The development of competence in source use by international postgraduate students

Mary Davis

Institute of Education, University of London

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Education

July, 2014

Declaration and Word Count

I hereby declare that, except where explicit attribution is made, the work presented in this thesis is entirely my own.

Word count (exclusive of appendices and bibliography): 79,954 words

Mary Davis

Abstract

This study investigates the development of source use by international postgraduate students at a UK HEI over a two year period. While other studies have examined source use at one time, in one area or with a small number of students, this study aims to establish what constitutes competence in key features of source use at Master's level from the development shown by a larger number of students.

The data comes from eight postgraduate students from China, Japan, Sri Lanka and Algeria in the form of four assignments submitted during a Pre-Master's programme and subsequent Master's degree. Interviews were carried out at each stage as an adjunct to the assignment data to investigate participants' perspectives and knowledge of source use. The assignments were analysed for competence in five key features of source use: citation, paraphrasing, reporting verbs, critical engagement and avoidance of plagiarism. From the findings, different strategies, development and ability in source use emerged, leading to the establishment of three types of users: risk takers, safe players and competent users. The risk takers adopted strategies such as copying attributed and unattributed source text. The safe players used a small range of features but were extremely careful to avoid plagiarism. The competent users employed a range of features and did not take risks with plagiarism. From the final group, descriptors of competence in source use are defined which form the key contribution of this study to the field of EAP and to postgraduate education.

The thesis highlights the following implications for practice: more continuous teaching of source use is necessary throughout postgraduate courses; EAP may not provide sufficient instruction in source use; tutors need to take students' language level and prior education into account; and engaging students in discussing and defining plagiarism is essential for their development of source use.

Acknowledgements

Contents   **Page**

Tables

Abbreviations

APA – American Psychological Association

BALEAP – British Association of Lecturers in English for Academic Purposes

CAT – Copied Attributed Text

CUT – Copied Unattributed Text

EAP – English for Academic Purposes

EFL – English as a Foreign Language

ESL – English as a Second Language

HE – Higher Education

HEIs – Higher Education Institutions

HESA – Higher Education Statistics Agency

IELTS – International English Language Testing System

L1 – First language

L2 – Second language

L3 – Third language

MSc – Master's of Science

OECD – Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

PG – Postgraduate

PLATO – Plagiarism Teaching Online

QAA – Quality Assurance Agency

UG – Undergraduate

UKCISA – UK Council for International Student Affairs

UKVI – United Kingdom Visas and Immigration

ZPD – Zone of Proximal Development

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 First thoughts

> *In my country, I can copy a whole assignment, without writing a word, and get an A. Here it is different, and at the beginning I didn't know anything.*
>
> *We don't know about citation before we come here. In my country, we need to use professional language in our writing, otherwise it does not sound right. We don't need to put the author, just at the end.*
>
> *International students are not good at paraphrasing…sometimes we do plagiarism without noticing it.*
> *(Davis, 2007)*

The above comments come from international[1] postgraduate students in a study I undertook in my workplace, which I will call Southern University[2]. My early research into the use of sources by international students convinced me that there was a need to investigate their difficulties in much greater depth and thus motivated this study. As an English for Academic Purposes (hereafter EAP) tutor in UK HE, I have worked closely with international postgraduate students on their source use for many years. I define source use in this thesis as how students employ material written by other authors in their own texts, and by international postgraduate students, I focus on those at level 7 undertaking Master's degrees, as I consider there is a gap in understanding their needs and experiences. These students have frequently commented to me, 'here it is different', because in nearly all cases, their experiences of undergraduate study in their own countries differ to those on postgraduate courses in the UK. As their views above demonstrate, some of these students start with great challenges, such as not knowing how to put citation in their text or having very little understanding of plagiarism (discussed in depth in chapter 3), within a UK HE context. I have seen that sometimes my students have 'eureka' moments when they make progress in their understanding and ability, but also that they get frustrated, confused or worried about their source use. Worse still, some may not progress, or even fail in their studies due to plagiarism. It is incontestable that international students need to develop an ability to use sources appropriately in order to succeed in their studies.

---

[1] International students are defined in this study as non-native speaker students whose domicile is outside the EU.
[2] Southern University is a post-1992 university located in the South of England.

Within EAP, tutors are aware of these difficulties and the need to support international students with source use (Pilcher, 2006; Ridley, 2006), but may not know enough about how their students develop, in order for their teaching to be effective. Subject tutors may expect students to use sources at a competent level, but not have the time or expertise to support their students' development (Hall and Sung, 2009). It is thus very important to these teaching contexts to investigate how international students develop their source use and to establish what constitutes competence in source use, as I will discuss in depth in chapter 3.

As a parallel to my investigation of international postgraduate students, by writing this thesis, I embarked on my own journey of learning to use sources at doctoral level. I have experienced the difficulties of developing and gaining what may be deemed competence at this level. I have been told 'be more critical', 'your voice is subsumed', 'your position on these studies needs to be clearer', and 'your arguments need to be more compelling for the reader'. It took me a long time and many drafts to fully grasp how to act on these comments. I was also warned about plagiarism through a statement in the IOE student handbook: 'You are reminded that all work undertaken as part of your studies at the Institute must be expressed in your own words and incorporate your own ideas and judgements' (IOE, 2007: 27). Although I thought I had a very good understanding of plagiarism, I still found this warning to be rather threatening in the phrase 'you are reminded' and discouraging about my own source use because of the instruction 'all work…must be expressed in your own words'. This instruction sits uncomfortably with my view that many of the words and phrases we use are in fact shared and the concept of one's 'own words' can be very unclear (Davis and Morley, 2013). I also found I had many questions about the formatting required for in-text citations and bibliographical references, which were not fully answered by the student handbook. By experiencing these problems with source use myself, I have felt more able to understand and relate to the experiences of my students. In my case, however, I have the benefit of using sources in my L1. I have also worked and studied in UK HE for many years, I have even taught source use at Master's level for a long time, yet I still found it hard to make this leap from source use at Master's level to that of PhD. What, then, can it be like for international postgraduate students working in an

L2 or L3, from a different education system, with no prior experience of source use according to UK conventions?

So, with this question in mind, the aim of this thesis is to examine what constitutes competence in source use at Master's level in UK HE and how international students try to achieve it. The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate the need for this study, introduce the main ideas and indicate how the research will be presented. Firstly, I will outline the situation that international students experience in the UK in terms of problems of source use and plagiarism. I will then draw attention to the importance of this study to EAP and postgraduate study in UK HE, and its contribution to current research in source use. Finally, I will present the over-riding research questions and an overview of the chapters of this thesis.

1.2 Source use context for international students in UK HE

In this part, I will look at the general situation in terms of source use problems for international students, then specifically at source use within EAP and postgraduate study in UK HEIs.

1.2.1 Source use problems

The similarities and differences between home and international students related to gaining competence in source use and avoiding plagiarism are open to debate. As Bourdieu and Passeron (1994: 8) proclaim, 'academic language… is no one's mother tongue'; in other words, all students have to learn to write academically, and need instruction and practice. However, it seems international students are at a disadvantage when they begin programmes of study in the UK, because of their lack of knowledge or ability to use sources in a UK HE context (Carroll and Ryan, 2005). They may experience a range of difficulties with elements of source use, which I will briefly outline here and elaborate on in chapters 2 and 3. There is evidence to suggest that students who are non-native speakers of English (those for whom English is not a first language, and who have been educated outside an English dominant country) have more difficulty with paraphrasing (Keck, 2006) and that clear changes in a non-native speaker students' discourse style from their own to one sounding more native, are easily noticed by tutors (Bull, Couglin, Collins and Sharp, 2001). They may have a

limited repertoire of reporting verbs (Hyland, 2002; Thompson and Ye, 1991), which seems likely to impact on their ability to engage with source material. They may also find the notion of criticality in their reading and writing difficult in a UK context (Wallace and Wray, 2011). Furthermore, international students may have learnt different rules about citation and attribution which they are required to change (Davis, 2007). Most seriously, they may experience problems with plagiarism in a UK HE context (Bennett, 2005).

Research has confirmed that it is very hard for international students to follow the academic conventions of a new educational culture to avoid plagiarism (Carroll and Ryan, 2005; Schmitt, 2005). Many studies have given evidence that international students are more likely to plagiarise, and more likely to be caught (Bennett, 2005; Carroll and Ryan, 2005; Hayes and Introna, 2003; Sutherland-Smith, 2008). A recent study has demonstrated that a disproportionate amount of complaints from postgraduate students, many international, relate to plagiarism: Behrens (2010) reports that 39% of complaints to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator come from postgraduates, of which 22% are from outside the EU, and most of these complaints relate to plagiarism. This gives some evidence that international postgraduate students, in particular, experience problems related to plagiarism. If teaching and learning around issues of plagiarism is not given priority, a considerable number of these students could be labelled plagiarists and receive penalties for academic misconduct (Introna and Hayes, 2004; Pecorari, 2008; Sutherland-Smith, 2008).

1.2.2 EAP and source use

Teaching about source use and avoiding plagiarism has become an integral part of instruction in EAP. It appears in EAP coursebooks, such as Bailey (2011) under headings such as 'Critical Thinking', 'Paraphrasing' and 'Avoiding Plagiarism' and is a major focus of academic writing modules on pre-sessional programmes preparing international students for progression to degrees. EAP puts international students not only as a high priority, but only priority, in most cases, in contrast to many taught Higher Education contexts, which do not prioritise them (Carroll, 2005a). It seems that the teaching of source use and avoiding plagiarism increasingly falls to EAP; for example, Day (2008)

argues that many subject tutors provide only warnings and guidelines to students about plagiarism, rather than instruction, and that it has become the work of academic staff in supporting roles to provide this.

However, the impact of EAP teaching and support with source use may not be as effective as intended. As observed by Spack (1997), it cannot be assumed that source use skills learned in EAP transfer easily to further study. Once they go onto a new area of study, students may fall back on previous habits or not see a connection with their EAP learning, and hence not use it. James (2006) suggests more transfer of skills occurs when content is included in EAP, but his student respondents did not all agree that they transferred their learning about paraphrasing and citation, which are key elements of source use. In terms of improvement within EAP, Storch and Tapper's (2009) investigation of the academic performance of 69 students at the beginning and end of a two semester EAP programme, in terms of language and grasp of rhetorical structure concluded that students made progress with structure and formality, but not language. Similarly, Shaw and Liu (1998) found that non-native speaker writers from a wide range of countries and backgrounds, mostly graduates, developed their academic writing over a 2-3 month EAP pre-sessional programme, particularly in terms of a more formal writing style, but not their language ability. Yet, according to Leki and Carson (1994), in their investigation of non-native speaker perceptions of ESL writing instruction, students most want to improve their language skills to gain more vocabulary for self-expression and paraphrasing. Therefore, more research is required of source use in an EAP context to understand student experiences and inform EAP teaching of source use.

1.2.3 Postgraduate education in the UK and source use

There are important specific problems with source use for international students at postgraduate level, particularly in terms of pedagogy, staff perceptions and expectations. Firstly, one criticism raised at postgraduate education is lack of inclusion of international students, or inclusion only at a superficial level, not one where their needs are integrated into pedagogy through adaptation of teaching methods, varied learning opportunities and appropriate assessment (De Vita and Case, 2003). Thus, Master's programmes continue to run based on a pedagogical design for home (UK-

domiciled) students, despite the fact that the programmes may be full of international students. While universities and lecturers should value what Bourdieu (1986) calls the 'cultural capital', meaning the different social and cultural knowledge and skills that international students bring to the classroom, there is little evidence of this (Ryan and Hellmundt, 2005). Furthermore, it has been asserted that lecturers and researchers tend to apply a 'deficit model' to international students (Ballard and Clanchy, 1997), meaning that they under-value the students' previous education and skills, and require them mainly to adapt to the new academic culture in order to progress (Hall and Sung, 2009; Carroll and Ryan, 2005). Some researchers have suggested that in order to gain competence with source use, international students need to learn a 'new game' with 'new rules' (Carroll, 2005b; Leask, 2006); in other words, they need to 'unlearn' previous practices in the ways they use sources and follow the academic conventions in their new educational setting (Davis, 2007). There is pressure on international students to make this adaptation quickly, or risk failure (Handa and Power, 2005; McGowan, 2005a). This is particularly important for international postgraduate students, who already learnt certain rules during their undergraduate degrees, usually in a different context to the UK.

Evidence of negative tutor perceptions of international students has received attention. Biggs (1999: 123) explains some of the issues as tutors see them:

> The cultural background of many international students is thought to make it difficult for them to adapt to the style of tertiary teaching adopted in the host country. In particular, many international students are too teacher-dependent, too uncritical of material they have been taught, prone to rote memorization; they misunderstand the cardinal sin of plagiarism.

Biggs emphasises how these tutor perceptions again point to deficits in international students and the sense that they lack the skills to succeed. These perceptions can be supported to some extent by statistics. According to HESA (2009/10)[3], the percentage of non-EU full-time Master's students who left without an award in 2009/10 was slightly higher than that of EU students. However, this evidence should encourage further investigation of learning and teaching, rather than dismissing international students as lacking in competence.

---

[3] Bespoke data request 25/6/14 for which I am obliged to add the following disclaimer: HESA cannot accept responsibility for any inferences or conclusions derived from the data by third parties.

In addition to perceptions of a lack of competence, many studies have shown that tutors seem to make a direct link between international students and plagiarism (Angélil-Carter, 2000; McGowan, 2005a; Park, 2003; Pennycook, 1996; Sutherland-Smith, 2008). For example, Park (2003) suggests that international students are among those who cheat and plagiarise most. Surveys about plagiarism suggest that some tutors view plagiarism as a problem related or even limited to international students (Davis, 2012a; Sutherland-Smith, 2008). A tutor in my study published elsewhere stated quite categorically that 'All the most serious examples of plagiarism that I personally have come across have been from international students' (Davis, 2012a: 29). Thus, some tutors seem to single out international students as the main perpetrators of plagiarism. It is clearly important to raise tutors' awareness of international students' development and problems with source use to avoid this kind of stereotyping.

In academia, the main model of source use postgraduate students are expected to follow is the idealised expert scholar. This scholar is the author of the published work in academic journal articles and books that students read while working on assignments. The level of expertise in source use of this author would equate to that of the lecturer and is clearly greatly above that of a postgraduate student, and of international postgraduate students in particular (Pecorari, 2002). There has been some focus in the literature on expert source use (Harwood, 2009; Hyland, 1999). However, with the huge growth in international postgraduate students who need to use sources at a level to succeed in their Master's, but not beyond, the focus needs to turn now to definitions of competent source use at their level, rather than that of expert scholars. The majority of students undertaking Master's degrees in social sciences such as business are doing so for career development, not for academic progression. Thus, for both EAP and Master's study, it is much more pertinent to examine the features of source use that constitute competence at this level.

