary, to achieve the above-discussed criteria that help achieve rigor in qualitative research design, I collected multiple data sources while paying special attention to the precise recording of participants' exact words. I remained sensitive to how my presence as a researcher may have been affecting the cases in the center of this study. I also immersed myself in data and reflected on data for sufficient amounts of time and kept a detailed audit trail throughout the research process. I addressed my research

concerns with my peer research group. Finally, I rated a minimum of 10% of collected texts with another rater in order to establish reliability for the identified coding categories.

<div style="text-align: center;">Researcher as instrument</div>

In line with major tenants of qualitative research inquiry, I realize that as a researcher, I am not able to perceive phenomena with complete objectivity because my background and life experience have shaped my perception of the world. For example, in my development as an L2 writer and later an instructor of L2 writers, I have developed assumptions and biases about issues, such as the nature and complexity of L2 writing, instruction of L2 writing, response to and evaluation of L2 writing, and the concept of plagiarism. To capture participants' meanings as accurately as I can, I attempted to scrutinize my biases as I conceptualized, collected, analyzed, and interpreted data. What follows is a brief examination of the personal biases that may have affected the research process and a discussion of strategies I employed in the effort to minimize my influence on the investigated experience of the participants.

As someone who first composed English academic assignments in a culture that did not condemn inappropriate source use to the extent it is condemned in the North American culture and as someone who formed her academic writing skills in an institution that did not teach source use strategies explicitly, I realize that the lens through which I view L2 writers' difficulties with source use is a highly sensitive one. Because the observed instructor did not share my background or experience, it is possible that my evaluation of her instructional practices is harsher at times than it would be if another

researcher was examining this topic.

My experience as an instructor of L2 academic writers in a variety of university ESL courses may have also played a role in how I viewed the practices in the center of my study. My experience has led me to believe that providing a definition of plagiarism in one's syllabus and warning students not to plagiarize prior to major written assignments is not sufficient to allow undergraduate L2 writers to internalize appropriate academic source use practices. Rather, I believe that using explicit instruction, including a large number of example effective and ineffective texts, providing opportunities to revise writing, and modeling of the process of incorporating sources into one's writing are crucial for L2 writers' development of academic writing skills. These pedagogical beliefs result from my understanding of second language acquisition as a complex, developmental process and from the importance I place on incorporating genre and process theories into teaching L2 writing. It is possible that these strongly held beliefs and the knowledge I have developed from current research have made me less perceptive of the effectiveness of alternative pedagogical practices.

Additionally, drawing on my personal experience as someone who had to learn to navigate three distinct educational systems (i.e., Slovak, British, and American institutions of higher education), I tend to be more aware of the challenges that students of English as a second or additional language face. I am sympathetic to L2 writers who struggle to adapt to a new culture while coping with the social and cognitive demands in their academic work. I believe that even skilled L2 writers typically spend a longer time composing than their L1 counterparts with comparable educational background. Oftentimes the writing assignments viewed as manageable for L1 writers are

overwhelming for L2 writers. This assumption may have made me overly critical of instructors who have unrealistically high expectations for the second language writers in their courses. However, overall, I expect that the understanding of L2 writers and their needs, which I have developed during my career as a writing instructor, has enhanced my understanding of the difficulties that the individual students selected for this case study have with textual borrowing.

Finally, as someone who identifies with the role of applied linguists to engage with differences and oppose essentialism, as well as to be aware of "the workings of power" (Pennycook, 2001, p. 123), I have a natural tendency to adapt a critical stance in my work. However, in the study I attempted to disguise reactions to situations in which participants express potentially essentializing or disparaging attitudes toward L2 writers. My reason for assuming a less critical approach to the phenomenon under investigation is based on the fact that the goal of the study is descriptive and explanatory rather than transformative. I believe we first need to fully understand the dynamics of how issues like source use and plagiarism are addressed between instructors and their students before we can move to empowering, transformative practices.

While objectivity is not perceived as the ultimate goal, or even as something attainable in the qualitative research, it is important for researchers to attempt to manage their biases in order to provide pictures of the cases that are true to the participants rather than to researchers' own beliefs. In order to manage my biases in this case study, I kept a self-reflective journal throughout the study. After every observation or interview I engaged in reflecting on my reactions to the data, examining closely whether these reactions may have been affecting my interpretations of the data. As mentioned earlier in

this chapter, I also drew upon on my peer research group to discuss any instances where my understanding of the data could have been distorted as a result of my background or biases.

Ethical considerations

Because the purpose of the study was to examine instruction on source use as it naturally occurs in an ESL writing course and source use skills that L2 writers naturally use as they write authentic assignments, it was necessary that I did not share my exact research agenda with my participants. Instead, I told the participants that the dissertation study focuses on the teaching and learning of academic writing.

I complied with the policies and procedures posited by the University of Utah's Institutional Review Board (IRB). I submitted my study for IRB approval and followed the IRB guidelines to obtain an informed consent from the participants. I informed the participants of what participating in this research entailed and emphasized that they were free to withdraw from the study at any time. I ensured confidentiality to the best of my ability. I assigned each participant pseudonyms and kept all the data secure.

Table 6. Paradigms common in social and behavioral sciences

	Positivist	Postpositivist	Pragmatist	Constructivist
Ontology	"Naïve realism" Reality is out there to be studied. captured, and eventually completely understood (Taskhakkori & Teddlie, 1998, p. 23).	'Critical realist" - a true reality exists but can't be apprehended; driven by natural laws that can't be fully understood.	"Accept external reality. Choose explanations that best produced desired outcomes" (Taskhakkori & Teddlie, 1998, p. 23).	"relativist" ontology – multiple truths and realities.
Epistemology	"Objective point of view. Knower and known are dualism" (Taskhakkori & Teddlie, 1998, p. 23).	"modified objective" epistemology – "findings probably objectively true" (Taskhakkori & Teddlie, 1998, p. 23).	"Objective and subjective points of view" (Taskhakkori & Teddlie, 1998, p. 23).	"subjectivist" – inquirer and inquired a single entity – findings are a product/creation of interaction between researcher (R) and participants (Ps).
Axiology	"Inquiry is value free" (Taskhakkori & Teddlie, 1998, p. 23).	Strives for neutrality, "inquiry involves values, but they may be controlled" (Taskhakkori & Teddlie, 1998, p. 23).	"Values play a large role in interpreting results" (Taskhakkori & Teddlie, 1998, p. 23).	Acknowledges values, neutrality is not possible.
Methodology	Quantitative-experimental/manipulative; correlational.	Mostly quantitative, some qualitative, more natural settings. If qualitative methods are used, they are rigorously defined; low level statistics are used, such as descriptive statistics and frequency counts.	Quantitative and qualitative.	Qualitative Hermeneutic (interpretative) – depict individual constructions as accurately as possible; Dialectics – compare and contrast individual constructions so each respondent interacts with constructions of others Individual constructions elicited, compared, contrasted – R & Ps; Ps & Ps interact and co-construct.

Table 7. Participants' backgrounds

Pseudonym	Sex	Age	Country	Field of Study	English Language Test Score
Aiko	Female	23	Japan	Literature	IBT 67
Junmo	Male	20	South Korea	Biology	CBT 258
Chaoren	Male	21	China	Urban Planning	NA

Table 8. Data collection

Methods	Data Collection during the researched ESL 1060 course	Data
Classroom observations	3x50 min. a week	Field notes on all lessons; about 40 hours of observations) Digitally-recorded classes in which source use is the focus
Documents	Throughout the semester	Course syllabus, slides, worksheets, handouts, relevant book chapters
Text analyses	Summaries Writing assignments (two written for ESL 1060 and two for mainstream classes) produced by three students in ESL 1060	Text analyses of summaries Text analyses of writing assignments (minimum of 4 major assignments from each student, 12 in total (about 8000 words of text)
Observations of students' text production practices	Throughout the semester	Three to four hours of observations per each of the three selected L2 writers per each of the three to four selected assignments (about 9-16 hours of observations per student
Interviews with students	One at the beginning of the semester and one at the end of the project. Short interviews after each writing observation (four to six times per semester). Short interviews after classes on source use.	6 major interviews, average 1 hour each (three at the beginning, three at the end of the semester). 15-18 short interviews. All interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed.
Interviews with instructors	One at the beginning of the semester, one at the end of the project. Short interviews after classes on source use	Two 60 minute interviews Two-four shorter interviews, average 15 minutes each Digitally recorded and transcribed.
Researcher's self-reflecting journal	Reflective entries on most relevant observations, interviews, and documents	2-3 entries per week

CHAPTER 4

THE TEACHING AND LEARNING OF TEXTUAL BORROWING

This chapter sets out to explore the following research question and its sub questions:

What is the nature of ESL writing instruction on plagiarism and textual borrowing?

    a.   How are the concepts of plagiarism and textual borrowing presented and practiced in the L2 writing classroom?

    b.   What kinds of instructional characteristics does an L2 writing instructor and L2 writers consider useful in teaching L2 writers about plagiarism and textual borrowing?

I will first briefly describe the organization of the ESL 1060 course in terms of interactional structure. Subsequently, I will discuss three main themes identified in Deena's instruction. Additionally, in this chapter, I will describe lessons that exclusively dealt with textual borrowing. Specifically, I will focus on Deena's instruction of paraphrasing, quoting, and summarizing. After describing the lessons and discussing Deena's rationale for the lessons, I will consider students' reactions to the instruction, especially their opinions about instructional usefulness related to plagiarism and textual borrowing in the L2 writing class (ESL 1060). Throughout the chapter I will mostly draw upon the voices of the three selected L2 writers. However, in the case of discussing the

in-class activities on paraphrasing, quoting, and summarizing, I will offer analyses of collaborative work produced by all of the enrolled students. I will conclude the chapter with a discussion of the examined instruction.

In the discussions of Deena's teaching throughout the chapter, I urge the reader to consider my comments in reference to the treatment of issues related to plagiarism and textual borrowing—areas in which Deena and her students could benefit from changes to her instruction. Although I raise criticism of this particular aspect of Deena's teaching, I view Deena as a successful instructor overall, and her general effectiveness was evidenced by positive end-of-the semester student evaluations.

<u>The usefulness of teaching about plagiarism</u>

<u>and textual borrowing</u>

Course overview

Deena spent considerable time in her course on addressing avoidance of plagiarism and on textual borrowing strategies. In fact, as Table 9 shows, 520 of the total 2050 minutes (almost 25% of the total class time) were devoted to the topics such as avoiding plagiarism and using sources. The course observations revealed that Deena's instruction rested on 1) explicit course lecture, 2) small group work, 3) pair work, and, to a considerably smaller extent, 4) individual work. A typical day in Deena's classroom began with administrative issues such as taking the class roll and reminding students of important deadlines and assignments. After the first few minutes, Deena began her delivery of a PowerPoint presentation, which often started with a review activity. After revisiting the most important information from the previous class, Deena generally

continued the lecture with a presentation of new concepts. The slides were adapted from PowerPoint presentations prepared by previous teaching assistants. Deena relied almost exclusively on her colleague's work, making only occasional changes to the documents passed on to her (for a more complete discussion of Deena's use of instructional materials see Tomaš, 2010).

Although the lecture was teacher-led, Deena encouraged students to interact with the material by prompting them to ask clarifying questions and offer opinions. Frequently, the instructor stepped away from her computer and wrote students' suggestions on the board or illustrated contested points with examples. Unlike Leslie, the academic writing instructor described in Ouellette (2006), Deena was willing to give up her role as the "floor holder" during lectures (Ouellette, 2006, p. 138). For example, instead of answering students' questions directly, Deena frequently posed questions back to them, allowing students to negotiate answers. Thus, the flow of information in Deena's classroom often changed from uni- to bi-directional. Like David and Yasuko in Casanave's (2004) research, Deena, at times, left the podium as she monitored collaborative work her students were asked to engage in. However, overall, she did not seem to succeed in completely overcoming the physical constraints of the classroom space, which lent itself considerably more to teacher-centered instruction.

The instructor typically devoted the last part of her classes to pair and group practice of the new information. Deena explained her preference for collaborative learning over individual work: "I like having students work in pairs, bouncing ideas off of each other. I feel like if they do it individually, they may as well do it at home." At times, organizing groups appeared time consuming. One reason was the large number of

students in the class and another was Deena's choice to employ creative group formation techniques rather than asking students to work with peers sitting in their proximity. Deena recognized the time as a major pitfall related to group work, but rationalized her decision by saying that if she was to let her students work with students who sit together, "they'd always end up working with their buddies rather than with people from other cultures, people they don't know." As another benefit of group work, Deena mentioned the availability of additional examples. Specifically, she viewed the value of student-produced examples as a demonstration of the multiplicity of ways to write from sources.

> When you work with a pair, you hear your ideas and your partner's ideas, but it's nice to see that another group came up with something different, not only because it may give you ideas of what you may do better next time, but also because I think it hammers home the point that there isn't the wrong way to summarize or paraphrase as long as you follow the rules. So, everybody does it differently, which is great and that's what makes everyone unique, blah, blah, blah…. As long as they follow the rules, they're ok.

Interestingly, students frequently perceived the pair and group interactional modes not as ways to accomplish a lesson's objective but, rather, as an objective in itself. For example, when asked during the interviews what the main point of the various lessons was, the three students in the study mentioned the following: "doing an activity with a peer," "see what partners did," "learn [from] partners' mistakes, work with others, group study," and "working in a pair." This issue of students' misinterpretation of the main point of the lesson will be re-addressed in a section on students' responses to selected lessons on textual borrowing, later in this chapter.

Instructor's attitudes toward and reasons

for teaching about avoiding plagiarism

Throughout the semester, Deena frequently referred to textual borrowing as something that was "tricky" and "confusing" yet essential for success in academic writing. Overall, the instructor placed teaching about plagiarism high on her hierarchy of instructional priorities—she referred to these issues as "really crucial" and "one of the core things that students need to make use of." She further explained:

> If an ESL student has a problem with grammar or vocabulary, it points them out as an ESL student, but they still can have fundamentally well-thought out ideas, which I think is the most important part. However, instances of plagiarism sort of undermine that whole, those ideas they are developing.

An analysis of course observations corroborates Deena's asserted emphasis on the topics of plagiarism and textual borrowing. As Table 9 shows, the total time spent on these topics was 520 minutes, which is about 25% of the overall course content.

Deena's explanations during class lectures, her responses to students' questions and comments, and her feedback on students' writing illustrate her attitudes toward and reasons for teaching about avoiding plagiarism, which, in turn, shed light on her construction of instructional usefulness. Specifically, three identified themes capture Deena's understanding of plagiarism and textual borrowing. These three themes will be examined in detail.

Appropriate textual borrowing as a means to avoid punishment

Several aspects of Deena's instruction foreground the punitive nature of plagiarism, frequently discussed in the literature (Howard, 1999, Pecorari, 2004). Starting with the syllabus, the section on plagiarism was visually more salient than any other

sections. It began with the word *plagiarism* spelled in all capital letters and followed by a bolded, exclamatory sentence *Read this carefully***!** Three bullet points captured the consequences of plagiarism in the ESL 1060 course: 1) a failing grade in the course, 2) a possible expulsion from the university, and 3) a mandatory meeting with the instructor during which the plagiarized work would be identified.

In addition to highlighting the topic of plagiarism in the course syllabus, the instructor further underscored the topic's importance when she chose to devote the first lesson in the course to plagiarism. The lesson asked that students discuss several scenarios, which revolved around plagiarism and textual borrowing. Deena's inspiration for this activity came from a handout on plagiarism, which she adapted from a website.[11] Deena found the scenarios presented in the handout valuable because she believed they allowed the students to relate to the information better than if they were only to consider the rules in isolation.

Following the initial lesson on plagiarism in which Deena addressed the punitive consequences, the course focus shifted to skill building. However, after Deena received multiple drafts of students' report papers, which included what Deena referred to as "varied degrees of plagiarism," the instructor found herself wanting to re-address the topic and did so in a way that stressed the punishment attendant to plagiarizing[12]. She reported feeling puzzled at the situation given that she had "covered the topic [of plagiarism] extensively." She speculated that the problem resulted from her failure to remind students about appropriate textual borrowing prior to the first draft of the report

---

[11] Comparison of the handout and the original website upon which the handout was based revealed that the handout included large sections copied directly from the website without conventional acknowledgement.

[12] Deena reported that of the 34 papers, six did not have any in-text citations and another eight had insufficient citations. She asserted that students appeared to provide citations with quotations, but failed to credit their sources when the paraphrased and summarized from them.

paper. She elaborated: "It's like we moved to new topics, so they weren't thinking about it. They weren't focused on that. They were focused on researching and content, which is great, but it can't be at the expense of something this critical." When asked to specify what forms of plagiarism she had identified in students' drafts, Deena reported that several students did not include any in-text citations in their papers even when these citations clearly built on other sources. Other forms of plagiarism were "less severe" according to Deena, such as failure to include page numbers following quotations or using too many of the original words in their paraphrases.

Even though in the one-on-one interview context Deena accepted some of the blame for the fact that so many of her students' drafts included problematic textual borrowing, in class she appeared to shift the responsibility to her students. She referred to the drafts with missing in-text citation as "unacceptable academic writing." She asked that those students whose feedback indicated the lack or insufficiency of in-text citations "focus on that because that's the one, first, primary thing [they needed] to worry about." Her discourse implied punitive consequences of plagiarism: "It's not an issue of style or good writing. It's an issue of plagiarism and legal issues. It's the most critical thing." She underscored the consequences of failing to address the problematic parts of students' report papers: "Just remember, if you don't learn the lesson now and you plagiarize in the final draft or in another course, you are going to get an F." Perhaps because she sensed that a majority of her students did not plagiarize with the intention to cheat, Deena re-evaluated her message, relating her own experience with writing from sources:

> I want you to know that this is not easy. It's still hard even for me. When I write and use sources, it makes me super nervous. But, you *should* be nervous about this. Just in a sense that it motivates you to be *very* careful and conscious of this issue.

Deena expressed the hope that if her students could share this perspective, the punitive nature of inadequate textual borrowing would serve as a motivator rather than a source of anxiety.

Although the instructor's course narrative often adopted a punitive tone, especially in the first part of the course, Deena's attitude toward plagiarism appears to have softened as the course progressed. In a mid-semester interview, the instructor displayed a growing sensitivity to the cultural and academic challenges that often contribute to less than conventional textual borrowing practices among L2 writers. When asked about the reasons for L2 writers' struggles with textual borrowing, she explained:

> For ESL students, in a lot of cultures, it's ok to not give credit. And I think another big reason is not really quite understanding. I know they understand the general concept and understand how it applies to what they do, but I think the other thing is they sometimes just get overwhelmed. I mean, it's so difficult to write in a second language; there are so many things all at once, so I think sometimes it can get overwhelming…

A change in Deena's attitude toward punishment associated with plagiarism was also apparent with regard to the plagiarism policy. Deena shared her increasing doubts about the value of this policy in ESL writing courses:

> It's definitely important that the policy is in place so that everyone is clear about the possible consequences of plagiarism, but almost always when I've encountered instances of plagiarism [in the ESL 1060 course] they have been minor and/or unintentional and the policy was sort of irrelevant.

Even in instances of intentional plagiarism, Deena struggled to implement the plagiarism policy. This became evident when one of her students submitted the third paper to Deena in which, as Deena reported, he had "copied about 85% of the paper from a website." However, despite the fact that Deena labeled the student's work as "blatant plagiarism," she found herself unable to justify a failing grade on the assignment. Deena described the

episode:

> I have been deciding if I wanted to fail him on the paper or in the class. But after we talked about it, I decided I just did not think it was not fair to fail him on a draft that was not really a draft.[13] But, I was worried that he would get away with this and do this again. So, I said "if I grade this paper now and you leave this class and you do this again, it will be failure for me." He talked about how he knew the consequences, he said that "you had given me a really big warning" (laughs) and he said, "yes, I made a really big mistake." So, I don't know…. I don't actually feel positive that he won't do it again, but I don't think there is not another way to proceed fairly…. I also explained to him that if this was the final draft or if this was for another class, he would have failed the paper and probably the course. It's not just a little bit of plagiarism, it's a lot.

Deena's decision not to pursue formal channels to punish the student who has plagiarized his paper is not uncommon. Writing instructors' reluctance to implement the policy on plagiarism has been documented in research (e.g., Sutherland-Smith, 2005). Sutherland-Smith (2005) identified a number of factors that contribute to writing instructors' avoidance of policy implementation. Among these are 1) a lack of agreement as to the role of intention in plagiarized work, 2) a difficulty in detecting plagiarism, 3) a fear of being judged by colleagues and administrators, and 4) various concerns related to the time commitment needed to pursue a case of plagiarism. Interestingly, Deena's decision does not appear to fall under any of these categories. During the interview with her student, it became clear that she had correctly identified a case of intentional plagiarism. Not being full-time faculty at her institution and believing that plagiarism can occur in anyone's course, Deena did not feel particularly anxious about being judged by her colleagues. Although she was wary of wasting time should she decide to pursue this case, she did not report this to be the reason why she decided to "just let it go."

By this time in the semester, Deena appears to have become increasingly

---

[13] The student asked Deena for an informal feedback on this draft one week prior to the deadline.

conflicted about the pedagogical value of implementing a plagiarism policy. She felt that the punishment was only necessary if the student did not "learn the lesson about the seriousness of plagiarism." She was willing to "give a student the benefit of the doubt if they say that they did not mean to plagiarize." She added: "If I can [deal with plagiarism] without failing them in the class, I'd prefer that route." Deena's quotes suggest that she adopted the view of the ESL course as a safe space for L2 writers to learn how to avoid plagiarism, and punishing them for unconventional source use appeared to clash with this pedagogical objective. When confronted with what she considered to be plagiarism, Deena chose to re-explain the information about this topic or discuss it with specific students individually, rather than implementing the course policy. This response stands in contrast to her beliefs about punishment for plagiarism, expressed in an interview at the beginning of the semester.

Textual borrowing as a strategy for accruing credibility in one's writing

As the previous section demonstrated, Deena frequently warned her students about the severe consequences of plagiarism, especially early in the course. However, she wanted them to understand this concept beyond punitive terms—she did not want students to avoid plagiarism simply "because it's against the rules" or "because they are wronging someone else." Instead, she hoped that they would realize that plagiarism "totally undermines [their] credibility as writers." She explained further: "I always tell my students that if you plagiarize, nobody is going to believe your work. Whereas, if you give credit to the sources, it actually builds up your credibility." Different versions of this statement were echoed frequently in Deena's classroom discourse. In fact, she

brought up the issue of credibility 22 times during the semester. For example, she told her students that "one of the most important things to keep in mind when you write is to be credible." In a review session on plagiarism, she listed credibility as the second most important reason for "not wanting to plagiarize."[14]

Deena defined *credible* as "believable, whether it's academic or not." Her lectures evoked two dimensions of credibility: "perceived trustworthiness" and the "perceived expertness" (Hovland and Weiss, 1953, as cited in Haas and Wearden, 2003, p. 171). To illustrate, according to Deena's explanations during lectures, achieving credibility in academic writing was a result of a careful consideration of different aspects of sources. For example, Deena taught students to think carefully about who the author was, where and when the source was published, and whether the publication benefited any particular entity. "You have to ask yourselves, can I trust this information?" she advised her students. On numerous occasions, Deena foregrounded "expertness," equating it with credibility. She recommended to her students that when they were unsure whether a particular source was credible or not, they ought to do additional research on the author of the publication. She added: "If you find out that the author has a Ph.D., that he is very well educated, then you can assume it's a credible source." When asked during an interview about her tendency to connect the instruction of textual borrowing with the concept of credibility, Deena was unable to identify a specific event or reading that influenced this view. She speculated that it may have been a consequence of her own experience learning how to produce a master's thesis. She viewed herself as a novice researcher with a desire to claim a place in her discourse community. To do so, she knew

---

[14] The first reason listed was "plagiarism is bad."

she had to report on her research in ways that would be credible to her readers.

Although Deena discussed the different qualitative components of a credible source, the prevailing message centered on the quantity of sources used. This "more is better" attitude manifests itself in the following quote from one of Deena's lectures: "citing a lot of sources means you have done a ton of work. This gives you a lot of credibility, your audience knows how much work you have done." According to Deena, the audience's appreciation of the considerable amount of work implicit in a large number of citations is a guarantee of credibility, and consequently, of the reader's trust. She recommended that her students adopt the following attitude: "I did all the work, looked up all the experts, and that's why you should trust me." Students' varied level of acceptance of this view of credibility will be discussed later in this chapter.

In addition to discussing the concept of credibility in connection with source use in general, Deena also addressed credibility during the instruction on the three specific textual borrowing strategies (quoting, paraphrasing, and summarizing). She told her students: "It gives you more credibility if you paraphrase or summarize than when you quote," a statement contested in the instructional materials on textual borrowing. For example, Behrens, Rosen, and Beedles (2006) write "Quotation, used sparingly, can lend credibility to your work or capture a memorable passage" (p. 27). Arguably, it is more likely that quoting lacks credibility when used excessively, surmounting the student's own voice.

Overall, the concept of credibility as a reason for using sources in ESL 1060 was emphasized to the extent that credible became equated with academic by the three selected L2 writers. (See writers' responses to instruction discussed later in this chapter.)

Such emphasis is not inappropriate in the instruction on avoiding plagiarism, which often adopts an overly punitive tone. However, in order for students to internalize this concept, it may be necessary to go beyond developing their relevant declarative knowledge—engaging them in practice activities is a critical next step for instructors hoping to facilitate their students' understanding of the role of credibility in academic writing. Additionally, instructors need to find balance when addressing quantity and quality of sources as components of credibility. Deena's tendency to emphasize that students use a large number of sources in order to be credible is problematic; it may lead students to adapt an approach to writing in which they plug in citations just to increase the length of their reference list instead of engaging in a more in-depth dialogue between what has been written about a topic and their own opinions and evaluations of it. Finally, Deena's explanations of credibility did not address the challenges associated with electronic sources. Given students' tendency to favor electronic over print sources, it is necessary that instructors are aware of the nuanced nature of "e-credibility" (e.g., Haas and Wearden, 2003).

Textual borrowing as a way of avoiding responsibility for others' content

While the previous two themes have been addressed in the relevant literature and instructional materials on avoiding plagiarism and teaching about textual borrowing, the idea of textual borrowing as a way of avoiding responsibility for others' content appears to be unique to Deena. The following quote from a class lecture illustrates the instructor's position:

> Citing is, sort of like, this is somebody else's evidence. So, I did all this
> work, looked up all this evidence. So, if there is a problem with the

information, no one will blame me, but they will blame that guy.

In another lesson, Deena said: "Imagine I find an article about cows having four stomachs and later on it is found that they only have three. Am I or the other guy going to get in trouble?" Over the course of the semester, Deena shared this view of textual borrowing with her students on four occasions.

When asked about this perspective on textual borrowing, Deena said that she mentioned it because it "show[ed] an additional benefit to citation" as a result of which more students may have understood the reasons for avoiding plagiarism. She elaborated on this claim in an electronic message following the end-of-the-semester interview:

> The more reasons you give a student to avoid plagiarism, the greater the chance that at least one of them will resonate with the student, which I think is essential because sometimes students, especially ESL students, need a bit of convincing that plagiarism is even an issue.

Deena has also thought that this perspective offered students a "motivation for proper citation." This opinion became evident in her claim that this perspective "add[s] more fuel to the fire" in that it "provide[s] as much motivation for proper citation as possible….Maybe it will make [students] more aware of the issue and help prevent them from forgetting about it when they're working on a paper in another class or years down the road."

The instructor saw the concept of blame as connected to the frequently emphasized concept of credibility. She told her students during a class: "Not only does correctly citing your sources build your credibility, it also protects the credibility that you have already built up." In an interview, Deena said that when discussing this perspective during the course she tried to put it in the context of having credible sources: "Ideally this wouldn't ever happen because you've done responsible research and chosen reliable and

credible sources." This opinion was echoed in the interviews with two of the three selected writers. (See discussion later in this chapter.)

Deena's decision to associate the concept of "blame" with textual borrowing is unique. However, it is not clear whether this theme resonated with the students in Deena's course given that it did not evoke specific rhetorical situations. Contextualizing this concept better could have reinforced Deena's message; for example, the instructor could have emphasized the role of academic audience, which, in most cases, focuses on the content of the writing rather than its form. In other words, instructors across the curriculum judge accuracy and relevance of students' claims and if students produce "blame-worthy" information, they may fail an assignment and even the course. In professional settings, the need to avoid producing information for which writers could later be blamed becomes even more critical. Deena's failure to address the role of audience may have obscured the links, which she saw between (avoiding) blame and (achieving) credibility, to her students.

Executing instruction on textual borrowing

Deena repeatedly told her students that avoiding plagiarism was "tricky" or "confusing," which is why they have to "learn how to do this right." In ESL 1060, Deena constructed "doing this right" as appropriate paraphrasing, summarizing, and quoting of the source material. These three textual borrowing strategies will be discussed in this section. Specifically, I will examine how Deena presented information about these strategies and what practice opportunities she provided to her students. After an

investigation of this triadic model[15] and the role it played in the ESL 1060 course, I will discuss students' perspectives on the usefulness of the lessons on textual borrowing.

Paraphrasing

Deena defined paraphrasing as "restating information from a source in [one's] own words, using your own sentence structure." She further explained that one should paraphrase "when the information is important, but the specific wording isn't." Next, Deena introduced three paraphrasing guidelines from the Norton Field Guide, the course textbook; namely, using one's own words and structure, using quotation marks in all original wording, and attributing the restated content to the original source. She frequently returned to these "basic rules of paraphrasing" throughout the semester.

As the first practice exercise, the instructor read "The People Upstairs," a short poem by Ogden Nash (1983). After clarifying vocabulary in the poem, Deena shared with her students three example paraphrases of a part of the poem. The paraphrases differed in the level of reliance on the original wording and structure. Each paraphrase included a reference to Nash, using parentheses. After reading each example paraphrase, the instructor asked students whether they considered it to be an appropriate or inappropriate paraphrase of the original. This approach to teaching paraphrasing has been criticized because judging the appropriateness of isolated sentences has a limited value for advanced student writers who are expected to be able to integrate restated source text with their own ideas (Tomaš, 2006; Tomaš, 2011).

Beyond the problem of authenticity in the paraphrase judgment task, the fact that

---

[15] Scholars often refer to paraphrasing, summarizing, and quoting as a triadic model for using sources (e.g., Barks and Watts, 2001).

the instructor based the example paraphrases on a poem, rather than a conventional academic genre, complicated matters further. Students' misunderstanding of the task was evident in their comments and body language displayed during the activity. One student voiced his confusion when he made this comment about the first example paraphrase: "But, this doesn't sound like a poem!" Another student responded: "[It's] bad, it doesn't tell about the whole poem." Arguably, these comments reflect students' consideration of the purposes of paraphrasing; namely, that the genre of the paraphrase should match the genre and central message of the original. However, instead of addressing these purpose-driven issues, Deena chose to re-focus students' attention on the discussed guidelines for paraphrasing, prompting them to consider whether the paraphrase used different words, modified the original structure, and contained a reference. Although many students continued to appear confused, Deena proceeded to address the second example paraphrase. A student pointed out that the words in this paraphrase were too similar to the words in the original poem. The instructor agreed, demonstrating this close reliance on the original by pointing out the copied lexical chunks in the poem. By the time the instructor introduced the third example paraphrase, most students understood how they were expected to apply the paraphrasing guidelines in their evaluation of paraphrases, which was evident in an increased and more confident participation. In discussing the third example paraphrase, students agreed that it was the best paraphrase because its words and structure had been modified and a reference to the original source included.

The next practice activity on paraphrasing was based on a comic strip. The instructor presented students with a comic and asked them to paraphrase its second frame that read "Your dumb dog can't follow a simple command! He just walks away!" Deena

asked students to apply what they have learned about paraphrasing, again reminding them to focus on changing the words and structure. Unlike in the previous task, she also asked that students consider the steps they should follow as they paraphrase: "Understand the idea, throw out the words, consider the meaning of the idea, and restate it in your own words." After a few minutes, Deena asked two students to share their paraphrases:

> Student 1: The dog doesn't want to sit and he just walks away when he sits down.
> Student 2: The dog doesn't want to obey his owner.

Deena thanked her students for sharing the examples and commented, "The second [paraphrase] is sort of between paraphrase and summary. You just have to decide which one you want to use." She did not restate the difference between the two textual borrowing strategies (i.e., paraphrase or summary) nor elaborate on what contextual factors may play a role in students' choices to adopt one approach over another. Interestingly, she did not address the fact that neither student included a reference to the original source, as per the guidelines on paraphrasing presented earlier.

Like the first paraphrasing practice activity based on the poem, the second, comic strip-based paraphrasing practice activity raises questions about its pedagogical effectiveness. Specifically, it could be problematized on account of the fact that it engages students in an inauthentic practice with a small number of isolated sentences rather than on authentically connected academic discourse that students may actually encounter in their academic experiences. When asked about her use of comics and poetry (and the desired inclusion of movie clips and commercials) Deena explained:

> I wanted the students to see a couple of different things so that they are able to sort of reflect on that and see how it's same or different…. These activities were meant to be like a warm-up, to help build up to the other things like paraphrasing a paragraph…. I wish I had time for more warm-up activities like this. It would be nice to use something entirely different

like another commercial or something else that is sort of interesting and gets them to practice again paraphrasing and summarizing because it's something they have to do all semester long in their papers.

In a later interview, Deena added:

I'd like to do more with academic texts themselves because even though it's the same skill whether you paraphrase a comic, a poem, or an academic text I think it still can be sort of intimidating then [to] have to work with academic texts specifically.

Deena's rationale, inherent in the above quotes, suggests that she is aware of the fact that these activities lack in authenticity. Clearly, she understands that the goal of paraphrasing instruction is to prepare students for writing academic papers given her statement "it's something they have to do all semester long." She recognizes that the main purpose of these "warm-up activities" is to "build up to other things like paraphrasing a paragraph" or, as she said in another interview, "to make a step from shorter texts such as the poem and the comic to a longer one like the Molnar article students read later in the semester." However, Deena's understanding of the importance of authentic practice for academic contexts appeared to be outweighed by her desire to make her lessons more engaging and less "intimidating" to her students. To justify the pedagogical choices she has made in her instruction on textual borrowing, the instructor drew upon her belief that regardless of what students were paraphrasing, they were practicing "the same skill." However, it is questionable whether practicing textual borrowing within nonacademic genres transfers to academic ones or whether the links between the two remain obscure to novice L2 writers (Russell, 1997).

Although the question of transfer of textual borrowing skills in general is outside the scope of this research project, it appears that in the case of students in this particular course, such extension of textual borrowing from nonacademic to academic genres was

not obvious. When asked to paraphrase a paragraph of an academic text in their next paraphrasing practice activity, students appeared to struggle, despite the two preparatory activities and the fact that they worked in pairs and were able to draw on each other's knowledge and skills. Essentially, students approached the in-class paraphrasing task in two distinct ways. Four pairs (25%) paraphrased the original paragraph in a sentence-by-sentence fashion while the other 12 pairs (75%) produced summaries rather than paraphrases of the paragraph. Having noticed students' tendency to summarize rather than paraphrase, Deena re-addressed the difference between the two:

> So, remember, when you paraphrase, you care about the details, but you don't care about the words. Summarizing tends to be shorter. So, remember, [when you paraphrase] you care about the details in your paragraph, so you want to include those details, but in different words. But of course, you don't want to include all the details because then you could just quote.

Given that the instructor provided the above clarification as students were finishing their paragraph paraphrases, few students attempted to modify their work and, therefore, practice paraphrasing as opposed to summarizing. Similarly problematic is the work by those partnerships that managed to avoid summarizing but employed a sentence-by-sentence approach to paraphrasing. This approach to paraphrasing encourages students to follow the original text too closely and, thus, risk following the ideas from an outside source, which is by many considered plagiarism.

Despite Deena's insistence on the importance of in-text and end-of-text citations, only four of the 16 pairs (25%) included an in-text reference and only one pair (6%) provided an end-of-the text reference to the original article. The lack of attribution may be a result of students' assumption that because the instructor knew what article was being paraphrased, an explicit attribution would have been superfluous. Deena's failure

to comment on the lack of attribution in the paraphrase examples produced by students in the previous task may also have influenced their writing in this task. However, it is possible that students would have added the in-text and end-of-text references had they had more time to complete this task.

While students failed to reference the original article, they were able to avoid direct copying in this task. Only two pairs (13%) retained occasional original words and short phrases (e.g., *bindi phenomenon*) in their paraphrases. When unable to substitute original words with appropriate synonyms, students often chose to surround the borrowed words with quotation marks. Because Deena did not address such paraphrase-quote combinations in her instruction on textual borrowing, it is likely that students who used this strategy in their writing learned it prior to taking the ESL 1060 course. It is also possible that, as they worked in pairs, they negotiated this strategy in an effort to avoid copying phrases from the original source—a practice that could be viewed as plagiarism.

Although students were successful in avoiding direct copying, they struggled with preserving the meaning of the original article. Three partnerships (19%) misrepresented the content of the article in their paraphrases. This fact is worrisome as it may reflect difficulties with reading comprehension although it is possible that students simply did not have sufficient time to re-read the paragraphs before paraphrasing them.

The paragraph paraphrase that pairs produced was used in the last task on paraphrasing—an evaluation task in which students were asked to comment on each other's work. The analysis of the evaluative comments suggested that students were able to identify problematic paraphrases, especially if the problems related to the level of lexical and structural modification. Specifically, seven pairs (44%) commented on

students' restatement of the original words and four (25%) on modifications of the original sentence structure. Three pairs (19%) raised concerns about their peers' misrepresentation of the content of the original paragraph and one pair (6%) commented on the lack of attribution. Six (38%) partnerships also commented on issues pertinent to summarizing versus paraphrasing, echoing, perhaps, Deena's re-addressing of the issue during the previous task. An analysis of students' commentary revealed that while some students adapted Deena's recommendation to include details in their paraphrases, others continued to focus on abstracting main ideas. The two comments from students' feedback illustrate this disconnect in students' beliefs:

> Pair 1: "It is very brief and easy to understand the main point of this paragraph."
>
> Pair 2: "The paraphrase is too short and does not give a lot of details in the paragraph."

The fact that some students continued to be confused by the concept of "details" in various forms of textual borrowing was evident in a later summary evaluation task in which several partnerships commented on the need for more details.

Although only one class session was exclusively devoted to paraphrasing as a textual borrowing strategy, Deena repeatedly re-addressed this topic throughout the course. Her message remained reductive in nature; the instructor emphasized the importance of changing the original words and structure and providing a reference to the source. More context-driven issues like paraphrase functions or integration of paraphrases with students' own text remained unexamined. Similarly, the process and important composing strategies relevant to successful paraphrasing were mentioned only briefly in the form of recommended steps. Also, Deena's instruction did not bring to light

the fact that paraphrasing is more or less common depending on a type of assignment and that it is somewhat inconsistent across genres. The instructor's failure to familiarize her students with these important topics is addressed further in Chapter 6.

Quoting

When presenting the triadic model early in the semester, Deena only addressed quoting briefly, describing it as "the easiest way to avoid plagiarism." She told her students to put quotation marks around the borrowed text and follow it with the last name of the author, the year of publication, and a page number in the parentheses. Following this brief explanation, a student asked whether quoting or paraphrasing was considered "more professional." Deena responded to this question in the following way:

> If there is a big section with important information, there is no reason to quote it because then you will end up with too long of a quoted text. It gives you more credibility if you just paraphrase or summarize. Sometimes though somebody writes a paper and uses a great phrase. I could never rephrase it in a better way so that's when I should quote.

Following Deena's response, another student asked about the "maximum number of quotes or paraphrases" in a single paper. Deena answered:

> You want to use your own words enough. You want to use others' research and evidence to support what you are saying. It also kinda depends on what kind of paper you write. For example, in a report paper you should use lots of sources if you write about cows. But for example, if you write an argument you may want to use your own voice more.

Deena's responses to her students' questions about the specific nature of quoting and more general nature of textual borrowing were informative. However, the pedagogical value of brief explanations such as those above is unclear. Textual examples from student papers and/or published research would greatly contribute to illuminating these concepts

for undergraduate L2 writers.

At a later point in the semester, after Deena had the opportunity to read student papers, she decided to return to quoting. Deena said she did so because she had seen her students struggle with this textual borrowing strategy at two levels:

> They sometimes don't pay enough attention to conventions, like they leave out the page number or have open quotes. But this is not such a big deal. They'll eventually get this. What they really need to work on is not just sticking the quotes in their paper, but introducing their quotes better so that it's clear to their reader how the quote relates to ideas in their papers.

To address the difficulty of problematic source integration, Deena introduced a concept of "quote frames," which she claimed to have learned in an academic writing reference book. She provided students with this explanation:

> If you have your quote by itself, it's sort of just dangling in the space, fending for itself. There is nothing around it. It does not talk for itself, so you have to talk for it. You have to have something to introduce it and follow it with something behind it.

A student asked whether framing a quote results in increased "writing flow." Deena agreed, adding that it also provided the reader with context and showed connections between the source and the ideas developed in the paper.

After the explanation, Deena shared with her students that one way to introduce a quote is with the formula "author+ signal verb + quote," which she wrote on the board together with an example (X states that "…"). She then asked students to think of additional ways to introduce a quote. Students offered several alternative signal phrases such as "X claims," "X wrote," and others. Following Deena's example, students did not offer alternative ways to the presented formula although one student asked about the use of parentheses. The student's specific concern involved placing the year of the

publication immediately behind the author's name versus placing it after the quote, together with the page number. Deena said the two choices were "the same," explaining further that the reason a page number has to follow rather than precede the quote is because "when you read [the paper], it distracts you a little, it kind of stops you from following it."

Following the brief brainstorming of ways to introduce a quote, Deena challenged her students to think of ways to "explain the quote" after it had been used: "As a reader, I don't know what the author [of the quote] was thinking. You have to explain, say more." The instructor illustrated with an example quote "It makes me sick" from the article by Molnar and Reeves (2002) that students analyzed in their first writing assignment. Deena commented: "So, let's say you said after this quote something like 'this quote provides very good evidence that Molnar's and Reeve's stance is negative'. This tells my reader exactly what I think about the topic." Following this example, Deena recommended three additional phrases for "closing the quote." She wrote these phrases on the board.

Basically, X is saying…
In other words, X is saying…
X's point is that …

Deena's instruction on quoting was largely reactive. Initially, the instructor offered only a brief explanation of quoting conventions in the class and only after discovering students' difficulties with integrating quotes from outside sources with their own ideas, Deena decided to return to the topic. However, it is highly unlikely that the instructor's pedagogical intervention was effective for the following reasons. First, Deena only shared with her students a limited number of ways in which quotes could be introduced and the example phrases for post-quote explanations that she provided are not

particularly common in academic writing. Second, students had no opportunities to practice quote integration in the class and little time to internalize the new information, given the timing of the discussion of quote framing.[16]

Summarizing

Deena began her lecture on summarizing by eliciting from her students what they thought summarizing entailed. The main responses offered by the students included "cutting length" and "writing main ideas." When she asked when it is appropriate to summarize, students suggested that summarizing lends itself to stories and long sources. The instructor responded: "So are you starting to see that each of these ways has its own reason? You always want to think which one [paraphrasing, quoting, or summarizing] is the most useful and appropriate for your writing." The explanation was supported with a definition provided on a slide. However, similar to Deena's instruction on paraphrasing, the introduction to summarizing was short and decontextualized.

After the definition of summarizing,[17] Deena presented the guidelines and steps for summarizing, again relying exclusively on the information presented in the course textbook. The first step Deena wanted her students to make as they began the summarizing process was to "identify the thesis." Next, she recommended "identifying main points and key support." Then, Deena asked that students "toss out the words and details" and finally "state the essential ideas in [their] own words." The instructor covered these points from the slide without elaborating, modeling, or giving examples of the steps.

---

[16] At the time of the lesson on quote framing, students had only one paper left to write.

[17] To define summary, Deena copied a definition from the course textbook, which described summarizing as "stating the main ideas found in a source concisely and in your own words."

After Deena presented the definition and steps for summarizing, she gave students an opportunity to ask questions. One student asked whether the main difference between summary and paraphrase is in "details." Deena appeared to embrace this way of thinking about the different ways of source use as she commented: "Yes, that's a good way to look at it. So the most details with quote, less with paraphrase, least with summary." Published instructional materials corroborate this perspective on the difference in types of textual borrowing strategies. For example, the Norton Field Guide (Bullock, 2009), the required textbook in Deena's course, recommends that students "paraphrase sources that are not worth quoting but contain details [they] need to include" and that they "summarize longer passages whose main points are important but whose details are not" (p. 410). Similarly, Hult and Huckin (2010) advise that students summarize "if [they] need little detail to make [their] point" (p. 246). Finally, quotes and paraphrases typically have a similar number of details; they differ in that in paraphrasing the original details are rephrased.

After answering students' questions, the instructor introduced three summaries of the same poem used during the discussion of paraphrasing, eliciting from students their opinions about the poems. During the evaluation process of the three example summaries, Deena encouraged students to focus on 1) an inclusion of the main idea, 2) an adequate modification of the original words and structure and 3) a provision of a reference to the source.

The next practice activity—a summary of a comic strip—was also similar to a previously used task on paraphrasing. Deena read the comic and asked students to summarize it in pairs. She reminded them to follow the identified steps for effective summarizing, use their own words, and credit the original source. After a few minutes,

Deena asked students to share their summaries. One pair volunteered and one pair was chosen to share. The summaries from these two pairs are as follows:

> Pair 1: Hotdog is more civilized than Carlos because he knows where to sit (archiecomics.com).

> Pair 2: Hotdog doesn't want to sit down. Carlos doesn't have patience, Jughead doesn't wait and Hotdog comes back with a chair. Archiecomics.com

When discussing the first summary, Deena elicited from students the reasons why it was appropriate—students agreed that it captured the main idea, used original words, was of appropriate length, and cited the reference. Rather than giving the class an opportunity to evaluate the second summary, the instructor offered the following evaluation:

> So, these two summaries would be written for different purposes, right? This one talked about each frame, which is great if that's your purpose. And the other one talked about sort of the one picture of the whole story, one sentence describing the whole story. They are both right. You just would choose one type or the other type, depending on how long you would want it to be, what you are writing it for, what your purpose is. Right?

Deena's explanation appears somewhat problematic in that, according to the definitions presented in the course, the second, student-produced "summary" was closer to what the instructor defined as a "paraphrase;" it included as many details as the original, using different words, and a slightly different structure. It was also not completely clear in what kind of a situation, or with what kind of "purpose," the second example would be preferable to the first. The reason is that comics as a genre contain very few words to begin with; therefore, it is difficult to imagine an authentic "purpose" for summarizing comics using a similar number of words.

After the comic summary, the instructor introduced a new activity: a summary of an article that students were supposed to read for homework. Deena gave students nine minutes, later extending this time by additional five minutes. She asked that students

produce a short summary. She suggested that they not write more than two or three sentences but added that they can write more if they want to. Deena also reminded her students to use their own words, focus on main ideas, and include an intext and an end-of-text reference to the source.

According to the three, above-mentioned criteria set by Deena, none of the 14 summaries that student pairs produced during this in-class practice activity qualified as "appropriate." Only five summaries (36%) succeeded in focusing on the main ideas of the article. The remaining nine summaries (64%) were problematic either from the standpoint of failing to include the main ideas, misrepresenting the main ideas, or including excessive details. Only one of the 14 summaries (7%) included an end-of-text reference. Where students did succeed was in including an in-text reference—only one summary failed to attribute ideas to the author of the original article. Furthermore, students were able to avoid excessive direct copying and used, instead, their own words in summarizing information from the article. Only three (21%) of the 14 summaries included a phrase copied from the original source. Examples are "graduated from Yale University", "who grew up in Los Angeles", and "the context and meaning of these cultural components". The fact that students were able to avoid excessive copying of words and phrases is noteworthy given that they only had a limited time to produce the summaries.

Once each pair produced a summary, the instructor asked that pairs exchange their summaries with other pairs and evaluate each other's work. As she monitored the students' constructing feedback for their peers, Deena found herself making suggestions about what they can focus on as they comment on peers' summaries: "You can say things like *good words* or *too long*." When asked later about the reason for her intervention,

Deena reported noticing that students were overly positive about each others' work, avoiding "constructive criticism." This tendency is not unusual in students with limited academic experience.

The analysis of student feedback revealed that partnerships focused primarily on commenting on the presence or absence of main ideas (nine pairs, 64%) and details (five pairs, 36%). Five partnerships (36%) also praised their peers on using their own words. Three pairs (21%) commented on the absence of reference and length of the summary. One pair (7%) praised their peers about the clarity of their writing. Deena collected the summaries with peer commentary, but she only used these documents to account for students who were present in the class. She explained:

> I'd love to be able to look these over and bring up problems in our next class, but we are running out of time; we have to move on. Also, I feel that because I was monitoring as students were writing these [summaries], I kinda know how they did. I don't think there are any major problems like plagiarism.

Deena's decision not to provide feedback on the inclass examples was a missed opportunity, which did not go unnoticed by the students. (See further discussion later in this chapter and in Chapter 6).

Deena's reductionist view of textual borrowing reflected in her frequent repetition of the three basic rules appeared to dominate the described lessons on textual borrowing and the course in general. Interestingly, contrary to this central message, Deena told her students on two different occasions that successful academic writing should not be perceived as getting the right answer to a problem, but rather, as an endeavor strongly affected by one's individual choices and preferences. This tension between teaching textual borrowing as a relatively fluid, individualized concept on one hand and a tangible

set of rules on the other was apparent in the instructor's treatment of student-produced summary and paraphrase examples discussed earlier. It is also illustrated in Deena's quote expressed in one of the lessons on textual borrowing:

> There isn't a wrong way to summarize or paraphrase as long as you follow the rules. So, everybody does it differently, which is great and that's what makes everyone unique…. As long as you follow the rules, you're OK.

In summary, the instructor presented appropriate textual borrowing strategies as tangible, academic skills that students were expected to develop in order to avoid punishment and stigma resulting from plagiarism. Specifically, Deena wanted her students to learn how to paraphrase, quote, and summarize effectively. While the three textual borrowing strategies were delineated in the form of separate definitions in Deena's PowerPoint presentations, students appeared confused about how the strategies, especially paraphrasing and summarizing, differed from one another. This confusion was likely fueled by Deena's tendency to accept all student examples as equal, as was evidenced by her, previously discussed, positive evaluation of both student-produced comic summaries. Additionally, the fact that Deena never presented these textual borrowing strategies in the context of authentic written academic assignments or sample student papers may also have contributed to students' continued struggle with understanding of textual borrowing.

Further concerns arising from Deena's instruction are a lack of opportunities to engage in synthesizing information from different sources, integrating source ideas with one's own voice, or analyzing textual borrowing across assignments and academic genres. Additionally, the processes inherent in effective writing from sources remained largely unaddressed—steps were presented briefly via the PowerPoint with no

accompanying modeling or practice activities.

It appears that Deena's conceptualization of instructional usefulness relevant to plagiarism and textual borrowing rested on the following:

- o warnings about punitive consequences of plagiarism,
- o explanations of credibility and blame as reasons for appropriate textual borrowing,
- o attributed summaries, paraphrases, and quotes of the borrowed material, and
- o opportunities to practice summarizing, paraphrasing, and quoting in low-stakes, collaborative activities in a variety of (non-academic) genres.

A comparison of students' views on the usefulness of the instruction follows.

Students' response to the instruction on
plagiarism and textual borrowing

Interviews with three selected writers, of the 34 students in the class, inform this research about students' perceptions of the usefulness of the instruction. In this section I will examine these writers' reactions to the identified themes and their responses to lessons devoted to paraphrasing, quoting, and summarizing.

With respect to the first theme, which emphasized the punitive consequences of plagiarism, the three L2 writers in the study reported that this information was not new to them; they had encountered it in their home countries prior to coming to the United States. Two of the writers (Junmo and Aiko) said that discussing it again was useful in that it reminded them how "careful" they had to be about using sources in the U.S. Unlike Aiko and Junmo, Chaoren resisted the instructor's emphasis on punitive consequences: "This is something we've heard million times. This is something I know… I know it's a big deal. So let's talk about things we don't know…."

Aiko and Junmo once again differed from Chaoren when it came to their evaluations of usefulness of the second theme identified in the course—credibility. While the first two accepted Deena's explanation that credibility in academic writing rests primarily on a large number of citations, Chaoren challenged this notion by raising an issue related to newspaper articles. During one of the lectures, he posed a question for Deena: "So how about newspapers? I mean, the authors must have done a lot of research, right? But, there is no references at the end [sic]." Deena acknowledged Chaoren's point, explaining that this fact was most likely a result of space constraints. "With newspapers," she explained, "you can assume, and it's the only time you can assume this, that the authors have done a lot of research. And only in instances when it's a really credible journal. So, this is one exception to the rule when you don't have to have a list of references to be credible." Chaoren acknowledged the explanation, but he did not appear convinced that a large number of citations was important in academic writing, especially in the argumentative genre: "I can't fully agree with what Deena told us about using a lot of references. For me, an argument paper is not to present others' ideas, it's about my ideas. So, I just used three references." While accepting the idea that the more references used, the more credible the final written product, Aiko and Junmo raised a concern related to credibility as evidenced by a large number of references. They explained that, because of their developing English language proficiency and academic expertise, they found it unrealistic to use more sources than the minimum number required in their university assignments.

The three writers had more similar opinions about the usefulness of the third theme dominant in the course—textual borrowing as a way of avoiding responsibility for

others' content. Aiko did not find this way of thinking about textual borrowing as particularly useful. She raised the issue of cross-referencing, saying that one is bound to "notice the mistake when … refer[ring] to lots of sources." If a researcher was to fail to do so, he or she "would deserve the blame because you developed your thesis based on the 'wrong' information." Perhaps because of their scientific backgrounds, Junmo and Chaoren were even more dismissive of this perspective. For example, Junmo said, "I don't know, it's not really possible to publish wrong information because, like, in my field—biology—every research is checked by many scientists. So, I just don't see how they could write incorrect information." Chaoren also referred to the peer review process in his evaluation of the usefulness of this theme: "I think the peer review process is very strict; it's unlikely that not correct or updated information would get published. I think you just have to be careful to use credible sources and not some suspicious Internet sites."

The three writers were even more united in their opinions about usefulness of the actual lessons on textual borrowing. They all claimed that the lessons were generally useful although they shared concerns about the small number of examples and practice activities, the lack of opportunities for authentic practice, and the nature of class interaction during pair and group work. First, the three L2 writers agreed that they would have liked to consider more examples and engage in more practice activities on textual borrowing. In Junmo's words, Deena typically "just explained things and showed a few examples of …[inaudible] herself, but we did not actually get to do any examples or exercises for ourselves. Like we come up with our own examples and stuff." Chaoren also wanted to practice more. Facing a summary paper in one of his courses, he reflected on the instruction received in ESL 1060: "I don't think it was really that useful to me. I

mean, I know I have to change words and not plagiarize, but it's hard to know what information to keep and throw out, how to start writing this paper. I wish I had example summaries to consider, to review."

Deena was reluctant to use student examples during class discussion because some students may find such practice uncomfortable. However, students did not appear to share their instructor's concern about privacy; they expected their examples to be analyzed and discussed. Deena's failure to provide students with sufficient examples of source-based academic texts and engage them in rhetorical and lexical analyses of such texts greatly reduced the potential instructional benefits of her instruction (Keck and Tomaš, 2010).

Deena's use of comics and poetry in the course was also viewed as somewhat problematic by the students. Junmo said that summarizing comics and poems was not useful to him given that he was a science major. He also expressed concern over a sentence-level approach to summarizing and paraphrasing, calling instead for a discourse-level approach: "Instead of just going over some sentences, I think it's better to get couple of papers and figure out some parts that may be plagiarized." Comments by Aiko and Chaoren also suggest that they perceived the lessons as lacking in authenticity. Chaoren expressed a need for "more academic" and Aiko "more serious" practice. This finding is corroborated by Leki and Carson (1997) who report that university L2 writers perceive their ESL classes as "friendly places with little at stake" (1997, p. 53).

In addition to expressing a need for more extensive and authentic practice, the three interviewed students were dissatisfied with the nature of interaction in the class, especially the pair and group work. It is not that these students displayed a resistance

toward pair and group work; rather, they considered it to play an important role in their learning. However, they felt resistant toward their classmates whom they viewed as unwilling to participate in the collaborative in-class activities.

Junmo appeared to be particularly disappointed in his peers' lack of participation. For him, this lack of engagement with the material and fellow students during pair and group work resulted in the overall lack of usefulness of the lessons:

> Some activities that we did in groups weren't really helpful. Not because [Deena's] teaching style was not good, but it's actually more about the students' attitudes because some of them were not really interested in it so it didn't really work.

Aiko and Chaoren also felt alienated toward their peers because of their lack of participation. However, unlike Junmo, whose disappointment in the dynamics during the collaborative in-class activities made him decide to work individually, Aiko and Chaoren's approaches to such activities capture their determination to maximize their learning experience despite their disapproval of their classmates' behaviors:

> So many non-native, especially Asian, especially Korean or Japanese, students tend to be very quiet so I don't think it's very good. So I try to be active. Active people are actually making the classes or how it is going to be is made by active people. And the instructor is commenting on that. And silent people are not, are just, they are not gaining any benefit from the class.

> I was always the one who talks [during pair and group work]. It is really helpful to me because when you have an idea you can talk about it, you can find flaws and one thing triggers another thing so I found it really interesting and helpful, but for people who didn't want to talk they were not taking advantage of this opportunity and in the real world it's all about information flow, it's all about communication. And they are your classmates so if you don't want to talk to them then what are you doing in that class? So yeah, I did not mind the pair work and group work….But, I must say, sometimes, it was annoying how we got into the groups—you know, like find someone with white shoes kind of nonsense (laughs). A little bit childish, I think.

The dissatisfaction with collaborative in-class practice in the three writers points to the importance of making instructional objectives explicit to students. Deena's sharing of her rationale for using collaboration and creative group formation techniques could have lessened students' resistance to it. If more students understood the benefits of collaborative instructional approach and, consequently, played a more active role in the class, Junmo, Aiko, and Chaoren would have likely evaluated this aspect of the course as more useful. What is uncertain, however, is whether Deena's rationale for collaboration included instructional benefits beyond "working with people" and exposure to examples. Arguably, if students are to embrace collaboration in a composition course, it has to be carefully built-into the curriculum, driving all aspects of the course, not just in-class practice activities. How instructors like Deena could experiment better with collaboration in their teaching about plagiarism and textual borrowing will be examined in Chapter 6.

<u>Discussion</u>

The case study demonstrates the complex nature of instruction on plagiarism and textual borrowing. On one hand, the instructor's approach to the presentation and practice of these topics reflects trends in the literature (e.g., foregrounding the punitive aspects of unconventional textual borrowing). On the other, Deena's instruction also reveals unique and nuanced characteristics, such as viewing appropriate textual borrowing as a way of avoiding responsibility for content. What is striking about the identified themes in Deena's teaching is the overall negativity associated with the L2 student writer. Even prior to any instances of plagiarism, the L2 writer is pictured as someone likely to produce "blameworthy" information, lack credibility, and be willing to violate

institutional rules. Meanwhile, the concept of giving credit where it is due, a principle that underscores the Western notion of personal ownership, remains largely unexplored by Deena in her teaching. Her teaching is instead focused more on the warnings about punitive consequences of plagiarism, explanations of credibility and blame as reasons for appropriate textual borrowing, and extensive emphasis on basic, reductive paraphrasing rules such as changing words and structure.

In addition to presenting students with three reasons for avoiding plagiarism, Deena centered her teaching on basic rules for appropriate textual borrowing strategies, especially paraphrasing and summarizing. Specifically, she focused on rephrasing the original information in one's own words and structure and providing a reference to the original. The instructor emphasized these rules in her lessons on paraphrasing and summarizing and reinforced them throughout the semester. While Deena focused on the rules for textual borrowing strategies, she appeared to ignore their functions, which is viewed as problematic by L2 writing scholars (e.g., Yamada, 2003). Example functions include interpreting and manipulating source material, connecting information in the text with the writer's reality, developing a new perspective of the source information. Similarly, Deena's lectures provided only limited information about the process of writing from sources in the form of steps in rephrasing, which she copied from the book into a PowerPoint presentation. These steps did not include information on source identification and organization, areas of considerable difficulty in two of the three selected L2 writers.

With respect to practice, Deena's lessons included tasks such as those in which students summarized or paraphrased isolated sentences or short comic strips, but she did

not engage students in analyzing textual borrowing in the context of more sustained and authentic academic discourse. Deena's failure to complete the deductive process, which characterized her instruction, was recognized by the three selected students who commented on the lack of example analyses in their evaluation of instructional usefulness.

Also absent in Deena's instruction were opportunities for academically authentic, yet scaffolded[18] practice in integrating sources. The course observations revealed that when teaching about textual borrowing, Deena engaged her students in scaffolded, academically non-authentic practice activities (e.g., rephrasing single sentences, evaluating appropriateness of single-sentence paraphrases and summaries of a poem, paraphrasing and summarizing a poem and a comic) and unscaffolded, authentic practice activities (e.g., summarizing and paraphrasing an academic essay and writing papers). In Chapter 6, I argue for the importance of scaffolded, authentically-oriented activities, from which Deena's students could have benefited.

Finally, even though Deena briefly covered basic steps for paraphrasing, she did not model the process nor provided opportunities for scaffolded practice of the process. Relying solely on developing students' declarative knowledge of steps and strategies for avoiding plagiarism without also equipping them with procedural knowledge is problematic in L2 writing instruction. In order to internalize these important processes, students need to experiment with different steps and strategies before they discover those that work well with their own learning styles.

Undoubtedly, it is important that university writers understand reasons for using

---

[18] Do I need to give a definition of what I understand as "scaffolded" or is it sort of common knowledge in our field?

academic sources responsibly. Similarly, it is key that they become adept at modifying language from original sources and attributing this information. What is questionable, however, is whether such macro and micro approaches to instruction on avoiding plagiarism are sufficient. An inclusion of authentic and scaffolded example analyses and practice activities, as well as opportunities to engage in the process of producing and integrating textual borrowing, may be necessary in helping L2 writers learn how to write from sources (See further discussion in Chapter 6.)

The data from student interviews and assignments points to the important roles of feedback and assessment of textual borrowing. The final grade in ESL 1060 was comprised of the scores in the three main papers and class participation. Neither grades nor feedback were provided on the low-stakes tasks assigned during the different lessons, so students were not given opportunities to evaluate their understanding of the concepts prior to the graded assignments. The missed opportunities for providing formative assessment, which is considered critical in language-based courses (Bachman and Palmer, 2010), is worrisome, especially given the serious problems uncovered in student writing. For example, it was evident that students struggled with the concept of main ideas in terms of identifying and including main ideas and also misrepresenting them in the in-class summary practice activities. Similarly, students' confusion about what constitutes "details" in textual borrowing strategies was never noticed by the instructor because of her decision not to respond to in-class writing. Students' problems with quote integration only manifested themselves in the second paper, which forced Deena to adapt a reactionary approach to the instruction on integration.

Clearly, the case study points to the complexity of approaching instruction on

plagiarism and textual borrowing. Deena faced a number of difficult choices regarding what kind of practice to provide, what type of context to provide it in, and with what degree of formative assessment. Her decisions specific to the practice of textual borrowing clashed with the three students' beliefs on instructional usefulness. Unlike the instructor who was hesitant to implement student examples and engage in analyses of these examples, the three selected L2 writers wished for more examples and analyses. They indicated that they would not be offended if Deena were to share their writing with other students. Similarly, students expected more formative feedback from the instructor. Additionally, there was a disconnect between the instructor's and students' perspectives on pair and group. Deena's strong preference for a collaborative approach to practice and her complete dismissal of autonomous, individual in-class work prevented her from including additional individual writing tasks, which may have made at least some of her students feel more invested in the tasks. Alternatively, Deena could have overcome some of her students' resistance to pair and group work if she had shared with them her expectations of what successful pair and group participation entailed and holding students accountable for the writing they produce as they work together. The fact that Deena did not read or provide feedback on the writing students produced in pairs and groups sent a message that these class activities were low-stake.