1.3 Contribution of this study

Source use is an under-researched area and very few longitudinal studies have been carried out of the development of source use, especially among international postgraduate students. One such study by Martala (2006) made use of assignments

and questionnaires to chart the progression of students through a Pre-Master's level pre-sessional course in EAP to the end of their Master's degree, and found that all student participants experienced difficulty with referencing on their EAP course, but this improved on their Master's. However, the main aim of the study was to assess overall writing development, rather than source use specifically. The most notable other longitudinal studies are Spack (1997) and Currie (1998), both of which analysed the source use of one Asian female undergraduate student. Spack looked at a Japanese student's thinking regarding citation over three years, and Currie looked at a student from Macau's source use strategies on a weekly basis over one semester. However, neither of these studies examined the development of competence in source use, nor looked at the postgraduate context, which this study will do.

A number of other studies have looked at one feature of students' source such as citation (Petrić, 2007), paraphrasing (Keck, 2006) or attribution (Chanock, 2008), or two connecting features such as reporting verbs and stance (Hyland, 2002), but none have been found that examine the development of the key features together and set out descriptors of competence in source use. Therefore, this study makes a major contribution to research of source use by demonstrating the development of a group of international postgraduate students in all the key features through an analysis of their assignments and further insights from interviews. In this way, the study offers some important findings that can be generalisable to international students in Anglophone HEIs, and a deeper understanding of what competence in all areas of source use means at postgraduate level. This knowledge can be applied to both EAP and postgraduate teaching contexts and therefore generate more understanding of international postgraduate students' source use throughout their studies. This study therefore seeks to contribute to the field of EAP, which Hyland (2006: 5) defines as 'a field open to self-scrutiny and change'; in examining source use in my own context in depth, I aim to put forward suggestions for changes in the field of EAP. More generally, I aim to contribute to an understanding of competence in source use at postgraduate level, and to suggest implications for university policies regarding source use and international students.

1.4 Summary

This chapter began by giving some background to my study, in which I showed my motivation for researching source use among international postgraduate students. I then introduced three main areas. I looked at some key problems with source use experienced by international students in UK HE, in particular problems of plagiarism, and the need to understand how students use and develop their use of sources. I discussed the role and effectiveness of EAP in supporting their development of source use towards competence. I went on to consider some of the issues for international students at postgraduate level, including pedagogy, staff perceptions and expectations. By emphasising the need to explore and understand international postgraduate students' development of competence in source use, I outlined the contribution of this study to source use research. Thus, this research seeks to examine the three areas introduced above through the following aims:

- To analyse how international postgraduate students use sources in their written assignments
- To define competence in source use at postgraduate level
- To analyse the features of source use
- To chart development in source use over two years
- To examine the problems with plagiarism in the development of source use
- To assess the implications of source use development for EAP, postgraduate education and HEIs.

These aims will be addressed in the following overarching research questions:

1. How do international students use sources on a Pre-Master's and Master's course in the UK?
2. What constitutes a competent user of sources at postgraduate level?
3. What are the implications for EAP, postgraduate subject tutors and universities?

These research questions are explained in more detail with a breakdown of sub-questions in chapter 4, which provides an account of the method.

An overview of the chapters of this research is as follows. Chapter 2 will discuss the context of this study at Southern University, as a typical UK HEI, and focus on issues related to source use among some of the key groups of international students in this institution. Chapter 3 will provide a literature review of the discourses of source use features and research related to competence in source use. Chapter 4 will set out the research design and methodology used in this research, examine the ethical issues, present a profile of participants and reflect on the methods of data collection and research tools used. Chapters 5 to 7 will present the findings from the research in the form of source use extracts from participants' assignments and interview comments, and analyse the development of source use in three groups. Chapter 8 will discuss the features of source use emerging from the study that constitute competence, and examine the implications of this study for EAP, postgraduate education and university policies. Chapter 9 will conclude this research with a summary of the key issues and implications, acknowledge the limitations of this study, and offer suggestions for further research.

Chapter 2: Research context

We are international in our orientation: in our curriculum, our staff, our student body and our partnerships in an increasingly interdependent world (Southern University, 2009a).

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to establish the context for this research, by presenting the key issues in the pedagogical setting and examining the backgrounds of the participants. Firstly, it will discuss the context of Southern University, as an example of a UK HEI. It will focus on the importance of international students to the university, the strategies with which the university approaches them, and the challenges they experience there. While the example of Southern University could be generalisable to other HEIs, I consider it important to specify some of its policies and approaches in order to understand the experiences of international students there. I argue that this context is worthy of study because of the importance of international students to UK universities and the lack of research about international postgraduate students' source use in this context.

The second part of this chapter will examine studies of international students from four specific countries: China, Japan, Sri Lanka and Algeria, who form the main participants of this research. In focusing on these groups of international students, my aim in this chapter is not to problematise the existing research on them as cultural groups, but to assess studies of the problems that they may encounter studying in UK HE, particularly with source use, in order to frame a background to the participants in this research.

I recognise that in separating students into nationality groups, there is a risk of cultural stereotyping and over-generalising. I am aware that students of the same nationality can be very diverse; however, I consider that research into the source use of specific national groups can be very useful to gain more understanding of the educational, cultural and linguistic backgrounds of the participants. I also acknowledge the differences in the available literature to discuss these groups. While there is a large body of research about Chinese students and a certain amount about Japanese students, there is very little about Sri Lankan and Algerian students. However, I took

the decision to discuss each group, because I considered that they represent quite distinct groups of learners, and that it is important to develop some understanding of their separate contexts in order to interpret their source use.

2.2 Southern University

Southern University is a 'new' university, created by the reform of 1992 in which former polytechnics in the UK could assume the status of universities. As such, it promotes itself as a modern institution with a strong focus on teaching and learning (Southern University, 2009a). It is located in a city in the South of England with a high population of students.

2.2.1 Importance of international students

Southern University rates strongly in terms of numbers of international students and nationalities represented. It has a high proportion of international students to home students, and was ranked 23rd out of 167 higher education institutions in the UK for this number (Southern University, 2010a). University publicity highlights that 20% of the student body is international, representing more than 145 countries (Southern University, 2010b).

From this large number, it is clear that international students play an essential role in Southern University's finances. Southern University calculates that £17.4 million per year currently comes from international student fees, approximately 20% of the annual income (Southern University, 2010a; 2010c). International student numbers are particularly significant at postgraduate level. While overall figures from UKCISA (2010) suggest that 40% of postgraduate students are international, figures for certain courses at Southern University are much higher. At Southern University Business School in the academic year 2009-2010, 160 out of 241 postgraduate students were international (Cox, 2010), thus forming 66% of the whole postgraduate student body in the School. This means the Master's programmes in the School are largely supported by the recruitment of international students and are likely to rely on their income stream to operate. The value of the international postgraduate market is highlighted in the university's annual accounts statement:

> The university views the postgraduate market (within the EU and internationally) as the key area for development and growth over the next five years and is reviewing and refreshing its offer to achieve its potential. (Southern University, 2010c: 8)

This statement reflects the definite focus of Southern University on international postgraduate students.

Furthermore, the university states that one of its eight current objectives is to 'increase the diversity of the student body to represent a wider range of backgrounds, cultures and countries' (Southern University, 2010c: 6). In this desire to 'increase the diversity of the student body', Southern University draws attention to a problem, in that although 145 countries are represented, a small number dominate, with China and India the top two by far (Southern University, 2010d). This mirrors global trends, as one in five international students worldwide is either Chinese or Indian (Choudaha and Chang, 2012). Studies have shown that while university staff welcome the principle of an international environment, they are concerned with the lack of diversity among international students, usually because of the predominance of Asian students (Robson and Turner, 2007).

In promotional activity, the university stresses the importance of international students directly to the curriculum of postgraduate study:

> We value the academic and cultural contribution made by international students to the University and to our master's degrees; where so much of the curriculum has an international focus, your contribution is especially relevant. (Southern University, 2010b)

There is a clear emphasis in this statement that Southern University values international postgraduate students. This emphasis fits with scholarly opinion that universities and lecturers should value the different social and cultural knowledge and skills that international students bring to the classroom (Ryan and Hellmundt, 2005). However, according to Lee (2013), such promotions to international students create a 'false halo', as students are often disappointed because little attention is paid to their experiences once they arrive. Thus, universities need to consider how to incorporate the contribution of international postgraduate students more effectively; the efforts of Southern University will be discussed below.

2.2.2 Strategies towards international students

In common with most UK HEIs, Southern University has recently implemented an internationalisation strategy, meaning the 'process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of tertiary education' (Southern University, 2009a: 24). This definition of the strategy demonstrates how seriously the university views internationalisation. One of the ways Southern University seeks to implement internationalisation is through the development of global citizenship as a key learning outcome or graduate attribute. Global citizenship is defined by Southern University (2010e: 5) as 'Knowledge and skills, showing cross-cultural awareness, and valuing human diversity. The ability to work effectively, and responsibly, in a global context'. This attribute highlights the university's intention to create 'engaged global citizens' among its student body by graduation (Southern University, 2009a). As the epigraph at the beginning of this chapter shows, the university proclaims it is 'international in its orientation' (*ibid*). Thus, the university aims to offer a clearly international environment, which welcomes international students and helps students develop for a global future.

Another way that Southern University implements an internationalisation strategy is at a programme level. Each programme has to address internationalisation of the curriculum. For example, one business course handbook explains 'the programme curriculum has at its core the internationalisation of trade and the cross-cultural competences managers need to operate successfully at a strategic level within this ever-changing global environment' (Southern University, 2009b: 3). In this way, the university attempts to achieve a connection between the programme and the development of professional skills in the workplace afterwards, as part of internationalisation. This strategy is sometimes seen as an essential outcome of internationalisation, as argued by Clifford and Joseph (2005): '(internationalisation) calls for universities to provide its students with an education that will allow them to perform successfully, professionally and socially, in a multi-cultural environment'. However, it seems difficult for universities to achieve internationalisation, because of the lack of resources, training, appropriate pedagogy and awareness of different

cultures (Halliday, 1999). Thus, despite the efforts of Southern University, internationalisation may not take place as intended.

2.2.3 Challenges for international students

The previous section outlined the university strategies for international students; however, a number of challenges exist for international students, especially related to pedagogy. Southern University, like many UK HEIs, places great emphasis on self-directed learning, where learners make their own decisions within their study (Jordan, 1997). This form of learning is central to postgraduate courses, so it is important to consider the problems international students may have with it.

Some of the teaching and learning methods in the example of MSc Economics from Southern University (2009b) are highlighted as: student-led discussions, problem-solving tasks, self-directed reading from a variety of sources, team work and reflective practice. The handbook for the course then emphasises: 'Much of the teaching is aimed at encouraging the student to take individual responsibility and be self motivated in learning. Due consideration will be given to different cultural and educational backgrounds' (Southern University, 2009b: 3). There is an assumption in this statement that it may be difficult for students of different backgrounds to take responsibility for their own learning and to direct themselves, rather than be directed by a tutor. It also suggests that students not used to this learning style will be supported, though it is not explained how. However, some research into teaching and learning within postgraduate education suggests that there is little 'consideration' of different backgrounds (Leask, 2009). Moreover, many studies show students experience a major change in teaching style when they study overseas which can make learning difficult (Handa and Power, 2005; Hayes and Introna, 2003). It is important to support students in any transition to a different teaching style, as Cheng (2000: 444) explains: 'any teacher, Western or Eastern, who plans to use methodologies which inevitably involve students' participation, must make sure that the students are familiar with and accept such methodologies'. Thus, there is a call for tutors to consider their approach to the introduction of a student-directed methodology; for example, students may adapt more successfully to a new methodology when there is active discussion of tutor and student expectations.

Furthermore, the proportion of taught hours to self-study can also amount to a big change from what international students may be used to. As an example, the MSc Economics course at Southern University comprises of 180 credits, from five compulsory modules and two optional modules, as well as a dissertation and personal development plan, which is quite typical for Business School courses. This amounts to 266 taught hours and 1,534 self-study hours, totalling 1,800 hours per year (Southern University, 2009b: 14). Thus, although this is full-time study, only 17% of the study comprises of taught hours, while 83% is self-study, so a great responsibility for learning rests with the students, and to take up this responsibility, they need to be independent and self-reliant learners. As one student reports in a feedback session: 'Postgrad study? It's down to you and your own effort now' (Southern University, 2007). International students may not have developed self-study skills in their previous education, and time management of self-study may be a frequent problem, which the university seeks to address through plentiful self-access study skills advice (Southern University, 2010f). However, it seems likely that international students unused to self-directed methods will struggle with this system.

Another problem is that international students are in fact perceived as increasing the workload of postgraduate tutors, through their need for support with study, and the time needed to help them with cultural and linguistic issues (Hall and Sung, 2009). The interview data in this study from five lecturers of business suggests that they have a limited understanding of the needs of their international students. Hall and Sung call for an urgent review to balance UK universities' financial need to recruit students with the concomitant need for resources for both students and staff. Similarly, Carroll and Ryan (2005) reported that international students were seen as adding to lecturer workloads, and some lecturer respondents in Robson and Turner's (2007) study resented the extra work and burden from international students which hindered the development of their research careers. Zepke and Leach's (2005) investigation of the integration and adaptation of international students to Anglophone HE concludes that they achieve a higher rate of successful completion when they have more direct contact with tutors. Thus, these studies problematise the lack of time in the lecturer workload which does not match the need for support of international students.

So far, I have highlighted that at Southern University, international students are considered very important, and strategies are in place to support internationalisation. However, more needs to be done in terms of supporting individual students who come to the university with a wide range of different educational experiences to help them deal with the challenges of postgraduate study. In the following section, I will discuss some of these student groups and examine the difficulties they may face with source use in an Anglophone HE context.

2.3 Specific international students

This section will focus on a discussion of four specific nationality groups of international students who study at the research context of Southern University. The majority of international students at Southern University, as at many UK HEIs, are from Asia and the Middle East or other Arabic-speaking countries; thus, participants from these regions will be the focus of this research. As explained in the introduction to this chapter, I take a cautious approach to generalising about the features of nationality groups, but consider it worthwhile to gather some understanding of their educational, cultural and linguistic backgrounds, which seem likely to affect their source use at postgraduate level in UK HE. Therefore, I will discuss what studies have revealed for each nationality group separately, as follows: Chinese, Japanese, Sri Lankan and Algerian learners. I will refer to a range of studies of these groups at different levels of education, mainly undergraduate; in fact, few studies of source use of these nationality groups at postgraduate level can be found, which indicates the need for further research at this level.

2.3.1 Chinese learners

The UK recruits more international students from China than from any other country (HESA, 2010), with 47,033 in the year 2009-10, 13% of all non-UK domicile students (OECD, 2011), and their potential to remain the biggest group remains high. Changes in China such as the recent rapid rise in middle-class urban Chinese and the need to speak English at a good level to work in international companies are reflected in the growing number of those studying English (Choudaha and Chang, 2012). In fact, the largest number of learners of English in the world is in China (Graddol, 2006). For many

of these learners, it is an important step to study overseas, as by gaining an international degree, Chinese graduates can progress further in their careers (*ibid*).