Finally, Deena's and her students' beliefs about instructional usefulness specific to plagiarism and textual borrowing also differed in the area of authenticity. Deena included in her lessons textual borrowing tasks based on non-academic genres such as poetry and comics, finding these genres useful in learning to write from sources. This decision likely rested on Deena's belief that students view writing from sources as

"intimidating," which is why she thought it was better to initially practice textual borrowing in the context of shorter, less "intimidating" tasks. After all, Deena believed, students can transfer textual borrowing skills practiced in the context of less authentic tasks to actual academic writing tasks. Finally, Deena thought that by drawing upon a variety of genres in her lesson, students will be more engaged in the tasks. Ironically, at least for the three interviewed students, this decision did not result in an increased motivation to learn. On the contrary, students appeared to resist the creative genres, calling instead for "serious," "academic" practice. This student preference was in contrast to Deena's belief system—the instructor's overarching instructional goal appeared to be to create a friendly, stress-free space in which students develop as writers.

The type of practice and genre most appropriate for teaching textual borrowing merits a more detailed examination given the reported student dissatisfaction. It appeared that students contested both, the type of practice and the type of genres upon which the practice was based. Deena herself appeared conflicted as to what kind of practice was the most useful. On one hand, she saw the importance of addressing textual borrowing in the context of authentic assignments such as research papers. On the other, she valued various low stakes assignments, built on nonexpository texts (e.g., poetry or comics), partly because she believed that the skills students acquire in these practice activities are transferable to more authentic contexts. At the same time, however, the instructor made a choice not to offer feedback on students' textual borrowing strategies in these assignments and instead, only critiqued students writing from sources in their three main papers. Although Deena blamed a lack of time and a large number of students as her main reasons for not providing feedback on these assignments, she herself may have had

doubts about the worth of these lower-stakes, unauthentic practice activities. It is possible that her value system conflicted with her logic—in theory Deena accepted the importance of authentic practice, but in practice, she focused more on creating the right kind of environment for learning, at the cost of authenticity. In the midst of the different dilemmas the instructor faced, important questions emerge: Are low-stakes practice activities particularly useful for teaching textual borrowing strategies? What kinds of low-stakes practice activities are the most beneficial (e.g., ones within academic or non-academic genres)? If low stakes practice is beneficial, how can we effectively communicate to our students the need for initially decontextualized practice or practice that is based on nonacademic genres? How do instructors learn to develop and implement effective low-stakes practice activities on textual borrowing? These questions, provoked by this dissertation study, merit exploration in future research.

In summary, it is possible that if Deena had taught under more ideal conditions or if she had been professionally trained to recognize and address instructional challenges relevant to the topics of plagiarism and textual borrowing, she would have been able to deliver the lessons on textual borrowing strategies in more effective ways. Consequently, students may have perceived instruction as more useful and relevant to their academic careers. However it is important to note that a description of activities and materials relevant to instruction on plagiarism and textual borrowing does not provide a complete picture of the effectiveness of the course or the instructor because it does not capture the voices of all students, the class dynamics, the instructor's personality, and other important instructional factors. This fact became evident in the end-of-the semester evaluations, which revealed high student satisfaction with the course, despite the

identified shortcomings of some aspects of the instruction on plagiarism and textual borrowing described in this chapter and the three students' reactions to Deena's lessons. Overall, students showed considerable respect for the instructor and indicated that the course helped them improve their academic writing skills. The extent to which Deena's instruction specific to textual borrowing affected (the three) students' practices across academic assignments will be examined in the next chapter.

Table 9. Percentage of instructional time spent on plagiarism and textual

borrowing

Lesson Number	Topic of the Lesson	Class time
Lesson 1	Plagiarism (information in the syllabus)	10 min.
Lesson 3	Plagiarism	20 min.
Lesson 4	Plagiarism and ways to avoid plagiarism (summarizing, paraphrasing, quoting)	50 min.
Lesson 5	Summarizing	50 min.
Lesson 6	Paraphrasing	50 min.
Lesson 7	Strategic reading (focus on strategies relevant to textual borrowing-e.g., summary of paragraphs)	10 min.
Lesson 8	Strategic reading	10 min.
Lesson 10	Appropriate textual borrowing in the writing of textual analysis paper (focus on including the information about the original source in the paper's introduction)	10 min.
Lesson 12	Appropriate textual borrowing in the writing of textual analysis paper (focus on reporting verbs, in-text and end-of text citation, page numbers, secondary citation)	40 min.
Lesson 14	Feedback session on the textual analysis paper (focus on quote framing and credibility)	35 min.
Lesson 20	Database search, review on quote framing and end-of text citation	40 min.
Lesson 21	Strategies for effective textual borrowing (example of keeping index cards with citations and references)	15 min.
Lesson 25	Review (textual borrowing and credibility)	10 min.

Table 9. Continued

Lesson Number	Topic of the Lesson	Class time
Lesson 26	Appropriate textual borrowing in the writing of a report paper (focus on summary/paraphrase review, clarification about citing translated text, discussion about credibility and textual borrowing)	40 min.
Lesson 30	Review of textual borrowing and credibility	30 min.
Lesson 32	Review activity (focus on research, plagiarism, citation, credibility)	20 min.
TOTAL CLASS TIME		**520 of the total 2050 min.**

CHAPTER 5

SECOND LANGUAGE WRITERS' IMPLEMENTATION

OF INSTRUCTION ON AVOIDING PLAGIARISM

AND WRITING FROM SOURCES

Chapter 5 explores the links between the instruction on avoiding plagiarism and writing from sources that L2 writers in this study received and their implementation of this instruction in their writing from sources in the ESL and mainstream courses. Although the three L2 writers' responses to various aspects of instruction are discussed, the focus is on the composing and textual borrowing strategies that the three selected L2 writers used as they produced source-based writing. Specifically, this chapter addresses the following research question and sub questions:

What role does instruction that is focused on strategies for avoiding plagiarism play in L2 writers' source-based writing?

a. What composing strategies do L2 writers use when writing from sources in their ESL and mainstream courses? Are these strategies consistent with the instruction they receive?

b. What textual borrowing strategies do L2 writers use in their assignments for ESL and mainstream courses? Are these strategies consistent with the instruction they receive?

I will first examine the general composing strategies upon which each writer drew as he or she wrote from sources. Then, I will discuss in detail the textual borrowing strategies[19] they used in their academic papers. Throughout this chapter, I will draw links between the three writers' practices and the received instruction, particularly the instruction on strategy use. I will conclude the chapter with a discussion of the three writers' practices, examining more closely the challenges they faced with respect to effective writing from sources.

The reader will notice a discrepancy in the amount of information provided about different papers that the students in the study wrote. As specified in the methods chapter, I observed each student for 16 hours. However, the observation time was not evenly distributed among each of the analyzed papers. The uneven distribution of time meant that I was able to present more data for some papers than for others. Similarly, the extent of background information provided in class by the instructors (e.g., written and oral guidelines) differs. The chapter also includes brief descriptions of the three L2 writers' reading strategies. Even though the study was not designed to include reading strategies, the inclusion of these data is important. As several L2 writing scholars (e.g., Hirvela, 2004) have pointed out, L2 writers' reading abilities directly affect their success in writing from sources. The selected descriptions of the observed interface between academic reading and writing are only included in cases when they illuminate L2 writers' source-based writing.

---

[19] Only the first draft of each paper is considered in the discussion of textual borrowing strategies. I discuss textual borrowing strategies in any subsequent drafts in the section on instructor's feedback in Chapter 4.

Composing and textual borrowing strategies across

ESL and non-ESL academic assignments

Aiko

As an exchange student whose primary reason for studying at a Western University was to improve her English proficiency, Aiko had considerable freedom in selecting her courses. She requested permission to take ESL 1060 despite the fact that she had not previously taken the required ESL 1050 course. She "heard from a friend that this was a really useful course about writing," and because she only planned to spend one more semester at the University, she did not want to miss out on an opportunity to "really learn to write in English." In addition to ESL 1060, Aiko enrolled in a German language class (German 2020), German literature class (German 3040), and Grammar and Stylistics for Academic Writing class (Linguistics 3510). In all but her German language class, she was expected to produce source-based assignments in English.

In the discussion that follows, I examine Aiko's general composing strategies before discussing textual borrowing strategies employed in two of her academic papers: a report paper produced in the ESL 1060 course and a research paper written in the Grammar and Stylistics for Academic Writing course (Linguistics 3510). I decided to analyze Aiko's ESL report paper because of Aiko's claim that this was the only source-based written assignment produced during her year at the American university that she viewed as successful. My reason for examining Aiko's writing of the Linguistics research paper was her topic selection: she decided to explore plagiarism.

<u>Composing strategies in Aiko's writing from sources</u>

Throughout the process of producing the two selected source-based writing assignments (the ESL report paper and Linguistics research paper), Aiko utilized all four types of composing strategies outlined by Riazi (1997): cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies, social strategies, and search strategies. (See the discussion of composing strategies in Chapter 2.)

She relied on search strategies in the early stages of both of her main assignments. Specifically, Aiko considered the assignment guidelines, the assessment rubric (in the case of her ESL report paper), and the assignment contract (in the case of her Linguistics research paper). Aiko spent relatively short time on identifying sources from which she intended to write. For example, in the case of her report paper, she spent 35 minutes on locating the sources she planned to use, describing her search process as pretty simple: "I just went to the scholar database and put [in] *homosexuality* and saw articles that discussed this topic, and so I printed out the ones I liked." She added that the reason why she relied on the "scholar database" was so that she can find "credible sources." Aiko's reference to credibility as an important criterion for identifying appropriate academic sources is consistent with the instruction she received. However, in Aiko's case, the focus on credibility appeared to come at the expense of other factors critical in appropriate identification of source texts. For example, Aiko failed to consider the rhetorical context of the four publications she had selected, which suggests that she viewed the sources as "autonomous" rather than as "rhetorically and socially configured" (Haas, 1994, p. 79). To illustrate, although all of the articles Aiko had selected were relatively recent, ranging from 1999 to 2009, they came from three different fields: social science, education, and

exercise and sport science. Additionally, Aiko appeared unaware of the differing geographic settings in the articles; one was a historical overview of relevant issues in the United States while the other three reported on outcomes of studies conducted in the Netherlands, Australia, and New Zealand. Most importantly, however, the four articles had minimal overlap in terms of content. It is true that the general topic was homosexuality, but the particular issues addressed were considerably different. This fact led Aiko to center her report around topics rather than issues or themes as more experienced writers would (Nelson and Hayes, 1988). She organized the paper around random subheadings, following a paper-by-paper summary approach to report writing documented in other novice academic (L1) writers (e.g., Haas, 1993; Higgins, 1993, Nelson and Hayes, 1988).

In addition to the lack of connectivity among the selected sources, the difficulty level of the identified readings likely contributed to Aiko's struggle with this assignment. All of the selected articles were lexically dense, including a large amount of jargon specific to each field. The fact that Aiko did not understand a considerable percentage of the vocabulary in the sources was evident in her substantial reliance on her L1, a cognitive strategy outlined by Riazi (1997). For example, Aiko wrote translations for nine words in the margins of the abstract by Quinivan and Town (1999): *hold for, affirming, disenfranchised, reparation, equity, pathologisation, legitimate, policing*, and *venues*. Aiko's time-consuming reading and rereading of the articles is also a testament to her struggle with the level of textual difficulty in the selected sources. Clearly, Aiko's developing language proficiency—and, arguably, the ineffective use of reading strategies—were a major hindrance in her writing of the report paper.

Unlike her ESL report paper, Aiko's use of search strategies appeared more deliberate in the early stages of producing the Linguistics research paper. Because she read an article on the topic during her course, she knew she wanted to focus on students, particularly the international students, given that they were likely to have difficulty with learning how to avoid plagiarism. Consequently, instead of using overly general phrases such as *plagiarism*, Aiko searched the database relying on more specific concepts such as *academic writing and plagiarism*, *plagiarism and ESL students*, or *university ESL students and learning about plagiarism*. Aiko identified four articles that she intended to read and later use in her paper. Reflecting her self-identified focus, three of the articles dealt with issues specific to L2 writers in academic contexts and reasons for their difficulties with source use, while one article was less pedagogical in nature and dealt more with the Western concept of ideational ownership.

However, while Aiko's selected sources in this paper had a narrower focus than those in her ESL report paper, they were still of considerable length as well as lexical and rhetorical difficulty. Her understanding of what constitutes effective search strategies in the university context was problematic on another account—Aiko decided not to use an article by Keck (2006) that she had already read for her course and which she had an opportunity to discuss in the class and work with in a homework assignment. Because the topic of this article seemed to be the same as the topic she chose for her research paper, I asked her to explain her reluctance to use this source. Aiko said that she did not want to be perceived as "lazy" by the instructor. She also explained that she would have to give a presentation about her paper and she did not want to share with her classmates "something boring that they have already read, something they already know." While

Aiko's desire to challenge herself is noteworthy, her decision to not use the source with which she was the most familiar was unfortunate. Drawing upon an article she understood well would likely have facilitated Aiko's writing from sources.

In the instances of both papers, after Aiko printed out the articles she had selected, she began the reading process, utilizing pre-reading strategies such as focusing on the abstract. This stage of the reading process took Aiko between 20-50 minutes. She frequently paused her reading process to check for "technical words and terms." Following the close reading of an abstract, Aiko said she then considered the article's headings and subheadings in order to find "something interesting or something concerned with my topic" and only "pick up those parts." However, observations of Aiko's early reading behavior revealed that immediately after reading the abstract, she began the detailed reading of the article rather than further engaging in pre-reading strategies such as previewing. Because reading took her considerable time, she was unable to complete reading each source. To cope with her assignments, Aiko instead focused on reading the first few pages of each article. When asked about the reason behind her selectiveness she said:

> Most of the time, front [sic] part of the article has general information and is easy to understand for me and for the reader of my paper, so I think it makes me easier to write about those topics and the later part of the paper the author provide [sic] any suggestions so they are talking about more complicated, cutting-edge, things. So, I'm not capable keeping up with the later half.

Aiko engaged in yet another reading strategy in order to keep up with the difficulty of her readings: re-reading. She spent considerable time re-reading different parts of the selected articles. For example, during one, four-hour observation, Aiko devoted over three hours to re-reading four pages of one of the articles. Re-reading is

generally viewed as a legitimate way of dealing with textual complexity, but it can also signal academic difficulties. For example, as Haas (1994) argues, readers who rely on this strategy too extensively tend to view the text as an object, failing to consider its rhetorical context. Consequently, these writers often get overly fixated on the information inside of the text, failing to find connections between texts and linking these connections with their own ideas. This difficulty is apparent in Aiko's writing from sources.

During the process of her reading and re-reading, Aiko used several cognitive strategies outlined by Riazi (1997). Frequently, she engaged in note-making. Specifically, she highlighted and underlined parts of the texts. Although the highlighting strategies were briefly mentioned during the instruction in ESL 1060, Aiko claimed to have used these strategies prior to taking this course. She said she had learned about the importance of this composing strategy in Japan. When asked about the difference in her use of these two strategies, Aiko explained that when underlining, she "doesn't pay so much attention." She referred to highlighting as a "second step strategy" in which she "really pay[s] attention." However, as with the re-reading strategy, Aiko's note-making may not have been as effective as is generally believed. Frequently, she underlined or highlighted concepts she found "interesting" rather than those relevant to the topic she was developing.

Unlike the textual highlighting and underlining, the index card strategy, a note-taking cognitive strategy recommended by the instructor in ESL 1060, was new to Aiko. Immediately after the class in which Deena described this strategy, Aiko expressed her desire to implement it: "I think this could be pretty useful for me. It can help me [in] keeping track of good information." However, despite her initial enthusiasm, Aiko never

used the strategy, explaining in a later interview that it seemed "too time-consuming." It is possible that if the instructor modeled the strategy and/or allowed opportunities for students to engage in using this strategy in class instead of simply telling them about it, Aiko would have seen the benefits of employing it in her writing from sources.

Of the cognitive strategies compiled by Riazi (1997), Aiko appeared to draw less upon elaboration and inferencing,[20] composing strategies deemed as critical in successful writing from sources. The fact that she was not succeeding in effectively incorporating elaboration in her repertoire of composing strategies was evident in Aiko's failure to make apparent connections between the different ideas in her paper. (See discussion later in this chapter.) Her extensive reliance on translation and resistance to guess the meanings of words in context suggests that Aiko has difficulty with inferencing. Neither of these important composing strategies (i.e., elaboration and inferencing) were addressed by the instructor in the course.

Following the initial round of reading, re-reading, and note-taking, Aiko engaged in a metacognitive composing strategy referred to as outlining. For her ESL report paper, she began with an informal outline of ideas, using a piece of paper. Following the construction of this document, she transferred the points that she was planning to develop in her paper to an "electronic outline" in Word. Generally, the main points in her outline came from a different article, reflecting Aiko's adaptation of the "topic-driven" rather than "issues-driven" approach to writing from sources (Nelson and Hayes, 1988).

Based on the points identified in the outline, Aiko wrote topic sentences, each in a

---

[20] *Elaboration* is defined as "the mental process of relating the new knowledge to existing information in long term memory" and as "a process of making meaningful connections between different parts of new textual information." *Inferencing is defined* as "using available information to guess meanings of new items, predict outcomes, or fill in missing information" (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990, p. 230).

different colored font. When asked for the reason behind this metacognitive strategy, Aiko claimed that it helped her "keep track of ideas, the main points [she] want[ed] to develop." This particular composing strategy appeared to be critical in Aiko's writing— once she wrote down the topic sentences, after about 25 hours of reading-based preparation, she appeared ready to write. This stage in Aiko's writing from sources could be characterized as completing her outline by inserting sentences under the relevant, color-coded, topic sentences.

Aiko's outlining in her later paper, written for the Linguistics course, took the shape of an electronic outline right away. She explained that by omitting the construction of her outline on paper, she hoped to save time: "I want to make an outline directly on the computer, an electronic outline so it's less time. I can write more this way." When asked what led her to believe that this is a more effective metacognitive strategy, Aiko indicated an awareness of her tendency to "wait too long before writing." Aiko began the process of constructing this "electronic outline" with thinking about the rhetorical context discussed in her ESL class. She wrote the following: "Purpose (report the issue and resolve it)," "audience (Globalizing Acadimia) [sic]," and "stance (it's important)." When asked what prompted Aiko to begin her outline in this fashion, she responded: "I learned in the ESL class that it's important to start paper thinking about this." However, while Aiko indicated on top of her paper that her purpose should be an "issue" that is reported and resolved, analysis of her later draft revealed that her writing was, again, topic rather than issue-driven.

Aiko's problematic use of outlining as a metacognitive composing strategy may, in fact, have contributed to her tendency to adapt a point-by-point, topic driven approach

to source-based writing. In the first stage of her Linguistics paper outline, she typed the following subheadings into her outline: "Introduction with background information," "Question that makes thesis statement," "Point 1," "Point 2," "Point 3 (1+2)," "Conclusion," and "References." Aiko listed example paraphrases or quotes from her sources within most of these points, again color-coding her ideas. However, rather than use her outline to help identify connections between readings, Aiko used relevant evidence from each source under a separate subheading, using a separate color for each source, rather than cross-coloring ideas across sources. As she continued to work on her paper, she included additional subtitles: "the nature of written text," "the struggling students with non-Western education," "writing as a means to express the process of creation," and "deliberate and unintentional." With each new "point" Aiko was trying to make, she appeared to move away from an effective synthesis of information, further obscuring the relationships between the identified points and their connectedness to the thesis statement.

With Aiko's inclusion of more and more details in her "electronic outline" of the Linguistics report paper, the document slowly transformed into a paper draft. However, as the outline that she had worked so hard creating disappeared, Aiko began to feel a need for organizational scaffolding that would help her monitor her ideas. Consequently, she returned to a metacognitive strategy of paper-based outlining even though she initially hoped to omit it from her strategic repertoire. Her paper-based outline captured two causes of plagiarism: 1) the role of cultural background and 2) manifestintertextuality/ constituitive intertextuality. These concepts did not appear to correspond with the main points in the draft of her paper, which further indicates Aiko's

difficulty with outlining as a metacognitive composing strategy for writing from sources.

In addition to outlining, Aiko used several other metacognitive composing strategies. For example, she assigned herself goals for the number of pages she hoped to produce each working session even though, in every one of the seven documented instances, Aiko's estimates proved to be unrealistic. As she wrote, Aiko continued to take notes on her readings and modify her outline. She engaged in yet another metacognitive strategy, named "rationalizing appropriate formats" (Riazi, 1997, p. 105) when she made changes to her paper title and subtitles. Finally, Aiko used the assessment rubric provided by the instructor to "monitor and evaluate" (p. 106) her progress.

One particular opportunity that could have provided Aiko with practice in using several cognitive and metacognitive strategies and which, consequently, could have facilitated her source-based writing merits a more detailed discussion. In the Linguistics course, students were asked to prepare a PowerPoint presentation that would provide an outline of their paper and allow them to share this information with their peers. Aiko enjoyed developing the presentation, saying that she was "better at giving presentations than writing." She found the presentation useful although she did not attribute its usefulness to the fact that it allowed her to engage in elaboration and inferencing as cognitive strategies; planning, rationalizing appropriate formats, or and monitoring and evaluating as a metacognitive strategies, all of which could be drawn upon in this kind of a task. Rather, she said it "forced" her to "think about the listener" and to make sure her classmates had "fun." She said it was important to her to focus on selecting the most interesting information from the articles she was reading. For example, one phrase in the presentation—"interaction of Alan and Zhu" – was bolded in her PowerPoint slides, thus

suggesting its importance. Alan and Zhu are cases in Gu and Brooks (2008), one of Aiko's sources on plagiarism. And although Aiko's paper did not mention the importance of this "interaction," Aiko was excited about including this information in her oral presentation: "I really like the example of Zhu because I can really understand how she felt." Certainly, the fact that Aiko was aware of the expectations of her audience is noteworthy. However, her failure to use this task to facilitate the writing of her paper—arguably one of her professor's main purposes for this assignment—was a lost opportunity.

Overall, the interviews and observations suggest that Aiko used search and social composing strategies to a considerably lesser extent than she used cognitive and metacognitive composing strategies in both of her papers. She spent limited time searching for appropriate sources for her papers and made a questionable decision not to use a highly relevant source in her writing because it had been discussed in her class. Additionally, she said she consulted the assignment guidelines only once, when the assignment was first given. She did not search or request others' examples as models for her own writing. With respect to social composing strategies, Aiko did not ask the instructor for formal or informal feedback prior to the assignment deadline. In the case of her ESL report paper, she claimed to enjoy having a peer comment on her paper during the peer review session but employed only a few, surface-level suggestions in her second draft. She claimed she had not received any comments on her PowerPoint presentation that would lead her to modify the draft of her paper.

The interviews about and observations of Aiko's use of composing strategies have direct implications for her textual borrowing strategies. Aiko's lack of certain cognitive

strategies, such as inferencing and elaboration, and her problematic implementation of metacognitive strategies, such as outlining, negatively affected her use of sources as will be illustrated in the next section.

Textual borrowing strategies in Aiko's writing from sources

ESL report paper

The assigned, three to four-page report paper was the second paper in ESL 1060 in which students wrote from sources. Deena explained that report was "an essay that integrates and synthesizes research from a variety of sources." She told her students to "choose a topic and conduct research on your topic using [the library] resources, both books and online materials." With regard to textual borrowing, the assignment sheet explained that students would be expected to "use and correctly cite at least four sources. All sources must be academic and credible." Furthermore, the assignment guidelines reminded students to use "appropriate paraphrasing, quoting, and citations!!!" and include "a works cited page." (Emphasis was original.) The assignment was accompanied by a rubric and presented to students with three deadlines for different portions of the assignment.

As Table 10 shows, Aiko's draft of the ESL report paper was almost entirely based on the four identified sources—24 (83%) out of 29 sentences she wrote in the report paper were directly linked to the texts Aiko had selected. Of the different textual borrowing strategies, Aiko relied most frequently on paraphrasing (66%), summarizing, (10%), and quote combinations (7%). Aiko's paper was not problematic from the standpoint of prototypical plagiarism—her text included no unquoted reproductions or

near copies. Also, a considerable number of sentences (14, 58%) that drew upon an outside source were explicitly attributed. Of the sentences based on sources, 13 (54%) were unsupported.

However, textual analysis revealed that as an L2 writer had deep-rooted problems with textual borrowing. Among the most concerning, captured in Table 10, was Aiko's frequent misrepresentation of the content in the outside sources—more than half of the sentences based on outside sources (50% of paraphrases, 4% of summaries) failed to preserve the meaning of the original texts.

In the process of rephrasing original sources, Aiko frequently failed to substitute the original words with suitable synonyms, a common occurrence among developing L2 writers (Ouellette, 2008). Example 1 captures a paraphrase from Aiko's text that illustrates her synonym substitution strategy very well; Aiko rephrased the adjective "over-represented" with the phrase "outrageously many." Such mixing of the academic and spoken registers is rare in academic discourse. Also, even though the overall content of the original corresponds with the content in the paraphrase semantically, the topicality in the paraphrase is problematic at the discourse level. This is because the paraphrase foregrounds *fitness* rather than *gay men* by placing the former noun early in the sentence (See Example 1).

Example 1

Original text: "Gay men are underrepresented in mainstream club sports and traditional `masculine' team sports and over-represented in commercially based fitness sports." (Elling and Janssens, 2009, p. 71)

Aiko's text: Specifically, fitness, which came out recently as a profit-making exercise attracts outrageously many gey [sic] men as opposed to traditional social team sport, which typically shows masculinity.

Aiko struggled to reconcile what she had learned about paraphrasing in ESL 1060—the importance of changing words and structure—with the appropriateness of maintaining original terms, generally referred to as "common knowledge." For example, in an effort to paraphrase adequately, Aiko once used the words *homophile* as a synonym for *homosexual*. However, the instructor's feedback on Aiko's draft suggested that this word was "really rare" and that "[her] audience might be confused about it." Deena recommended that Aiko uses the word *homosexual* instead. Aiko appeared frustrated after seeing Deena's comment: "I was trying, you know, not to plagiarize, but change words as much as possible." This episode suggests the importance of discussing the concept of "common knowledge" and "original term maintenance" when instructing L2 writers on textual borrowing.

Not all of Aiko's paraphrasing, specifically her synonym substitution, was problematic. In fact, more often than not Aiko succeeded at the level of basic rephrasing. As Example 2 shows, Aiko was often able to use paraphrase effectively. In this paraphrase, Aiko finds an appropriate semantic equivalent (*less masculine*) for the original phrase *associated with femininity*. Additionally, unlike the previous example paraphrase which complicates the original structure, this example portrays Aiko as able to modify original text by simplifying it.

Nevertheless, this example uncovers Aiko's difficulty with transparency in attribution. Although the paraphrase is not explicitly attributed, the reader of her paper may infer that its content comes from Elling and Janssens (2009) given that these authors were referenced in the sentence that preceded the paraphrase. However, such an

Example 2

> **Original text**: "Since male homosexuality is associated with femininity and mainstream competitive sports with hegemonic masculinity, gay men are regarded as generally unsuited to sports, and to team sports like football in particular (Connell, 1995; Laberge and Albert, 1999; Plummer, 2006)" (Elling and Janssens, 2009, p. 71)
>
> **Aiko's text:** Since male homosexuality is regarded as less masculine, so they are not suitable for sports.

Nevertheless, this example uncovers Aiko's difficulty with transparency in attribution. Although the paraphrase is not explicitly attributed, the reader of her paper may infer that its content comes from Elling and Janssens (2009) given that these authors were referenced in the sentence that preceded the paraphrase. However, such an assumption would be incorrect because Elling and Janssens (2009) were, in fact, citing other authors, whom they had referenced in the parentheses, when discussing this particular content. Aiko failed to capture this nuance related to secondary citation.

When asked to elaborate on why she attributed certain ideas to the author of the text she had selected rather than the original authors cited in the text, Aiko's response indicated her awareness of this secondary citation nuance. She explained, "I think I need to show this information is from the other researcher. But, in my Linguistics class I was given feedback that said you shouldn't put the sources in the sources." Because Aiko did not answer whether she thought it would be appropriate to find and cite the original source, it is impossible to conclude whether Aiko's misuse of secondary citation was a result of her incomplete understanding of this issue, a lack of time, or another reason.

In addition to problematic attribution, Example 2 also highlights Aiko's difficulty with preservation of meaning in the original source. While the original text clearly

denotes a distant agent (the society) when referring to gay men as "unsuited for sports" and further hedges the statement with the use of the adverb "generally," Aiko's sentence fails to capture the outside agency and qualify the statement. Instead, it appears as if it was Aiko's own conclusion that gay men are "not suitable" for sports.

Aiko's struggle with meaning preservation did not go unnoticed by Deena; the instructor's feedback addressed the meaning-related issues in Aiko's textual borrowing strategies with comments ranging from indicating misunderstanding ("I don't understand. Do you mean….. or….?") to directly dismissing Aiko's assertions ("This doesn't make sense"). Arguably, Aiko's frequent failure to preserve the meaning of the original sources, evident in the draft of her paper, is a reflection of her difficulties with reading comprehension, which, in an interview, Aiko herself suggested was a problem: "I guess I'm not surprised that Deena's not understanding me so well sometimes. Maybe I don't write so precisely. Or maybe I just misunderstand sometimes… when I read you know."

Finally, as was suggested in the discussion of composing strategies, Aiko had difficulty synthesizing readings in ways that would draw clear connections between ideas from different sources and integrating those ideas with her own. Aiko appeared to sense that her discourse lacked textual interrelationships, which is, arguably, why she employed subheadings to signal to the reader the relevance of different parts of her report, ignoring the instructor's recommendations against it. In fact, the instructor asked in her feedback that Aiko use "topic sentences instead of these subtitles!!." Deena struggled to "follow" Aiko's points, commenting on the lack of overall coherence: "good content and info given, but sometimes hard to follow." In one instance, Deena's feedback pointed to several specific examples where connectivity among sources in Aiko's writing is

problematic. Aiko was unable to address these concerns effectively even in a later draft. (Issues relevant to feedback on textual borrowing and its assessment will be returned to in Chapter 6.)

Not only was Aiko unable to show how her sources related to each other, she also failed to incorporate her own voice in the writing she produced. Aiko's report paper included only three original sentences (10%). In the few instances where Aiko attempted to draw upon her own voice rather than an outside source to improve coherence in her text, she tended to struggle. Example 3 includes Aiko's original sentence "In order to make it easier, they provide the readers with the findings from research" between the attributed summary and combination (see Sentence 2 in Example 3). However, the sentence is redundant because it makes explicit the knowledge her audience already assumes. Indeed, Deena comments on the irrelevance of the sentence in her feedback: "Why is this important? Delete."

Aiko received 78% on the first draft of her report paper and 90% on the second draft of her paper, giving her a final grade of 84%, suggesting a partial success in her ability to implement in her writing what she has learned in ESL 1060, including the information on textual borrowing. Despite her failure to keep up with the deadlines for the course and her general struggle with the challenges presented in the process of writing this paper, Aiko considered her work on the report worthwhile and the grade she received for it an accomplishment.

Example 3

> **Aiko's text**: 1) Quinlivan and Town try to come up with suggestions to make the sexual diversity of students acceptable. 2) In order to make it easier, they provide the readers with the findings from research. 3) That is how the victims of "schools as heteronormalizing institutions" (p.509)were exposed to the methods of normalization; keeping not mentioning about sexuality in general, taking homosexuality as a disease, and regulating the border of male and female.

Linguistics research paper

In the course entitled "Grammar and Stylistics for Academic Writing" (Linguistics 3510),[21] Aiko was expected to produce a research paper on one of the discussed topics. Aiko chose plagiarism as the main topic for her paper, explaining that "it seemed to be big and hot topic, a cutting edge topic" and that "compared to the other grammatical things like coherence, negation, or articles, it's more related to [herself]." However, while the topic resonated with her at a personal level, Aiko was hesitant when asked whether she was going to include in her paper some of her own experiences with writing from sources. She said that she was not sure whether that would be "appropriate" since it was an "academic paper." However, while she discredited the value of her own experience, Aiko excitedly reported on finding "a similar case to [her] case" in the literature, which she was planning to include as an example. Aiko's preference for published work appeared to come at the cost of devaluing her own experience and echoed Deena's emphasis on using credible sources, particularly sources published by authors with Ph.Ds.

The draft of the research paper that Aiko was able to produce included a variety

---

[21] Describe the course and say it was cross-listed and accepted as an upper division writing requirement

of textual borrowing strategies, as Table 11 shows. Of the 35 sentences that constituted her draft, 30 were based on outside sources. Fourteen were paraphrases (40%), nine combinations (26%), three summaries (8%), two quotes (6%), and two near copies (6%). Aiko did not write any unquoted reproductions. Of the sentences that were based on outside sources, 16 (54%) were attributed. Seven (23%) were unsupported.

As with her ESL report paper, Aiko was successful in avoiding plagiarism. In the numerous instances in which she borrowed from outside texts in the process of writing the research paper on plagiarism, Aiko displayed an ability to quote or rephrase sources sufficiently and attribute them appropriately. The quote combination in Example 4 illustrates her effort to employ the rules on avoiding plagiarism that she received in ESL 1060. For example, when borrowing from Shi (2004), Aiko switched the order of ideas— she began by quoting the part of Shi's text that addressed *Confucianism* before quoting the part on *Western practice*. In addition to reordering Shi's ideas, Aiko was able to separate the author's voice from her own voice by using quotation marks and page numbers where appropriate. And while the phrase "crucial background" may not be optimal, it allowed Aiko to complement the author's claims with her own assertion about the relevance of the contrasting concepts (i.e., Confucianism vs. Western practice) to Asian university students. When asked about her use of Shi's text, Aiko said that she made the changes in order to "make the opposition a little bit stronger." The discourse-level textual analysis revealed that foregrounding the information about Confucianism was, indeed, appropriate—Aiko wrote the quote combination under the section heading "ESL students' misunderstanding."

Example 4

> **Original text**: "An example of the nonwestern culture that contrasts the Western practice of limited and controlled access to intellectual property is the Asian tradition of Confucianism that advocates open and broad access to knowledge as common heritage." from Shi (2004, p. 265).
>
> **Aiko's text**: "Confucianism that advocates open and broad access to knowledge as common heritage."(Shi, 2006, p.265) as opposed to "the Western practice of limited and controlled access to intellectual property" (Shi, 2006, p.265) is the crucial background of Asian culture that makes a big difference in college students' writing.

Unfortunately, the kind of success in integrating an author's claim with her own assertions demonstrated in the discussion above was not a common occurrence in Aiko's writing. Aiko frequently failed to integrate her own voice with the voice of another author. Example 5 comes from a section in Aiko's research paper included under a section title "The Death of the Author," directly copied from Pennycook (1996, p. 204). The lack of her own voice makes it impossible for a reader to understand how Pennycook's ideas relate to the thesis of Aiko's paper.

Aiko not only fails to relate the information from a source to her own ideas, but her writing also lacks content linkage between the different outside texts referenced in her paper. So while Aiko is able to rearrange ideas within a short section of an individual text, as has been shown in Example 4, she appears to struggle with synthesizing information from multiple sources. Arguably, this problem, evident also in her writing of the ESL report paper, originates early in the research process. Because she tends to select articles that share a general topic, but not a main focus, Aiko positions herself poorly for building upon ideas from different sources and connecting them in ways that professors expect. Indeed, Aiko's professor found her inability to synthesize problematic. In his

Example 5

> **Original text**: "It was not until the great shift of thinking in Europe that became known as the Enlightenment that this view of imagination shifted and was replaced by the productive paradigm of the modern." (Pennycook, 1996, p. 204)
>
> "Shifting from the earlier onto-theological view of meaning, the humanist subject now became the centre of creativity." (Pennycook, 1996, p. 205)
>
> **Aiko's text**: However the paradigm shift, which has occurred in Europe, so called "enlightenment" changed the traditional onto-theological view. "The humanist subject [now] became the centre of creativity." (Pennycook, 1996)

feedback, he commented: "this is mostly a series of summaries of different sources; I was unable to follow any particular line of an argument."

In addition to problems with integrating voices of authors with her own voice and synthesizing information from multiple texts, Aiko's paper suggests difficulty with transparency in source attribution. As Table 11 shows, Aiko attributed sources frequently in her paper. Sixteen of the 30 sentences (54%) in which Aiko borrowed information from outside sources were explicitly attributed. However, in five sentences (17%) that contained information from an outside source, Aiko failed to credit the correct source.

Finally, as was the case with her ESL report paper, analysis of Aiko's draft of the Linguistics research paper also revealed problems with meaning preservation. Almost a quarter of the sentences based on outside sources (seven sentences, 23%) failed to capture the content of the original texts. The near copy in Example 6 illustrates this problem. While attempting to simplify or re-order the content in the original text, Aiko misrepresented the author' message by claiming that the object of postmodern and poststructuralist's questioning was "language, discourse, and subjectivity" (part of the

Example 6

> **Original text**: "The postmodern and poststructuralist positions on language, discourse, and subjectivity, therefore, raise serious question for any notion of individual creativity or authorship." (Pennycook, 1996, p. 209).
>
> **Aiko's text:** The postmodern and poststructuralist started to question language, discourse, and subjectivity.

grammatical subject in the original) rather than "individual creativity" and "authorship."

Aiko's draft received extensive feedback from her professor, including commentary on her use of sources, which underscored two concerns. First, Aiko's professor pointed out the lack of synthesis in Aiko's writing, suggesting that she develop "a line of argument" rather "a series of summaries of different sources." Second, he advised Aiko to improve her thesis statement and focus her paper on supporting the claim(s) expressed in the thesis statement throughout the paper. In addition to these major points, he commented on several other issues related to textual borrowing. Specifically, he wrote that he found "the number of quotations to be a bit distracting." He explained further:

> A few choice quotations can be useful, but by the end of this I felt there were more than a reader would want to have to read. Remember that every time you switch from your words to somebody else's words you force your reader to adapt to new writing style.

Aiko's professor also raised concerns about the surface level issues relevant to citing; namely, he reminded her to ensure that all her sources are listed in the reference list and organized alphabetically. Finally, he commented on the absence of page numbers for some of her quotes and drew her attention to several "open quotes," which he saw as instances in which Aiko did not include quotation marks at the end of the quote, only at

its beginning.

Given the extent of the professor's feedback on her draft, Aiko requested four weeks to produce the second, final draft. However, despite her daily work on the paper, she was unable to meet this new deadline. Undoubtedly, Aiko's language and academic difficulties played a role in her struggle with this assignment. However, Aiko also found herself distracted; she was getting ready for a move back to Japan and suffering from pollen allergies, which she said "really affected [her] concentration." It is possible that if Aiko had found herself in a more optimal space when revising this paper, she may have been able to meet the extended deadline.

To resolve the situation, Aiko set up an appointment with the professor during which they agreed that she would receive an incomplete grade in the course. And although this provision allows a year for completing any missing assignments, Aiko and her professor decided that she would take up to four weeks to complete and submit the revised paper. This arrangement renewed Aiko's optimism about the assignment: "I am so glad I can work on this [paper] a little bit more. I think I can get a lot of work done at the airport and the plane and if I have until then also for a few days at home." Despite Aiko's resolve to complete the assignment according to the agreement with her professor and her professor's email inquiry about her progress, she did not manage to finish the paper for another three months. When she finally emailed her second, final draft to her professor, she apologized for "not having responded [to his] e-mail quickly" and asked him to "allow [her] to submit the paper." She committed to addressing any feedback he may have within two months. In a later email exchange with Aiko, I found that she has not heard back from her professor.

<u>Summary and discussion of Aiko's writing from sources</u>

During the interviews, Aiko displayed considerable respect for published literature, dismissing the value of including reflections on her own experience in the paper on plagiarism. However, despite the claim that such "unhealthy respect for the absolute authority of texts" may lead these students to reproduce these texts inappropriately (Moody, 2007, p. 199), Aiko's writing was not overly dependent on the wordings of the outside sources—she was able to avoid plagiarism. As the analyses described above showed, Aiko made an effort to use outside sources responsibly by avoiding extensive unacknowledged copying and other unconventional textual borrowing strategies. Consistent with the instruction in ESL 1060, she frequently changed the original wording and modified sentence structure, often rearranging the original ordering of ideas. She explicitly attributed a considerable number of sentences borrowed from outside texts.

Despite Aiko's ability to avoid plagiarism and her efforts to implement what she had learned about textual borrowing, she continued to experience difficulties with the following issues relevant to textual borrowing: 1) source selection, 2) transparency in attribution, 3) preservation of original meaning, 4) content linkage and integration, and 5) strategy use.

Aiko's choice of sources was problematic on two counts. First, she often selected articles whose foci were dissimilar, which prevented her from identifying common themes. Consequently, she was unable to organize her paper around issues and relied, instead, on a point-by-point summary of different sources. Second, Aiko tended to select particularly long and lexically dense articles, thus, sabotaging her potential for gaining

full access to their content. Aiko's English language proficiency and her lack of experience with academic writing appeared to play a role in her inability to engage with the content of the articles at the level necessary for successful writing from sources. This is not to say that undergraduate L2 writers should not be expected to process complex readings. Rather, I believe, they need information about how to strategize in their courses and prioritize in their assignments. Arguably, Aiko may have been more successful in her source-based assignments if she had based them on readings more accessible to her. Additionally, L2 writers could benefit from better understanding of what is expected and appropriate in undergraduate courses. Aiko's fear of being perceived as "lazy" by her professor and "boring" by her peers if she was to use a source discussed in the class was unfounded.

In addition to struggling with appropriate source identification, Aiko had difficulties with attribution. In most instances when she borrowed from texts, she included an explicit reference to a source. However, as the textual analysis revealed, in many instances the attribution did not match the correct source. In other words, Aiko frequently misused secondary citation, obscuring the transparency in attribution of her sources. The interview data suggests that she did so knowingly—Aiko claimed to have learned in her class that it is a preferred academic practice to include citations of primary rather than secondary sources.

The next area of difficulty with textual borrowing for Aiko lay in accurate representation of the meaning of the original sources. Aiko misrepresented the meaning of 23% of source-based sentences in her Linguistics paper and 54% in her ESL paper. An analysis of the sources Aiko used in these two assignments demonstrated that the articles

Aiko selected for her ESL report paper research paper were considerably more difficult than those she used in her Linguistics paper, which explains why her textual borrowing strategies misrepresented the original sources to varied degrees. Specifically, the sources Aiko used in her ESL paper were longer, contained more unknown vocabulary, and came from highly academic, peer-reviewed journals. These factors clearly affected Aiko's reading comprehension, causing her to misrepresent the original content.

Although Aiko's difficulty with reading was apparent, it is also possible that in some instances, Aiko correctly understood the original content, but her developing ability as a writer failed her in conveying the meaning. Another explanation for Aiko's incorrect representation of content may be her ineffective use of composing strategies. For example, if Aiko took better notes or employed graphic organizers to break down the difficult parts of her readings, she may have better understood the content and, consequently, represent it more accurately in her writing.

Analysis of Aiko's writing also suggested problems with successful synthesis and integration of information, which would make apparent to the reader how ideas from different sources in Aiko's papers were linked. Additionally, Aiko not only struggled with showing connections within and across the texts upon which her writing was based, but she also failed to integrate information from sources with her own ideas. It was clear that she tended to overly rely on sources, at the cost of her own voice. For example, in her paper on plagiarism, she was initially planning to include an example of "Zhu," an L2 writer struggling with textual borrowing. Aiko said: "I really like the example of Zhu because I can really understand how she felt." However, while Aiko was willing to include in her paper a voice of an L2 writer similar to herself, she was hesitant to include

her own voice, to share her own struggle with writing from sources.

Aiko's reluctance to use her own voice and experience appeared to stand in contrast with her evolved definition on plagiarism, which foregrounded ownership of one's ideas instead of an earlier understanding of plagiarism as "stealing others' ideas." When asked at the end-of-the semester interview how Aiko viewed plagiarism, she commented: "It's more like, it became more like my own writing is my own property; so it shouldn't be imitated or shouldn't be read in front of a whole bunch of people, or it shouldn't be copied or anything."

Aiko's experience with academic writing, especially writing from sources, could be characterized as a constant endeavor to keep up with the requirements. She was resourceful, devising a range of coping strategies in order to overcome the challenges presented to her. For example, when she realized she did not have sufficient time to read all her articles, she focused on the first few pages of each reading. When she found herself unable to complete her assignments by the established deadlines, she approached her instructors and negotiated extensions and further guidance. She also visited the University's Writing Center. Nonetheless, despite her efforts to keep up with the many challenges she faced, Aiko did not feel that she was succeeding as an academic writer. It is unclear whether her developing language proficiency, lack of experience with academic writing, ineffective strategy use, health issues, lack of instruction, or a combination of those factors affected her overall performance. It is also possible that Aiko's struggle was a result of underlying reading problems that may have impacted her success in reading English, and possibly also in Japanese; her problems with meaning preservation when writing from sources and her constant, time-consuming re-reading of

short sections of the text was paralyzing to her progress through assignments.

Chaoren

During the semester in which Chaoren participated in this dissertation research, he was required to produce writing in four different courses: Advanced Expository Writing for ESL Speakers (ESL 1060), Writing in a Research University (Honors 3200), People and Place (URBPL 3101), and American National Government (PS 1100). In total, he wrote 12 academic papers. For the purposes of this research I will focus on five papers from three of the above courses.[22] I have chosen to examine the *contribution paper* that Chaoren wrote for the Honors Writing course and the *mid-term paper* he produced in the Urban Planning course because of Chaoren's claim that these constituted the best writing he had ever produced. He reported working particularly hard on these assignments. Because of his dedication, he believed that he was able to contribute new ideas to the topics: "I've just been feeling well writing; I know I have something to say. For other papers that are three to five pages it feels like I can write two pages and then b.s. two-three pages."

In addition to examining the two more extensive and high-stakes papers, I will discuss briefly two shorter assignments which preceded the contribution paper: a *summary paper* and a *critique paper*. These two assignments were designed to help prepare students for the main contribution paper. Given that they drew upon the same source used in Chaoren's contribution paper, I was interested to find out how his understanding of different rhetorical contexts may have affected his textual borrowing.

---

[22] I was unable to be present during Chaoren's production of all five papers. Consequently, the length of my discussion of each paper differs according to the extent to which I observed Chaoren's writing of these papers.

Finally, I will present the analysis of Chaoren's argument paper written for the ESL course. The reason for including the ESL paper is twofold. First, it allows me to examine the extent to which Chaoren's textual borrowing strategies are consistent across a variety of higher and lower-stakes assignments. Additionally, Chaoren's source use in the context of argumentative writing provides an important point of comparison to other novice academic writers' source-based argumentation documented in the literature (Higgins, 1993). However, prior to examining his textual borrowing strategies in the above-mentioned types of papers, I will discuss Chaoren's use of general composing strategies.

Composing strategies implemented in Chaoren's writing from sources

Unlike Aiko and Junmo, Chaoren employed different composing strategies to write in his major and ESL assignments. I will first describe his approach to producing two of his major assignments, which I observed throughout the process, and then compare that approach with his writing of an ESL paper.

After reviewing the assignment guidelines (when available), Chaoren liked to "think carefully about the assignment" rather than begin searching for sources. He said he did not have a special place for this early "thinking" stage: "Maybe I am walking to dorms or having a meal in the cafeteria and I just brainstorm…think about what I should write." In this initial process of planning, when he developed important ideas, Chaoren employed the note-taking cognitive strategy, often using a paper napkin or a back page of a previously written assignment.

Next, Chaoren proceeded to search for sources. If he was unclear about aspects of

the assignments or concepts he was planning to write about, Chaoren drew upon Wikipedia to build background knowledge. Chaoren shared two examples of his use of this resource:

> When I was doing a water supply project in Salt Lake City I used Wikipedia to look up the history of the gateway community and even some history or geographic information about that place. Before I did my globalization paper, I had to define rhetoric so I write in [the Wikipedia site] *rhetoric* and it automatically shows its definition.

When asked about not relying on Wikipedia as a source, Chaoren echoed the concern about credibility addressed in ESL 1060: "I don't think Wikipedia is that credible. I mean anyone can just type stuff there." However, this concern about credibility was outweighed by the importance of building schemata on the topic he was planning to write about.

After brainstorming, initial note-taking, and clarifying concepts using Wikipedia, Chaoren typically engaged in several simultaneous processes: reading and re-reading of sources and further note making. Reading appeared to be particularly important to Chaoren. He referred to himself as a "slow reader" although "careful reader" may be a more appropriate label for his approach to dealing with the assigned readings. He spent many hours reading, usually starting with skimming the article or chapter prior to more detailed reading. Depending on the assignment, he read the same text two or three times, averaging about six hours per 20-30 page long academic journal article or textbook chapter. Unlike Aiko, during reading Chaoren only looked up key words and did not write down the translations. Also, he always completed the readings and engaged in re-reading less frequently.

Throughout the reading process Chaoren often took notes, saying they helped him

"organize [his] thoughts." Chaoren's note taking was typically in the form of underlined or highlighted sections of the reading. Like Aiko, he did not distinguish between these two strategies. To illustrate Chaoren's use of note-taking, when reading Casey (2007), he underlined this sentence: "plastics don't pollute, people do," but highlighted this sentence: "so 25% of our planet is a toilet that never flushes." His explanation for highlighting the latter sentence implied two purposes. First, he found that it expressed a particularly powerful message, which he planned to mention in his summary paper and later develop in his critique and contribution papers. Second, he viewed it as the central idea of the chapter. In his words: "I highlighted it while I was reading it first time. It's a pretty cool sentence—it's scary man, scary! I think this is the whole point that the author wants to tell us. She wants to scare us not to use plastic and damage the planet." Chaoren's ability to abstract the main purpose of the text during his reading process suggests effective inferencing as a cognitive composing strategy.

Despite his preference for highlighting and underlining, Chaoren appeared able to adapt his note-taking. For example, when reading from his textbook, Chaoren chose to write notes on sticky notes instead of marking the text. He explained that he wanted to resell the book in the future. Chaoren did not draw on the index card strategy recommended in ESL 1060 because like Aiko, he considered it "too time-consuming." He believed that sticky notes allowed him to easily orient himself in the sources he was using in his source-based writing. When tackling particularly difficult readings, Chaoren summarized an article's paragraphs by writing summary sentences next to each paragraph. He said that this strategy helped him to "remember what the author said in the article because it's so long."

Another interesting observation of Chaoren's use of note-taking as a cognitive composing strategy was that he often varied the formats of his note-taking—sometimes he wrote notes or outlined using a computer while at other times he made do with a piece of paper, even a paper napkin. He laughed when I referred to these documents as "notes" or "an outline," and explained that "only [he] could understand these because they are not readable, more like chaos." One of the phrases written on this document was "integrating readings." When I asked Chaoren what he meant by this particular comment, he responded: "This idea rang a bell that reminded me of some other reading so if this idea was expressed in another reading, I can use it to support my thesis." Chaoren's ability to connect ideas from his current reading to other readings provides evidence for his effective use of not only note-taking, but also elaboration as a key cognitive composing strategy.

As is the case with most academic writers, the process of reading, writing, and organizing thoughts and notes was not neatly divided into subsequent stages for Chaoren. Although he tended to engage in reading prior to writing, he always kept his sources in close proximity, re-reading parts of texts during the writing process. For example, in the process of producing his summary paper, he typed while occasionally re-reading parts of his source. When asked what he typically did when he paused to re-read the information in the article, Chaoren said that he wanted "to recall the structure and the aspects that the book mentions" and "to check some things, like the year or the name—like captain Moore." This quote suggests that unlike Aiko, Chaoren re-read parts of texts with specific purposes such as seeking clarification. He also differed from Aiko in his use of L1 (another cognitive strategy outlined by Riazi (1997))—even though he occasionally

looked up vocabulary, he did not write down the translations, worrying that doing so would digress his writing.

Similar to his use of cognitive strategies, Chaoren was an adept user of metacognitive composing strategies. As was shown in the earlier discussion, he was able to plan his writing process prior to searching for sources and monitor his progress during reading and drafting. Whenever possible, he also engaged in evaluation. For example, when producing the ESL argument paper, Chaoren consulted the assessment rubric before and after he produced his draft. He appreciated the rubric, calling it a "great guideline" that allowed him to "make sure that [he] can get full points." When asked about the points in the rubric relevant to plagiarism and textual borrowing, Chaoren said that "this area was a little bit vague, but at least it kept [him] on track and helped [him] remember to be careful."

Another metacognitive strategy—assigning goals—was evident throughout Chaoren's writing process. Unlike Aiko who always underestimated the time she was going to need to complete daily writing tasks, Chaoren was surprisingly precise when predicting his writing. From early on in the writing process he would correctly estimate how long each part of the paper was going to take. Additionally, as he produced source-based assignments, he was able to focus on the main purpose and did not allow himself to digress because of conventions related to textual borrowing. For example, after he included information from an outside source, he made a brief note to himself using red font as a reminder to address this part of his paper later either by including an exact reference or by adding a reference to the list of references at the end of his paper. Chaoren's concern about an efficient progression through the assignment did not come at

the cost of self-monitoring. After every two to five sentences, Chaoren always stopped to re-read what he had written. If he found himself dissatisfied with his writing, he did not hesitate to change or delete the text.

Chaoren appeared to be considerably more adept at using social composing strategies than Aiko and Junmo (the third writer in the study discussed later in this chapter). When he produced first drafts of his "important papers," he emailed them to his father, a university professor in China, asking for suggestions. After he received and incorporated his father's comments, he emailed his paper to his professors, requesting preliminary feedback. In several instances, he arranged a follow-up meeting with his professors to discuss his paper or their suggestions for improvement. Finally, he appreciated peer review and always tried to incorporate his peers' comments into his writing.

When writing in the context of ESL 1060, Chaoren used fewer social strategies but was, nonetheless, quite resourceful. To illustrate, even though Chaoren initially thought about exploring the topic of the border between the US and Mexico in his ESL argument paper, he eventually decided to pursue another topic—the role of cars in the American society. He confirmed with the instructor that this was an acceptable topic. Chaoren also asked Deena whether she would allow him to use an MLA rather than APA style given his "need to learn this style for [his] field." Satisfied with his work in the course, Deena granted both of Chaoren's requests. As I discovered later, both of these appeals were motivated by the fact that Chaoren had written a paper for another class, which he wanted to reuse in the argument paper. Chaoren shared that he found himself busy completing coursework and getting ready to leave for China shortly after the

semester ended, so he "[didn't] want to do too much extra work" on the ESL argument paper. He explained that he was planning to write most of the paper in one of the classes scheduled in the computer lab, claiming "it's just like two hour stuff."

Overall, Chaoren was an excellent user of composing strategies. Although he was generally provided sources in his courses and consequently was not able to engage frequently in search strategies, he demonstrated resourcefulness in employing Wikipedia to build background knowledge when necessary. Chaoren's use of cognitive and metacognitive composing strategies portrays him as an adept academic writer who is able to adapt to various contexts and task demands. Finally, his frequent use of social strategies demonstrates his resourcefulness.

Textual borrowing strategies in Chaoren's writing from sources

Summary paper (Honors 3200)

The series of three papers assigned in Writing in a Research University (Honors 3200), which culminated in the contribution paper, began with the summary paper of an article on plastics (Casey, 2007). The guidelines for the assignment, given orally in the class, asked students to write a one-page summary of the article. Chaoren reported learning basic summary skills in China, but he said he had never produced a summary in English. Before he began the assignment, Chaoren was somewhat unsure about how to best approach the task of reducing the content of a 4400-word article into a one-page paper. When asked whether instruction from ESL 1060 helped prepare him for this task, he commented, "not really. I mean, I know I have to change words and not plagiarize, but it's hard to know what information to keep and throw out, how to start writing this

paper."

Given the nature of the summary task, it is perhaps not surprising that Chaoren relied exclusively on summary sentences as he borrowed from Casey's (2007) text. As Table 12 shows, of the total 17 sentences, 12 (71%) were summaries. Of these 12 summary sentences, six (50%) were explicitly attributed to the original source. All of the summary sentences captured the correct meaning of the original essay. When asked why he did not use additional textual borrowing strategies such as quotations, Chaoren explained: "This is just the summarize and then I want to use some of her examples and her quotations in the later part, the analysis part [sic]." When asked about the role of the ESL instruction in his preference for summary sentences, Chaoren suggested that he may be implementing information from the course in his summary writing: "It's kinda like what [Deena] said about details. How quotes have details, but summary has less details."

Example 7 presents a summary sentence in Chaoren's paper and the related content in Casey's (2007) essay. The first clause ("It has been bringing a lot of convenience to our society") is a summary of a specific section of the original text, while the second clause ("it brings more damages to our planet at the same time") summarizes the original essay as a whole. Clearly, this sentence contains several grammatical mistakes (e.g., the use of progressive aspect of the present tense, the use of plural in "damages", etc.) However, Chaoren's sentence succeeds in avoiding plagiarism and maintaining the original meaning.

Chaoren was engaged in a recursive process of writing and revising throughout the production of the first draft of the summary paper. Specific to textual borrowing, he made several revisions in attributing sources. Example 8 includes four instances of such

Example 7

> **Original text**: "Plastic has given us bulletproof vests, credit cards, slinky spandex pants. It has led to breakthroughs in medicine, aerospace engineering, and computer science. And who among us doesn't own a Frisbee? Plastic has its benefits; no one would deny that." (Casey, 2007, p.108)
>
> **Chaoren's text**: It has been bringing a lot of convenience to our society; however, it brings more damages to our planet at the same time.

revisions. When asked about the reason for the revision of Sentence 1, Chaoren claimed that the phrase *she tells a story* was "not very formal" and that the revised sentence sounded "more academical [sic]." When asked about his revision of Sentence 2, he commented: "it's summary so I want to do it from my view, not from the author's view. If I always say *she said that*, *she did that*, I just repeat the author, instead of summarizing. For summarizing I just wanna make it my stuff instead of the author's." When explaining the omission of the author's name in sentence 3, Chaoren said that he wanted to make his writing more "smooth." Finally, he justified his revision of sentence 4 in the following way: "I wanted to come up with a word that's like the same meaning as *she shows the idea* and then, I don't think *she conveys the idea* is what we talk or write normally so I just changed it to *she suggests*."

Clearly, Chaoren was aware of the importance of maintaining an academic tone in his writing. However, his intuition did not always lead him to the most optimal revision. This is apparent in sentence 1 where he obscured meaning in an effort to 'academize' the original construction *author+tell a story*. Additionally, changing an attributed paraphrase to an unattributed one, as in the example Sentence 2, can be viewed as problematic. It seems that Chaoren intuitively knew that it was not appropriate to use an explicit marker

Example 8

<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px;">

Sentence 1 initially produced in the draft: She tells a story of captain Moore.
Revised sentence 1: This experience introduced by Casey leads the essay to the discussion of recent situation of plastic.

Sentence 2 initially produced in the draft: She analyses the harmful chemical components of plastics.
Revised sentence 2: All the plastic products have some harmful chemical components that connect to people's daily life.

Sentence 3 initially produced in the draft: In some parts of essay the author, Casey discusses…

Revised sentence 3: In some parts of essay the author discusses…

Sentence 4 initially produced in the draft: She conveys the idea that the battle with plastic…

Revised sentence 4: She suggests the battle with plastic…

</div>

for attribution in every summary sentence he produced. As he explained: "It's her essay so I can't just get rid of her totally, I did my best to make it like my stuff, but sometimes I cannot avoid to mention her." This quote expresses the tension between Chaoren's beliefs that his writing must be academic on one hand, yet original on the other. It also implies his confusion as to what summarizing is exactly—in a traditional summary, one's effort should not be to "get rid of the author" or try to be particularly original. Even if Chaoren felt the need for some originality, its most appropriate form should be in integrated and brief evaluations of the author's ideas not in "getting rid of" or "avoiding" the author.

Critique paper (Honors 3200)

Following the summary paper, Chaoren was to write a *critique paper*, also referred to by the professor as an *analysis paper*. Similar to the summary paper, this

assignment was based on the article by Casey (2007). Students were given information about the critique paper orally in class. As Chaoren recollected, his professor asked that students "pull out an idea from the [summary] paper and go deeper." Although initially Chaoren claimed to understand the purpose of this assignment, later observations and the instructor's feedback revealed his lack of experience in producing this genre. In an interview after the assignment, Chaoren reported that he found the critique paper considerably more difficult than the summary paper. He said he wished that his professor would have given him "more information about this, more structure, what the paper should be like, what he really wants." He added that he would have appreciated an example paper, something his professor provided for the previous, summary assignment.

Chaoren's textual borrowing was more varied in this paper than in his summary paper—he employed six summaries (15%), three quotes (8%), two combinations (5%), and one paraphrase (3%). Of the 12 sentences directly traceable to the article, six (50%) were attributed. All of the sentences preserved the meaning of the original source. These strategies are summarized in Table 13. Reflecting his belief in the importance of the article's author's voice in this paper (compared to the summary paper), Chaoren indeed produced several quotes and combinations in his critique paper. Example 9 illustrates the change in his approach to textual borrowing well. The first column includes a portion of Chaoren's summary paper, the second the critique paper, and the third the original text from Casey (2007). As can be seen in the example, in addition to providing quotes and quote combinations in his writing of the critique paper, Chaoren also modified his original summary sentences from the summary paper. For example, he changed the order of ideas and paraphrased two sentences from the summary paper as one sentence in the

Example 9

Excerpt from Chaoren's summary	Excerpt from Chaoren's critique paper	Relevant original text
In addition, there are also a lot of difficulties in the field of plastic recycling. Most of the recycled plastic cannot be reused in later plastic productional [sic] processes, which is different from what people have learned.	Only few people know that most of the waste plastic products are dumped into the ocean and the earth since the recycling and reusing processes of plastic are too complicate to accomplish. "Of the seven different plastics in common use, only two of them have much of an aftermarket. So no matter how virtuously you toss your chip bags and shampoo bottles in to your blue bin, few of them will escape the landfill." Even the few amount of plastics recycled cannot "always result in less use of virgin material."	And of the seven different plastics in common use, only two of them—PET (labeled with #1 inside the triangle and used in soda bottles) and HDPE (labeled with #2 inside the triangle and used in milk jugs)—have much of an aftermarket. So no matter how virtuously you toss your chip bags and shampoo bottles into your blue bin, few of them will escape the landfill—only 3 to 5 percent of plastics are recycled in any way. (1 paragraph) Therefore, unlike recycling glass, metal, or paper, recycling plastic doesn't always result in less use of virgin material.

critique paper. When asked why he simply did not copy those sentences given that they were his own, he responded: "Some of the words [in the summary paper] are not very proper for a *real* academic paper. Like a difference between "find" [written in the summary paper] and "discover" [written in the critique paper]. Discover makes me look more smart maybe, more formal."

The two quotes and the quote combination in Example 9 also merit discussion. Chaoren was clearly selective when deciding which information from the original text he should and should not include in his paper. As can be seen from the comparison of his critique paper excerpt and the original article excerpt, he did not simply copy the quote from Casey. Instead, he made an appropriate stylistic choice to simplify the original sentence, first by omitting the detailed information about the specific recyclable plastics (PET and HDPE) and later by leaving out the exact percentage of plastics mentioned at

the end of the original paragraph from which he selected the quote. Chaoren relied on simplification when producing the combination. Instead of enumerating the other materials to which Casey compared the plastics in the original sentence, Chaoren was able to, rather ingeniously, connect the quote part of the combination to his own content captured in the first part of the sentence.

The section of Chaoren's critique paper is a testament to his ability to read critically, modify sentence structure and words adequately, and support his writing with information from outside texts effectively. However, an analysis of his inclusion of quotes and quote combination also reveals two problematic areas in Chaoren's textual borrowing. First, his simplification of the first quote leads Chaoren to make a grammatical error. Second, the fact that Chaoren fails to attribute any of the textual borrowing strategies in this paragraph to the author of the article, makes it obscure for the reader to understand whose ideas are expressed in the presented quotes and quote combinations. Both of these concerns are connected to the issues related to integration discussed later in this chapter.