At the same time, there has also been a massive expansion of universities in China. According to Jin and Cortazzi (2006), in only five years from 1999 to 2004, the number of higher education students more than trebled to over 20 million to cater for the increase in demand. With this growth, university systems have become less homogenous, meaning that students graduating from universities may have diverse levels of skills and learning styles. Furthermore, Chinese undergraduate and postgraduate students who come to the UK will include some top-ranking students aiming for high level qualifications, and others who come because they did not achieve high enough scores for Chinese universities. The parents of some of these students may have limited education but new wealth, while some less-well off students may be funded by their family's social networks (Jin and Cortazzi, 2006). Therefore, the stakes are high and academic success is perceived as essential for future employment (Kennedy, 2002). This reveals some of the pressure that Chinese students may be under when they study in the UK.

Many Chinese students who come to the UK also face challenges in changing their practices and adapting to a new HE context. A common problem is lack of knowledge about academic writing, as there is little emphasis on this in China. In the Chinese academic system, sources may not need to be mentioned; according to Kirkpatrick (2004), students tend to assume educated readers such as their tutors will recognise their sources, so they may consider citing is unnecessary or even insulting to their tutors' knowledge. He argues that this just means Chinese learners use citation differently, but this practice is commonly seen as plagiarism in Anglophone countries. However, as Bloch (2012: 17) asserts, 'the Chinese view of plagiarism is far from monolithic'; we cannot assume all Chinese learners approach it as Kirkpatrick suggests. One difference may be in the teaching of how to avoid plagiarism. The use of references is often taught in a rather abstract way by providing self-access to a guide in Anglophone countries, which would contrast with a Chinese teaching style of giving concrete rules and examples to follow (McGowan and Lightbody, 2008).

Chinese students have been shown to experience some difficulties with paraphrasing. Hirvela and Du (2013) make an in-depth examination of two undergraduate Chinese students' experiences of paraphrasing and find that they both struggled to use it as a part of the process of writing a research paper, rather than a language or comprehension exercise. Despite exposure to other purposes of paraphrasing, one of the students seemed to continue to see paraphrasing only as a check of language ability as she had been taught in China, which seems to indicate that initial instruction in paraphrasing is difficult to change.

Chinese students may be unfamiliar with the requirement to critically evaluate source material (discussed later in 3.2.4). This may be connected to some approaches to reading taught in China such as reading and learning one source in depth, rather than multiple sources, and checking the meaning of each word, rather than reading extensively and gaining gist meanings (Jin and Cortazzi, 2006). Sometimes a lack of apparent critical thinking skills among Chinese students tends to endorse the stereotype of reticent learners (Wray, 2008). However, Wray (2008) and Cheng (2000) find evidence that Chinese learners are becoming more diverse and do not conform to some stereotypes of passive learners found in other studies (Cortazzi and Jin, 1996; Flowerdew and Miller, 1995). For example, Cheng (2000) argues that reluctance among Chinese learners to discuss reading texts is not an indication of passivity, but their focus on the vocabulary, grammar and content of a text, instead of linking it to discussion. Therefore, it is important to note some different skills and approaches among Chinese learners.

From these studies, it can be seen that Chinese students may experience problems with adaptation to a new educational culture and problems in source use with citation, paraphrasing and critical thinking, although the extent of the problems is likely to vary.

2.3.2 Japanese learners

The number of Japanese students in UK HE has fallen in recent years, following the effects of the last decade's recession in Japan. According to Jin and Cortazzi (2006), there were 30,000 Japanese students in UK universities and schools in the middle of the last decade; however, in the academic year 2009-10, there were only 3,871 in UK

HE (OECD, 2011). Japan had a literacy rate of 99% in 2002, and a population of 127 million in 2009 (World Fact Book – CIA). The reasons Japanese students decide to come to the UK may be similar to the motivations for Chinese students, in that they wish to gain English language competence and a UK academic qualification.

Some studies have highlighted a wide gulf between Japanese students' home educational context and Anglophone HE, in terms of rules and writing style. Gray and Leather (1999) assert that the Japanese education system values certainty and accuracy; therefore, students may struggle when they perceive teaching or regulations not to be completely clear. This may happen in an Anglophone context where they are not given clear instruction on plagiarism (Hyland, 2001). Pecorari (1998) highlights the challenges that Japanese students face with academic writing in a UK context. She argues: 'The distance between the Anglophone and the Japanese view of using sources is so great that it can be understood only after repeated discussion and practice' (1998: 2). Her paper is written as advice for teachers of Japanese students, rather than based on empirical research, but she offers some examples, such as: Japanese students tend to think that they do not need to cite when something is obviously true, and need a great deal of practice to change this approach.

Japanese academic writers may also find it difficult to develop a clear authorial voice, a term I define as a writer's demonstration of their stance on an issue (discussed below in 3.2.4). Hinds (1987) explains that Japanese is a reader-responsible language, in which the reader must work to interpret the message, while in English, the writer must make the thesis clear. He analyses an essay in Japanese, demonstrating the lack of clear connections between information, which leave the reader to infer the meaning. If Japanese students are used to writing in this way, it may be challenging for them to assume an authorial voice in English and make individual arguments that are immediately clear to the reader. Furthermore, Hinds (1987) suggests that Japanese writers are likely to compose just one draft to submit as a final version; in contrast, academic writing in English demands a process of drafting and re-drafting for the writer to achieve a polished product for the reader. This shift of responsibility and approach seems likely to make academic writing in English more difficult for Japanese students.

Similarly, some studies suggest Japanese students tend to have difficulty with critical reading and establishing their position in relation to texts (this will be discussed in more depth in 3.2.4). Toh (2011) describes the problems Japanese EAP learners have in approaching reading critically and offers a possible solution. He proposes a pedagogical approach for critical reading by viewing textual information from a range of interpretations including peer discussion and blogs about familiar topics, which would help students to become co-constructors of knowledge from the text. By focusing on subjects familiar to students in a monocultural EAP class in Japan, Toh suggests critical reading is achievable. However, in multicultural EAP classes in UK universities, this approach to critical reading would need to be adapted to the subjects known by all cultural groups. Dorji (1997) argues that Japanese undergraduate students who come to the UK are surprised to be asked for a spontaneous opinion, whether right or not. She asserts that they find it hard to argue or give their own view and need a process to adapt (*ibid*). Similarly, Harumi (2011) demonstrates that Japanese undergraduate students are likely to wait to speak until they know they are 'correct', and this may give the impression of reticence or lack of opinion.

These studies provide some evidence to show that Japanese learners may have many obstacles to overcome to adapt to academic writing in the UK HE context, particularly with critical reading skills and demonstrating their own views.

2.3.3 Sri Lankan learners

The number of Sri Lankan students in UK HE is very similar to the number from Japan, with 3,553 reported in 2009 (OECD, 2011). HESA (2010) statistics show that they occupy a fairly high position in some parts of the UK, as the fifth largest group represented among international students in Northern Ireland and ninth in Wales, though much lower in England. The number of Sri Lankan students in UK HE is not as high as other Asian nationalities, but the number from the whole Indian sub-continent reached 47,227 in 2009, a similar figure to China (OECD, 2011).

According to WHO, the literacy rate in Sri Lanka for 2010 was 91%, and the population reached 20,602,000 in 2009. Most universities are government-run and teach in English. University places are very limited, and only 6% of those who sit the entrance

examination get admitted (Fullbright Sri Lanka, 2012). This means that Sri Lankan students increasingly look to study overseas. A study by Little and Evans (2005) reveals a large and growing market for external qualifications and courses, demonstrating the level of interest among Sri Lankans to study in the UK or other Anglophone countries.

Students from Sri Lanka or countries with a similar ESL background have a different mother tongue, and use English in their daily lives and study. However, this is a different English to the one they encounter in the UK, and in UK HE in particular (Carroll, 2005a). As Abhayawansa and Fonseca (2010) argue, despite the high numbers of students represented in Anglophone HE, there is a lack of research about the approaches to learning of international students from the Indian sub-continent. Their research demonstrates that some Sri Lankan undergraduate students of accounting in Australia had surface (means to an end) motivation to pass exams, rather than deep (learning for later goals), to use the terms from Biggs (1979). As one Sri Lankan respondent explains 'If you are taught something, I think, you should be tested. Or what's the point?' (Abhayawansa and Fonseca, 2010: 540). Respondents took time to adjust to a more learner-centred approach, rather than memorisation and reproduction of text. The study demonstrates that Sri Lankan students unsurprisingly are influenced by their previous educational and cultural knowledge. More significantly, it shows that the cultural specificity of teaching methods, even within the same academic discipline, needs to be discussed at length so that students understand how to succeed in a new academic context. This point is important for most international students, and is discussed above with reference to Chinese students. However, it may not be given enough attention if there is an assumption that students who have already studied the same subject in English in their own countries are already equipped with the knowledge and understanding they need for their postgraduate study in an Anglophone context.

Some problems with plagiarism in HE have been reported related to the Indian sub-continent. Satyanarayana (2010: 373) laments that plagiarism is 'rampant and all pervasive' in Indian scientific writing, and also suggests that there is very little to regulate plagiarism in Indian HE, so students can copy source text without being noticed. There are no studies to examine a comparison with Sri Lanka, but it seems

possible that such practices may influence or be shared by students there, by dint of their shared political and cultural history with a geographical neighbour. Nayak and Venkatraman (2010) investigate the problem of Indian students, often top-ranking in their own country, of being at risk of failure in Australian universities. They report the experiences of seven students, mainly postgraduates, who had problems with deep learning, critical thinking and referencing, because they were not used to an Anglophone context and different ways of using sources. It seems likely that Sri Lankan students in UK HE may experience similar problems with source use.

Thus, there is some evidence that Sri Lankan students have problems adapting to an Anglophone HE environment, may adopt a surface learning approach, and in common with some Indian students, could experience problems with critical thinking, referencing and plagiarism.

2.3.4 Algerian learners

The number of Algerian students is very small, compared to the other groups above, with only 261 in UK HE in 2009 (OECD, 2011). However, if they are considered together with other Maghreb and Middle Eastern students, the number totals 25,054 (7%) international students for that year (*ibid*). The number of Arabic speakers has seen considerable growth in recent years in US and UK HEIs (Choudaha and Chang, 2012); therefore, it is becoming more important to research the needs of this group of learners. According to WHO, Algeria had a population of 36,383,000 in 2009 and a literacy rate of 73% in 2006, which is the lowest of all countries represented here. This is comparable to other Maghreb countries, and indicates a problem for educational development.

The national language of Algeria is Arabic, but there is still a considerable influence of French. According to Clark (2006), currently the reforms of Maghreb countries follow the European system, in terms of the length of undergraduate, postgraduate and PhD degrees, and in this way, establish the influence of European HE over Maghreb countries. Therefore, Algerian students experience a university system in their own countries which has some similarities with the UK, in contrast to Asian students. While most education is in Arabic, French is still used in technical subjects, such as science

and maths, and Algeria has kept the baccalauréat at the end of secondary school (Clark, 2006). The government aims to encourage student mobility, and the reform in 1992-3 made English the first language taught in school, which suggests school leavers should have a good level of proficiency (*ibid*).

However, Algerians are likely to experience some of the problems that other Arabic speakers have with academic writing, such as difficulty with sentence length because Arabic uses long, metaphoric sentences, unlike English academic writing (Al Fadda, 2012). Regarding problems for Arabic speakers with source use, McCabe, Feghali and Abdallah's (2008) study of undergraduate students at three Lebanese universities found a high level of academic dishonesty according to US standards, but not according to local students who felt they were merely helping each other, as part of a normal practice in their collectivist culture. Their study is important in highlighting different practices and standards, but the results are perhaps not surprising. More notable may be the finding in an interview-based study of 20 Arabic L1 academic writers in Jordan that postgraduate students struggled more with mastery of source use from a disciplinary perspective than a linguistic one, especially those in social science subjects (Pedersen, 2011). This may be due to the difficulty of argumentation and development of authorial voice in social sciences. In a similar way to Toh's (2011) finding reported above in relation to Japanese learners, Pedersen also found that Jordanian students were able to engage critically with sources when they could clearly relate to the topic. Research with a similar focus by Iyer-O'Sullivan (2013) found that 10 ethnically Arab postgraduate students of education in Dubai struggled to establish an authorial voice from a tendency to idealise the published source. They asked 'how can we criticise experts?' and exclaimed 'I can't say it any better' (Iyer-O'Sullivan, 2013: 9). I contend that these concerns are not specific to Arab students, but they may be heightened by an educational background where criticality has not been previously encouraged.

These studies have provided some evidence that Algerian students may experience problems with source use in the ways that other Arabic speakers do, in terms of language use and the influence of their culture in decisions about how to study. However, the use of sources by Arabic speakers, especially from Maghreb countries,

has not been examined in depth to date; further investigation would clearly be very useful.

2.4 Summary

This chapter has established the context of international students at Southern University. It has shown their importance to the university in terms of numbers and finance. It has outlined how the university attempts to incorporate the contribution of international students through learning outcomes and the internationalisation strategy. However, it has also noted the problems for international students from a change of learning methodology, especially an increase in self-directed methods and limited pedagogical support. These problems for international students at Southern University can be seen as typical of UK HEIs, and ones that need urgent attention.

The chapter has also looked at the context of some specific groups of international students, by examining studies of their problems in Anglophone HE, especially those related to source use. It has found a considerable number of studies about Chinese students' source use, but fewer about the other nationalities, presumably due to their smaller numbers in Anglophone HE. These studies indicate that Chinese students use citation differently or consider it unnecessary, may lack critical thinking skills, and experience problems with language use, such as with paraphrasing. Similarly, Japanese students have been found to have problems paraphrasing, establishing an authorial voice and reading critically. Studies about Sri Lankan students suggest that they may focus on surface rather than deep learning, and in common with Indian students, may lack critical thinking skills and consider the copying of text to be acceptable. Research about Algerian students is sparse, but it seems that their academic writing would be influenced by Arabic which has a very different sentence structure. In common with some other Arabic speakers, they may also have a different approach to plagiarism and experience some difficulty with developing an authorial voice.

These studies suggest that problems in source use exist for each group, and that further research is necessary to examine the way students from each country use and develop their use of sources, in order to understand and support them more effectively. In addition, a considerable number of these studies have focused on

undergraduate students; it seems the issues for postgraduate students and source use have been given less attention in the literature. Therefore, this study will focus on the context of Southern University and postgraduate students from these specific countries in order to examine their source use development. Details of the participants and research approach will be provided in chapter 4 on methodology.

In summarising this chapter, I acknowledge the differing approaches to research of international students and the varying conceptualisations of key issues regarding source use. Here, I emphasize that my position in this research is as an EAP practitioner with the aim of contributing to the EAP context by gaining more understanding of the development of source use among international postgraduate students. Therefore, in the following chapter, I will also approach the literature review about source use and competence from its relevance to the EAP practitioner context.

Chapter 3: Source use and competence

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I aim to establish the position of current research into source use and competence, and thus argue for the importance of this study to build on the body of literature about source use features and competence and to join up the two areas.

Firstly, I will discuss perspectives of source use and the key features that constitute source use according to current research: citation, paraphrasing, reporting verbs, critical engagement and avoidance of plagiarism. Before discussing the last feature, avoidance of plagiarism, I will examine studies which discuss what plagiarism is, before moving to what it is not. By critically examining studies of these key features, I argue that further investigation of all features is necessary to establish what is involved in source use and how it develops.

Secondly, the chapter will consider discourses of competence and relate these to source use. I chose to theorise source use through the concept of competence, because of the clear need for both scholars and educators to come to an understanding and agreement about what constitutes a competent user of sources at postgraduate level.

3.2 Source use

As briefly defined in chapter 1, source use refers to the actions by a writer in utilising words and ideas from other authors when producing a text. There is little evidence of this term before the frequent use in the past decade by Pecorari (2002; 2003; 2006; 2008; 2013). Pecorari's use of the term signifies a deeper and more integrated element to academic writing than the commonly used 'referencing', which looks only at the acts of adding other authors' names to words and ideas to a text; for example, Jordan (1997) divides referencing into quotations, footnotes and a reference list. In contrast, the term 'source use' is suited to this study, since I intend to focus on the multiple actions by student writers in making use of source material in their assignments and to analyse their actions in depth and over time. Following Pecorari, a number of other researchers have also begun to use the term 'source use' to discuss student academic

writing (for example, Abasi, Akbari and Graves, 2006; McCulloch, 2012), and I will join this approach.

There is agreement in the literature that source material is a completely expected feature and essential requirement of academic writing in Higher Education (Baynham, 1999; Hyland, 2009; Swales and Feak, 2004). Without it, it would be impossible to write academically, as a text would lack evidence, authority, argument and context. All genres of academic writing require a student to make appropriate use of the sources they have consulted (Pecorari, 2008; Pecorari and Shaw, 2012). Thus, there is no question about the importance for all students in gaining the skills to use sources appropriately.

Source use is not one skill or action; it is clear that there are a number of key elements which make up source use. In the following subsections, I will discuss five key elements, which I arrived at through both my reading of relevant studies, and, as I will discuss in chapter 4, through my own research of students' source use. The five elements are: citation, paraphrasing, reporting verbs, critical engagement and avoidance of plagiarism. I will review these elements separately, but also recognise some of the connections and overlaps between them. In my review, I will also look at the existing literature on competence in each feature.

3.2.1 Citation

I begin with citation because it may be considered the most obvious feature of source use, as it signals to the reader that a source is being used by the writer. Within studies of applied linguistics, the term 'citation' is widely used to refer to the act of placing a reference to source material in a writer's text (Hyland, 2004; Swales, 1990; Thompson, 2005). This basic understanding of citation will be used as a starting point in this research. The key areas of literature on citation relate to their function or purpose, to rules regarding formatting, and to the range of use, and will be reviewed below.

Moving on from understanding citation as a referencing act, research into the role and purpose of citation has been given more attention in recent years by a small number of scholars. The work of Swales (1990; 2014) is particularly important. Drawing on Swales'

seminal work (1990) on genre analysis and his Creating A Research Space (CARS) model, Swales and Feak (2004) situate citation in a research role. They assert that writers can employ citation for purposes such as: to indicate their contribution to a field by defining contextual references to other authors, to give authority to the writer and show respect for other scholars. The CARS model has subsequently been used to inform pedagogy and further studies of the use of sources, such as Kwan (2006) and Petrić (2007). In a more recent study, Swales (2014: 119) draws attention to the fact that students have to 'embark on the arduous process of learning to cite in such a manner that their academic papers are increasingly persuasive and convincing'. Thus, as Swales points out, learning to use citation is very challenging, and also a major part of academic study, as citational choices are critical in making student assignments successful. Pecorari (2008: 49) takes this point further:

> Good source use entails understanding the role of citation in the life of the disciplinary community and in its texts; mastering the range of forms in which citations can be included in a text; understanding the rhetorical effects that formal choices have on the text, and the purposes for which citations can be used and knowing about the conventional expectations of the discourse community.

Thus, as Pecorari points out, good source use involves the development of many skills related to citation up to a level of 'mastery' within a disciplinary community; it seems clear that developing these skills would take a long time, especially for international students. Swales (2014) also notes that there may be a difference between the intended purpose of a student in using certain citation, and the assumed understanding of that purpose by the tutor. This view points to the gap between the citational practices and knowledge of students and tutors, which needs more attention.

Some authors have focused on citation functions by tutors, such as Harwood's (2009) study involving twelve academic expert users in the disciplines of computer science and sociology. The experts in his study analysed a recent publication of their own and reported up to eleven different functions of citation and both inter- and intra-disciplinary differences. Signposting was the most common function for the computer scientists, and showing a position the most common for the sociologists, while further functions included giving credit, building an idea and aligning oneself to certain research. Through his method of interview probing and direct discussion of the

participants' own texts, Harwood's study is useful in providing insights into citational choices by experts. To look at students' choice of citation functions, Petrić (2007) examined citation in Master's dissertations written in English by second language writers at a Central European university and found the majority of usage to be for attribution purposes among eight low-level students (at a pass or pass with honours grade), and for a wider range of uses such as synthesis and evaluation by eight higher-level students (at a high honours pass grade). Due to the skewed distribution of higher awards on the programme, Petrić's 'low-level' group did not all gain a much lower grade than the 'high-level' group; however, the comparison is important as it involves a discussion of competence and shows some correlation between students using a wider range of citation functions and gaining at least slightly better marks. Following up on both studies, Petrić and Harwood (2013) investigated the use of different citation functions by one distinction-level European postgraduate student of management. They noticed that although she used a smaller range of citational functions than the experts in Harwood's (2009) study, she varied the range to suit the task requirements. For example, in the analysis of a film from management perspectives, she used more citation with an 'application' function; in other words, by connecting a situation to a cited theory. This leads them to suggest that some teaching of citation functions should be task specific, which could be a useful method for international postgraduate students. The studies by Harwood and Petrić are especially significant, as they are among the few studies that examine citation functions in depth. Apart from their work, there is a lack of research into the functions of citations used specifically by international postgraduate students.

Within EAP practice, citation is often referred to as 'referencing' (as suggested in 3.2 above), perhaps to simplify the action as the mechanics of naming a source. For example, Bailey (2006: 99) defines a reference as 'an acknowledgement that you are making use of another writer's ideas or data in your writing'. In their study skills guide, Williams and Carroll (2009) highlight referencing as part of the communication between writer and reader, in that it is an act of placing a 'signal' in a text to tell the reader where information comes from. As Pecorari (2008) and Chanock (2008) argue, the tutor expert reader expects these signals, but the student non-expert writer may not be fully aware of this expectation. In contrast, Angélil-Carter (2000: 1) asserts that

many academic staff dismiss referencing as 'a technical problem to which students need to apply their minds', while students are likely to see it as a more serious problem that requires a lot more attention. I suggest that the view students and tutors take of citation depends on the importance given to it in their educational context. Thus, if staff dismiss it in the way Angélil-Carter suggests, students may not gain the understanding and awareness needed to use it appropriately.

Universities usually provide library research guides which lay out the rules of citation, according to the institution's referencing system. In these guides, there may be too much attention to formatting citation, rather than its purpose and functions, because, as Pecorari (2013: 65) argues, 'citation conventions are nothing more than the mechanics of referencing'. It seems that because formatting rules can be listed and learnt, they are often tested as evidence of good citation. However, it seems true to say that while citation is a study skill that can be learnt through instruction on formatting and procedural rules, students need extensive practice in order to use it well (Carroll, 2007). There is also a continuously growing number of possible types of sources to cite (Kwan, 2008; Williams and Carroll, 2009), which can be bewildering to students. As a result, both student writers and tutors need to consult comprehensive referencing guides such as Pears and Shields (2013), who break down rules of citation into multiple sub-rules, covering almost any possible source material including blogs, podcasts and social media sites. It is worth noting here that as these examples are all new kinds of source material, even expert scholars may not know the rules for formatting the citations. This fact draws attention to the difficulty of knowing all the rules of current citation formatting; it is no longer a question of students just learning the difference between citing a book and citing an article.

One important element of citation for students to learn is the breakdown into two basic types according to the position in a sentence: integral and non-integral (Swales, 1990). Swales defines integral citation as the positioning of the author in the sentence, followed by a reporting verb, which draws more attention to the author, and non-integral citation as the author in brackets at the end of cited information (following the Harvard or APA system), which puts the focus on the information, rather than the

author. Learning these differences is essential in the competent use of citation, to enable students to write effective literature reviews and create convincing arguments (Ridley, 2008). In her comprehensive guide and research on literature reviews, Ridley (2008) also notes the differences between the disciplines in preferences for integral or non-integral citation. She argues that writers in the humanities and social sciences make more use of integral citation with reporting verbs because knowledge is more contested. Hyland's (2004) research is important in this respect, as he identified quite distinct disciplinary differences in citation choices in a range of journal articles. This research did not include student writing, but demonstrates the importance for academic writers to be aware of disciplinary differences in citation.

This section of the review has looked at studies of citation regarding functions, formatting and forms. There is an expectation in many of these studies that students should master these skills and that by doing so, citation can help students to construct knowledge in their texts (Shi, 2008; Spack, 1997). However, it is unclear from the existing literature what mastery of citation involves, which indicates the need for this research. The next section moves to another key feature of source use, paraphrasing.

3.2.2 Paraphrasing

Unlike citation, learning to paraphrase is not about following a procedure with guidelines, and requires both a wide linguistic resource and a great deal of practice. Bailey (2011: 50) provides one definition of paraphrasing as 'changing the wording of a text so that it is significantly different from the original source, without changing the meaning', although other interpretations (Keck, 2006) will be discussed below.

Paraphrasing is considered a particularly important language issue for international students which demands attention from tutors; for example, Chatterjee (2007) calls for more pedagogic interventions to focus on paraphrasing, and Flowerdew and Li (2007) propose that tutors should acknowledge the role of formulaic language in scientific writing when students paraphrase and re-use source material. The impact of a limited vocabulary on non-native speaker students' ability to read source material and use it in their writing has been emphasised by Schmitt (2005). It has also been suggested that if international students are admitted to English-medium universities with a low IELTS

score, they are likely to need help with academic writing (Ridley, 2006). A great deal of research has confirmed the problems that international students face when they are given the instruction 'use your own words' for written assignments (Angélil-Carter, 2000; McGowan, 2005a; Pennycook, 1996; Sutherland-Smith, 2008). A worrying tendency in assessment, especially concerning international students, is that tutors currently focus much more on the copying of words, rather than ideas. Angélil-Carter (2000: 93) asserts that:

> Most markers, though they understand plagiarism to include the use of the ideas of others without acknowledgement, are generally fairly lenient when this occurs in student essays. They are annoyed far more by word-for-word copying whether acknowledged or not.

 As suggested by Introna and Hayes (2004) and Pecorari (2013), one of the consequences of the current widespread use of text-matching software, such as *Turnitin*, to check student work, is that tutors pay more attention to the words used in student texts. This is very significant for international students, as those with a small range of vocabulary are likely to have high matches to original text picked up by the software and thus face accusations of plagiarism (discussed below in 3.2.5), essentially because of poor paraphrasing skills.

Poor attempts at paraphrasing are often called 'patchwriting', a term created by Howard (1993: 233) to mean 'copying from a source text and then deleting some words, altering grammatical structures, or plugging in one-for-one synonym-substitutes'. These strategies can easily be recognised as among the practices used by international students, especially at an early stage. Howard (1995) argues that a period of patchwriting should be expected in a student's learning development, when the student does not have enough language or knowledge about a subject to write about it in their own way. Other scholars agree that patchwriting can be a developmental stage towards competence, for example Pecorari (2003: 338) asserts: 'Today's patchwriter is tomorrow's competent academic writer'. Howard (1995) insists this is a common stage for all writers, but especially non-native speakers struggling with limited resources. I reported her view elsewhere that paraphrasing can be impossible for international students:

> What we are asking international students to do is ridiculous, it's not possible. Unless there is some way to sort of inject vocabulary into international students, you know, it is not a question of them just knowing the rules, but it is a question of them acquiring

the facility with English to allow them to do anything but cut and paste and patchwrite. (Davis, 2012a: 25)

Howard makes a strong argument that the requirement for international students to paraphrase effectively is unrealistic, unless there is extensive vocabulary teaching. I agree that international students need to learn a great deal of discipline-specific vocabulary, but the degree of their problems with paraphrasing also depends on their previous study and knowledge of the subject, as well as their language level upon entry to their study.

The teaching of vocabulary in EAP tends to be rather limited and of a generic nature, usually because the students in most EAP classrooms are multi-disciplinary. While EAP tutors may recognise the usefulness of developing the vocabulary of each student's discipline, this might be difficult to achieve in practice. Lee and Swales (2006) suggest that one useful way to work on vocabulary skills in EAP is to encourage students to build their own discipline-specific corpus. In this way, students could work usefully on their vocabulary development within their discipline and perhaps be better equipped to paraphrase. In contrast, EAP textbooks usually have sections dedicated to generic paraphrasing practice, with strategies such as changing vocabulary, changing word class and changing the word order (Bailey, 2011). Sowton (2012) suggests that paraphrasing can be achieved by changing the grammar, for example changing a verb phrase from active to passive. Research by Keck (2010) endorses the importance of grammatical skills for effective paraphrasing. Thus, strategies for expanding vocabulary and manipulating grammar need to be taught and most importantly, frequently practised, so that non-native speakers can attempt to use sources effectively.

However, Hirvela and Du (2013) hold that decontextualised paraphrasing exercises, such as those commonly used in EAP classes, do not enable students to understand the purpose of paraphrasing. Their study of two Chinese undergraduates reveals that there may be a tendency for L2 students to focus on the structure and language of the original and on 'knowledge telling' from one separate source, rather than 'knowledge transforming' in the way they represent text from multiple sources to create ideas in their own paper. This may be an expected earlier stage of paraphrasing. I agree with Hirvela and Du (2013) that further support with paraphrasing is necessary throughout

a period of study, not just at the beginning. As Carroll (2005a: 36) argues, 'it takes skill, practice and time to begin to do yourself justice in another language and EFL students…enrolled on a one-year Master's may never have that opportunity'. Furthermore, Pecorari (2013: 70) alludes to another current phenomenon:

> When writers lack confidence in their abilities to produce accurate and appropriate-sounding representations of their ideas in their sources, they often adopt a strategy that is neither quotation nor paraphrase.

This strategy is likely to lead them to problems with plagiarism. It is clearly essential for EAP to support students in their development of paraphrasing skills, and to help students understand the differences between quotations and paraphrasing. To do this, it is necessary for EAP to use a range of approaches with both generic and discipline-specific vocabulary learning, although the latter is more difficult in EAP.