Chaoren was disappointed with the grade (B) and the feedback he received for his critique paper. He reported: "Basically my professor told me that I made this critique review more like a contribution paper. That I put too much of my own stuff in instead of the writer's stuff." Chaoren's professor also suggested that he work "more carefully with detail." Chaoren's professor's feedback also included comments on textual borrowing; similar to the example in the table, Chaoren's professor commented on a part of his text in which Chaoren failed to attribute the ideas clearly. Chaoren said he understood his professor's comments, but he raised objections about the instruction in the course leading

up to this assignment:

> It's the first bigger paper I wrote for that class and that it was really abstract, really vague, and the teacher didn't give out any guidelines or instructions and I haven't read that much critical analyses so I didn't know the format of the paper, what to write. I thought it was just to express the idea of the author or the book. So, it was just not sufficient instruction.

However, despite the lower grade, Chaoren was optimistic about his next assignment in the class, saying he was going to do whatever it takes to "ace it."

Contribution paper (Honors 3200)

Following the summary and the critique papers, which were designed to help prepare students for the final assignment, students in Honors 3200 were asked to write a *contribution paper*. Chaoren recollected the guidelines given by the professor in the class in these words:

> Now you guys have learned that there are so many problems in the world, so now you need to address the solutions. Think about the solution side of things instead of the problem side. Everyone knows the problems, so think about the solutions. Apply your knowledge.

The analysis of textual borrowing strategies in Chaoren's first draft of the contribution paper corroborated his statement that he "[had] something to say." Of the total 112 sentences, 63 sentences represented his original thoughts and evaluations, untraceable to the sources he used during the writing process. What further underlined his desire to "make it [his] stuff" was the use of the personal pronouns "I" and "we," which he utilized five and six times respectively in his paper. However, as Chaoren's quote below shows, he was hesitant to use the personal pronouns in his academic writing, echoing his concern about credibility, emphasized in the ESL course.

> The teacher told us to express our ideas. He said it's your contribution so say it. But, generally I think I would rather avoid using I. Because in the

paper you are just stating a fact not your personal feeling so using too many "I"s can be confusing and inconvincible maybe.

However, standing in contrast to Chaoren's endeavor to use his own voice extensively is the fact that this particular paper also contains the highest number of near copies—seven—in all of his writing (6%), and even one instance of an unquoted reproduction (1%). Of the more conventional textual borrowing strategies Chaoren produced: paraphrase (19, 17%), summary (15, 13%), combination (six, 5%), and quote (twp, 2%). Of the total sentences based on the outside sources, 10 were explicitly attributed (20%) and only one sentence failed to reflect the meaning of the original source (2%) (see Table 14.)

Given that Chaoren was the most successful and most confident of the three L2 writers in this study, it was somewhat surprising that he used an unattributed unquoted reproduction and several unattributed near copies in this paper, which made his writing problematic from the standpoint of general discussions of plagiarism. Chaoren's opening paragraph to the paper, captured in Example 10, demonstrates his less conventional textual borrowing in this paper. The paragraph contains the following textual borrowing strategies: near copies (Sentences 2, 6, 10, and 12), summaries (Sentences 3 and 11), paraphrases (Sentence 5, 7) and a combination (Sentence 4). For the purpose of the demonstration, all words in Chaoren's text that appear in the original text have been bolded.

After his opening original sentence, Chaoren writes a near-copy (Sentence 2). The content in the near copy has come from two original paragraphs and has been structurally rearranged even though the words remained the same. In the process of modifying the structure of the original, Chaoren has made a mistake in the preposition phrase "the

Example 10

Chaoren's text	Original Source
(1) We have no place to hide from being poisoned by plastics. (2) On **August 3rd, 1997**, Captain Moore sailed **through the eastern corner north Pacific subtropical gyre, a 10-milion-square-mile oval** in the Pacific Ocean. (3) Surprisingly, he discovered an area filled with all kinds of plastic junk. (4) **A line of plastic bags "ghosting the surface."** (5) **Nets, ropes, bottles, oil jugs, bath toys, tires and even traffic cones** were floating lazily and freely. (6) **The trail of plastic** junk **went on for hundreds of miles**. (7) This is the area in North Pacific Ocean now **referred to as the "Eastern Garbage Patch"** by **scientists**. (8) All of these plastics, disposed by the human society, gathered here through rivers, winds and other media. (9) Moreover, these plastics cause severe consequences. (10) Each year, **more than a million seabirds, 100,000 marine mammals and countless fish die in the North Pacific, either from mistakenly eating** these plastics **or from being** trapped **in** them **and drowning.** (11) What was worse, the amount of plastic junk in this area is growing each year since they cannot be decomposed in a short term if not at all. (12) **Together these areas cover 40 percent of the sea** on this planet.	It happened on August 3, 1997… (5 sentences) He had the time and the curiosity to try a new route, one that would lead the vessel through the eastern corner of a 10-million-square-mile oval known as the North Pacific subtropical gyre. (10 sentences) It began with a line of plastic bags ghosting the surface, followed by an ugly tangle of junk: nets and ropes and bottles, motor-oil jugs and cracked bath toys, a mangled tarp. Tires. A traffic cone. (8 sentences) As Alguita glided through the area that scientists now refer to as the "Eastern Garbage Patch," Moore realized that the trail of plastic went on for hundreds of miles. (32 sentences) More than a million seabirds, 100,000 marine mammals, and countless fish die in the North Pacific each year, either from mistakenly eating this junk or from being ensnared in it and drowning. (87 sentences) Together, these areas cover 40 percent of the sea.

eastern corner of." Following the near copy, Chaoren summarizes an original paragraph describing Captain Moore's discovery in Sentence 3. Next, Chaoren writes a combination that consists of a near copy and a quote. Although at first sight it appears that Chaoren made a mistake by failing to include a verb in this sentence, it is possible that he was attempting to mirror the style of the original article, which uses enumeration of nouns rather than complete sentences.

Sentence 5, coded as a paraphrase, merits a more detailed discussion. Like the original, it provides a list of the different articles of garbage. However, unlike Casey (2007), Chaoren includes all the items in one sentence rather than in several sentences

and simplifies some of the phrases. Chaoren's discussion of this particular paraphrase suggests his sensitivity to the stylistic choices made by the author of the original text as well as his understanding of the purpose of the text he was producing:

> This author, she saw the real scene so she knows what's going on there. I'm trying to construct the image in the paper, but, I haven't looked at the real scene except for watching TV. I think she is putting these words (tires, a traffic cone) as separate sentences, because if you see the nets, ropes, jugs, bath toys, those kinds of things you may not be surprised because they are really common—you may not be too surprised to find these in the ocean. But tires and traffic cones, they are not supposed to be there in the scene, in the ocean. So, it's kind of like, make it more surprising, shocking and emphasize…. It feels for me like she is saying "look what you have done to the ocean." Makes it more powerful.

In addition to simplifying the sentence structure in the paraphrase, Chaoren simplified some of the compound nouns (e.g., oil jugs instead of motor oil jugs, bath toys instead of cracked bath toys). He explained that he did this because, "building an image [was] not the main purpose of [his] paper so [he didn't] care if they [bath toys] were cracked." It appears that because Chaoren was aware of the "powerfulness" of the original wording, he was reluctant to change the enumerated items more extensively.

Chaoren's Sentences 6 and 7 come from one sentence in the original. Chaoren split the original content into two sentences, changing the order of the two ideas. Sentence 6 is a near copy as all but one word come from the original source. Sentence 7 is a paraphrase despite the quoted phrase "Eastern Garbage Patch.[23]" Sentences 8 and 9 are Chaoren's original sentences. Sentence 10 is a near copy, featuring an added beginning and several synonym substitutions. Sentence 11 is a summary. Finally, the closing sentence is a near copy.

---

[23] In instances where a word or a phrase is surrounded by quotation marks in the original, a sentence has not been coded as a combination.

When asked about his less conventional textual borrowing in this paper compared to his previous papers, Chaoren appeared somewhat defensive, claiming that he changed his wording between the draft and the final paper: "I'm sure I changed it. I would never have used this many [original] words." Chaoren's genuine disbelief about the unconventional nature of textual borrowing captured in Example 10 may imply an atypical lapse in his concentration during the production of this paper. It is, after all, the only paper in which he produced an unquoted reproduction and more than one near copy.[24]

Mid-term paper in an urban planning course

Of the classes he was taking during the semester in which this dissertation study was conducted, Chaoren appeared to have put the most effort in the People and Place course (URBPL 3101). Specifically, Chaoren placed particular importance on the mid-term paper, which he entitled "An Unpopular Place." The paper was described in the syllabus as "a short essay in which you will reflect on how the themes and methods contained in the course readings to date apply or are illustrated in our study neighborhood." The length was specified as three to five pages and grading was said to be based on the "content (i.e., the degree to which your essay integrates various components of course content) (2/3); style, grammar, and professional quality (1/3)." Students were expected to use MLA style.

As with other written assignments Chaoren produced, the mid-term paper he wrote for URBPL 3101 depended on outside texts to a considerably lesser extent than the

---

[24] Chaoren's professor did not notice the level of unconventional textual borrowing in Chaoren's paper. He provided him with positive feedback and A as a final grade for the paper.

writing of the other two L2 writers in this case study. Only six (12%) of the sentences written in the first draft were traceable to an outside source. Of these six source-based sentences, four (68%) were explicitly attributed. (See Table 15.)

Although only a small number of sentences were traceable to the five outside sources that Chaoren referenced at the end of the paper,[25] his draft included many concepts discussed in lectures and the textbook. In other words, because the assignment required that students apply their knowledge of concepts to an analysis of a specific place in the community, the connections between the concepts and outside sources, which tended to discuss general principles rather than specific places, were only vaguely apparent. Because of his growing background knowledge in the field of Urban Planning and the nature of the assignment, the writing that Chaoren produced appeared more as his own internalization of the course content than any other assignment he wrote during this study. Example 11 provides a representative illustration of Chaoren's approach to writing of this assignment. While the second and fourth sentences are paraphrases of a specific outside text, the remainder of the sentences is untraceable to the sources Chaoren used. In particular, the sentences following the second paraphrase reflect Chaoren's ownership of the content. Instead of reluctantly dispersing his voice in form of evaluative sentences that minimally complement ideas in the outside sources, as is common in novice academic writers, the assignment allowed Chaoren to apply and extend his knowledge of the content.

Subsequent to his writing of the first draft, Chaoren received feedback on this paper from his father, most of which he implemented. Unlike with the contribution paper,

---

[25] Chaoren did not include references at the end of the first draft although he did include notes in red font, indicating the need for footnotes.

he did not have sufficient time to request feedback from his professor prior to the official deadline for submission. Missing this opportunity, however, did not appear to affect the outcome of this assignment for Chaoren. He received full points on both the content and form of the paper, an A in the assignment, and an enthusiastic comment from his professor written at the end of the paper: "A very nice essay. Bravo!" With regard to textual borrowing, the instructor commented on Chaoren's use of quote by Kunstler at the beginning of his essay. She wrote: "This is one of my favorite quotes!" The instructor did not appear to be concerned with Chaoren's more problematic use of sources.

ESL argument paper

The final assignment in the ESL 1060 course, and one of the final assignments in the semester during which I worked with Chaoren, was an argument paper. Unlike with the previous two papers, Deena did not provide students with an assignment sheet, but her PowerPoint slides included the following information about the paper:

> For this paper, you will argue a stance on the topic you have developed in your previous two papers. It is important to note that argumentation is not simply talking about an issue; an effective argument includes convincing support (from your research) and careful consideration of other positions or sides of the issue. Your assignment is to write a four to five-page paper in which you argue a position on your topic. In addition, you will need to use and correctly cite at least 4 sources. ALL sources must be credible.

Similar to his other assignments, Chaoren's first draft of the argument paper did not overly depend on outside sources. As Table 16 shows, of 46 sentences, only nine (20%) were traceable to the specific sources Chaoren used. Of the nine sentences, six (7%) were unattributed and three (3%) attributed. None of Chaoren's sentences was unsupported.

Example 11

Original Source	Chaoren's text
"The third place is a generic designation for a great variety of public places that host the regular, voluntary, informal, and happily anticipated gatherings of individuals beyond the realms of home and work" (p. 146). In the absence of an informal public life, Americans are denied those means of relieving stress that serve other cultures so effectively." (p. 143)	The first effect brought by the border vacuum is the lack of third places1[26]. Third places are places not being used as residential or working functions. They are anchors for generating informal public life.1 People in modern life need third places to release pressure and stress imposed on them. The missing of third places cannot only make nowhere for people to gather and socialize with each other, but also makes a place unpopular. In the study area, the only place that can generate public life along the 500West Street is the Northgate Leasing Center of the residential apartments.

Example 12 presents two textual borrowing strategies from Chaoren's paper: an attributed near copy and an attributed summary, separated by Chaoren's original sentence. The content of the near copy is distinguished from the original by including an additional phrase "by itself" early in the sentence and a relative clause at its end ("which relates largely to cars"). The summary sentence effectively relays content of a larger section in Chaoren's textbook without retaining excessive original wording.

Three issues related to textual borrowing in Chaoren's ESL argument paper merit discussion. First, Chaoren's belief in the importance of using his own voice in academic writing was yet again echoed in an interview about this paper. He said: "Well, actually, I

---

[26] While this is where Chaoren originally placed the footnote marker, he revised it in a later draft by moving it at the end of the following sentence, thus capturing the source origination more appropriately.

can't fully agree with what Deena told us about the structure of the argument paper. She said we should use a lot of references, but for me, an argument paper is not to present other's ideas, it's about my ideas. So, I just used three references." Clearly, Chaoren continues to foreground the importance of his own voice, his original contribution. Like with his other papers, his statement implies that he has not yet learned effectively how to bring his and others' ideas to a coherent whole.

Second, Chaoren reused several sources which he had drawn upon in papers written for other courses. For example, as the summary sentence in Example 12 shows, he referenced Jacobs (1993) whom he previously cited in the mid-term paper produced in the Urban Planning course. Chaoren explained: "Urban planning is very broad major so if you read one book there is going to be an economy issue, a social issue, and cultural issue so you can quote them in any paper as a resource or reference." He also cited Gore (2007), whom he did not review in the process of writing the argument paper, but whose documentary *The Inconvenient Truth* he had seen previously. When asked to comment on his use of sources in this paper, he said: "I know where to find those references. Like the

Example 12

> **Original Source:** New York State currently spends about $15 billion annually in public funds and direct user charges to operate, maintain and improve transportation.
>
> **Chaoren's text:** New York State by itself currently spends about $15 billion annually in public funds and direct user charges to operate, maintain and improve transportation, which relates largely to cars [inserted foot note symbol]. The total money spent on and for cars each year is almost uncountable in the U.S. as a whole. On the other hand, the highways and bridges built for cars create some empty spaces around them referred as Border Vacuums by Jane Jacobs, [inserted foot note symbol] one of the greatest urban planners in the 20th century.

part that talks about the negative influences on cars I know the reference—like I can check out Al Gore's book. And for the effect on economy it's still credible because I can see some statistics and just argue." This approach to source-based writing suggests Chaoren's internalization of knowledge and his ability to extend this knowledge to new contexts. (See discussion on elaboration in an earlier section on Chaoren's composing strategies.)

While such extension of knowledge is generally considered favorably by academics, copying and pasting of exact wordings across assignments is often not. The analysis of Chaoren's draft of the ESL argument paper revealed that he did just that: he reused two texts he had previously written for other classes in a word-for-word fashion. Specifically, he included in his ESL argument paper two sentences about plastics that he originally produced in the Honors Writing course. He also reused a large portion of a text he originally produced in a course from the previous semester. Chaoren addressed this issue during the interview without being prompted to comment on it: "I just copied and pasted it and changed the order a little bit. But, it's not simple copying and pasting—I have those ideas." An analysis of Chaoren's draft revealed that he implemented this "copy and paste" strategy in his introductory paragraph as well as his second and third body paragraphs, which constituted about a third of the argument paper draft. This practice stands in direct opposition to Chaoren's production of the critique paper written for the Honors Writing course, in which he made considerable changes to his wording when reusing parts of his preceding summary paper in his critique paper.

It is possible that in the eyes of many academics, Chaoren's decision to reuse a paper written for another course is questionable, even inappropriate. However, for others,

Chaoren's behavior is defensible on account of the extent of his modification and integration of the reused parts of the paper. After all, Chaoren had to produce 12 papers during the semester, many of which required multiple drafts. In order to succeed, he had to make strategic decisions such as reusing his work and background knowledge and prioritizing his effort in the different courses he was taking. While acknowledging some value of the ESL course, Chaoren was not prepared to work as hard on the ESL papers as he did when producing writing which he found more meaningful for himself as a student, an urban planning major, and a person. The following quote captures the difference in his attitude:

> I'm not saying that ESL papers are not important, I'm just not interested in those sorts of topics. But, for the contribution and the urban planning paper, it's like I'm doing something to the world. Like, the contribution paper I actually made some solutions [sic] and the urban planning paper I actually researched and made some solutions [sic] to that area. So, I'm thinking, I'm feeling like I'm doing something to the world. Not just writing in vain.

Summary and discussion of Chaoren's writing from sources

Like Aiko, Chaoren was able to avoid direct copying of large passages in his writing. Of the five discussed papers, only one paper included an unquoted reproduction (1 sentence) and three papers included near-copies (7 sentences). Even when producing these unconventional textual borrowing strategies, Chaoren did not simply copy and paste continuous parts of an outside text. Rather, he was able to synthesize information from different sections within a text and across texts, even if, in a few instances, he retained a larger number of the original words.

With regard to attribution, it appears that Chaoren continued to struggle with delineating the different voices in his writing. On one hand, he understood the importance

of giving credit when accounting for other people's ideas. On the other, he intuitively knew that it is not appropriate to use explicit markers of attribution in every sentence: "It's her essay so I can't just get rid of her totally, I did my best to, you know, make it like my stuff, but sometimes I cannot avoid to mention her." This quote expresses the tension inherent in Chaoren's belief that his writing must be both academic and, at the same time, original—a difficulty that has been demonstrated in research on L2 writers (e.g., Spack, 2004). The quote also seems to imply a flaw in Chaoren's understanding of source integration; rather than viewing the integration of authors' and his ideas as desirable, Chaoren appears to be working toward "getting rid of" or "avoiding" the original author. This tendency, at times, interrupts the academic flow of his writing. For example, instead of using a commonly used signal construction (e.g., the author+ state/suggest), he writes "this experience introduced by Casey leads the essay to the discussion of…" Clearly, Chaoren is not yet aware that some aspects that are key to successful writing from sources are relatively stable and not conducive to creative self-expression.

Chaoren's struggle with accounting for different voices in his academic writing has been fueled by his desire to matter. As the analysis of interview data showed, the meaning making is at the core of Chaoren's writing-related endeavors. Throughout the study, Chaoren was driven to contribute ideas to the body of knowledge developed by published authors. He viewed the lack of one's own originality in writing as offensive as plagiarism itself:

> Plagiarism is not giving the original author credit. And also, you cannot and you should not cite like a certain percentage. A certain proportion of your paper needs to be your idea even if you give the author credit. If you copy and paste the whole paper, even if you give the author credit, then

> what's the point? So, it's just trying to avoid..., to use the author as a source to support your idea, it's not about expressing the idea again for the whole paper. That just doesn't make sense.

This attitude stands in sharp contrast to that of writers who extensively follow ideas or sequences of ideas from published texts.

In respect to strategy use, Chaoren was able to draw on a variety of reading and writing strategies such as brainstorming, skimming and detailed reading, highlighting, underlining, and summarizing parts of texts, and taking notes. Unlike Aiko who was unable to adapt her strategies, Chaoren strategically altered his strategy use depending on an assignment or resource upon which his writing was based (e.g., he uses sticky notes instead of highlighting in order to resell a textbook). Throughout his writing he used strategies in ways that allowed him to avoid digressions. For example, instead of slowing down to complete in-text citations, he marked areas of his text where attribution or referencing needed to be further improved and he returned to these areas later in the revision stages of his writing.

Chaoren's effective use of cognitive strategies such as elaboration and inferencing and his multistage approach to reading and writing resembles the case of Pablo, a graduate L2 writer documented in Connor and Kramer (1995) (described also in Chapter 2). Like Pablo, Chaoren approaches the task of reading and later writing with a clear rhetorical purpose in mind and throughout the process interprets the text and makes connections to his own ideas and other readings.

Junmo

During the semester when he participated in this dissertation research project, Junmo was taking 12, instead of his usual 18 credits. After failing several courses the previous semester, Junmo shared with me his renewed commitment to academic success. His goal was to "focus on studying and not some extra activities" and get As in all the courses he was taking. Of the courses in which Junmo was enrolled, two required source-based, academic writing: ESL 1060 and Principles for Biology (BIO 1210). After I discuss Junmo's general composing strategies, I will examine his textual borrowing in three papers. Two of these papers (rhetorical analysis and report paper) were assigned in the ESL 1060 course and one in the Principles for Biology course (a summary paper).

Composing strategies in Junmo's writing from sources

Like Aiko, Junmo began his research process with a broad topic. For example, in the case of his report paper, Junmo initially planned to write about global warming. However, Deena advised him against it. Junmo recollected: "She said that it's going to be too broad for me because there are so many topics about global warming so she suggested that I do certain area. Like there is a climate change in certain area so I could research about the area a little bit more." Unsure about what "area" he was interested in researching, he decided to simply "read what's out there" and decide on a subtopic as he encountered a specific concept or issue that he would like to examine more closely.

In order to find an appropriate subtopic, Junmo relied on Google. For about two hours, he engaged in what Nelson (1993) referred to as a fast "fact-finding mission." To illustrate, Junmo would enter a general phrase like 'global warming' and open top

recommended entries displayed by the Google search engine. At times, he only read the title or the title and the first sentence and at other times Junmo read over a full paragraph. He expressed frustration during this process, complaining that most sources he was finding "[were] not really good because they have a lot of pictures but not a lot of text." The sites he referred to were those targeting young audience (e.g., http://epa.gov/climatechange/kids/gw.html), some of which he included in his paper. When asked why he preferred the easily accessible online resources over scholarly databases, Junmo commented: "I don't do as much research as I'm supposed to do because I can come up with a lot of ideas without researching." This observation was inconsistent with the analysis of his writing, which revealed close reliance on outside texts and a limited inclusion of his own ideas or commentary.

After the initial search, Junmo decided to examine negative effects of global warming on polar bears, centering his paper around four identified sources, one of which included Wikipedia. Junmo kept track of these main sources by copying the selected web links into a Word document. Like Aiko, Junmo tended to draw information primarily from the first part of his articles. In the case of one of his sources, he only read the abstract. In the case of the report paper, he did not print copies of sources nor did he utilize the note taking cognitive strategy. Instead, he simply started typing his paper, frequently stopping to return to the sources he had selected to re-read information or check for facts.

Like Aiko, Junmo did not seem as adept to use elaboration cognitive composing strategy—he did not appear as readily available to see connections between new ideas from different sources he was reading or links between the new ideas and those he had

learned previously. For example, in an argument paper written for his ESL class he chose to argue against global warming despite agreeing with readings in his biology class that viewed climate change as a real crisis. He acknowledged his difficulty with keeping track of ideas from different readings and his ability to make important connections: "It is difficult for me to put ideas together from the researches [sic] that I did because they are lot of similar resources."

Junmo only employed his first language on several occasions as he looked up translations for unknown vocabulary, using an online dictionary. Like Chaoren, he did not write down the English equivalents. Similarly, he said that he did not rely on his knowledge of writing in the first language as he was producing his papers.

With respect to metacognitive strategies, Junmo did not explicitly engage in assigning goals although it appeared that he had realistic expectations as to his ability to draft a paper. This was evident when he waited until a day prior to the deadline to produce a draft of the report paper. Junmo planned as he wrote, relying on a mental rather than written outline. For example, if, during his checking of sources he encountered an idea which he wanted to use in his paper, but not in the paragraph he was writing at the time, he typed it in the lower section of the Word document as a topic sentence beginning a new paragraph. Junmo did not appear to use, at least not explicitly, the metacognitive strategy entitled "rationalizing appropriate formats." Also implicit if at all existent was his use of monitoring and evaluation—on occasion he reread his writing as he was producing it, but not to the extent Chaoren or Aiko did. He explained his lack of focus on monitoring and evaluation in his first drafts: "When I write the first draft I don't really pay attention because you know it's going to get edited and be reviewed by someone

else." Junmo added that he employed this metacognitive strategy later on, following feedback from his peers and/or the instructor.

Relying on peer and instructor feedback were Junmo's main social composing strategies, which he saw as only marginally beneficial. He was particularly skeptical about the value of peer review:

> We were supposed to correct some grammar mistakes and put comments on the paper, but a lot of students are not really like…. They participate, but they don't really don't know what to do how to correct because they don't really know if it's correct or not so….It's better to get comments from the instructor.

However, while Junmo did not value peer review from the perspective of the social composing strategy, which allowed him to receive feedback on his work, he appreciated it from the standpoint of a search composing strategy—he liked that it allowed him to see examples of others' writing: "It's good to do peer review because we can see other examples and get ideas." He also evaluated positively the availability of the model argument paper distributed by the instructor. Additionally, he utilized the search strategy entitled "using guidelines." For example, as he was producing his report and argument papers, he studied Deena's PowerPoint presentations, which contained information about these genres. He also claimed to consider the rubric in the early stages of his writing process.

While on average, Junmo spent about three to five hours producing the first draft of his ESL papers, in an early interview Junmo claimed to spend longer time writing his summary papers for the Biology course. He described how he approached these assignments:

> I look through, skim through [the articles]. This helps me figure out what it's talking about, what the main point is. I kinda write down the main

idea. After that I sit down and read very carefully, the details." But, since it's a scientific article it's kinda hard to understand at once so I kinda read over and over until I understand.

He added that because the articles included a lot of terminology, he was unable to understand them completely even after reading them four or five times. He said: "They have so many scientific words and terms, so I usually copy some words from the article when I write the paper." When asked to clarify what he meant by "copying," he explained: "I write how scientists came up with those ideas, how they are going through them in the article. I kinda copy those processes. Then I write some of my ideas at the end."

While it is possible that Junmo indeed read and re-read his sources "four or five times" when he was producing the first two summary articles, he only spent about 55 minutes reading the article on which his third summary paper was going to be based. Junmo first skimmed the article, and then read it one time, occasionally looking up vocabulary. At times he appeared to reread portions of the text. Once he completed the reading, he wrote a one-page summary, which took him less than an hour.

In summary, Junmo was not a particularly adept user of composing strategies. However, unlike Aiko, he was able to not let his ineffective use of strategies affect his writing. This is largely because he avoided long and challenging texts and instead based his writing on shorter and less lexically dense sources. Clearly, this practice undermines his instructor's central message in the ESL 1060 course—that of the importance of credibility in selecting sources for source-based assignments. Junmo's decision not to engage in identifying and reading more academic or 'credible' sources was a result of his belief that he was able to "come up with a lot of ideas without researching."

Textual borrowing strategies in Junmo's writing from sources

Rhetorical analysis paper

The first assignment, which required Junmo to use an outside source in his writing, was a two to three-page rhetorical analysis paper, also referred to by the instructor as "textual analysis," assigned in ESL 1060. According to the assignment guidelines handed out in the class, students were expected to analyze "a text's rhetorical situation by paying particular attention to how a writer thinks about things like purpose, audience and stance." Students were encouraged to "make a claim and support it with evidence from the text." The text upon which the textual analysis paper was based was "Buy me! Buy me!" (Molnar and Reaves, 2001). On the assignment sheet, the instructor further emphasized:

> You are not analyzing or critiquing the issue, but rather the author's presentation of the controversy. In other words, the focus of this paper is not just **what** Molnar says, but **how** and **why** he says it.
>
> **Paper format**: 1 inch margins; 12 pt. font; 2-3 pgs.; double spaced; appropriate paraphrasing, quoting, and citations!!!

The rhetorical analysis paper assignment was accompanied with an assessment rubric and a set of three deadlines. Among the seven main assessment constructs specified on the rubric was "citation." In order to receive full points on citation, student papers were expected to "be absent of plagiarism, mention an author's name throughout, and include an appropriate end of text citation." With respect to the deadlines, students were first expected to submit a draft of the paper to the instructor who provided them with feedback. After incorporating the instructor's feedback, students brought their revised papers to a peer-review session. Following the peer review, students revised their papers one final time and submitted their final draft to the instructor for final evaluation.

Junmo struggled with understanding how to write this paper despite the fact that was present at all the lectures, engaged in the in-class activities, including a peer-review session. Junmo's main concern in the early stages of producing the draft was that he was writing a "summary about the paper" instead of "analyzing authors' stance and purpose." Analysis of Junmo's draft and later the instructor's feedback indeed confirmed that he produced a summary rather than an analysis of the reading, a mistake documented in novice academic writers (e.g. Higgins, 1993; Walvoord and McCarthy 1990).

Only two sentences in Junmo's draft of the textual analysis paper were original and included content that could not be linked to the original article. The remainder of sentences in the paper was based on the source. With respect to specific textual borrowing strategies, Junmo primarily replied upon paraphrases (10, 50%), followed by quote combinations (three, 15%), summaries (two, 10%), and quotes (two, 10%). Of the 17 textual borrowing strategies, 12 (71%) were attributed and one (6%) was unsupported. (See Table 17.)

Several aspects of Junmo's textual borrowing merit discussion. Despite the frequently documented tendency of L2 writers to rely on direct or near copies, none of Junmo's sentences were coded as unquoted reproductions or near copies. Only two sentences contained phrases with three or more words consecutively following the original. However, in neither instance the number of borrowed words exceeded 50% of the overall words in the sentence, which qualified these sentences as paraphrases rather than near copies (See the discussion on coding in Chapter 3). To illustrate, the example paraphrase (Example 13) includes five words (in bold) taken directly from the original source. However, few would argue that supplementing these particular term-like content

Example 13

> Original text: Corporations pay for or subsidize school events, activities, or scholarships in return for the right to associate their names with a good cause and to increase brand recognition in important market segments. Unfortunately, corporations also target classrooms, playgrounds, or athletic fields to tap captive, impressionable audiences.
>
> Junmo's text: Also, recently Molnar and Reaves found that corporations not only aim for the students who need money, but also **classrooms, playgrounds, or athletic fields** to interest students who get impressed easily.

words (or the word "corporations" mentioned earlier in the paraphrase) with synonyms would improve the sentence. In fact, doing so would most likely negatively impact Junmo's academic discourse. (See the discussion about Aiko's use of the synonym "homophile" examined earlier in this chapter.)

Different choices that Junmo made in the production of the paraphrase in Example 13 portray him as a skilled user of English. For example, he was able to abstract content from two sentences in the source. Some may argue that in so doing Junmo reduced the content to too great of an extent. However, given that most of the first part of his paper concentrated on two students who benefited from the involvement of corporations by receiving scholarships, his choice to comment only on students (rather than also on school events and activities) is justified. The examination of further lexical choices in Junmo's paraphrase reveals relatively effective rephrases of the verb "target" to "aim" and of the phrase "to tap captive impressionable audiences" to "to interest students who get impressed easily." Junmo's success in and ease with rephrasing implies that his academic vocabulary is extensive. The only questionable lexical choice in this paraphrase is Junmo's decision to include the temporal adverb "recently" since this

adverb has no semantic equivalent in the original article. However, despite this exception, the example paraphrase portrays Junmo as a relatively advanced writer, able to handle complex grammatical sentences and make effective lexical and discourse choices in his textual borrowing.

An analysis of Junmo's draft uncovered several bolded phrases in his paper that explicitly referred to the original article (e.g., Authors (2001) claimed…, Molnar and Reaves (2001) found that….) Junmo explained that he did it because he "thought [the instructor's] citation instruction [Deena] taught was like this." In other words, because Deena bolded the different ways of explicitly referring to a source in her PowerPoint presentation during the instruction, Junmo assumed that the bolding of these phrases was expected in this paper[27]. Interestingly, it was not the instructor's feedback, but a comment written on Junmo's draft during peer review ("I don't think you should bold here") that made him realize that bolding the attributive phrases was unnecessary.

Similar to Aiko and Chaoren, Junmo met the assessment criteria for "citation" defined in the rubric—his draft of the rhetorical analysis paper was "absent of plagiarism, mention[ed] author's name throughout, and include[d] an appropriate end of text citation." He received 80% on his first draft of his paper, 96% on his final draft of the paper, and an A- as a grade for the overall assignment. Junmo was disappointed with his score on the first draft, but satisfied with his eventual, final grade.