Unlike Bailey's (2011) view reported at the beginning of this section, Keck (2006) does not consider that all paraphrasing is 'significantly different from the original'. She suggests that there can be four levels of paraphrase: near copy, minimal revision, moderate revision and substantial revision. The work of Keck (2006; 2010; 2014) on categorising levels of paraphrasing ability is very useful to this study, so I will discuss it in detail here. In her study of paraphrasing by 79 L1 and 74 L2 undergraduate students, Keck (2006) defines an 'attempted' paraphrase as when a writer takes some source text and makes at least one word-level change. Thus, her categorisation of paraphrases ranges from almost identical strings of text (near copy) to completely rephrased text (substantial revision), but omits any copying and pasting of complete excerpts, which would be an 'exact copy'. In her analysis of text, Keck uses the term 'unique links' for words or phrases that are identical to the excerpt and not used in other parts of the text, and the terms 'general links' for words or phrases that are both identical to the excerpt and to other parts of the text. She makes this differentiation to suggest that 'general links' are connected to main ideas or key terms as they occur in several parts of the text, and therefore are probably more acceptable to re-use than 'unique links' which are tied to a specific section of text. To make her analysis, she calculates the number of words in the sentence and within that, the number of unique links, to create a percentage. In this way, she calculates 'near copy' to be a text with more than 50% of words with unique links, 'minimal revision' to be between 20-49%, 'moderate

revision' to be 1-19% and 'substantial revision' to have no unique links. For example, based on the original text 'comparable worth, the notion that different jobs can be rated equal and paid equally', the bold words in the following paraphrases show the unique links (as analysed by Keck). A near copy is 'comparable worth is an idea **that different jobs can be rated equal and paid equally**'; minimal revision is 'comparable worth is the idea **that different jobs can be rated equal** by a set of standards and be **paid equally**'; moderate revision is 'comparable worth is the idea that various jobs may be ranked **equally**, and therefore should be **paid equally**', substantial revision is 'this article discusses the concept of comparable worth, a concept set on balancing out wages for all workers of the same job level' (Keck, 2006: 268). These four categorisations of attempted paraphrases will be later referred to in my analysis of student assignments.

The different levels of paraphrasing are likely to reflect the linguistic and grammatical resource, understanding of content, and experience of paraphrasing of the writer. Keck (2006) suggests that native speaker writers are more likely to produce substantial revisions than non-native speakers. So, if paraphrasing is defined as making a text 'significantly different from the original' (see Bailey, 2011, above), it seems that non-native speakers may not be able to paraphrase successfully. Keck (2014) revisits her earlier research and suggests that novice writers (both L1 and L2) have most difficulty with paraphrasing; nevertheless, she found that those who relied on exact or near copies were a small group of L2 learners. There are different views of just how much re-phrasing makes a paraphrase acceptable, but using Keck's categories, I suggest that for the purposes of Master's study, the level of moderate revision (1-19% of unique links to source text) is adequate for international students. I base my view on two considerations: achieving a substantial revision can be very time-consuming and difficult for a non-native speaker student at this level; a moderate revision is unlikely to be considered as inappropriate textual borrowing or highlighted by the text-matching tool *Turnitin*. Research into international students' practices regarding paraphrasing is important to analyse their strategies and note where and when more support is needed so that they can achieve at least moderate revisions.

This part of the review has looked at paraphrasing problems related to language, understanding and current definitions of levels of paraphrasing. The following part will move to discuss reporting verbs as another element of source use.

3.2.3 Reporting verbs

Like paraphrasing, competence in reporting verbs is connected to language competence. A reporting verb is defined as one a writer employs to introduce an author and their findings and is generally used with integral citation (Swales, 1990). The literature on reporting verbs has focused on range, functions and disciplinary differences, with some focus on the teaching and learning.

Important work on analysing reporting verbs has been done by Hyland (1999; 2002; 2004). His research, building on early work by Swales (1990), presents a breakdown of reporting verbs into those which are 'evaluative', and thus indicate the writer's position relative to the source, such as 'argue' or 'claim', and those which are 'non-evaluative', which indicate the writer's neutrality to the research, such as 'state' or 'report'. Hyland (2002) makes further distinctions into 'research acts' of the author's results, such as 'concludes', 'cognitive acts' of the author's ideas, such as 'believes', and 'discourse acts' where the writer shows their interpretation using an author's ideas, such as 'denies'. Hyland's work draws attention to the many subtleties of meaning and function within reporting verbs, which make it clear that they require a high level of linguistic and academic knowledge to use well. The wide range of functions in reporting verbs was also demonstrated by Thompson and Ye (1991) who found more than 400 reporting verbs which indicated the writer's different perspectives, intentions and integration of ideas into their texts. They state that international students tend to use a small range of reporting verbs, which would seem likely to limit the students' ability to engage critically with the sources they read.

It may also be difficult for international students to possess an awareness of disciplinary differences related to reporting verbs. In his research of these differences, Hyland (1999) finds that the reporting verbs most frequently used in marketing and sociology are 'suggest' and 'argue', while those for electronic engineering are 'use' and

'propose'. This has implications for novice writers, as they need to know not only the meanings of reporting verbs, but also which are chosen and used in their disciplines. Acquisition of discipline-specific reporting verbs is most likely to occur through the reading of subject material and subsequent practice, so, clearly the process of learning to use reporting verbs effectively takes time.

In the same sort of approach to paraphrasing, EAP textbooks tend to present reporting verbs in categories, which could be grammatical (verbs followed by 'that' or a noun + for + gerund) or those showing a reaction from the reader to the source text author's position (such as 'doubt') (Bailey, 2011). Sowton (2012) emphasises the importance of understanding the meaning of reporting verbs and outlines the denotation (core meaning), connotation (implied meaning) and strength (strong, weak or neutral) to help learners use them appropriately. For example, he suggests that 'affirm' has the denotation of 'declare positively', the connotation 'useful when comparing the views of two or more authors' and is 'strong' (Sowton, 2012: 129). These distinctions can help students, but would be more effective if connected to a disciplinary context. The work of Swales and Feak (2004) is important in laying out the frequency of use of different reporting verbs for different disciplines. In these ways, students can be guided towards making appropriate choices with reporting verbs, although merely learning categories of meaning does not make their use competent. Using this kind of categorisation can be seen as a useful starting point for understanding their meaning.

In addition to learning the categorisation of reporting verbs, students need to select the appropriate form, grammar and tense for the desired rhetorical function. Novice writers may not understand differences in the reporting expressions to use when drawing on sources; for example, 'as noted by P' indicates that an author notes something and is right to note it, so the writer has the same authority as the author, whereas 'as P argues' means that the writer is deferring to the author's authority (Pecorari, 2008). Swales and Feak (2004) highlight the differences in tense use of reporting verbs, with the present simple indicating closeness with the writer's view, the writer's own research or current knowledge, the present perfect indicating more distance, and the past tense showing the greatest distance. Manipulating appropriate tenses for reporting verbs thus requires considerable skill and practice. Shaw (1992:

303) points out that 'non-native and unskilled writers can create anomalous or difficult texts by choosing the wrong kind of reporting sentence'. He examines the use of reporting verbs in terms of past and nonpast tenses, with integral and non-integral citation, the generality of the point being made and the writer's support for the work cited. He concludes that it is very important for tutors to teach how the reporting verbs fit into the sentence and paragraph, for the purpose of coherence. If reporting verbs are taught in isolation, it may be difficult for students to see how they fit into the text. Thus, the teaching of reporting verbs requires contextualisation and like paraphrasing, the provision of a great deal of practice for international students in order to achieve competence. It is an important area of learning, because if academic writers are able to use a range of reporting verbs appropriately within their disciplines, they are often more able to engage critically with sources. Therefore, the range of verbs, including different categories (evaluative and non-evaluative) are important for source use and will be referred to in the analysis for this study.

A number of studies of reporting verbs have connected their use to authorial voice and evaluation (Hyland, 2002; Shaw, 1992). I agree that these features can be connected, but in this study, I will consider voice and evaluation under critical engagement, which will be reviewed as the next feature of source use.

3.2.4 Critical engagement

Critical engagement with literature is a very important universal requirement of source use; as Wallace and Wray (2011: 7) affirm, 'all academic traditions require a critical engagement with the works of other scholars'. However, it is often difficult for students to know exactly what the requirement of their academic tradition is because critical engagement is not a simple or single element; it involves a process of critical thinking, reading and writing, and a further subset of many skills such as comparing, synthesising and evaluation (Ridley, 2008). Therefore, perhaps to simplify this difficult concept, study guides try to put it into student-friendly and straightforward definitions; for example, Williams (2009: viii) says being critical is equal to 'being thoughtful, asking questions, not taking things you read…at face value', while Cottrell (2011) describes critical skill as evaluating reading and relating it to other information. These definitions are probably much more helpful for students to understand than

rather general learning outcomes such as: 'critically evaluate approaches to business and management research', used for the dissertation module on Master's degrees in Business (Southern University, 2009b: 50). I recognise the importance of unpacking the notions of a critical approach; therefore, I will break them down here into critical thinking, critical reading and critical writing. I understand that these skills and practices join up and overlap, but by considering them separately, I aim to establish what is understood currently in research of different areas of critical engagement.

Starting with critical thinking, there has been a long tradition of highlighting its importance for learning. The definition by Ennis (1985: 45) 'critical thinking is reflective and reasonable thinking that is focused on deciding what to believe or do' emphasises the action, or that the thinking will lead to action. Ennis divides this thinking into a process which starts with information, goes through problem solving and a clear interpretation until a conclusion is made. Similarly, Cottrell (2011) presents critical thinking as a process through many actions including identifying argument, evaluating evidence, recognising techniques employed by authors and drawing logical conclusions. However, De Bono (1984) argues that there is too much focus on critical thinking in academia and there should be more focus on other kinds of thinking that are not responses to information. This is an interesting objection, but not one that can be argued in the context of source use which requires a critical response to information.

One area of research has focused on how critical thinking can be taught. Willingham (2007) argues that teaching critical thinking separately from content is meaningless, because critical thinking is built on responses to content. In the multidisciplinary EAP classroom in which students are not taught content, the teaching of critical thinking skills, like the teaching of discipline-specific vocabulary, may therefore be difficult to achieve. Some authors have looked at ways that critical thinking can be taught in language classrooms; for example, McKinley (2013) argues that tutors cannot claim some cultures are not good at critical thinking and considers it is the responsibility of tutors to approach it differently. Based on this approach, he suggests that if given appropriate linguistic structures to use, Japanese learners will be able to engage in

critical thinking. This seems to be a useful first step, to equip students with language, but would need to be followed up with extensive practice and clear instruction.

Regarding the notion of critical reading, Wallace and Wray (2011: 7) argue that the skill lies in: 'assessing the extent to which authors have provided adequate justification for the claims they make'. They suggest that this assessment depends on what the authors communicate and the relevant knowledge and experience of reader. Therefore, it can be said that critical reading depends on the ability of both the writer and the reader. Other researchers have taken this further and claim that critical reading has to be socially situated and dialogic (Toh, 2011; Wallace, 2003). This means that critical reading stems from the cultural identity of the reader and their interaction with the text.

Critical reading is often a difficult concept for students to grasp. Weller (2010) argues that there needs to be time allocated to the teaching of critical reading. Universities expect students to be able to do critical reading, but tend not to allocate time or resources for students to learn and practise it as a skill, perhaps because it is difficult to do inside the classroom. Furthermore, Wallace (2003) contends that tutors might see non-native readers as 'incompetent' because they lack linguistic and cultural knowledge next to the 'model L1 reader', and argues that tutors should respect the diverse approaches of different students. If tutors do compare L1 and L2 readers in this way, they position international students at a clear disadvantage. A more inclusive response is proposed by Toh (2011), as discussed in 2.3.2. He makes a suggestion for tutors to introduce critical reading through texts in which students can easily bring their own cultural knowledge and understanding in order to 'read into' the text and begin to evaluate. Thus, his approach would be useful to help international students new to reading in this way, as it makes it an achievable task for them.

Students and tutors may have different understandings of critical reading. Weller (2010) contrasts students' perception that academic texts contain 'points of view' with tutors' perception of reading as 'critical encounters with texts that simultaneously integrate multiple perspectives' (Weller, 2010: 101). Thus, in her view, students examine texts for ideas, but their tutors examine them more interactively and at a much deeper level. This difference of approach seems to me to be expected, at least

initially, until students learn more about reading. This difference is also likely to contribute to the tendency by novice student writers to include 'points of view' from both the author they are reading and the published work that author draws on, without acknowledging secondary citation (East, 2005; Pecorari, 2006).

Moving onto critical writing, important research has been carried out by Ridley (2008). She sets out the strategies for critical writing as comparing theories, supporting arguments, synthesizing, agreeing with or rejecting other authors' views. These strategies for critical writing tie in with the different uses of citation, reviewed above in 3.2.1, but I suggest they can be grouped under two main actions: evaluating sources, and establishing one's own position or stance towards sources or a subject. Hyland (2009: 74) defines stance as 'an attitudinal, writer-oriented function which concerns the ways writers present themselves and convey their judgements, opinions and commitments', and differentiates this from engagement, which he suggests is the writer's connection with the reader and their knowledge and views, in the context of published articles. Hyland's definition of stance is helpful to this study, as it focuses on the writer's action; however, I will view this as part of engagement, rather than separate from it, because I am looking at the concept of critical engagement by a student writer. As mentioned in 3.2.3, critical engagement can be connected with reporting verbs; in-depth corpus-based research by Charles (2006) examined stance in reporting clauses using theses in social sciences and natural sciences by native speaker students. Her focus is on how the thesis writers report their own research. Therefore, this is a different area of reporting to how Master's level students comment on literature; however, her observation that social sciences students made their stance more evident through knowledge claims such as 'I argue' draws attention to the disciplinary variation in stance. Stance is also termed 'authorial voice' in a large body of literature, which I will now turn to.

The study of voice in text began with the early and highly influential work by Bakhtin (1981; 1986) who discusses the process of taking words and using them in one's own way:

> The word in language is half someone else's. It becomes 'one's own' only when the speaker populates it with his own intentions, his own accent, when he appropriates the word, adapting it to his own semantic and expressive intention. (1981: 294)

Many studies draw on Bakhtin to examine the challenging process of achieving an authorial voice in academic writing (Angélil-Carter, 2000; Baynham, 1999; Ritchie, 1989; Scollon, 1995). Ritchie (1989: 154) discusses the problem for students as 'the struggle to construct a voice of their own from the counterpoint of voices in the various cultures surrounding them'. Scollon (1995: 88) sees the role of a writer as needing to 'use another's code'. The study by Baynham (1999) looks at the problems for international students in creating their own voice while in the presence of these other voices. These studies demonstrate the need for support to help students develop an authorial voice.

Further problems have been shown in studies of the consequences of not being able to develop an authorial voice. McCulloch (2012) finds that international students who have a weak voice in writing lack an ability to evaluate, and this makes their source use ineffective. Pittam *et al*. (2009) chart the struggles for students to establish an authorial identity in academic writing, as they found it to be an unfamiliar concept. One of their informants expressed the tension between authorship and editorship 'I can't help thinking that I am editing everything, not putting my idea or opinion…or something new' (Pittam *et al*., 2009: 156). In the same study, an international student expressed another difficulty in adopting a stance in her current context:

> I'm from an Asian country and many books and research reports are from those born in Western society, so totally different. Sometimes I have a totally different point of view…but I can't express it because I haven't got any…evidence, so it's so frustrating sometimes for me too. Because I just don't think something like those people. (Pittam *et al.*, 2009: 159)

This student's comments provide a powerful account of the difficulty to express an authorial view in a different culture without available evidence, a point which may be overlooked by tutors. Similarly, Ivanič's (1998) study is important in highlighting the importance of identity within academic literacy and finding one's voice. Some of the participants in her study found it hard to write their own words, or they wrote words that they did not feel were their own, from a sense that they had to write in a certain way because of university regulations. This response to academic literacy is developed further by Lillis (2001) who problematises the insider nature to writing acceptably in higher education, where many student-writers struggle to belong, yet also be

themselves. In addition, Hyland (2006: 22) comments on another problem related to voice:

> Academic success means representing yourself in a way valued by your discipline, adopting the values, beliefs and identities which academic discourses embody. As a result, students often feel uncomfortable with the 'me' they portray in their academic writing.