When asked about his experience with this paper and specifically with his difficulty to borrow from sources, Junmo provided a conflicting reflection. Immediately after the second draft of the paper he reported that it is "easy to summarize an article and

---

[27] Aiko also bolded attributive phrases in the first draft of her textual analysis paper.

talk about main points, but it's actually really hard to demonstrate the author's stance and purpose because you can't just say "this is author's point" and write it down, but you have to show examples." However, in a later interview he said: "it's easy to figure out the author's attitude[28], but it's hard to express his or her ideas in our own words. That is still really hard." Despite the contradictory assertions from the interviews, Junmo did not seem to struggle with the assignment on the level of basic rephrasing. As the analysis of his textual borrowing suggested, he was able to avoid direct copying from the original article. What appears to have played a role in Junmo's difficulty with this assignment was his understanding of the purpose of the rhetorical analysis paper. Although he sensed that he was not "on the right track," he was uncertain as to what to do to meet the instructor's expectations. As he put it, he "just [didn't] know how to put it all together, the authors' stance and the examples and everything." This quote suggests that Junmo, like Aiko and Choaren, struggled with finding the balance between his own voice and the voice of the authors' of the article he was expected to analyze. In fact, only two of his sentences (both in his conclusion paragraph) were original and not directly traceable to the source he was using.

Report paper[29]

Although he claimed not to have experience with "research writing", Junmo felt more positive about writing the report paper than the rhetorical analysis paper; he found the genre to be more relevant to his experience as a biology major: "we research more and write research paper about lot of stuff in biology." Also, he displayed more

---

[28] The word "attitude" was used to explain what "stance" meant during the instruction.
[29] For details about this assignment, see section on Aiko's textual borrowing strategies in the first draft of the report paper earlier in this chapter

confidence, having earned a good grade in the previous assignment.

The most frequently employed textual borrowing strategies in Junmo's first draft of the report paper were paraphrases (13, 31%), followed by nine summaries (21.4%), three near copies (7.2%), three quotations (7.2%), and three quote combinations (7.2%). As with the previous textual analysis paper, he did not write any unquoted reproductions. Unlike in the previous paper, Junmo explicitly attributed paraphrases less often – only three of the 13 paraphrased sentences were credited to an original source. The total number of attributed textual borrowing strategies was 12 (36%). (See Table 18.) One (3%) textual borrowing strategy was unsupported.

Compared to the textual analysis paper, which included only two phrases with three consecutively copied words, Junmo's report paper contained considerably more (12) three (or more) word strings copied from a source. Of the copied phrases, many consisted of collocations such as *the earth's average temperature*, *climate change models*, *survive as a species*, *contact with the preferred habitats*, and *green house emissions***.** Others lent themselves to a relatively easy rephrasing (e.g., *it causes the changes in climate, have drowned and starved to death, energy to swim or walk, face extinction by the end of the century*). While the inclusion of several strings of words, copied directly from a source may not be acceptable to many writing instructors, it is worth to mention that eight of the 12 above-mentioned phrases (67%) were attributed to a source. Thus, it seems that Junmo did not use directly copied phrases with the purpose of passing these as his own. Rather, Junmo felt unable rephrase these phrases adequately: "I just couldn't think of good synonyms. So, I probably kept some words, but I mentioned the author and I didn't just copy or paste or anything like that."

Junmo's summarizing also merits discussion. All eight sentences coded as summaries were in the conclusion of Junmo's paper. None was attributed to sources and several were highly reminiscent of sentences already written in the previous parts of the paper—practice often promoted in writing classes, which ask students to restate main points in the conclusion. Junmo explained his lack of attribution: "I didn't want to repeat the sources. The reader already knows about articles I was using..., this is just summary of what I've already said." This tendency to include unattributed summary sentences in the conclusion was also evident in Aiko's writing.

Junmo's use of quoting highlighted his difficulty with source integration as is evidenced in example 14. This example provides a long quote which, in Junmo's draft, span across eight lines, comprising almost a half of his introductory paragraph. The quote focuses on the acceleration of earth's warming and includes excessive details such as the exact names of greenhouse gasses, thus obscuring the relationship between these ideas and Junmo's focus on polar bears.

Example 14

One of the most essential factors that warm the earth is human activities. According to the National Academy of Sciences, "the Earth's surface temperature has risen by about 1 degree Fahrenheit in the past century, with accelerated warming during the past two decades. There is new and stronger evidence that most of the warming over the last 50 years is attributable to human activities. Human activities have altered the chemical composition of the atmosphere through the buildup of greenhouse gases–primarily carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide. The heat-trapping property of these gases is undisputed although uncertainties exist about exactly how earth's climate responds to them". Human activities will eventually affect all the organisms on earth, including human beings, as a result of destroying ecosystem. One of the animals that are affected by climate change in ecosystem is polar bear.

Somewhat surprisingly, Junmo actually managed to maintain some cohesion, largely thanks to the repetition of the word "ecosystem" in two sentences following the quote. However, few writing instructors would view this source integration as desirable academic practice.

In addition to problematic source integration, analysis of Junmo's draft also revealed his problems with attribution. Example 15 consists of two consecutive sentences from Junmo's text. Sentence 1 is a combination sentence and Sentence 2 a paraphrase of two sentences consecutively following each other in the mentioned source. However, Junmo's use of the phrase "in other words" makes Sentence 2 appear not as an unattributed paraphrase of another source, but Junmo's rephrase of Sentence 1. When asked about this example, Junmo commented: "Deena said we should use this [phrase] because it helps us make clear what we want to say. So I used it to explain more about that quote." Junmo did not appear to be aware of the fact that the phrase is more frequently used to introduce one's original interpretations or ideas rather than a paraphrase from another source.

Example 16 from Junmo's report paper underscores another problem with his use of attribution—attributive cohesion. While both of the sentences below come from the same source, the reader of this text is unlikely to interpret the attribution this way. This is because the referent in the second sentence (Authors in "Polar Bears in a Warming Climate") does not connect to the authors attributed in the parentheses of the previous sentence. The lack of cohesion between the two devices for signaling explicit attribution could be remedied if a determiner "these" was used in the second sentence (as in "these authors…."). Junmo's text suggests that while he is aware of the importance of explicit

attribution, he is not attuned to the more nuanced aspects related to attributive cohesion.

Finally, what may seem particularly concerning with respect to textual borrowing is Junmo's tendency to follow the sequence of ideas from a reading. As Example 17 shows, with the exception of Junmo's original sentence (Sentence 4), ideas captured in Junmo's text follow the exact sequence of the source. Clearly, Junmo makes an effort to use synonyms and modify the sentence structure, but he does not see it as problematic that his whole paragraphs mirrors unattributed ideas from another text. According to the policy of the University at which Junmo was studying, such close following of ideas is termed as plagiarism[30]. However, Junmo clearly did not perceive it as such: "Maybe I should mention the source, but I don't think it had an author and I did put global warming in quotation marks. So, you know, the instructor knows that I used an article here." This quote reflects the lack of focus on addressing the close following of ideas in ESL 1060.

Example 15

> For example, "the U.S. must enact strong legislation" ("Polar Bears and Global Warming" in National Wildlife Federation.) In other words, some legal laws should be passed to reduce the amount of green house emissions that contributes global warming.

Example 16

> Also, they will be no longer able to survive as a species when sea ice eventually disappears as it's predicted. (Derocher & Lunn & Stirling, 2004.) Authors in "Polar Bears in a Warming Climate" said when sea ice gets thin it becomes more "fractured and labile" and therefore, it will be easy to move in response of winds and currents.

---

[30] Plagiarism includes, but is not limited to, representing as one's own, without attribution, any other individual's words, phrasing, ideas, sequence of ideas, information or any other mode or content of expression. http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-400.html Fix reference!!!

Example 17

> **Original text**: Global Warming: Global warming refers to an average increase in the Earth's temperature, which in turn causes changes in climate. A warmer Earth may lead to changes in rainfall patterns, a rise in sea level, and a wide range of impacts on plants, wildlife, and humans. When scientists talk about the issue of climate change, their concern is about global warming caused by human activities. (from http://epa.gov/climatechange/kids/gw.html)
>
> **Junmo's text**: 1) "Global Warming" is the term describing a gradual rise of the earth's average temperature. 2) As the earth gets warmer, it causes the changes in climate. 3) It is a significant issue because it affects everyday lives such as; the places to live, food to eat, and how the organisms propagate on their environments. 4) Not only the organisms but also the nature will face a few severe changes: sea level rises, rainfall patterns change, and so on. 5) One of the most essential factors that warm the earth is human activities.

The previous example also illustrates Junmo's ambivalence toward the Western concept of giving credit. Junmo did not consider it important to attribute this source because, as he put it, "there was no author in this article and so since I changed words and structure and stuff, I didn't think it was so important…" In another instance in which he was not sure who the author was, Junmo simply "picked one from the names on top of the webpage before the article". Both of these examples point to the lack of emphasis on this concept during the instruction in ESL 1060.

Despite of the many discussed problems with textual borrowing, Junmo received 90 % on the first draft of his report paper and a total score of 94 %, with which he was quite content. He said he "learned a lot about how to cite" in the process of this assignment although the analysis of textual borrowing in his argument paper revealed that his problems with writing from sources persisted in Junmo's writing.

Summary paper for principles of biology

The Principles of Biology course[31], which Junmo described as a "general biology class that covers all the knowledge in biology," required students to produce summaries of five articles throughout the semester. After summarizing each article, students were to pose five questions about it. Junmo chose articles from the WebCT database provided by two teaching assistants responsible for evaluating these summary assignments. When asked about the assessment of these summary papers and their role in the course overall, Junmo said that each article was worth five points, downplaying the importance of this assignment: "TAs grade [the summary paper], but I don't think they read over the whole thing. We just get points as long as we just turn it in. I get full points all the time, besides this one time last semester when I lost one point for citation." Junmo explained that the reason behind his grade being lowered was that he forgot to include an end of the text reference to the summarized source: "I guess I just didn't pay enough attention. But, I was surprised a little…. I don't know why they had to be so strict about it, because they know which article I was summarizing." Junmo's quote suggests perplexity over the prevalence of the Western concept of giving credit where credit is due, an issue mentioned only briefly in the ESL 1060 course.

With respect to specific textual borrowing strategies, Junmo again relied heavily on his source, which is not surprising given that he was producing a summary paper. As Table 19 shows, of the total 19 sentences, 16 were based on outside sources. Five were near copies (26%), four were paraphrases (21%), four quote combinations (21%), and

---

[31] This course fulfills the "physical/life science exploration" requirement. The course description is as follows: "Introduces the workings of life from the molecular to the ecosystem level. Topics include genetics, development, ecological interrelationships, evolution, physiology and behavior. A preparatory course intended for all life and health science students" (http://www.acs.utah.edu/GenCatalog/1104/crsdesc/biol.html#1210).

three summaries (16%). Of the textual borrowing strategies only three were explicitly attributed (19%). The meaning in one paraphrase was not supported (6%).

Given that this paper was produced for his major course, one would expect that Junmo considered this assignment to be more high-stakes than his ESL papers and consequently that he was more conscientious about his textual borrowing. However, as the analysis revealed, Junmo's paper included more near copies than his ESL papers—five sentences (26%) were coded as near copies, but many more sentences coded as "paraphrases" included three-or-more word strings[32] directly copied from the original article without adequate attribution. An interview with Junmo revealed that he was strategizing his effort once he realized that his raters were not focusing on the quality of students' textual borrowing: "It's not like I mean to cheat or anything. I didn't plagiarize, but maybe I wasn't so careful, you know, like in the ESL class where Deena is checking how we do this." Indeed, Junmo's use of near copies went unnoticed by the teaching assistants and he received full points for this assignment. Example 18 demonstrates Junmo's use of near copy as a textual borrowing strategy. Bolded words are those directly copied from the original.

Example 18

> **Original text:** Thus, the vultures' fate may be linked with that of millions of people; saving the vultures from extinction would protect people from dangerous disease.
>
> **Junmo's text: Saving** animals and nature **from extinction would protect people from dangerous disease.**

---

[32] In total, Junmo's summary included 13 three or more, directly copied, word strings.

Unlike his use of near copies, Junmo's use of explicit attribution was limited and not entirely purposeful. The three instances of explicit attribution in Junmo's paper, may, in fact, have simply been copied rather than conscientiously included. As Examples 19 and 20 demonstrate, Junmo did not explicitly attributed ideas to the author of the article he was summarizing, but rather, to an author (in Example 19) and entity (in Example 20) mentioned in the article. In other words, Junmo utilized secondary citation without making explicit that it was secondary, never attributing the original summary source. Junmo's failure to attribute the original source stands in contrast to summarizing practices of L1 writers who have been shown to attribute primary sources in more explicit ways (Moore, 1997, Tomaš, 2006)

Example 19

> **Original text**: "In 1988 Norman Myers of the University of Oxford developed the idea of biodiversity hot spots, small areas that harbor a great variety of endemic, or native and geographically restricted, plant species." (Kareiva and Marvie, 2007, p. 17)
>
> **Junmo's text:** As a part of plan that protects ecosystem, **Norman Myers of the University of Oxford** came up with **the idea of biodiversity** called "**hot spots**." Hot spots are small areas that protect a great variety of endemic or geographically restricted plan species.

Example 20

> **Original text**: "A year later an international team of more than 1,300 scientists undertook one of ecology's most ambitious endeavors: the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment." (Kareiva and Marvie, 2007, p. 16)
> **Junmo's text**: As another effort to protect nature and get attention of people, scientists took responsibility of **one of ecology's most** passionate **endeavors: the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment.**

Finally, Junmo's summary paper reflected mixed success with incorporating source ideas with his own. Junmo produced three original sentences and one original phrase with which he introduced a quote. One of the three original sentences concluded the paper while the other two came in the first paragraph. The purpose of all three sentences was to further highlight the importance of the discussed issue. While unnecessary repetitive, perhaps even redundant, Junmo's integration of his own voice in Sentences 2 and 3 (Example 21) with the voices of Kareiva and Marvie (2007) in the surrounding sentences was relatively successful. However, later in his paper when introducing a quote, Junmo struggled with blending his own voice with the other voice of the original author. As Sentence 2 in Example 22 shows, Junmo draws upon the introductory phrase "There is a quote of" and a colon following the quote. The ineffectiveness of this integration is further underscored by the lack of connection to the content expressed in the preceding sentence.

Example 21

1) It is hard to **see** an intimate relationship **between human well-being and aiding endangered species**. 2) People actually don't realize how important that is. 3) However, in fact, it is significantly important to understand this. 4) For example, **wetlands and mangrove stands** to **protect people from lethal storms**. 5) **Forests and coral reefs** support **food and income**.

Example 22

1) Besides, these ideas, conservationists have been put great effort to inspire people to participate and give funds to protect animals and nature. 2) There is a quote of Nobel Peace Prize winner: "Our fight against poverty, inequality and disease is directly linked to the health of the earth itself."

<u>Summary and discussion of Junmo's writing from sources</u>

Analysis of Junmo's writing from sources suggests Junmo's general ability to avoid prototypical plagiarism despite several problems related to textual borrowing. For example, he frequently retained strings of original words and his attribution of used outside sources was at times problematic. When he did use explicit attribution, he struggled to make it transparent and coherent. Additionally, Junmo's tendency to closely follow ideas from sources, though not excessive, could be labeled as ideational plagiarism.

As was seen in the discussion of Junmo's composing strategies, he frequently employed ineffective search strategies, failed to make use of social strategies, and underused cognitive and metacognitive strategies. Despite these shortcomings, Junmo managed to succeed in his courses with respect to writing from sources. Arguably, this was primarily due to his ability to strategize. Unlike Aiko, Junmo never overwhelmed himself with difficult sources. Instead, he relied on short, accessible, albeit not particularly credible, online sources. Although he often followed sequences of ideas from these sources, he always made sure that he modified his sentences sufficiently so as to avoid being accused of plagiarism as he understood it (in terms of words rather than ideas). In his biology courses, he recognized early on that the sentence-level textual borrowing fell outside the focus of his evaluators.

<div align="center"><u>Discussion</u></div>

The most desired manifestation of the three L2 writers' implementation of instruction lies in their ability to avoid blatant plagiarism. Contrary to frequent accounts

in the literature, none of the three L2 writers in this study copied extensively when writing from sources, which suggests that they were able to achieve this important objective in the ESL 1060 course and apply it in their non-ESL written assignments. Consistent with the received instruction, these writers used paraphrasing and summarizing as their main textual borrowing strategies. In so doing, they generally followed the instructor's main recommendations: they changed the original words and modified the original structure.

One particularly interesting finding was that despite a general tendency to employ paraphrasing and summarizing as their main textual borrowing strategies, the three L2 writers' textual borrowing was inconsistent across assignments. In other words, these writers varied their textual borrowing strategies depending on the context within which they wrote. Some of the specific factors that appeared to influence their textual borrowing were 1) the assigned genre, 2) the instructor to whom they planned to submit their writing, and 3) the difficulty of sources used. For example, Chaoren used fewer textual borrowing strategies in his argument and contribution papers than his summary and report papers, claiming that these genres required more of his own voice and less reliance on others' ideas. Junmo varied his near copying depending on whether he was writing for his ESL instructor (who he knew was going to pay attention to this area) or for the teaching assistants evaluating his biology summary papers (who he knew were not going to "care"). Aiko's textual borrowing appeared more stable in terms of the types of textual borrowing strategies across her two main assignments. However, the extent to which the content in these strategies matched the content of the original readings differed, seemingly depending on the difficulty level of the individual sources—the more difficult

the articles upon which she was drawing, the less likely she was to preserve the original meaning. The uncovered intra-writer variation appears to complicate the developmental view of textual borrowing, which claims that writers with low level of English language proficiency will employ more unquoted reproductions and near copies while writers with higher level of proficiency will rely on more conventional textual borrowing strategies. Further research is needed to examine how various social factors influence L2 writers' writing from sources.

While the three L2 writers avoided copying and pasting of large portions of outside sources into their drafts and more often than not succeeded at the level of basic rephrasing, they exhibited considerable difficulty with some of the more nuanced aspects of textual borrowing that were either not addressed in the course or addressed only marginally. For example, all three writers struggled with transparency of attribution as they frequently assigned ideas to wrong sources (e.g., secondary sources cited in the sources they were using). Aiko and Junmo often produced writing that lacked in what I refer to as attributive cohesion. Example 16 described earlier in this chapter demonstrates this particular problem with attribution. It is unclear whether these writers' difficulty with attribution is a result of the lack of emphasis on appropriate credit giving in Deena's course or their own strategic decision to save time by not identifying and consulting primary sources. When alerted to problems with attribution during interviews, the three writers appeared unaware of this issue on one occasion and fully cognizant of it on another.

Another area of struggle pertinent to textual borrowing, especially for Aiko and Junmo, lay in synthesizing multiple sources. Junmo frequently complained about "putting

it all together" and Aiko's feedback on her writing often included comments pointing to her inability to show connectedness between her ideas. Both of these writers tended to follow a point-by-point summary of different sources rather than synthesizing main issues or themes across readings. Reasons for these writers' lack of synthesis were not entirely clear. In Aiko's case, the likely factors in her failure to synthesize were her tendency to select sources with insufficient thematic overlap, her ineffective use of composing strategies such as outlining or elaboration, and her general reading difficulty. In the case of Junmo, it may have been the insufficient time spent on the assignments, the selection of too many short, disconnected online sources, or a lack of employed cognitive composing strategies during the planning and production stages of his source-based assignments.

Related to synthesis is the issue of source integration—in fact, successful synthesis of reading material may be a prerequisite for effective integration of such material with one's own ideas. As has been suggested in the literature (e.g., Spack, 2004), novice L2 academic writers have difficulty understanding how their writing can be based on outside sources on one hand and yet be original on the other. Aiko and Junmo tended to base their writing overly on the sources which they used at the cost of including their own ideas. Their reluctance to foreground their voice and experience stood in sharp contrast to Chaoren's belief in originality. It appeared as if Chaoren worked from the opposite side of the spectrum—while Junmo and Aiko struggled to see how they could integrate their own voices with those of the published authors, Chaoren appeared to be in search of ways to "get rid of" the authors and put forth his own ideas and opinions. None of the three L2 writers viewed source-based writing as a dialogue among writers,

including themselves.

Instruction targeting better use of composing strategies could have aided these L2 writers struggling with the above problems related to writing from sources. However, with the exception of social strategies (e.g., opportunities for peer feedback) and minimal search strategies (e.g., provision of assignment guidelines), Deena's instruction did not provide L2 writers with opportunities to expand their strategic competence. Even when important strategies were at play during class exercises, Deena never articulated or modeled them. Only in one instance did she make explicit a particular cognitive strategy (index card note taking) which she found helpful as a writer. However, a brief description of the strategy without modeling or opportunities for practice did not inspire the three L2 writers to implement it.

To summarize the findings relevant to the research question in the center of this chapter, the instruction received in ESL 1060 did appear to play a role in L2 writers' writing from sources. As was shown throughout this chapter, the three L2 writers were able to avoid blatant plagiarism by applying the rephrasing rules emphasized by the instructor in their textual borrowing strategies. To varied degrees, their textual borrowing practices and opinions were influenced by Deena's frequently discussed concept of credibility. Concepts that remained unaddressed in the course (e.g., issues of selection of appropriate sources, transparency in attribution, effective synthesis of readings, source integrations, and effective composing strategies relevant to writing from sources) were ultimately those that the three L2 writers struggled with the most as they produced source-based assignments. Further discussion of the uncovered problems with textual

borrowing and the options writing instructors have for helping L2 writers improve in these important areas will be addressed in the next chapter.

Table 10. Aiko's textual borrowing in the report paper

	Number	Percent of total sentences	Number of explicitly attributed textual borrowing strategies	Percent of total sentences based on sources	Number of unsupported textual borrowing strategies	Percent of total sentences based on sources
Quote	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Unquoted reproduction	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Quote combination	2	7%	2	8%	0	0%
Near copy	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Paraphrase	19	66%	11	46%	12	50%
Summary	5	10%	1	4%	1	4%
TOTAL	**26/29**	**83%**	**14**	**58%**	**13**	**54%**

Table 11. Aiko's textual borrowing in the linguistics research paper

	Number	Percent of total sentences	Number of explicitly attributed textual borrowing strategies	Percent of total sentences based on sources	Number of unsupported textual borrowing strategies	Percent of total sentences based on sources
Quote	2	6%	2	7%	0	0%
Unquoted reproduction	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Quote combination	9	26%	7	23%	2	7%
Near copy	2	6%	1	3%	1	3%
Paraphrase	14	40%	4	13%	4	13%
Summary	3	8%	2	7%	0	0%
TOTAL	**30/35**	**86%**	**16**	**54%**	**7**	**23%**

Table 12. Chaoren's textual borrowing in the summary paper

	Number	Percent of total sentences	Number of explicitly attributed textual borrowing strategies	Percent of total sentences based on sources	Number of unsupported textual borrowing strategies	Percent of total sentences based on sources
Quote	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Unquoted reproduction	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Quote combination	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Near copy	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Paraphrase	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Summary	12	71%	6	50%	0	0%
TOTAL	**12/17**	**71%**	**6**	**50%**	**0**	0%

Table 13. Chaoren's textual borrowing in the critique paper

	Number	Percent of total sentences	Number of explicitly attributed textual borrowing strategies	Percent of total sentences	Number of unsupported textual borrowing strategies	Percent of total sentences
Quote	3	8%	1	8.3%	0	0%
Unquoted reproduction	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Quote combination	2	5%	1	8.3%	0	0%
Near copy	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Paraphrase	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%
Summary	6	15%	4	33.3%	0	0%
TOTAL	**12/38**	**31%**	**6**	**50%**	**0**	0%

Table 14. Chaoren's textual borrowing in the contribution paper

	Number	Percent of total sentences	Number of explicitly attributed textual borrowing strategies	Percent of total sentences based on sources	Number of unsupported textual borrowing strategies	Percent of total sentences based on sources
Quote	2	2%	2	4%	0	0%
Unquoted reproduction	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%
Quote combination	6	5%	4	8%	0	0%
Near copy	7	6%	3	6%	0	0%
Paraphrase	19	17%	1	2%	0	0%
Summary	15	13%	0	0%	1	2%
TOTAL	**50/113**	**44%**	**10**	**20%**	**1**	**2%**

Table 15. Chaoren's textual borrowing in the urban planning paper

	Number	Percent of total sentences	Number of explicitly attributed textual borrowing strategies	Percent of total sentences based on sources	Number of unsupported textual borrowing strategies	Percent of total sentences based on sources
Quote	1	2%	1	17%	0	0%
Unquoted reproduction	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Quote combination	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Near copy	1	2%	1	17%	0	0%
Paraphrase	3	6%	1	17%	0	0%
Summary	1	2%	1	17%	0	0%
TOTAL	**6/49**	**12%**	**4**	**68%**	**0**	**0%**

Table 16. Chaoren's textual borrowing in the ESL paper

	Number	Percent of total sentences	Number of explicitly attributed textual borrowing strategies	Percent of total sentences based on sources	Number of unsupported textual borrowing strategies	Percent of total sentences based on sources
Quote	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Unquoted reproduction	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Quote combination	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Near copy	1	3%	1	1%	0	0%
Paraphrase	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Summary	8	17%	2	2%	0	0%
TOTAL	**9/46**	**20%**	**3**	**3%**	**0**	0%

Table 17: Junmo's textual borrowing strategies in the rhetorical analysis paper

	Number	Percent of total sentences	Number of explicitly attributed textual borrowing strategies	Percent of total sentences based on sources	Number of unsupported textual borrowing strategies	Percent of total sentences based on sources
Quote	2	10%	2	12%	0	0%
Unquoted reproduction	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Quote combination	3	15%	2	12%	0	0%
Near copy	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Paraphrase	10	50%	7	41%	1	6%
Summary	2	10%	1	6%	0	0%
TOTAL	**17/20**	**85%**	**12**	**71%**	**1**	**6%**

Table 18. Junmo's textual borrowing in the report paper

	Number	Percent of total sentences	Number of explicitly attributed textual borrowing strategies	Percent of total sentences based on sources	Number of unsupported textual borrowing strategies	Percent of total sentences based on sources
Quote	5	12%	5	15%	0	0%
Unquoted reproduction	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
Quote combination	3	7.2%	2	6%	0	0%
Near copy	3	7.2%	2	6%	0	0%
Paraphrase	13	31%	3	9%	1	3%
Summary	9	21.4%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL	**33/42**	**79%**	**12**	**36%**	**1**	**3%**

Table 19: Junmo's textual borrowing in the biology summary paper

	Number	Percent of total sentences	Number of explicitly attributed textual borrowing strategies	Percent of total textual borrowing sentences	Number of unsupported textual borrowing strategies	Percent of total textual borrowing sentences
Quote	0	0	0	0%	0	0%
Unquoted reproduction	0	0	0	0%	0	0%
Quote combination	4	21%	2	13%	0	0%
Near copy	5	26%	0	0%	0	0%
Paraphrase	4	21%	1	6%	1	6%
Summary	3	16%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL	**16/19**	**84%**	**3**	**19%**	**1**	**6%**

CHAPTER 6

EXPLORING THE PEDAGOGY ON TEXTUAL BORROWING

The research discussed in the previous two chapters yields nine important findings relevant to instruction on plagiarism and textual borrowing and L2 writers' implementation of this instruction in their writing from sources. (See Table 20 for summary of these findings.) This chapter briefly re-visits the findings, exploring their academic and pedagogical relevance. In other words, I ask, how do these findings further our understanding of the learning and teaching of textual borrowing to L2 writers? I also discuss what these findings may mean in the contexts of L2 writing teacher preparation and institutional support for faculty across the curriculum who are involved in teaching L2 learners. Throughout the chapter, I explore various pedagogical options for instruction on plagiarism and textual borrowing, which I believe is of particular interest to L2 writing instructors and scholars who work in similar contexts and/or wish examine these research questions. (See the discussion of transferability in Chapter 3.) The chapter concludes with a proposed framework for instructional support aimed at L2 writers learning to write from sources.

Exploring the findings: Focus on pedagogical options for the

instruction on textual borrowing

Functions of textual borrowing

In her instruction (see Chapter 4), Deena highlighted several rhetorical purposes for using sources, such as being perceived as more credible, avoiding blame for potentially wrongful information, and avoiding punitive consequences of inappropriate textual borrowing. By presenting her students with a series of real-life scenarios, she was able to engage her students in an important discussion of the rhetorical purposes of writers whose textual borrowing practices have been publically questioned. What was missing in Deena's instruction, however, was a discussion of the textual borrowing functions (e.g., developing a new perspective from the source information). In fact, by presenting paraphrasing and summarizing in terms of straightforward, function-less rephrasing of original words, Deena may have obscured the functions of textual borrowing to her students. The tendency to omit or oversimplify textual borrowing functions is not uncommon in the field of writing pedagogy. For example, as Harwood (2004) points out, published instructional materials dealing with the avoidance of plagiarism focus on "how citation is used, rather than what it is for" (p. 86). Familiarizing L2 writers with the different functions of textual borrowing is imperative in increasing their understanding of textual borrowing.

To do so, writing instructors can draw on the work of several L2 writing scholars (e.g., Berkenkotter and Huckin, 1995; Swales, 1990, 2004; Yamada, 2003). In his work on research genres, Swales (1990, 2004) comments that writers (in the early parts of their papers) use sources to "establish a territory" (Swales, 1990, p. 141). Berkenkotter and

Huckin (1995) add another function of textual borrowing—making one's work more valuable and meaningful to the readers. Yamada (2003) points out that writers' textual borrowing may also function to support their authorial voice, develop a new perspective from the source information, draw attention to the writers' own reality, or highlight important aspects of source information.

Deena frequently missed opportunities to address the functions of textual borrowing strategies in her instruction. For example, in one of the review lessons, Deena asked her students what the difference between paraphrasing and summarizing was, with a student volunteering the following answer: "summarizing lends itself to stories and long sources." Instead of further elaborating on the functions of each of the two textual borrowing strategies, the instructor simply responded:

> So are you starting to see that each of these ways has its own reason? You always want to think which one [paraphrasing, quoting, or summarizing] is the most useful and appropriate for your writing.

It is unclear whether Deena assumed that students indeed knew the "reasons" for different textual borrowing strategies, whether her knowledge was too tacit for her to formulate a response in class, or whether she was simply unaware of the functional differences of textual borrowing strategies. What is clear is that the three L2 writers in the study struggled with understanding the textual borrowing functions beyond the concept of credibility. This was evident in these writers' frequent misuse of and confusion about secondary sources (especially in the cases of Aiko and Junmo) and in the tension between using their own ideas and those of others (in the case of Chaoren).

Some may argue that the afore-mentioned functions of textual borrowing are beyond the grasp of novice undergraduate writers. As Casanave (2004) correctly points

out, writers need many years of meaningful participation in academic writing to develop complex writing skills. However, if these important assumptions about the functions of textual borrowing are left completely unaddressed in academic writing courses, they may well remain unaddressed during L2 writers' academic careers. I believe that writing instructors have the responsibility to introduce their learners to this issue in the expository writing courses even if complete mastery of textural borrowing functions may not be the most important goal.

Arguably, the best way to demonstrate textual borrowing functions to L2 writers is by examining student and published examples. In addition to discussing sample papers, writing instructors could engage L2 writers in analytical tasks that would require them to consider how different published authors use the same source. L2 writers could also be challenged to alter their textual borrowing strategies depending on particular contextual factors. For example, they could be asked to paraphrase a source in the context of an information genre (e.g., report paper) and in the context of a persuasive genre (e.g., argument paper) and discuss how and why their textual borrowing may differ. Such activities have a potential to help attune students to the functions by showing that real writers' textual borrowing is not a meaningless reuse of others' words.

Guidance on source selection

The three L2 writers encountered varied expectations for locating appropriate sources in their courses, especially their mainstream courses. Chaoren was typically given sources from which he was expected to draw in his writing; Junmo was given an option to either identify a source that he wanted to summarize or use one of the sources

from the compiled database, and Aiko was expected to select her own sources in most of her mainstream courses. In instances when the writers had to select their own sources, such as when preparing to write their ESL papers, they generally only engaged in this process briefly—each of the three writers took between 20 and 60 minutes locating the source(s) which they wanted to use in their writing.