Hyland connects competence with the establishment of an appropriate voice for a discipline, which is an important observation for this study.

This section has reviewed studies of critical engagement with source use through a breakdown into the processes of critical thinking, reading and writing, all of which involve evaluation. Within critical writing, it has considered the key areas of stance and authorial voice. I identify that studies of critical engagement that focus on evaluation and stance (Hyland, 2009; Ridley, 2008; Weller, 2010) are particularly important to this study; therefore, I aim to build on their findings in my analysis by looking at these two areas. The next section moves to a discussion of the last key feature of source use in this review, avoiding plagiarism.

3.2.5 Plagiarism and avoidance of plagiarism

Plagiarism attracts a great deal of research because of its growing importance in HE. However, most studies focus on student plagiarism as a problem (Currie, 1998; East, 2005; Handa and Power, 2005; Maxwell, Curtis and Vardanega, 2008; Park, 2003; Pennycook, 1996; Sherman, 1992; Thompson, 2005), rather than avoidance of plagiarism as a skill for source use, which is only recently beginning to gain more attention (McCulloch, 2012; Pecorari, 2013). Before focusing on avoidance of plagiarism as an essential skill for source use, I will examine existing research about what plagiarism is, through a consideration of definitions, disagreements, attempts to clarify and tutor responses. I will then move to what avoidance of plagiarism entails, in terms of knowledge and understanding as part of competence in source use.

A starting point to examine plagiarism is to define clearly what it is. However, there are a wide range of definitions among scholars and many create controversy. Sutherland-Smith (2008) drawing on the work of Foucault, Bakhtin and Barthes, suggests that 'no two people will think that plagiarism is the same thing or perceive it in the same way'

(p.79). Some researchers focus a definition on the relationship between texts, in the terms 'deceptive intertextuality' (Pecorari and Shaw, 2012: 159) and 'inappropriate textual borrowing' (Liao and Tseng, 2010: 187). Others claim more dramatically that plagiarism is a crime, such as 'plain theft' (Ragen, 1987: 39), 'intellectual burglary' (Maddox, 1995: 721) and 'a crime against which members of the academic community are currently waging a war' (Leask, 2006: 183). Some take a moral stance against plagiarism, defining it as 'the worst academic sin' (Walsh, 2002: 12). Other academics go even further and say it is both legally and morally wrong, and that it is culturally specific:

> Inappropriate use of another's work is legally wrong in the United States and considered to be morally wrong by many people in the country. However, China doesn't have such a law, and plagiarism doesn't have the moral effect on Chinese learners studying in their country. (Klein, 2011: 99)

I contend that this as an exaggerated view that seems hostile and derogatory to Chinese students. More appropriately, some researchers keep to the academic context by defining it as 'a breach of social norms among writers and scholars' (Blum, 2009: 21), and acknowledge it as a problem, rather than a crime: 'a complex problem of student learning' (Angélil-Carter, 2000: 2). I agree with Blum and Angélil-Carter that it is very important that plagiarism remains within its academic context as a problem, so that it is not exaggerated or misinterpreted as a legal crime or sin.

Research has shown many different interpretations of plagiarism. One of the first studies to offer different views of plagiarism was Pennycook's (1996) seminal paper which challenged Anglophone perceptions of ownership of words and criticisms of learning strategies such as memorization. His Hong Kong-based research demonstrated that plagiarism is very complex and cannot be easily dealt with; thus, he opened the door to further investigation of its complexities (Macdonald and Carroll, 2006; Pecorari, 2003; Russikoff, Fucaloro and Salkauskiene, 2003). Carroll (2007), one of the most widely cited and prolific writers in plagiarism over the last decade, argues that a vast number of factors impact on plagiarism, such as differences in guidelines, policies and procedures in universities. These may be understood differently by policy makers, tutors and students. Similarly, Sutherland-Smith (2008: 56) argues that 'plagiarism is complex, contextual and open to interpretation'. This could also explain

why students often do not understand the 'full scope' of plagiarism (Russikoff, Fucaloro and Salkauskiene, 2003), and many researchers are concerned with the lack of a consistent approach to plagiarism (Carroll and Appleton, 2005; Howard, 1999; Price, 2009).

Other research has been undertaken to provide a framework for institutional policy towards plagiarism (Park, 2004), and to investigate the treatment of plagiarism by universities (Larkham and Manns, 2002), although transparent and detailed findings are hard to gain in this area. Additionally, Sutherland-Smith (2008), in her cross-sectional study of six different university policies around the world, finds significant differences. For example, one policy is limited to essays and copying of words, while others spell out degrees of plagiarism as serious, moderate and slight for a range of student actions. This draws attention to the fact that plagiarism is treated differently, in different contexts. Price (2009) goes further in finding a lack of consensus about plagiarism and inconsistency about dealing with it in one UK university, which might be representative of the situation in many universities. Researchers of plagiarism have attempted to push for more fairness in approaches to plagiarism (Carroll and Appleton, 2005). For example, in her former context of Monash University, Sutherland-Smith (2008) contributed to a division in policy between plagiarism and cheating, so that plagiarism is not automatically associated with cheating.

A number of attempts have been made to classify levels or types of plagiarism. A major study by Yeo and Chien (2007) suggests that the separate factors of experience, nature, extent and intent need to be examined along a continuum, in order to make clear and fair decisions about plagiarism. This would enable a more complete analysis of what is happening when students do not use sources in an acceptable way, as more factors are brought into account, and the continuum stops the issue merely being black and white. This has some parallels with the plagiarism continuum devised by Sutherland-Smith (2008: 29) of transmissive and transformative teaching approaches, and intentional or unintentional plagiarism, as decided by the reader. This model draws attention to some of the key issues for tutors and policies of how intention is perceived. In their interpretation of university teachers' views in Sweden, Pecorari and Shaw (2012) developed a typology of intertextuality which identifies four ways of

categorising students' source use: indirect, such as the borrowing of formulaic phrases; conventional, following the expected rules for paraphrasing and quoting; unconventional, which breaks these rules, but not intentionally; and deceptive, which breaks these rules intentionally. This typology can be helpful to understand how tutors make judgments on source use. The 'indirect' and 'unconventional' categories are particularly important, as they seem to be considered more rarely than the other acceptable or unacceptable practices.

However, the most debated area in plagiarism, present in each model above, is whether there is evidence of an intention to plagiarise. Many studies have found this to be the deciding factor as to whether the student is penalised or not, or whether it is considered serious plagiarism or a 'lapse' (Pecorari, 2008). Park (2004) also provides a list of many subdivisions of plagiarism with ranking focused on intention. The students in Flowerdew and Li's (2007) study argued that as long as they felt the work was their own, they thought it was legitimate to borrow words, which again highlights the key role of intention. However, examining the role of intention can draw the discourse of plagiarism back to a criminal context; I suggest that care is needed to keep the focus on intention within the academic context. Another problem is that clear intent to deceive remains debatable, subject to varying interpretation and probably hard to prove without evidence of witnessing student actions in producing an assignment, which is generally impossible to do.

Related to intention, it is important to consider tutors' decisions about plagiarism. Pecorari (2008) recognises the power issues surrounding plagiarism by arguing 'plagiarism is what a person in authority says it is' (p.38). This concurs with the view of Lillis (2001) of the power relations that influence student writers' efforts to belong to a discourse community, and the depiction by Sutherland-Smith (2008) of the tutor-readers who control the interpretation. This position of power on the reader's side is a key concept in plagiarism. In a similar way, Marsh (2007) confirms that plagiarism can only exist where the reader identifies it. There is likely to be an imbalance of power between the expert reader (tutor of academic writing or subject specialism) and the novice writer (student, not yet familiar with UK higher education academic conventions). Pecorari (2008) emphasises that there may be conflict between student

writers and the tutor-readers of their texts: 'textual plagiarism can be identified when student writers and the people who evaluate their work do not agree which kinds of source use are appropriate' (p.10). The influence of the reader needs to be recognised in any text evaluation, especially plagiarism. This argument also leads to the conclusion that a student writer is not in control: the tutor-reader makes the decision about whether the text contains plagiarism. This issue will be pursued in chapter 7 in the findings for this study.

Other studies have debated the issue of responsibility for plagiarism. Anson (2008) argues that tutors must take responsibility. He describes the current position: 'students are assumed to know what plagiarism is and how to avoid it, thus relieving faculty of the responsibility to teach it' (p.140). Anson argues that staff should be driven by a desire to educate rather than stop cheating. Similarly, Gourlay and Deane (2012) find that despite a range of good practice and the adoption of an academic literacies approach (discussed below in 3.3.1) at one UK university, teaching staff still operated a deficit model towards students, while support and library staff seemed to accept they had a shared responsibility for students avoiding plagiarism. Both of these studies highlight that tutors need to be more involved in plagiarism education, by which I mean an integrated pedagogical approach to help students understand plagiarism and how to avoid it (Davis, 2012a).

Turning to avoiding plagiarism as a skill, the first essential element is to understand university plagiarism definitions. Southern University uses the following information in all module and course handbooks: '*plagiarism* - taking or using another person's thoughts, writings or inventions as your own' (Southern University, 2009c). The regulation specifies that plagiarism could be taking 'thoughts, writings or inventions', which may sound far removed from many students' context, where they are unlikely to consider 'writings', and 'inventions' even less so, as both of these terms sound out-of-date and inappropriate unless the student is studying literature for the term 'writings' and science or technology for 'inventions'. The definition limits sources to those written by 'another person' which thus does not seem to include those written by multiple authors, a group or organisation. The information also seems to be telling students what to avoid, but may not clearly specify what students need to do, a

problem identified in previous research (Anson, 2008; McGowan, 2005a). Therefore, I consider that the definition can serve as an example of university policies that could be misunderstood or hard to follow. I found that there were considerable differences among tutors, and between tutors and students in their interpretation of this definition (Davis, 2012a); for example, one student said:

> every single report or you know, dissertation or essay, must be based on the other people's writing or thoughts so if someone says like this, 'taking or using another person's thoughts, we can't', this means we can't use other person's thoughts, but we *have to* use [them]. (p.23) (Italics added.)

Thus, the regulation seems to present students with a dilemma in that it prohibited them from using sources, yet they knew sources were essential. Tutors responded quite differently to the definition. One remarked very positively: 'it is a nice simple one that covers the range of things that people may think about as plagiarism' (p.23.). Another tutor felt that something was missing: 'I think there needs to be a distinguishing between deliberate and non-deliberate, accidental plagiarism' (p.24). These comments indicate that students and tutors had different priorities in their interpretations of the definition.

In contrast to the ambiguity of the definition above, one of clearest breakdowns of the components that make up plagiarism has been provided by Pecorari (2000). She studied 53 definitions of plagiarism at universities in three countries. From these, she made a list of the six elements of plagiarism:

> An object (language, words, text)
> Which has been taken (borrowed or stolen)
> From a particular source (books, journals, internet)
> By an agent (student, person, academic)
> Without (adequate) acknowledgement
> And with or without intention to deceive.
> (Pecorari, 2000: 60)

This model is very helpful in making clear what plagiarism may consist of, with the advantage that each component can be analysed separately. Therefore, it would be very useful to discuss this breakdown with students to help them gain a better understanding of the different elements of plagiarism.

Moving on from knowing and understanding a definition of plagiarism, students then need to apply it through attribution, which can be defined as the appropriate acknowledgement of words and ideas to authors (East, 2005). There is a basic requirement in academic writing for students to acknowledge where their information comes from, as Ivanič (1998: 3) states: 'writers have to decide when to attribute a word or an idea to another writer, and when not'. As such, attribution may be seen, like citation, to be a question of following rules, for example, knowing that both words and ideas from sources must have citation next to them, and knowing that points of general knowledge do not need citation. However, many studies highlight problems with international students' attribution of sources which put them at risk of plagiarism (Bloch, 2001; Braine, 2002; Chanock, 2008; East, 2005; Lee, 2010; Pecorari, 2003; Sutherland-Smith, 2008). Chanock (2008) investigates why students use attribution with plagiarised text. She finds that the practice of copying text and citing it as if it was a paraphrase rather than a quotation stems from students' monologic understanding of argument to communicate what they have read. This contrasts with the dialogic view of knowledge in university regulations which require a clear distinction to be made between words from sources and the writer's own words. Chanock (2008: 8) draws attention to the gulf between tutors and students:

> For academics…the interplay of ideas, and the management of that interplay, are fundamental to the collective endeavour of constructing knowledge. It is essential for academic authors to identify who said what, where and when, and to do this *as* their discussion develops, in the body of their writing, not only in the reference list supplied for the readers' convenience. We should not be surprised, however, if the importance of this is not so apparent to our students…much of the academic knowledge that students encounter at school does not present itself dialogically as interpretation, but monologically as facts for them to learn; and they often expect this to be the case at university.

Chanock's explanation challenges tutor expectations effectively; 'we should not be surprised…' is a useful reminder to look more closely at students' contexts.

Chanock's conclusions seem to equate with Weller's (2010) views of contrasting student and tutor reading approaches (reported in 3.2.4) and demonstrate that for students to understand how to use text in the way that tutors require, explicit teaching and extensive practice are needed. Lee (2010) found a similar problem in essays written by East Asian students which contained too much or too little attribution, and did not show understanding of attribution or authorial voice. The problems of not

knowing how and why to attribute sources may stem from differences in context, culture and knowledge for students (East, 2005). For example, students have different ideas about what is common knowledge according to their familiarity about the topic, and therefore are likely to make different decisions about whether to cite it. Academic writers in a new educational context are also highly likely to attribute according to what they have previously been taught (Carroll, 2005b). Thus, a process of 'unlearning' previous rules and learning a new kind of attribution is needed.

To gain competence in avoiding plagiarism, opportunities for students to try out strategies are necessary. As I reported in the introduction, sometimes students may experience 'eureka moments' when they have major insights into how to use sources effectively (Davis, 2007), but research has shown that it takes time and effort to develop different strategies (Martala, 2006; Spack, 1997). One strategy students adopt is to try to use the academic discourse of their community. Some research has shown that this may initially lead to plagiarism (Barks and Watts, 2001; Ivanič, 1998; Lillis, 2001). In their efforts to sound 'right', students may take too many words from other sources. This is also consistent with the approach argued by Howard (1999: 7) about patchwriting (defined in 3.2.2 above):

> Students' patchwriting is often a move toward membership in a discourse community, a means of learning unfamiliar language and ideas. Far from indicating a lack of respect for a source text, their patchwriting is a gesture of reverence. The patchwriter recognizes the profundity of the source and strives to join the conversation in which the source participates. To join this conversation, the patchwriter employs the language of the target community.