Aiko and Chaoren favored the electronic scholarly databases as they searched for appropriate sources, echoing Deena's emphasis on credibility in their interviews. On the contrary, Junmo relied exclusively on the general Internet search-engines (e.g., Google) in his search, frequently employing questionable electronic sources such as biased websites and websites directed toward young audiences. Additionally, Junmo used Wikipedia as one of his primary sources rather than as a tool for building background knowledge as Chaoren and Aiko did.

Even though Aiko showed awareness of the importance of credibility in selecting her sources, she struggled at this stage of the writing process in other ways. First, she often selected sources with little thematic overlap, which likely contributed to her difficulty with making her writing coherent. Second, most of the sources she selected were so lexically dense that she was unable to complete them and frequently misinterpreted them in her writing. Her copying strategy was to rely only on the abstract and the first part of the article (i.e., the literature review) and this process led to problems with meaning preservation and attribution transparency.

Deena's focus on credibility appeared to be understood and accepted by two of the three L2 writers. However, even though she was relatively successful in communicating the importance of credibility as a criterion for source selection, she failed

to guide her students through the process and to offer practice in finding credible sources and feedback on students' success in so doing. If Deena had devoted more time to helping students maximize the source selection process, she may have been able to address issues that affect credibility, such as the time spent on locating sources, the selection of unfocused sources, and selecting linguistically difficult sources.

In order to address some of the problems with source selection, instructors like Deena can draw on two specific pedagogical activities. First, in order to provide students with an opportunity to practice selecting sources that lend themselves to a focused exploration, an instructor could present her students with a large number of articles that deal with a general, overarching topic but include several subtopics. Students could then try to categorize these sources into appropriate groups, and possibly identify a topic worth pursuing based on their selection. This pedagogical activity helps students realize that careful source selection is key in identifying sources that lend themselves to a focused examination.

Going beyond this kind of a consciousness raising activity, students could give brief oral reports on the main sources they identify. In these brief reports students could share with their classmates what the main ideas of the different sources are, how they build upon one another and the student's own ideas, and how they plan to use them in their writing. Requiring students to reflect on their source selection process is critical in L2 writing instruction in that reflection forces L2 writers to read critically and plan writing early—conditions that are generally agreed to help writers avoid plagiarism. Additionally, such informal presentations are useful for the instructor because they serve as tools for diagnosing potential problems. In other words, instead of waiting to read a

paper to realize students' difficulty with source selection, the instructor could identify potential problems in advance and in time for an effective pedagogical intervention.

Some L2 writers may be able to select sources appropriate for exploration of multiple subtopics; yet, they are unsure on which of the subtopics they can focus. In such instances two activities described by Anderson (1993) may assist these writers. "Focused freewriting" (p. 143) engages writers in freewriting while forcing them to focus on specific ideas in the texts that they have read. A "gut reactions" (p. 152) activity asks students to identify a particular sentence in the source or sources about which they felt strongly regardless of whether these feelings were positive or negative. Subsequently, students work with peers explaining the reasons for their choices, with the hope that these discussions can inspire ideas for focusing student papers.

The key role that source selection plays in the whole research process is conveyed well in Nelson (1995) who says that "a large portion of critical work required to produce a research paper often takes place during the search process, rather than during the writing process (p. 103)." Activities such as those described above have the potential to help students like Aiko and Junmo to identify appropriate sources, which, in turn, can help facilitate the remainder of the source-based assignment production.

Broader scope of instruction on textual borrowing

strategies and contextual factors

As the analyses described in Chapter 5 showed, the three selected L2 writers employed a large variety of textual borrowing strategies when they produced source-based assignments. These strategies included not only paraphrases, summaries, and

quotes but also near copies, combinations, and unquoted reproductions. They were attributed and nonattributed and their meaning supported and unsupported. However, the course instructor only addressed paraphrases, summaries, and quotes in her course, which is not uncommon among writing instructors. Even more limiting was Deena's instruction on attribution and support. Such a narrow scope of instruction on textual borrowing may be a result of drawing upon existing instructional materials, that, almost exclusively, promote the traditional triadic model (paraphrasing, summarizing, and quoting) (Tomaš, 2010). Another reason for not addressing a more complete range of textual borrowing strategies may be that writing instructors view near-copies and unquoted reproductions as inappropriate and hence, unworthy of instruction.

Additionally, the three L2 writers in this study have been shown to use textual borrowing strategies inconsistently. In other words, their textual borrowing depended on the assignment that they were completing, or, perhaps, the instructor to whom they were submitting the assignment. To illustrate, Chaoren used fewer sources in his ESL argument paper than in all his other papers, likely sensing that argumentation required more original ideas than the earlier report paper and perhaps also that Deena was satisfied enough with his work during the semester to have secured a good grade. Junmo used considerably more near copies in his biology summaries than in his ESL papers. He too demonstrated that this decision was largely strategic when he suggested that the teaching assistants in biology who graded these assignments were not as "interested" in his use of sources as Deena was. Aiko was more consistent with respect to the amount of attribution and direct copying across different assignments, but one of her examined papers included considerably more unsupported textual borrowing strategies than the other, suggesting

lower reading comprehension of the sources used. This finding appears to complicate the developmental view of textual borrowing which suggests that novice L2 writers draw extensively on near copying while more advanced L2 writers are able to steer away from this textual borrowing practice (Corbeil, 2000; Johns and Mayes, 1990; Shi, 2004). It does not appear that language proficiency and academic expertise alone determine the nature of textual borrowing in L2 writers' texts. The context within which they write also shapes their writing from sources.

Given the uncovered context-driven variations in the three L2 writers' textual borrowing, instructors may need to consider including in their teaching discussions the varied uses of textual borrowing strategies across assignments and genres. In her instruction, Deena addressed this issue on only one occasion. When a student asked whether there was a "limit [as to] how many paraphrases and quotes [one should] use," Deena responded: "It depends on what kind of paper you write. For example, in a report paper you should use lots of sources….But, for example, if you write an argument you may want to use your own voice more." A more in-depth examination of contextual factors that play a role in writers' decisions to borrow from texts could greatly benefit academic writers.

Given that the three L2 writers employed more than the three frequently discussed textual borrowing strategies (i.e., paraphrasing, summarizing, and quoting) and that their use depended on contextual factors such as specific instructors and assignments, it is important to address the additional strategies and their genre- and discipline-based variations. A particularly effective pedagogical approach to helping students expand the use of textual borrowing is to analyze source-based samples of L2 writing in class. As

was evidenced in this study, the three L2 writers wished that Deena had implemented student example analyses in her class, viewing this activity as particularly useful for their learning of textual borrowing. L2 writing instructors should consider asking their students for permission to use samples of their writing anonymously in future courses. Cross-disciplinary comparisons of textual borrowing practices may also inform writers about textual borrowing. (See discussion later in this chapter.)

<div align="center">Practice in organizing and integrating information</div>

<div align="center">from sources in discourse</div>

As was demonstrated in Aiko's and Junmo's writing, novice writers frequently write in a point-by-point fashion, at times retaining sequences of ideas in published sources (often considered as plagiarism). In order to help writers avoid this practice, writing instructors may need to provide opportunities for practice in organizing and integrating sources. An example organizing activity would ask students to create graphic representations of texts designed to help writers synthesize sources they plan to use in their papers. Students could do this first step individually, but they should also have the opportunity to compare their graphic organizers to those of their classmates' and/or receive instructor feedback on the effectiveness of these organizers. For students who favor outlining to organizing graphically, writing instructors could assign a similar task in which writers integrate their sources into the ideas presented in the outline.

With improved skills in organizing information from sources around issues rather than in a point-by-point manner, L2 writers may be better positioned to integrate their sources within their own ideas. In order to help them in the process, instructors can

explore source integration practice activities such as a "Paraphrase Integration Task" described in Tomaš (2011). This activity bridges student writers' understanding and practice of basic rephrasing rules on the one hand and their writing of authentic source-based academic assignments on the other. This task is more challenging than rephrasing at the level of single sentences but less complex than the fully authentic task, which requires the use of multiple sources in an academic essay. The task asks that students consider an academic essay, an excerpt from an essay, or an excerpt from a source that includes support for the essay writer's ideas. Writers are then asked to identify and incorporate information from this source into the essay. In addition to providing practice in source integration, the value of this approach for practicing textual borrowing is that it resembles a real-life use of sources—students have to weave together the voice of a writer and the voice of a published author. Additionally, it fosters critical thinking skills as L2 writers first match the source-based evidence with a corresponding idea in an academic paper and later evaluate the effectiveness of another writer's paraphrase integrations.

To further help L2 writers in developing their own voice, writing instructors can ask students to keep a reading log, also referred to as a "reading reaction journal" (1993) in which they record "questions, comments regarding the relevance or importance of the reading material, or emotional reactions to it (p. 140)." This reading-writing activity appears particularly valuable as it encourages writers to view source-based texts as dialogues between themselves and other authors. Adamson recommends that writing instructors comment on the recorded notes or ask students to discuss them during collaborative class activities.

Finally, as recommended for other identified areas of difficulty in L2 writers' textual borrowing, instructors could employ analyses of examples in order to help students examine source integration in authentic contexts. For instance, using different colored markers, writers could be asked to identify the many different voices in an example and then discuss the rhetorical purposes of the original writers' use of citations. It needs to be pointed out that the discussion is a key element of this activity—without it, students may not enjoy the full potential of the task, which is an in-depth exploration of voice and authority and their roles in the Western academic discourse.

<div align="center">Cognitive modeling in the instruction</div>

<div align="center">on textual borrowing</div>

In addition to the above-mentioned need for *text modeling*, which means modeling achieved through the analysis of examples, writing instructors interested in supporting their students' writing from sources should consider implementing *cognitive modeling* in their teaching (Cumming, 1995). In the field of L2 writing composition studies, cognitive modeling engages students in expert-like thinking processes important in successful academic writing "so that students can become aware of, and can practice, the complex mental activities that characterize expert composing" (Cumming, 1995, p. 383). Cognitive modeling is frequently omitted from writing classes and Deena's course was no exception; Deena modeled neither the composing nor the textual borrowing strategies for her students and instead relied solely on building her students' declarative knowledge. For example, when teaching guidelines and steps for summarizing, Deena

simply read four steps from her PowerPoint slide[33], without modeling how she, as an expert writer, would implement these steps in summarizing a source. With respect to composing strategies, she instructed her students about the index card strategy, briefly explaining what it was and why students should use it. Unsurprisingly, none of the three L2 writers incorporated this strategy into their writing process.

To model behaviors and strategies important for effective writing from sources, instructors can implement the kinds of tasks that mirror the source-based assignments required of their students. Specifically, writing instructors can lead L2 writers through such tasks by using a "think aloud" protocol (Devey, 1983) that consists of the instructor articulating the strategies and behaviors in which he or she is engaging during demonstrated source-based writing. Depending on students' needs, this procedure can be applied to the source selection stage, the reading stages, or the actual production of source-based writing. The goal of a think aloud protocol is to make explicit the tacit processes inherent in source use. This protocol provides an opportunity to articulate to students, in the context an authentic academic task, the steps and composing strategies necessary in effective writing from sources. The pedagogical objective in using this protocol is that by articulating the processes, students will gain insights into the practices of experts, which may assist them in incorporating some of these practices in their own reading and writing.

It is important to point out that modeling does not, and should not, have to be unidirectional. Following the teacher-led modeling, L2 writers can engage in modeling too. For example, a student can lead the think-aloud modeling with the teacher, and later,

---

[33] These steps were as follows: 1) "identify the thesis", 2) "identify main points and key support", 3) "toss out the words and details", and 4)"state the essential ideas in [their] own words."

students can be asked to model the process for each other, employing the think-aloud procedure (Casazza, 1993; Cumming, 1995). When students are not directly engaged in modeling, such as during the initial teacher-led modeling sessions or teacher-student sessions, they should be actively involved in the observations of the modeling process (e.g., by taking notes).

Cognitive modeling can be applied to a variety of steps and strategies relevant to textual borrowing. Of course, instructors may need to be strategic by breaking down the modeling sessions and targeting subsets of steps and strategies in each session. For example, instructors may choose to center early modeling sessions around the steps and strategies necessary for successful source selection. Later sessions could be centered around source reading, organization, and source-based writing production (including source-integration) with final modeling sessions centered around revising. Cognitive modeling can also involve prompting writers to think aloud about their writing during composing (Cumming, 1986).

It is widely accepted that writers equipped with composing strategies are believed to be more successful as writers (Olshavsky, 1977; Walwoord and McCarthy, 1990). The reason why modeling is considered key in the acquisition of strategies is because "strategies are best taught when instructors model expert processes directly" (Harris (1983) as cited in Higgins, 1993). Arguably, this is because modeling allows writers to internalize strategies and, as Greene (1993) suggests, helps them understand "the circumstances under which one might use these strategies to best effect" (Greene, 1993, p. 44). Even though the three interviewed writers did not indicate that modeling of the strategies would be helpful in their writing from sources (probably because they were

unaware of this pedagogical option), the uncovered difficulties with their textual borrowing suggest that they would have likely benefited from it.

It is important to point out that instructors who wish to use cognitive modeling to demonstrate important composing and textual borrowing strategies to their students must think carefully about the authentic academic behaviors in which L2 writers engage. To illustrate, instructional materials address note taking assuming that writers use hard copies of texts. However, as this research uncovered, some writers read electronic texts instead. In order to model the kinds of strategies and behaviors that L2 writers are likely to incorporate, instructors are challenged to determine these students' working preferences and learning styles prior to delivering modeling sessions.

Opportunities for individualized attention

Few writing instructors are able to offer individualized help or guidance when it comes to issues related to plagiarism, textual borrowing, or even general writing. Deena was no exception, providing few in-class opportunities for one-on-one interaction between her and the individual students in the course. However, because the three L2 writers demonstrated unique difficulties with textual borrowing, it appears that they could have greatly benefited from a more individualized approach.

Many writing instructors employ a student-teacher writing conference in order to individualize the instructional process, especially in the process of giving feedback. In a conference setting, an L2 writer typically brings the paper on which he or she is working and the writing instructor proceeds to read and discuss the text with the student. Alternatively, a student may bring in a paper on which the writing instructor had

previously commented and focus only on those comments that the student did not understand. The general effectiveness of student-teacher writing conferneces has been discussed in the literature on L2 writers (e.g., Conrad and Goldstein, 1999; Gitzen, 2002; Liu, 2009; Walker and Elias, 1987). One of the most frequently echoed conclusions is that student-teacher writing conferences provide space for clarification of complex issues that are difficult to address in written feedback. Although research has not yet examined whether issues specific to textual borrowing are addressed during student-teacher conferences or whether students are able to revise their drafts relative to textual borrowing as a result of such conferences, writing instructors committed to helping L2 writers' with textual borrowing strategies should explore this area.

In addition to student-teacher writing conferences, writing instructors often have opportunities to diagnose and address L2 students' problems with textual borrowing during class time. For example, Deena scheduled three lessons in the computer lab, allowing her students time to work on their papers. However, she missed an opportunity to gain insights into their use of sources by not taking the initiative to monitor the students' work—she never left the podium, using the class time to complete administrative and personal duties instead. Observations of student writing during lab time can be very informative, and writing instructors should view this time as a valuable diagnostic and instructional time rather than as time available for doing non-instructional tasks. Even if it may not be possible to observe every writer, writing instructors can focus on those writers who have shown difficulty with textual borrowing in previous assignments or who have clarifying questions on the use of sources. Alternatively, they can work with different students each time they observe.

Explicit guidelines for assignments and practice activities

Another, highly recommended, pedagogical option is to provide L2 writers with clear and explicit guidelines for their written assignments, including the articulation of specific objectives and expectations. As was demonstrated in Chapter 5, the three L2 writers in the study frequently mentioned a need for more clarity and explicitness with respect to their understanding of assignments. Specific to textual borrowing, Chaoren and Junmo struggled to distinguish the summary and the analysis papers. Aiko misconstrued what a "draft" entailed and made questionable choices with regard to source selection because of her lack of understanding of the expectations of Western academy.

It is imperative that writing instructors find ways of clearly conveying information about the assignments to their students. Oral instructions should be accompanied by written guidelines, descriptions of specific objectives for the assignments, and links to the overarching course objectives. They should also include relevant assessment tools and successful sample papers. Additionally, the expected work load should be broken down into manageable subtasks with corresponding timelines and possibly recommended steps for completion. Accountability for completing the sub-tasks should be built into the assignments so as to help writers avoid procrastination, increasing L2 writers' chances of producing more responsible source-based writing.

With respect to providing better guidelines for practice activities, instructors must be able to articulate objectives for the assigned practice. It was apparent that Deena was often not clear on what specific objectives she had for the different practice activities. For example, as was discussed in Chapter 4, her rationale for doing collaborative practice did not extend beyond simply working with other students and gaining access to examples.

As a result, the interpersonal dynamics in pair and group work was not as effective as it may have been had the instructor motivated and explained her preference for inclusion of collaboration in the course.

In order to maximize the instructional benefits of collaborative work, instructors should draw on several pedagogical recommendations. First, they should critically evaluate when collaborative work accomplishes specific instructional objectives more effectively than individual work. To illustrate, Deena asked students to write paraphrases and summaries in groups. Given the apparent resistance of many of Deena's students toward collaborative work, it may have been more productive (and authentic) to ask students to first produce paraphrases and summaries individually and then compare their textual borrowing in pairs or groups, reflecting on the nature of differences in their texts. Second, instructors should address students' prior experiences with group and pair work, allowing for opportunities to discuss the influence of cultural, educational, and personal backgrounds on one's attitudes toward collaborative work. Writing instructors should know how to explain to their students why collaborative work is frequent in the U.S. higher education and what makes it conducive for acquiring a second language. Finally, writing instructors should be willing to share their own (positive and negative) experiences with peer review, thus creating an atmosphere of trust and openness in the classroom (Hansen & Liu, 2005).

Teacher feedback specific to textual borrowing

Although Hyland (2001) found that L2 writers' in her study had difficulty with revising their textual borrowing following instructors' feedback, all three writers in this

study were able to address a large number of Deena's comments as they revised their work. Certainly, not all of Deena's comments were clear to the students and in several instances the three writes failed to revise their work adequately. However, they appreciated the feedback, including the specific feedback on their textual borrowing, and perceived it as key in improving their writing.

Unlike with the main three course papers, neither grades nor feedback were provided on the low-stakes tasks assigned during the different lessons, which means that students were not given opportunities to evaluate their use of textual borrowing strategies prior to the graded assignments. The failure to provide formative assessment, viewed by some as key in effective writing from sources (e.g., Thomson, 2009), is worrisome, given the serious problems uncovered in the three L2 writers' work. For example, it was evident that students struggled with the concept of main ideas in terms of identifying and including them and also misrepresenting them in the in-class summary practice activities. Similarly, students' confusion about what constitutes "details" in textual borrowing strategies was never noticed by the instructor because of her decision not to respond to in-class writing. Students' problems with quote integration were clearly manifested in the second paper, which forced Deena to adapt a reactionary approach to the instruction on integration.

Although little research has addressed the role of formative and summative feedback on textual borrowing, the existing findings (e.g., Hyland, 2001; Thomson, 2009) suggest beneficial effects. However, convincing writing instructors to provide feedback on this aspect of academic writing is not easy. This is because commenting on textual borrowing requires considerable time; an instructor has to locate the sources the

student used, identify the information used by the student, and consider the effectiveness of this usage in the L2 writer's discourse. Given the typically large number of students in L2 writing courses, this practice may be unrealistic.

However, L2 writing instructors like Deena, who are constrained by time and class size, can draw on more viable pedagogical options for providing feedback on textual borrowing. In the instance of formative feedback on in-class work or homework, they can choose to comment only on a small subset of student-produced texts, each time varying the students on whose writing feedback is provided (thus ensuring that each student's work is considered at some point during the course). Alternatively, L2 writing instructors can focus on a subset of concepts relevant to textual borrowing. For example, Deena could have commented exclusively on students' success in including the main ideas in their in-class summaries and then focus on another issue in their in-class work on paraphrasing.

In the case of formative assessment, writing instructors can require students to submit their papers along with copies of the sources. Furthermore, instructors can ask that students highlight the information used from, thus, further facilitating the evaluation of textual borrowing. This practice may not only be beneficial for the instructor, but also for the student who, by being required to highlight the relevant passages, may pay more attention to this aspect of his or her writing. An additional option relevant to formative assessment of textual borrowing is to ask that L2 writers submit with their papers a memo or annotation with commentary on the written work (See Charles, 1990; Crawford, 1992, Ferris and Hedgcock, 1998, and Storch and Tapper, 1997). This approach, although not yet applied to textual borrowing specifically, is believed to be beneficial in that it

encourages student writers to review their work carefully prior to submitting it to the instructor and opens up a dialogue between the writer and the instructor-assessor. Writing instructors interested in trying to incorporate this instructional technique are advised to provide specific prompts relevant to the use of sources. This is because L2 writers have been shown to comment on the area of textual borrowing considerably less than on areas such as grammar and content (Storch and Tapper, 1997).

<div align="center">Reframing of textual borrowing as nuanced

and influenced by genres</div>

The three writers in the study were generally successful at the level of basic rephrasing of words in their source-based assignments and aware of the punitive consequences of plagiarism. To varied degrees, they also appeared to understand one of the rhetorical purposes of textual borrowing, especially the frequently emphasized concept of using sources in order to be perceived as more credible. These findings suggest that the three writers were able to implement the instruction they received in Deena's class.

However, the writers' texts and interviews also pointed to those aspects of textual borrowing that Deena's instruction did not prepare them to handle effectively. For example, they struggled with transparency and coherence in attribution, suggesting a lack of understanding about the importance of the Western concept of giving credit—an issue that was largely unaddressed in the ESL 1060 course. Also, they were unsure about how to weave together their voice with the voices of published authors. Similarly, they remained unaware of the relative conventionality inherent in reporting verbs, frequently

choosing non-conventional expressions to introduce their textual borrowing strategies.

Deena's instruction presented textual borrowing as homogeneous across genres. It is unclear whether the instructor was not fully aware of how genre dependent textual borrowing is or whether she thought that her students were not developmentally ready to understand textual borrowing at this level. The fact that Deena believed that the textual borrowing strategies students practice in the process of poem and comic-based tasks transfer to academic contexts suggests the former—the instructor may have had gaps in her own knowledge about the nature of textual borrowing across genres. The textual borrowing tasks based on non-academic genres were not received positively by the three L2 writers who expected more authentic academic practice.

It needs to be pointed out that writing instruction in ESL courses can never be fully authentic in the sense of direct transferability to students' major and minor courses as has been demonstrated in research (Hansen, 2000; Spack, 1997). However, a careful selection of tasks and supporting instructional materials on textual borrowing has a potential to contribute to students' improvement in the area of writing from sources. Instructors who desire to make their lessons more authentic may implement examples from students and published authors and center the class time around targeted analyses and discussions of such examples. In order to increase student understanding of the nature of textual borrowing in different disciplines, instructors can challenge L2 writers to analyze textual borrowing in their chosen fields or interview faculty in their departments.

Summary of pedagogical options for the

instruction on textual borrowing

Based on the main findings discussed in the sections above and summarized in Table 19, I propose a framework for instructional support on textual borrowing that future researchers may use as a basis for class observations and that writing instructors can consider in course development and lesson preparation. As Figure 2 shows, my proposal outlines four types of instructional support necessary for L2 writers learning to write from sources: 1) linguistic support, 2) textual support, 3) cognitive support, and 4) metacognitive support. These four types are embedded in what I refer to as targeted social support.

L2 writers who manage to avoid extensive direct copying do so by modifying clause elements in the selected paraphrases from sources (Keck, 2010). In order to support novice L2 writers in this effort, writing instructors ought to provide them with ample linguistic support beyond vague recommendations against staying too close to the original sources. During practice in textual borrowing, writers should be challenged to offer specific ideas for sentence restructuring and should have opportunities to receive feedback on them. Also important is a focus on academic vocabulary, particularly an appropriate use of synonyms, reporting verbs, and signal phrases. As has been shown in this study and in other literature (e.g., Keck, 2006), L2 writers often try to avoid direct copying of words and phrases by employing synonyms found in dictionaries. Because of their limited vocabulary, L2 writers often use synonyms inappropriately. With respect to reporting verbs and signal phrases, L2 writers are often unaware of the relative stability of these expressions in academic genres (See Hyland, 1999).

Writing instructors also need to provide L2 writers in their courses with textual support. Perhaps the most effective way of doing so is to include a discussion of the rhetorical purposes and functions of textual borrowing—L2 writers should have the opportunity to explore questions such as Why are sources used in academic writing? How are writers achieving their intended purpose with the use of textual borrowing? What are functions of different textual borrowing strategies? Additionally, L2 writers should be made aware of the variations in textual borrowing across genres. For example, instructors can lead them to examine the role of voice in argumentative versus reporting genres and point to differences in source usage between writing in the sciences and the humanities. To achieve this particular objective, writing instructors could draw on sample texts from different disciplines. They can also equip L2 writers with tools that would offer them opportunities to navigate academic contexts by learning to analyze texts in the disciplines (e.g., Johns, 1997). Finally, L2 writers should be supported in their manipulation of academic texts such as in instances when they need to integrate a citation within their own writing. Writing instructors could ask that students integrate various textual borrowing strategies and then discuss the effect that these different strategies have had on the overall discourse.

In addition to including linguistic and textual support in instruction on textual borrowing, L2 writers also need cognitive and metacognitive support. Specifically, they should receive practice in using a variety of cognitive strategies (e.g., note taking, elaboration, inferencing) and metacognitive strategies (e.g., planning, monitoring, evaluation). The desired behaviors relevant to textual borrowing should not just be mentioned during lectures, but should be modeled to them by their instructors. L2 writers

should also be guided in the early stages of their source-based writing such as during selection and organization of sources.

Finally, in order for L2 writers to succeed in their writing from sources, they need to receive ample (targeted) social support from their instructor (e.g., in the classroom and during individual writing conferences) and their peers (e.g., during collaborative activities such as peer reviews). Additionally, they should be made aware of resources available to them so that they can continue to access support even after they leave a particular writing course. Among such resources are the Writing Center (provided the institution has one), relevant reference books and websites that provide valuable discussions and examples of textual borrowing, library workshops and available university courses on academic writing. As is demonstrated in Figure 2, such social support should be viewed more than a type of support in that it should be available to students throughout the instruction. Also, it should be understood as targeted in that the instructor must have clear goals for its provision. To illustrate, Deena intuitively understood the importance of providing social support by requiring collaborative work in her course. However, she did not appear to connect it to specific objectives or communicate its importance to her students. Writing instructors have a lot to gain if they can use social support to target specific L2 writers' challenges with textual borrowing.

Options in L2 writing teacher preparation

It is important that writing instructors are able to incorporate existing research findings on textual borrowing into their teaching and that they critically evaluate their teaching practices and instructional materials. However, because it is not realistic for

most writing instructors to find time to "read up" on the issues, at least part of the burden should fall on the shoulders of teacher educators or L2 writing program supervisors whose role is to contribute to building writing instructors' professional background in this important academic area. Preservice teacher education in L2 writing pedagogy or ongoing professional support for inservice writing instructors should help writing instructors understand the intricacies of writing from sources and address the literacy challenges experienced by developing writers such as those described in Chapter 5.

First, writing instructors working with L2 writers must be able to support these students linguistically. Often the assumption is that instructors teaching grammar courses (often offered prior to students' enrollment in the writing courses) are the ones to help students with developing their accuracy and skills in grammatical restructuring. However, as was suggested earlier in this chapter, writing instructors hoping to help L2 writers avoid extensive copying, must be able to offer opportunities for the kinds of practice in textual borrowing that involves transformation phrase-, clause-, and sentence-level components.

In addition to targeting writing instructors' linguistic abilities, L2 teacher educators and L2 writing program supervisors can help writing instructors develop skills in providing textual support to L2 writers. To deepen witting instructors' understanding of the nuanced nature of textual borrowing, they can introduce relevant pedagogically-oriented scholarly sources and provide instructors with opportunities to discuss and reflect on the information from these sources. For example, to help facilitate writing instructors' understanding of genre-driven variations in textual borrowing, L2 teacher educators can introduce the work by Hyland (1999). To improve writing instructors'

understanding of attribution, they can draw on Pecorari (2006) who discusses it in the context of graduate L2 writers or Moody (1997) who focuses on the differences in attribution between undergraduate L1 and L2 writers. The present research and the work by Keck (2006, 2010) can assist writing instructors in becoming more attuned to the different kinds of textual borrowing strategies L2 writers employ. Finally, feedback issues addressed in Hyland (2001) are key in writing instructors' understanding of the important role of feedback in source-based writing.

In order to address the challenges experienced by developing L2 writers, teacher educators and L2 writing program supervisors can lead writing instructors to explore the findings gleaned from this study. (See the summary table at the end of this chapter.) Other case studies (e.g., Currie (1988), Leki (2001), and Spack (1997)) also provide vivid accounts of L2 writers who are struggling with textual borrowing and who may be similar to students these instructors may be teaching in the future. Depictions of actual instruction on textual borrowing are scarce, with exceptions being Casanave (2004), Ouelette (2009), and Wette (2010). These and other works can inform writing instructors about the challenges and possibilities relevant to textual borrowing.

Additionally, new writing instructors could use guidance in creating, adapting, and critically evaluating instructional resources and materials targeting textual borrowing (Tomaš, 2010). They need opportunities to research existing materials and to be challenged to improve upon them. Above all, they need to be made aware of the importance of authenticity in instructional materials design relevant textual borrowing so that they do not rely exclusively on discussions of appropriateness of isolated rephrases in their teaching of paraphrasing or summarizing. Framework outlined in Figure 2 can

facilitate their review, development, and assessment of course materials.

In addition to providing opportunities for expanding preservice writing instructors' knowledge of the literature on textual borrowing, and developing and evaluating instructional materials, L2 teacher educators and L2 writing program supervisors should serve as models to the preservice L2 writing instructors. In other words, L2 teacher educators ought to model in their own courses the kinds of practices or strategies they expect of the preservice L2 writing instructors. For example, in demonstrating the think-aloud cognitive modeling protocol, they can articulate their own research writing practice and can share the strategies that help them write effectively from sources. They might also introduce preservice writing instructors to the caveats they have experienced in submitting work for publication. Finally, teacher educators can encourage preservice writing instructors to engage in meaningful writing from sources such as producing book reviews or reviewing articles and submitting these documents for publication. Such meaningful personal experiences with academic writing are likely contributors to effective writing instruction (Yigitoglu and Belcher, 2011).

It is critical that L2 writing instructors have the opportunity to take the kinds of courses or participate in professional seminars that target L2 writing instruction including instruction on textual borrowing. Institutions that do not provide effective writing instructor support are likely to encounter more problems with plagiarism than those that do. This hypothesis springs from a belief that well-informed writing instructors can better prepare L2 writers for the challenges of source-based academic discourse. Professional training or support also benefits the writing instructors themselves as it directly contributes to their professional development. As a result of knowing more about

effective writing from sources, writing instructors like Deena may feel more confident about their own participation in academic writing and research.

<u>Options in disciplinary writing instruction</u>

Few descriptions exist of faculty in the disciplines supporting L2 writers in their production of source-based assignments. The idea that the responsibility for helping university students with language and writing issues should be shared among *all* university professors rather than designated to those teaching ESL and writing courses is simply not broadly embraced by university faculty (Long and Richards, 1997). Specific to avoiding plagiarism, when professors show willingness to participate in educating L2 writers about this issue, they generally envision doing so via brief "teachable moments" or by recommending to their students to watch online tutorials and read websites (Cimasco, 2011).

However, no quick fix can eliminate plagiarism or help L2 writers with producing effective source-based assignments. Faculty across the curriculum who hope to see L2 writers produce more effective source-based assignments, must be willing to provide ongoing support throughout the process. All of the different types of support discussed in this chapter and summarized in Figure 2 are applicable to writing intensive mainstream courses across the curriculum.