Thus, it seems that students' intention in using the words of others may often come from a legitimate desire to engage more deeply in the discourse of the community. There is a mismatch between what students attempt to do, and how their actions are perceived by the community around them. Their apparently good intention may not be clear to a tutor-reader who would see the result of using other authors' words, possibly inappropriately, but not see the attempt or the process behind it, which can be a normal stage towards competence. Barks and Watts (2001: 251) reinforce this view: 'As students enter a discourse community, they may engage in extensive borrowing of phrases…in the process of developing their authorial voice'. Borrowing

some language may be a normal step in beginning to use sources and a disciplinary discourse, and therefore should be seen as part of the process towards competence.

Competence in avoiding plagiarism involves a lot of practice. As Pecorari (2008: 37) contends, 'Avoiding plagiarism entails knowing how to use sources appropriately'. Pecorari explains that students need to know that universities take plagiarism seriously and that there may be severe consequences for plagiaristic acts, but they also need to know that not everyone agrees what it is. Furthermore, she demonstrates that students need to know that avoiding plagiarism cannot be achieved by avoiding sources because they are integral to academic writing. In her recent study, Pecorari (2013: 36) suggests that there is a gap between understanding and putting into practice: 'students who understand what plagiarism is often still have difficult acting on that knowledge in order to avoid it'. Thus, it is important to examine this gap in order to understand students' problems in avoiding plagiarism and how they may overcome them. In my interpretation of avoiding plagiarism as an essential skill for source use, I aim to build in particular on the work of Pecorari.

This section has reviewed the literature on plagiarism and on avoiding plagiarism. Having focused on each key feature separately in the previous sections, the final part of this review will discuss more overall understandings of competence related to source use.

3.3. Competence

In this section, I aim to examine relevant theories and frameworks that influence and relate to competence in source use within an EAP context.

3.3.1 Theories of competence related to EAP

I consider the most relevant theories of competence related to source use in EAP to be communicative competence and academic literacy which I discuss below.

Hymes' (1972) theory of communicative competence in language learning can be related to source use, as it focuses on context and a demonstration of ability. In contrast to the theory of Chomsky (1965) which contends speakers possess innate grammatical knowledge to produce correct utterances, Hymes (1972: 279) argues that

competence must include what a speaker needs to know to communicate by learning 'a set of ways…appropriate in their community'. This understanding of competence as being appropriate to the context is thus helpful to source use, as students need to learn the academic conventions of their current context in order to communicate their message effectively. Furthermore, one of Hymes' categories for competence, 'performed' is also very relevant to source use in terms of the actual occurrences of different features of source use in practice; it connects to source use interpreted as multiple actions, as discussed at the beginning of this chapter.

Communicative competence has been categorised in other ways which are useful to this study. Canale and Swain (1980) break communicative competence into four key areas: grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic. 'Grammatical competence' refers to linguistic ability; 'sociolinguistic' refers to understanding the social context of the communication; 'discourse' refers to understanding the meaning of the text; and 'strategic' refers to approaches used by speakers to continue, finish, or redirect communication. Thus, the majority of their categories of communicative competence focus on understanding, rather than using language, of which the most important areas of understanding for source use are 'discourse', in terms of text comprehension, and 'sociolinguistic' in terms of understanding the source context. Some research into academic literacy is helpful to interpreting the development of student writing, although it is not specifically focused on competence. Key research by Lea and Street (2000) explored three models of understanding student writing: as a study skill alone (which they refute as a deficit skill model); as academic socialization in which students are acculturated into the discourse community; and finally as academic literacies involving social practices and a negotiation of meaning. They present these as a linear development where the first model is superseded by the next, and so on; thus, they favour the final model, the academic literacies approach, which builds on both of the previous two, and involves considerably more complex influences on the interpretation. Lea and Street's work has been key in influencing a shift in the theoretical understanding of academic literacy. An important point from their work that Hyland (2006: 21) highlights is that 'literacy is something we *do*'. This is significant because it is the acknowledgement that literacy is not an abstract concept, but specific actions; I approach source use in the same way, as actions by users of sources. Hyland

(2006) argues that EAP has evolved to address new challenges in communicative competence that arise from greater emphasis on disciplines, varied modes of study and more diverse students. Drawing on Lea and Street (2000), he discusses ways that the different approaches of study skills, disciplinary socialisation, and academic literacies can address the needs of students within EAP. I acknowledge that elements of Lea and Street's three models exist in the teaching and learning context of each feature of source use: for example, within paraphrasing, techniques such as changing word forms can be seen as a study skill, developing a corpus of discipline-specific vocabulary to draw on when re-writing can be considered as a form of academic socialisation, and understanding the purpose of paraphrasing for knowledge transforming could come under an academic literacies approach. However, Lea and Street's model is not situated within EAP, but in L1 undergraduate academic writing in general. Furthermore, from the perspective of academic literacies, it has been suggested that attempts to value student contributions to the classroom might conflict with institutional regulations on source use (Bloch, 2012). Therefore, in the context of EAP, I will examine how international postgraduate students interact with these regulations and to what extent they develop competence in features of source use.

The conceptualisations of competence reviewed above are helpful to the wider context of EAP and language learning. However, in this research, I will focus on study competence as defined by Waters and Waters (1992: 265) in which students 'have a high degree of self-awareness', 'are good at critical questioning', 'are willing and able to teach themselves'. These elements reflect a conceptualisation of competence as not just possessing academic skills, but possessing these skills at a 'high' or 'good' level. Drawing on this conceptualisation, it is possible to equate academic competence with 'proficiency' in key skills, which has also been suggested by Sowden (2003) in an EAP context. Similarly, Pecorari (2008) has talked about 'mastery' within source use. In using these understandings of skills, I am referring to proficiency and mastery at postgraduate level, not expert user, as discussed in 1.2.3. I will now move on to review the existing frameworks of competence which include a specific focus on source use in EAP.

3.3.2 EAP frameworks of competence in source use

Some attempts within EAP have been made to specify the levels of skills that students achieve in general areas of source use. I will consider the two most up-to-date and relevant frameworks here, although as such, I acknowledge that critiques of these frameworks have not yet been made. Argent and Alexander (2013: 197) present a helpful framework of competence in academic writing, which they connect to a 'clear authorial voice', which includes:

1 taking a nuanced stance
2 selecting and reporting evidence (sources or data) critically
3 interpreting evidence to support your stance
4 choosing a persuasive structure for your argument
5 integrating the evidence into your argument, with the appropriate signals
6 using your own words.

Their framework includes a few evaluative features, such as 'appropriate' and 'critically', which hint at the level of skills involved. For competence as a user of sources, the most important of these in terms of the five key features of source use reviewed above are 'selecting and reporting evidence (sources or data) critically', 'interpreting evidence to support your stance', which both relate to the source use skills of critical engagement; 'integrating the evidence into your argument, with the appropriate signals', which relates to citation and avoiding plagiarism; and 'using your own words' which relates to paraphrasing and avoiding plagiarism. Thus, the framework is helpful to interpret some areas of critical engagement, avoiding plagiarism and following academic conventions appropriately. Their framework is based around actions, such as 'taking' and 'selecting', which is one way to examine the skills in source use, but does not include all the key features and indicates very little about the level of skills.

Similarly, the BALEAP (2013: 2) *Can Do* competency project set out the following skills for source use:

Incorporate relevant literature to create and support argument
Relate material from one source to another
Adopt critical stance towards source materials (particularly in relation to lecturers' own work)
Avoid plagiarism
Develop and establish own individual voice.

65

These descriptors generally follow the same areas as those by Argent and Alexander (2013) above and are useful to show an overview of source use skills. They include a different skill 'relate material from one source to another' which involves the skills of synthesis, comparison and evaluation, which are part of critical engagement with sources and citation skills, as discussed above in relation to the work of Ridley (2008). However, again the *Can Do* descriptors do not indicate levels of ability, which I consider necessary to evaluate competence in source use. Like those of Argent and Alexander's framework, they also focus on actions, rather than features, and do not refer directly to reporting verbs, citation and paraphrasing. These descriptors serve the purpose of setting out general skills, but do not specify enough about the features of source use to define competence. Therefore, there is a clear need for descriptors of competence which do examine each of the five features of source use in depth.

3.4 Summary

This chapter has considered the discourses of the features of source use and general competence in source use. It has reviewed the literature on the key elements of source use: citation, paraphrase, reporting verbs, critical engagement and avoidance of plagiarism. It then examined some discourses of competence relevant to EAP and source use: communicative competence, academic literacy and frameworks of competence in source use.

The review has shown that research into source use has tended to focus on separate key elements, rather than examining source use as a whole, and that the development of competence in source use is under-researched. There is a gap in the discourses of competence relevant to EAP and source use among international postgraduate students, which merits further research. From currently available literature, there is a lack of clarity about expected mastery of citation, the level of revisions expected in an acceptable paraphrase, the ability to use a range of reporting verbs and the level of skills with critical engagement. In addition, while a large amount of research has focused on plagiarism, very few longitudinal studies have been made which examine the avoidance of plagiarism as part of the development of competence in source use. Given the importance of international students to the postgraduate sector of UK HE and the problems many of them experience with source use skills including plagiarism,

there is a pressing need to examine how they develop their learning of source use, their understanding of how to avoid plagiarism and the strategies they employ in their writing. Furthermore, it is important to discover if, when and how they become competent source users. The findings about their development of source use can have implications for how they are taught on EAP and postgraduate subject programmes, as well as how universities address problems of plagiarism with international students. Therefore, this study will make an important contribution to both the literature and practice on source use and avoiding plagiarism, through a longitudinal investigation of the development of source use by a group of international postgraduate students at a UK university. The following chapter moves to focus on the design and method of this research.

Chapter 4: Research design and methodology

4.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the research design and methodology for this investigation. Firstly, it will set out the aims of the study and the research questions, and provide an overview of my research design. It will present the rationale for using the case study method. Then, it will give an account of the ethical considerations and process for ethical approval, the pilot study and the selection and recruitment of participants. It will present profiles of the participants and describe the methods for gathering written assignments and undertaking interviews. Following this, it will chart the four stages of this data collection over the two year period, and discuss the research tools used and the issues encountered. Finally, it will discuss the methods used to analyse the assignment and interview data. Throughout this chapter, references will be made to documents located in appendices 1-4 which were produced in the course of the research.

The aims of the research focus on an examination of data from student participants about the learning and teaching context of source use in an EAP Pre-Master's course and on subsequent Master's programmes. As set out in the introduction chapter to the thesis, the aims of this research were as follows:

- To analyse how international postgraduate students use sources in their written assignments
- To define competence in source use at postgraduate level
- To analyse the features of source use
- To chart development in source use over two years
- To examine the problems with plagiarism in the development of source use
- To assess the implications of source use development for EAP, postgraduate education and HEIs.

In considering the translation of these aims into research questions, I followed the advice of Andrews (2003) to make the questions answerable, or at least to have the potential to be answerable. The three overriding research questions about students' use of sources, competence in source use and the implications for the teaching of

sources, as put forward in the introduction chapter to this thesis, break down into a number of sub-questions to cover the scope of the investigation. They are set out below:

1. How do international students use sources on a Pre-Master's and Master's course in the UK?

- How do international postgraduate students use sources at different stages of their study?

- How do they change or develop their source use?

- What problems do they encounter with plagiarism?

2. What constitutes a competent user of sources at postgraduate level?

- Which are the key features of source use?

- How can competence in these features be defined?

- How do international students use sources competently to avoid plagiarism?

3. What are the implications for practice for EAP, postgraduate subject tutors and universities?

- What should EAP tutors do?

- What should postgraduate subject tutors do?

- What should universities do?

By asking these questions, I aim to contribute to the field of EAP and to postgraduate education through a study of the source use of international postgraduate students and an examination of competence in source use at this level. I aim to offer insights into these students' practices with source use, and to establish descriptors of competence that will be of use to scholars and practitioners working in this field.

4.2 Overview of research design

The theoretical perspective with which I approached this study is interpretivist. This means that individuals construct meaning from interpretation of content in a socially situated context (Crotty, 1998). Crotty sees interpretivism as a research approach where the meaning of a person's experience and values is transmitted to another. I adopted an interpretivist stance because I designed my study around an in-depth investigation of the experiences of student participants with source use in the socially situated context of a UK HEI. I constructed meaning from layers of interpretation of the participants' understanding, knowledge and ability in relation to source use. This way of meaning making is central to a socially constructed interpretation of academic discourse, defined as the main way that individuals in universities communicate, frame problems, understand issues, create knowledge and adopt a stance (Hyland, 2009). Thus, I interpreted the data by attempting to understand the meanings that participants make within their academically situated context.

Building on this theoretical perspective, I identified the epistemology or stance towards knowledge informing this work as constructionism (Crotty, 1998), also termed constructivism (Cresswell, 2003). Crotty (1998: 9) defines this as 'humanly fashioned ways of seeing things whose processes we need to explore and which we can only come to understand through a similar process of meaning making'. Constructionism is relevant to the study because I investigated the process of learning development in the student participants' use of sources and tried to understand it by analysing their decisions with the features of source use, using my knowledge of source use development. Furthermore, as Cresswell (2003) explains, in this theory, knowledge is constructed from a full range of experiences, which depend on understanding the context. Thus, I aimed to construct meaning from the wide range of my data from student participants, and understand the context from my own position as EAP tutor, researcher and postgraduate user of sources. From my data, I built a model of development of competence in source use.

My study is data-driven, in that the theory comes from the empirical data. I began with some assumptions about how students learn to use sources in EAP and the problems they may experience, as outlined in chapter 1. These assumptions came from my

experience of teaching international postgraduate students on an EAP Pre-Master's programme for over five years; thus, my starting point as a researcher came from my teaching role. From this starting point, I set up an exploratory study. Exploratory research is carried out where a problem is not clearly defined and scope is not clear (Dörnyei, 2007), which suits this study as the ways international students develop source use have not been previously defined, and it is not clear what that development entails. As Dörnyei (2007: 39) states, 'Qualitative research has traditionally been seen as an effective way of exploring new, uncharted areas. If very little is known about a phenomenon, the detailed study of a few cases is particularly appropriate because it does not rely on previous literature'. Thus, qualitative research in the form of an exploratory study of a few detailed cases fits my research context, since, as has been shown in the literature review, very few longitudinal studies of source use and the development of competence have been found.

The focus of this research is the use of sources in student text; therefore, the most important data comes from the student participants' written assignments. I examined the key features of source use (citation, paraphrasing, reporting verbs, critical engagement and avoidance of plagiarism) from a textual analysis of these assignments, by scanning the text for specific linguistic or rhetorical features, following the recommendation of Hyland (2004). According to Dörnyei (2007: 19), although this sort of data is often labelled qualitative, it may also be given a category of its own, 'language data', which he defines as 'language samples of various length, elicited from the respondent primarily for the purpose of language analysis (for example…a solicited student essay)'. Dörnyei's term 'language data' is helpful for this research as I examined some language features such as reporting verbs, although I also looked at some features that fall outside language, such as citation formatting. As an adjunct to the assignment data, I conducted interviews with the participants. I approached these qualitatively and analysed them for the participants' comments and insights on the key features of source use. Therefore, I chose a qualitative approach to the data, method and analysis, as this seemed the most effective and useful means of conducting this study.