Professional development targeting interested faculty should provide opportunities for discussions of the influence of language proficiency and cultural and educational backgrounds on students' ability to write from sources. Many professors are simply unaware of the long and complex nature of second language and disciplinary

expertise acquisition (Zamel and Spack, 2004). In addition to discussions of various theoretical concepts, trainers have the responsibility to introduce faculty to practical ways of supporting L2 writers in their courses. Lectures and slides conveying information about the different kinds of support (e.g., linguistic, textual, cognitive, metacognitive, and social) should be accompanied with ample opportunities for actual practice. During training sessions, faculty should be able to reflect on the assignments that they typically require in their courses and challenged to think of alternatives to the kinds of research-based genres or paper topics that tend to lead to increased instances of plagiarism. They should also be given time and support to learn how to break down assignments into manageable stages and develop ideas for supporting L2 writers at each of the identified stages.

The take-away message from any kind of professional development for faculty wishing to better assist L2 students writing from sources must be that they, as professors in their selected disciplines, are uniquely positioned to do so. This is because most of the students in their courses are there because they have chosen the particular discipline as their major or minor. Consequently, the students are often motivated to succeed, look to their professors for guidance and feedback, and have a genuine desire to improve their writing performance. Consequently, faculty in the disciplines who are willing to overcome their reluctance to focus on language and writing have a definite advantage in furthering L2 students' academic language development.

Conclusion

This chapter examined pedagogical options that L2 writing faculty and faculty in the disciplines can consider if they wish to support L2 writers producing source-based assignments. I advocate for a variety of activities that support writers linguistically, textually, cognitively, and metacognitively, sharing specific pedagogical activities that can be adapted to any course. I also argue that social support should be available throughout the instruction and that it should be targeted (i.e. used deliberately) with the purpose of achieving instructional objectives specific to textual borrowing.

I also explored what the findings in this case study mean for L2 teacher education; hoping that the presented descriptions and analyses can serve as a catalyst for starting important conversations about teaching academic strategies in high-stakes contexts. I outlined several possible options L2 teacher educators have to prepare L2 writing teachers for teaching academic writing from sources. Specifically, I argued for 1) an inclusion of seminal pieces on writing from sources in the teacher preparation courses and/or seminars, including case studies, 2) opportunities to create, adapt, and critically evaluate instructional resources and materials targeting textual borrowing, 3) a focus on authenticity in relevant material development, and 4) a provision of expert insights into writing from sources (e.g., by modeling our own source-based writing practices and strategies). I believe that L2 teacher preparation that incorporates such activities can equip new writing instructors with tools necessary to develop and deliver effective instruction on avoidance of plagiarism and textual borrowing.

Table 20. Summary of main findings

Main findings		Pedagogical options
Instructor-focused	**L2 writer-focused**	
The instructor focused on how to borrow from sources rather than on the purpose of textual borrowing.	L2 writers often failed to attribute sources or lacked transparency when attributing sources.	Functions of textual borrowing
The instructor did not provide guidance on source selection beyond requiring a library tour.	L2 writers struggled to select appropriate sources.	Guidance on source selection
The instructor reduced instruction on textual borrowing to rules for paraphrasing, quoting, and summarizing as the main textual borrowing strategies.	L2 writers also employed near copies, combinations, and unquoted reproductions. L2 writers' textual borrowing differed across assignments.	Broader scope of instruction on textual borrowing strategies and contextual factors
The instructor did not effectively deal with source organization and integration.	L2 writers had difficulty with integrating their voice with the voices from outside texts.	Practice in organizing and integrating information from sources in discourse
The instructor did not address reading and composing strategies relevant to textual borrowing.	L2 writers often employ ineffective reading and writing strategies related to textual borrowing.	Cognitive modeling in the instruction on textual borrowing
The instructor provided minimal opportunities for one-on-one interaction with individual students.	L2 writers demonstrate unique difficulties with textual borrowing.	Opportunities for individualized attention
The instructor failed to provide clear guidelines for activities and assignments.	L2 writers frequently struggled to understand activities and assignments.	Explicit guidelines for assignments and activities

Table 20 Continued

Main findings		Pedagogical options
Instructor-focused	**L2 writer-focused**	
The instructor provided considerable feedback on textual borrowing in paper drafts, but not in in-class practice activities.	L2 writers were able to improve their textual borrowing following teacher feedback. L2 writers wanted additional feedback in in-class practice activities.	Provision of teacher feedback specific to textual borrowing
The instructor presented plagiarism in punitive terms and textual borrowing mostly as homogeneous across genres and assignments. The instructor believed that skills in textual borrowing transferred across genres.	L2 writers demonstrated varied understanding of the concept of plagiarism and contextual influences on textual borrowing. L2 writers showed a preference for practicing textual borrowing strategies in the context of academic genres.	Reframing of textual borrowing as nuanced and influenced by genres

Table 21.Types of support for L2 writers writing from sources

Targeted Social Support

- o Work with the instructor
- o Work with peers
- o Access to relevant resources

Linguistic Support	Textual Support	Cognitive Support	Metacognitive Support
o Clause and sentence restructuring o Academic vocabulary (especially synonym usage, reporting verbs and signal phrases)	o Functions of textual borrowing o Contextual factors affecting textual borrowing o Source manipulation (e.g., source integration task) o Sample source-based texts o Analysis of textual borrowing in various disciplines	o Cognitive strategies o Cognitive modeling o Monitoring of in-class work o Source selection o Source organization	o Metacognitive strategies o Memos or annotations accompanying papers o Ongoing reports on writing from sources

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

If we consider the L2 writers in this study as examples of typical, emerging L2 academic writers studying in institutions of higher education in the United States, it is clear from an analysis of the data from this study that the ability of L2 writers to produce successful source-based assignments means much more than avoiding plagiarism by employing simple rules for paraphrasing, summarizing, or quoting. The L2 writers in this study were challenged to select appropriate sources, understand and manipulate them, attribute them transparently, and integrate them effectively within their own writing. It is no small task for novice L1 writers to accomplish these tasks, let alone for students who are reading and writing in their L2.

In examining three L2 writers' textual borrowing practices and general approaches to writing from sources within and outside the context of an ESL expository writing course, this study has attempted to illuminate issues relevant to instructional support provided for these writers and their ability to make use of such support. As a result of this research, I am able to offer several contributions to the fields of L2 writing and pedagogy. Before further elaborating on the value of this research, however, I will address the limitations of the study.

Limitations of the study

Because the three writers self-selected to participate in the research, it is possible that they were considerably more motivated or driven than "average" university L2 writers and as such may not be representative of the kinds of textual borrowing practices in which most L2 writers engage. This fact may explain why one of the main findings in this study (that undergraduate L2 writer did not rely on direct copying excessively) stands in contrast to other research (e.g., Shi, 2004).

As with all interview-based observational research, the role of the researcher's presence cannot be overlooked. Although I made every possible effort to be unobtrusive during the observations of writers' reading and writing, it is possible that my presence influenced their behaviors. The same is true with interviewing—it is possible that the three L2 writers tried to tell me, as the researcher, what they thought I wanted to hear rather than what they really thought. Similarly, although the participants in the study were told that this was a study on L2 writers' experience with academic writing, it is possible that as the semester progressed, they began to realize that the true focus was, in fact, on textual borrowing. This is particularly likely in the case of the instructor who may have been aware of my interest in this area. Sensing that I was examining the issues related to plagiarism and textual borrowing, may have influenced Deena's instruction in important ways. For example, it is possible that she would not have spent as much time addressing this topic had I not been conducting research in her class.

Another limitation lies in the fact that this study only examined L2 writers' textual borrowing during the semester in which they enrolled in an ESL writing course. Observing writers prior to their taking this course would have shed more light about the

extent to which they incorporated the instruction. In other words, it is possible that what I perceived as the writers' efforts to incorporate instruction on textual borrowing from ESL 1060, was, in fact, something they had been doing even prior to taking this course.

Finally, as was acknowledged in Chapter 3, my own experiences and biases have likely influenced my interpretations of the data. This realization is not unexpected given that I approached this study from the pragmatist paradigm, which accepts that the researcher's values and beliefs are inherent in the research process. My hope is that by scrutinizing my biases and assumptions throughout the process of data collection, analysis, and interpretation, I was able to capture my participants' meanings.

<u>Contributions of the study</u>

In conceding to the above limitations, several of the study's findings greatly inform scholarship on textual borrowing and L2 classroom practice. Given that these (nine) findings have been summarized in the previous chapter (See Table 20), I will only address those that have the most potential to impact the focus and methodology of future studies on textual borrowing.

One of the major contributions of this study is that it provides a detailed, situated account of one academic writing classroom, with a specific focus on the instructor and three course participants. Unlike existing published research, the study offers an in-depth description of instruction. Descriptions of Deena and her approaches to instruction on textual borrowing can provide a basis for examination of writing instructors in other contexts. At the level of pedagogy, this case study can be implemented in various L2 teacher education contexts, especially those that help prepare future academic writing

instructors. Preservice writing instructors could benefit from discussing challenges that Deena experienced and reflecting on the different options available in the instruction on textual borrowing.

At the level of discourse analysis, this study contributes by examining "combination"—a frequently overlooked textual borrowing strategy and by describing L2 writers' problems with "attributive cohesion"—an unexplored challenge experienced by L2 writers writing from sources. Clearly, L2 writers use combinations in much of their source-based writing, with paraphrase-quote and summary-quote combinations appearing as the most common. The reasons why L2 writers employ this strategy are not clear. It is possible that they do so to avoid plagiarism. This strategy may also be a testament to their effort to integrate the source content with their own voice. This dissertation was just the first step in increasing our understanding of this particular textual borrowing strategy. With respect to attributive cohesion, it was noted that two of the three L2 writers in this study failed, at times, to make their source-based writing, especially as it pertains to attribution, cohesive. As with the issue of combination as a textual borrowing strategy, this particular phenomenon needs to be re-examined in future research to corroborate that this may be an area of concern for L2 writers rather than an accidental occurrence in two writers' texts.

Important also is the finding that L2 writers' textual borrowing is more fluid than has been previously suggested. To illustrate, much of the research has concluded that textual borrowing is, to large extent, developmental—writers at lower levels of proficiency copy excessively from sources while more advanced writers are able to avoid such non-conventional practices. However, this study pointed to inter-writer variability

by demonstrating that L2 writers' textual borrowing strategies can differ considerably across assignments. If corroborated by future research, this finding entails important methodological implications. Specifically, it warns against generalizations about L2 writes' textual borrowing practices that are based on single, restricted research tasks such as 100-word summaries.

Additionally, as this study has demonstrated, examining the process of L2 writers' writing from sources can greatly contribute to our understanding of L2 writes' practices and challenges. Although observations and think-aloud protocols appear to have lost popularity in recent decades, it is time to revisit these methodological approaches, primarily on account of the fast changing technology and its influence on writers' practices. If it was not for the inclusion of observations, several important findings would not have surfaced in my study. For example, I would not have uncovered Junmo's exclusive reliance on reading from the computer screen or the extent of Aiko's re-reading of her sources. Additionally, the actual observations of the three L2 writers' practices made it apparent that writers are frequently not correct when reporting on time spent on tasks and that they frequently under or over estimate their strategy use. Thus research that relies solely on interviewing to gain insights about important aspects of writing from sources may not reflect the actual writing behaviors.

Future research

As was suggested in the section above, it is desirable for future research to widen the array of examined textual borrowing strategies and broaden the scope of methodological approaches and types of data relevant to textual borrowing. Specifically,

it would be beneficial if methodological approaches such as observations or think-aloud protocols were employed in addition to the more common qualitative methodological methods such as interviews and text analyses. With regard to text analyses, this research points to the importance of examining documents other than paper drafts or final papers. I have come to realize the value of this recommendation when I examined Aiko's outline of her Linguistics research paper. This document made obvious the connections between Aiko's ideas and those of Pennycook (1996) that were not clear from her paper alone.

Researchers working in the area of textual borrowing also need to investigate variations in L2 writers' textual borrowing and the role context plays in such variations. If future research confirms that L2 writers' textual borrowing strategies are highly contextualized rather than purely developmental, it can have important implications for instruction. Specifically, instructors could benefit from understanding what specific contextual factors are likely to produce more effective source-based writing. Such understanding would allow writing instructors as well as instructors in the disciplines who assign source-based assignments to better target their instruction on textual borrowing.

This research also points to the necessity of a closer consideration of reading as well as writing and the connections between the two processes in the research on textual borrowing Existing research tends to focus almost exclusively on examining L2 writers' writing at the cost of understanding their reading. Knowing what textual borrowing strategies L2 writers use without understanding whether these strategies correctly represent the meanings of used sources ignores an important part of writing from sources. Indicating whether L2 writers' textual borrowing strategies are supported or not

supported is an important first step toward grounding textual borrowing in the area of L2 reading and not just L1 writing research.

Two earlier pedagogical suggestions need to be corroborated in future research. Specifically, I have argued that undergraduate L2 writers would benefit from being engaged in more problematized instruction that would introduce them to functions of textual borrowing and engage them in more in-depth textual analyses and discussions about concepts such as giving credit. However, it is possible that many undergraduate students may have a need to engage in more basic processes such as manipulating sentences by changing words and structures; they may simply not be linguistically and academically ready to handle more complex issues relevant to textual borrowing. I have also argued for a value of example-based pedagogical activities. However, it needs to be pointed out that little is known about the benefits of using examples on general academic writing, let alone on textual borrowing. The little research that exists does suggest that exposure to model texts has positive effects on subsequent academic writing, at least in the context of L1 writers (e.g., Charney and Carlson, 1995).

Finally, future research should provide information about L2 writers' use of technology. It is possible that the instructional strategies we teach (e.g., underling) are no longer relevant for students who read texts from computer or i-pad screens. More information about how university L2 writers draw on technology in their source-based assignments could yield important suggestions for instructional material and curriculum developers.

Conclusion

This case study attempted to shed light on the nature of instruction on textual borrowing and the extent to which L2 writers in the higher education context implement this instruction as they write from sources. It allowed for an in-depth exploration of textual borrowing because it drew data not only from texts, but also from interviews and observations. The findings paint a picture of instruction on textual borrowing as a complex endeavor characterized by a multitude of difficult choices and decisions, as well as missed opportunities. The portrait of the L2 writers in the center of this study is even more nuanced—the three writers appear to occupy different points on a continuum of academic engagement with source-based writing, ranging from academic survivorship (in the case of Aiko), to emerging academic participation (in the case of Junmo), to active academic participation (in the case of Chaoren). Additionally, from the standpoint of appropriateness of textual borrowing, the three writers range not only among each other, but also within themselves, varying their textual borrowing strategies across assignments. It is my hope that the complexities and questions raised by this study are seen as opportunities for future research, classroom practice, and L2 writing teacher preparation.

REFERENCES

Ammon, U. (2001). *The dominance of English as a language of science: Effects on other languages and language communities*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Abasi, A.R. & Akbari, N. (2008). Are we encouraging patchwriting? Reconsidering the role of the pedagogical context in ESL student writers' transgressive intertextuality. *English for Specific Purposes, 27*, 3, 267-284.

Angelil-Carter, S. (2000). *Stolen language?: Plagiarism in writing* (2000). Pearson Education, Essex, England.

Bachman, L. & Palmer, A. (2010). *Language Assessment in Practice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Barks, D. & Watts, P. (2001). Textual borrowing strategies for graduate-level ESL writers. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 246-267). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Behrens, L, Rosen L.J. & Beedles, B. (2006). *A sequence for academic writing*. NY. New York: Longman.

Benesch, S. (1993). ESL, ideology, and the politics of pragmatism. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*, 4, 705-517.

Berkenkotter,C. & Huckin, T. N. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bloch, J., & Chi, L. (1995). A comparison of the use of citations in Chinese and English academic discourse. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy* (pp .231-274). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Bloch, J. (2001). Plagiarism and the ESL student: From printed to electronic texts. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 209-228). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Borg, E. (2000). Citation practices in academic writing. In P. Thompson (Ed.), *Patterns and perspectives: Insights for EAP writing practice* (pp. 14-25). Reading, UK: CALS, University of Reading.

Bullock, R. (2009). *The Norton field guide to writing*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.

Buranen, L. (1999). 'But I wasn't cheating': plagiarism and cross-cultural mythology. In L. Buranen and A.M. Roy (Eds.) *Perspectives on plagiarism and intellectual property in a postmodern world* (pp. 63-74). New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

Campbell, C. (1990). Writing with others' words: Using background reading text in academic compositions. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 211-230). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Casanave, C. P. (2004). *Controversies in second language writing: Dilemmas and decisions in research and instruction*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Casazza, Martha, E. (1993). Using a model of direct instruction to teach summary writing in a college reading class. *Journal of Reading 3*, 211 –230.

Chandrasegaran, Antonia. (2000). Cultures in contact in academic writing: Students' perceptions of plagiarism. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, *10*, 91-114.

Chandrasoma, R., Thompson, C., & Pennycook, A. (2004). Beyond plagiarism: Transgressive and nontransgressive intertextuality. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 3*, 171-194.

Cheng, A. 2006. Understanding learners and learning in ESP genre-based writing instruction. *English for Specific Purposes*, *25*, 1, 76-89.

Cherryholmes, C.H. (1992). Notes on pragmatism and scientific realism. *Educational researcher, 14*, 13-17.

Connor, U., & Kramer, M. (1995). Writing from sources: Case studies of graduate students in business management. In D. D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy (pp. 155-182). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Conrad, S., & Goldstein, L. (1999). ESL student revision after written comments: Texts, contexts and individuals. *Journal of Second Language Learning, 8*, 147-180.

Corbeil, G. (2000). Exploring the effects of first- and second-language proficiency on summarizing in French as a second language, *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 3*, 1, 35-62.

Crabtree. B.F. & Miller, W.L. (1992). *Doing qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J.W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. (2nd ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Cumming, A. (1995). Fostering writing expertise in ESL composition instruction: Modeling and evaluation. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy* (pp. 375-397). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.

Currie, P. (1998). Staying out of trouble: Apparent plagiarism and academic survival. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*, 1-18.

Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2004). Multilingual scholars and the imperative to publish in English: Negotiating interests, demands, and rewards. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*, 4, 663-688.

Deckert, G. (1993). Perspectives on plagiarism from ESL students in Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 2*, 131-148.

Davey, B. (1983). Think-aloud: Modeling the cognitive processes of reading comprehension. *Journal of Reading, 27*, 1, 44-47.

Dickstein, M. (Ed.). (1998). *The revival of pragmatism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Dillon, D.R., O'Brien, D.G. & Heilman, E.E. (2000). Literacy research in the next millennium: From paradigms to pragmatism and practicality. *Reading Research Quarterly, 35*, 1, 10-26.

Dong, Y. R. (1996). Learning how to use citations for knowledge transformation: Non-native doctoral students' dissertation writing in science. *Research in the Teaching of English, 30,* 428-457.

Dudley-Evans, T. (2002). The teaching of the academic essay: Is a genre-approach possible? In Ann M. Johns (Ed.). *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Eisenhardt, K.M. (1999). Building Theories from Case Study Research. In A. Bryman & R.G. Burgess (Eds.). *Qualitative Research: Volume 1* (pp. 135-159). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Elling, A. & Janssens, J. (2009). Sexuality as a structural principle in sport participation: negotiating sports spaces. In *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 44**,** 71-86.

Fitzgerald, J. (1995). English-as-a-Second-Language Learners' Cognitive Reading Processes: A Review of Research in the United States, *Review of Educational Research, 65*, 2, 145-190.

Flowerdew, J. (2007). The non-Anglophone scholar on the periphery of scholarly publication. *AILA Review, 20,* 14-27.

Flowerdew, J. & Li, Y. (2007). Language re-use among Chinese apprentice scientists writing for publication. *Applied Linguistics, 28*, 3, 440-465.

Gasson, S. (2003). Rigor in grounded theory research – An interpretive perspective on generating theory from qualitative field studies, in Whitman, M. and Woszczynski, A. (Eds.), *Handbook for Information Systems Research*, Idea Group, Hershey PA, pp. 79-102.

Gitzen*,* M. (2002). Face to face*:* Conferencing as ESL writing instruction. *Unpublished doctorial dissertation.* Purdue University.

Greene. S. (1993). Exploring the relationship between authorship and reading. In A. M. Penrose & M. M. Sitko (Eds.), *Hearing ourselves think: Cognitive research in the college writing classroom* (pp. 33-51). New York: Oxford University Press.

Gu, Q. and Brooks, J. (2008). Beyond the accusation of plagiarism. *System, 36*, 3. 337-352.

Ha, P.L. (2006). Plagiarism and overseas students: stereotypes again? *ELT Journal, 60*, 1, 76-78.

Haas, C. (1993). Beyond "just the facts": Reading as rhetorical action. In A. M. Penrose & B. M. Sitko (Eds.), Hearing ourselves think: Cognitive research in the college writing classroom (pp. 19–32). New York: Oxford University Press.

Haas, C. (1994). Learning to read biology: One student's rhetorical development in college. Written Communication, 11, 1, 43–84.

Haas, C. & Wearden, S.T. (2003). E-credibility: Building common ground in Web environments. L1 - Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 3, 169-184.

Hansen, J. G. (2000). Interactional conflicts among audience, purpose, and content knowledge in the acquisition of academic literacy in an EAP course. *Written*

Communication, 17, 1, 27-52.

Hansen, J. G., & Liu, J. (2005). Guiding principles for effective peer response. *ELT Journal, 59,* 1, 31-38.

Harris, M. (1983). Modeling: a process method of teaching. *College English, 45*, 74-78.

Harwood. N. & Hadley, G. (2004). Demystifying institutional practices: critical pragmatism and the teaching of academic writing. *English for Specific Purposes, 23*, 355-377.

Haverkamp, B. E. & Young, R.A. (2007). Paradigms, purpose, and the role of the literature: Formulating a rationale for qualitative investigations. *The Counseling Psychologist, 35*, 2, 265-294.

Higgins, L. (1993). Reading to argue: Helping students transform source texts," In A. M. Penrose & B. M. Sitko (Eds.), Hearing ourselves think: Cognitive research in the college writing classroom (pp. 70- 101). New York: Oxford University Press.

Hirvela, A. (2004). *Connecting Reading and Writing in Second Language Writing Instruction*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Horowitz, E. (1986). What professors actually require: Academic tasks for the ESL classroom *TESOL Quarterly*, *20*, 3, 445-462.

Hovland, C.I. & Weiss, W. (1951). The influence of source credibility on communication effectiveness. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 15*, 635-650.

Howard, R. (1995). Plagiarisms, authorships, and the academic death penalty. *College English, 57*, 788-806.

Howard, R. (1999). *Standing in the shadow of giants: Plagiarists, authors, collaborators*, Stamford, CT: Ablex Publishing.

Hsu, Angela Yi-ping. (2003). *Patterns of plagiarism behavior in the ESL classroom and the effectiveness of instruction in appropriate use of sources*. Dissertation: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Hult, C.A. & Huckin, T.N. (2010). *The new century handbook*. New York: Longman.

Hyland, F. (2001). Dealing with plagiarism when giving feedback. *ELT Journal, 55*, 375-381.

Janesick, V.J. (2003). The Choreography of Qualitative Research Design: Minutes, Improvisations, and Crystallization. In N. K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry* (pp. 46-79). Thousand Oaks: CA. Sage.

Johns, A. (1985). Summary protocols of "underprepared" and "adept" university students: Replications and distortions of the original. *Language Learning, 35*, 495-517.

Johns, A. (1993). Text, role, and context: Developing academic literacies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johns, A., & Mayes, P. (1990). An analysis of summary protocols of university ESL students. *Applied Linguistics, 11*, 253-271.

Jones, A. A., & Freeman, T. E. (2003). Imitation, copying, and the use of models: report writing in an introductory physics course. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication, 46*, 3, 168-184.

Keck, C. (2006). The use of paraphrase in summary writing: A comparison of L1 and L2 writers, *Journal of Second Language* Writing *15*, 261–278.

Keck, C. & Tomaš, Z. (2010). Teaching paraphrasing and summarization skills: Recent research and new directions for writing pedagogy. Boston, MA: TESOL Conference.

Krishnan, L.A. & Kathpalia, S.S. (2002). Literature reviews in student project reports. *IEEE Transactions of Professional Communication, 45*, 3, 187-97.

Kumaravadivelu B. (2003). Problematizing cultural stereotypes in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly 37*, 4, 709–719.

Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Leki, I., & Carson, J. (1997). "Completely different worlds": EAP and the writing experiences of ESL students in university courses. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 39-69.

Leki, I. (2003). Living through College Literacy. *Written Communication, 20*, 1, 81-98.

Liu, D. (2005). Plagiarism in ESOL students: is cultural conditioning truly the culprit? *ELT Journal, 59*, 234-243.

Marshall, C. and Rossman, G.B. (1999). *Designing qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Martin, B. (1994). Plagiarism: a misplaced emphasis, *Journal of Information Ethics*, *3*, 2, 36-47.

Masson, M. E. J., & Waldron, M. A. (1994). Comprehension of legal contracts by non-experts: Effectiveness of plain language redrafting. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 8,* 67-85.

Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative Research in Practice*: *Examples for Discussion and Analysis*. S. B. Merriam and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McGowan, U. (2003). Plagiarism detection and prevention. Pedagogical implications for lecturers of first year university students. In D. Nulty & .N. Meyers (Eds.), 7th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference Proceedings. Brisbane, Australia: QUT. Retrieved 25 February 2009 from: http://www.adelaide.edu.au/clpd/resources/publication/confpapers/03_07_FYE%20Conf_McGowan_paper.pdf

Moody, J. (2007). Plagiarism or intertextuality? Approaches to teaching EFL academic writing. Asian. EFL Journal, 9(2), 195-210Moore, T. (1997). From text to note: Cultural variation in summarization practices. *Prospect, 12*, 54-63.

Morgan, D.L. (2008). Paradigms Lost and Pragmatism Regained: Methodological Implications of Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Methods. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 1*, 1, Pp. 48-76.

Morrow, S. L. (2005). Quality and trustworthiness in qualitative research in counseling psychology, *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 250-260.

Myers, S. (1998, March). Questioning author(ity): ESL/EFL, science and teaching about plagiarism. *TeslEJ, 3 (2)*, 121.

Smith, L.N. (Ed.). (2007). The best of Ogden Nash. New York: Ivan R Dee Publishing.

Nelson, J. & Hayes, J.R. (1988). *How the writing context shapes students' strategies for writing from sources*. (Tech, Rpt. No. 16). Berkeley, CA: National Center for the Study of Writing and Literacy at University of California, Berkeley, and Carnegie Mellon University.

Ouellette, M.A. (2004). *Voices on the landscape: Reconceptualizing plagiarism, voice appropriation, and academic competence in ESL freshman composition*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.

Oullette, M. A. (2008). Weaving strands of writer identity: Self as author and the NNES 'plagiarist.' *Journal of Second Language Writing 17*. 255-273.

O'Malley, J.M. & Chamot, A.U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Olshavsky, J. (1977). Reading as problem solving: an investigation of strategies. *Reading Research Quarterly 12*, 4: 654–74.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pecorari, D. (2001). Plagiarism and International Students: How the English-speaking university responds. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 229-245). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second-language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 12 (4): 317-345.

Pecorari, D. (2004). Plagiarism and international students: How the English-speaking university responds. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections (pp. 229-245). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Pecorari, D. (2006). Visible and occluded citation features in postgraduate second-Language writing. *English for Specific Purposes,* 25, 1, 4-29.

Pecorari, D. (2008). *Academic writing and plagiarism: A linguistic analysis*. London: Continuum.

Pecorari, D. (2008). Personal Communication.

Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*, 201-230.

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical Applied Linguistics: A Critical Introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Price, M. (2002). Beyond "Gotcha!": situating plagiarism in policy and pedagogy. *CCC, 54*, 1, 88-115.

Quinivan, K. & Town, S. (1999). Queer pedagogy, educational practice and lesbian and gay youth. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 12*, 5, 20, 509-524.

Riazi, A. M. (1997). Acquiring Disciplinary Literacy. *Journal of Second Language Writing 6*, 2, 105-137.

Rinnert, C. & Kobayashi, H. (2005). Borrowing words and ideas: Insights from Japanese L1 writers. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communications 15*, 1, 31-56.

Roig, M. (1997). Can undergraduate students determine whether text has been plagiarized? *The Psychological Record, 47*, 113-122.

Schwandt, T. (1989). Solutions to the paradigm controversy: Coping with uncertainty. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 17* (4), 379-407.

Seale, C. (1999). *The Quality of Qualitative Research*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics 11,* 129-158.

Scollon, R. (1994). As a matter of fact: The changing ideology of authorship and responsibility in discourse. *World Englishes, 13*, 33-46.

Sheorey, R. & Mokhtari, K. (2001). Differences in the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among native and non-native readers, *System, 29*, 4, 431-449.

Sherman, J. (1992). Your own thoughts in your own words. *ELT Journal, 46*, 2, 190-198.

Shi, L. (2004). Textual borrowing in second-language writing. *Written Communication, 21*, 171-200.

Shi, L. (2008). Textual appropriation and citing behaviors of university undergraduates, *Applied Linguistics Advance Access, 4*, doi:10.1093/applin/amn045, 1-24.

Song, M. (1998). Teaching reading strategies in an ongoing EFL university reading classroom, *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching, 8*, 41-54.

Sowden, C. (2005). Plagiarism and the culture of multilingual students in higher education abroad. *ELT Journal, 59*, 226-233.

Spack, R. (1997). The acquisition of academic literacy in a second language: A longitudinal case study. *Written Communication, 14*, 3-62.

Spack, R. (2004). The acquisition of academic literacy in a second language: A longitudinal case study, Updated. In V. Zamel & R. Spack (Eds.), Crossing the curriculum: Multilingual learners in college classrooms (pp. 19-46). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stake, R. (2005). Qualitative Case Studies. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.) the Sage Handbook of Qualitative research (3rd ed.), pp. 443-466. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Storch, N. and Tapper, J. (1997). Student Annotations: What NNS and NS university students say about their own writing, *Journal of Second Language Writing 6*, 3, 245–264.

Sutherland-Smith, W. (2005). Pandora's box: academic perceptions of student plagiarism in writing. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 4: 83-95.

Swales J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales J. (2004). *Research genres. Explorations and applications.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining the qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks: CA: Sage.

Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (2003). Major Issues and Controversies in the Use of Mixed Methods in the Social and Behavioral Sciences. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie, *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research*. Thousand Oaks: CA: Sage.

Tomaš, Z.(2011). Increasing authenticity of academic source use practice through paraphrase integration tasks. In M. Pennington and P. Burton (Eds.), *College writing toolkit: Tested ideas*. London: Equinox.

Tomaš, Z. (2010). Addressing writing instructors' needs for effective pedagogical resources on avoiding plagiarism. *Journal of Writing and Pedagogy 2*, pp. 223-250.

Tomaš, Z. (2006). *Textual Borrowing and Source Attribution in Second Language Writers*, *AAAL*, Montreal, Canada, May.

Walwoord, B.E. & McCarthy, L.P. (1990). Thinking and writing in college. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Wette, R. (2008). *Evaluating a unit on writing from sources*. TESOL Convention.

Wheeler, G. 2009. Plagiarism in the Japanese universities: Truly a cultural matter? *Journal of Second Language Writing 18*, 1, 17-29.

Whitaker, E. (1993) A Pedagogy to Address Plagiarism. *College Composition and Communication 44*, 4, 509-514.

Wilhoit, S. (1994). Helping students avoid plagiarism. *College Teaching, 42*, 161-164.

Winograd, P. (1984). Strategic difficulties in summarizing texts. *Reading Research Quarterly, 19*, 404-425.

Wolf, A.J.E. (1999). Context and relevance theory in language teaching: an exploratory approach. *IRAL, 37*, 2, 95-109.

Yamada, K. (2002). Comparison of Two Summary/Text-Integration Writing Tasks Requiring Different Inferential Processes *RELC Journal, 33*, 2, 142-156.

Yamada, K. (2003). What prevents ESL/EFL writers from avoiding plagiarism? Analyses of 10 North-American college websites. *System 31*, 2, 247-258.

Yeh, C. J. & Inman, A.G. (2007). Qualitative data analysis and interpretation in counseling psychology: Strategies for best practices, *The Counseling Psychologist, 35*, 3, 369-403.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yu. G. (2008). Reading to summarize in English and Chinese: A tale of two languages? *Language Testing, 25*, 4, 521-551.