As a qualitative study, an essential element to the research is to provide a truthful account of the data with plausible arguments and consistent conclusions (Richards, 2009). Richards explains that plausibility and consistency come from well-founded and sound steps with a trail of logs and records in which alternatives are examined and problems dealt with, and logical progression can be seen from one stage to another. As I will show in this chapter, I aimed to achieve a truthful and consistent account through reporting and analysing a collection of data as clearly, systematically and accurately as possible.

4.3 Case study methodology

Case study methodology was chosen for this research. Case studies have a well-established use in qualitative research, because they lead to an in-depth investigation of human behaviour. For example, Sturman (1994: 61) states that:

> The distinguishing feature of a case study is the belief that human systems develop a characteristic wholeness or integrity and are not simply a loose collection of traits. As a consequence of this belief, case study researchers hold that to understand a case, to explain why things happen as they do, and to generalize or predict from a single example requires an in-depth investigation of the interdependence of parts and of the patterns that emerge.

Sturman's view of a case study draws attention to the need to bring together and make sense of different data in order to determine the emerging themes. This point is useful for this study, because I made an in-depth analysis of assignment data to try to understand how international students develop their source use. Furthermore, as Yin (2003: 1) asserts, 'Case studies are the preferred strategy when 'how' and 'why' questions are being posed…and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context'. This suits the context of this study because the investigation is current and the questions are mostly 'how', with the most important focus on how students use sources.

Case studies are defined through a number of categories and sub-categories. Stake (1995) presents one form of case study as 'instrumental' where a researcher aims to use the study to understand wider behaviour, rather than only the case itself. I see my study as instrumental in that I aimed to understand the development of source use among international postgraduate students from my participants' actions. Yin (2003) suggests that 'instrumental' case studies break into two further subcategories:

exploratory, where there are no clear outcomes and explanatory, where answers are sought to explain certain effects. This case study is exploratory, as I set out to explore source use without looking to explain any specific source use behaviour. Furthermore, this research can be seen as a chronological case study (Yin, 2003) in that I conducted the study through tracking 8-15 international students over a two year continuous period through their Pre-Master's course (preparation for postgraduate study in the form of study skills, English language and content specialisation) and their subsequent postgraduate course (in business, technology or social science). I chose this approach because of the small number of students available to sample (21 in the year the study began), and the possibility of gaining in-depth information about them (Cresswell, 2003). I considered this approach would be more useful and meaningful to an analysis of learning development than more superficial information about a large number. I followed the process and limited the scope as described by Cresswell (2003: 15): 'the researcher explores in depth a program, an event, an activity, a process or one or more individuals. The case(s) are bounded by time and activity'. Thus, I explored one cohort of student participants in depth. The participants were bounded by time in that they were enrolled on the Pre-Master's and Master's courses at Southern University in the years of the data collection (2008-2010), and bounded by activity in terms of assignment submission and interviews.

It is important in this study that I was not looking at separate examples of student work in isolation. Instead, I examined the work of the same specific group of international postgraduate students, in chronological stages, and looked for perceivable patterns and trends in their source use habits and strategies. In my use of interviews, I aimed to find out more about their approaches to source use which guided these habits and strategies. As a case study, the research provides a means to develop generalisations about a wider population (Yin, 2003). Thus, with a data set of multiple assignments by eight students over two years, my findings can lead to some tentative generalisations about international postgraduate students in UK or other Anglophone HEIs. As I gathered several examples of similar phenomena subject to the same investigation, my study can be termed a 'collective' case study (Stake, 1995). It can also be termed a cohort study (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007), as the study involves a group of participants from whom data is taken at different times, and not

exactly the same data each time. As explained above, I define my case study as all the students participating in the study; thus, the term cohort study seems applicable.

One further essential element of this case study is that it was longitudinal, lasting two years and slightly longer in some cases with extensions for the final assignment. Longitudinal studies can be difficult to complete, especially because there is a greater likelihood of participants dropping out over time (Mason, 1996). In this study, a third of the participants dropped out after the first year (five out of fifteen), and almost half by the end (a total of seven out of fifteen). However, there is considerable value in longitudinal research for developmental studies, where an educational process is taking place, as in this study. Furthermore, longitudinal studies are particularly useful in the field of language, since they offer opportunities to analyse a sequence of development (Dörnyei, 2007), which is a main feature of this study.

Case studies are also recommended where the researcher is closely involved in the research setting, as I was. Richards (2009) suggests making use of the in-depth nature of the case study by writing it up promptly and talking about it with others. I made field notes on my data, and thought about my findings on a daily basis in my work, since I was researching my own context. I regularly discussed my research with colleagues and with a wider audience of EAP, academic writing and plagiarism researchers when I gave academic presentations (Davis, 2010a; 2010b; 2011a; 2011b; 2012b; 2012c). In this way, I was very engaged with my research and was able to discuss my insights and ideas and get comments from other professionals all the way through my analysis.

4.4 Ethics

This study presented a challenging and complex set of ethical issues, which were carefully considered before and during the collection of data. In accordance with the BERA (2004) guidelines, there were six key issues which influenced this study. They were to gain voluntary informed consent, meaning no coercion to participate; to take care with incentives to participants by considering whether it is appropriate and fair to make them; to make no detriment to participants or non-participants, by having no disadvantage in participation or non-participation; to protect the privacy of

participants, by identifying them by numbers or pseudonyms; to keep the right to withdraw without penalty; to minimize the impact of the research on participants and to avoid harm by keeping the research separate from their study. These issues will be discussed in relation to the development of my research.

The ethical procedures for both IOE and my own institution were closely followed, with advice gathered from my supervisor at IOE, and at Southern University, the chair of the ethics board, the school research officer and a senior researcher (see Appendix 1 for details of communication on the ethical process). A lot of drafting and re-drafting of my approach and information to participants was necessary (Davis, 2008). The concerns for the committee were especially about the power relations between the researcher and participants who were also tutor and students, and the fact that initially, I presented the 1-1 contact through student interviews as a benefit for their learning, which the committee considered unfair to non-participants. To avoid the power relations problem, the committee suggested undertaking the research at IOE, recruiting students at a university other than my own, not teaching these particular students or getting another tutor to mark their work. Unfortunately, none of these suggestions could be followed, as they would either remove the whole point of the study, which was the usefulness of looking at my own teaching context on the Pre-Master's as the researcher (Hyland, 2004), or would be quite impractical in my small teaching area.

However, various responses were agreed to fulfil their conditions: the one-to-one contact was not presented as a benefit to participants, and the research method was designed to bring neither benefit nor disadvantage to participants and non-participants, so the research was kept entirely separate from their study. To make sure my collecting these assignments for research purposes would not have any influence on my teaching and assessment, I refrained from undertaking any analysis of the assignments until well after the marks for modules were confirmed in Exam Board meetings, and also ensured that each assignment collected was double marked by a colleague. During the research period, I was careful to avoid all reference to my study when teaching classes, and to make sure there was absolutely no difference in the way I was treating either participants or non-participants. In this way, I was able to both

create a separation from the research and teaching context, and confirm that my research would not influence my assessment in any respect, in order to maintain fairness.

The ethical considerations were particularly important in my context of tutor-student, especially in the interviews. According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2009: 16):

> Ethical issues permeate interview research. The knowledge produced by such research depends on the social relationship of interviewer and interviewee, which rests on the interviewer's ability to create a stage where the subject is free and safe to talk of private events recorded for later public use. This again requires a delicate balance between the interviewer's concern for pursuing interesting knowledge and ethical respect for the integrity of the interview subject.

This balance of intention to gain useful results from interviews, while always ensuring the safety and respect for the participants, had to be carefully followed. The research could be considered sensitive (Lee, 1993) for two reasons: that it involves an investigation of students by their tutor; that it investigates plagiarism. As Lee (1993) asserts, questions on sensitive subjects should not lead the respondent to answer specifically about frequency in 'deviant' behaviour. When I discussed plagiarism in the interviews, I framed the questions carefully to avoid suggesting that participants themselves may plagiarise. For example, the interviews in stage 1 and 2 were based around tasks, where quotations, paraphrasing and plagiarism were discussed and a text was given for students to make an example of a quotation and a paraphrase. However, they were not asked to make an example of plagiarism, as this could be deemed an unethical task that may harm the 'framework of trust' necessary for interviewing on sensitive topics (Lee, 1993: 98). Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007) suggest that it is necessary to consider the effect of sensitive topic research not only on participants, but also on the researcher; in other words, it has been necessary for me to think about my position as the tutor of the research respondents, and my research in plagiarism. As Cresswell (2006) points out, the closeness of the researcher with the participants in the research has a clear impact on both and on the research, and therefore, I needed to manage this relationship carefully.

Participants were informed from the outset that they were free to leave the study at any time; some dropped out after the first year, either because they decided they no longer wanted to participate, or because they delayed starting their postgraduate

studies. This gives some evidence of my carefulness to allow participants the freedom to withdraw if they wished, and not coerce them to continue. What I found out through the ethical considerations for the study was that ethics is a continuous and defining part of research, not merely a process to complete at the beginning. Ethics needs to be a consideration in every stage and interaction with participants, and is even more important in one's own 'backyard', in other words, work or study setting (Malone, 2003). There are clearly important ethical considerations in this research; however, the effects of the intervention can be controlled, and as most educational research, the study is not very intrusive into the participants' lives (Hammersley and Traianou, 2007). Thus, I conclude that while the ethical procedures are extremely important, they should not prevent research of one's own students, as in this study.

4.5 Pilot study

It is generally acknowledged that it is important to pilot research instruments and procedures thoroughly and dedicate enough time to this before the main research takes place (Dörnyei, 2007). A three month time period for the pilot study was factored into the timescale for this research. Between June-August 2008, eight participants on the same Pre-Master's course as the main research study were recruited and each research tool was tested (see Appendix 2 for pilot study information for participants, consent forms and interview questions). Participants submitted an assignment and were interviewed using a sample interview for the first year of data collection.

Through the pilot collection of the assignments, I found it was relatively easy to gather assignments in this way, and it was possible to make some initial analysis of a comparative set of written assignments and to begin to see emerging issues, such as the varying ability to use reporting verbs and the more consistent ability to use non-integral citation (i.e. citation outside the sentence within brackets). I thus began to think about the features of the texts I could analyse at different levels, such as citation and paraphrasing. I checked my method of collecting assignments with EAP tutors and postgraduate tutors; all felt that the assignments would be the key data, but some suggested that there may be too much to analyse, which was an important observation that I later acted on.

For the interviews, I began a research log during this period, and while interviewing, made notes in two columns – one with notes of what participants were saying, and one of my observations about what they were saying, such as 'had difficulty with this question'. In this way, questions for the interview were refined. I made some notes about the interview format I was using, such as the appropriateness of some tasks given and how much time was needed. In keeping with the procedure suggested by Mason (1996), I also asked interviewees in the pilot study what they thought of the interview questions, for example, whether they were easy to understand and answer, and noted their comments. I also asked EAP tutors for their views on the interview questions at the pilot stage, including their views of the suitability of the questions for my research purpose, again noting their comments and making some adjustments.

Thus, the pilot study was useful for me to begin collecting and examining assignment data, to practise my interview skills and evaluate my interview questions through discussions with the pilot participants and colleagues. I had the opportunity to consider my approach to interviews as the tutor and researcher of the participants and how to handle the interaction appropriately. In these ways, I consider that I realized the significance of the piloting stage for my research (Dörnyei, 2007). However, the pilot study did not prepare me for the vast size of my final corpora and the problems with the later stages of my data collection, such as attrition and delays. I recognise the limitations of a pilot study with longitudinal research, as problems that may occur a long time afterwards cannot be predicted.

4.6 Recruitment of participants

In order to recruit participants for a research study, it is necessary to design a sampling frame, defined as 'the listing of all units in the population from which a sample is selected' (De Vaus, 2002: 72). I considered carefully where to recruit participants from in order to be able to say something about the wider population (*ibid*). However, according to Mason (1996), I carried out 'purposive sampling' by selecting a sample which had the features I wanted to research; I could not make a random sample as I needed to recruit international postgraduate students who took an EAP pre-sessional course and Master's programme at Southern University. As such, the sampling frame was very narrow, as it was limited to the students who enrolled on the Pre-Master's

course at Southern University at a particular entry point. I made my sampling strategy very systematic by only including those enrolled at this point and excluding latecomers in order to make conditions the same. I also excluded those taking a Pre-Master's course at another institution to avoid other variables and focus on my own context. All those recruited were full-time international students, as there was no part-time option, and at the time, there were no European or UK students enrolled on the course. The process followed for recruitment is outlined in the following table.

Table 1: Recruitment process

Step of recruitment and date	Researcher's action	Participants' action
Step 1 – Invitation to meeting 29/9/08	Created and distributed flyer to all students.	Received invitation to attend.
Step 2 – Meeting about research 2/10/08	Read out scripted information, distributed information sheet and answered questions from students.	Asked questions. Some took consent forms. Some filled in consent forms immediately, others took them away.
Step 3 – Consent and first contact (between 2/10/08 and 9/10/08)	Gathered signed consent forms. Emailed participants with further information about collecting assignments and interviews. Set up first interview dates.	Signed consent forms. Received further information. Agreed to first interview.

As can be seen in Table 1 above, all students were invited to a meeting via a flyer (see Appendix 3a). This was done because Southern University does not permit recruitment of students for research purposes via e-mail. The printed flyer was distributed to all students on the Pre-Master's course (19), all of whom attended the meeting, which was outside class time when they were all available. In this way, I followed the guidance from De Vaus (2002) to give all members of the group an equal chance to be included. I decided to script all the information for this meeting to avoid any risk of bias and coercion in my recruitment approach (see Appendix 3b). I read out this script at the meeting, gave out the information sheet for participants (see Appendix 3c) and answered questions. Fifteen out of the nineteen students who attended agreed to

participate in the study (thus 79% of those enrolled). Once the consent forms were signed (see Appendix 3d), I contacted the participants by e-mail to give further information and to set up dates for the data collection.

4.7 Profiles of research participants

 In the first year, 15 research participants completed stage one and two of the study; however, five dropped out after stage two for reasons such as a delay in their studies, and two more did not complete the full study. Thus, I decided to use only the complete data set from the eight remaining participants, as shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Profiles of student participants

Participant number and pseudonym	Nationality	Gender	Age at start of study	English EFL/ ESL, L2/L3	IELTS band at start of study	Previous UG study	Master's programme
1 John	Chinese	M	22	EFL/L2	5.5	3 year diploma Business and Management	MSc Business and Enterprise
2 Alice	Chinese	F	21	EFL/L2	5.5	3 year diploma Civil Aviation	MSc International Trade and Logistics
3 Shaun	Sri Lankan	M	23	ESL/L2	(equiv) 6.5	3 year degree Law	MSc International Management
4 Yolanda	Chinese	F	21	EFL/L2	5.5	3 year diploma Management	MSc Digital Media Production
5 Mike	Japanese	M	24	EFL/L2	6.0	4 year degree German and European culture	MSc Marketing
6 Kevin	Chinese	M	23	EFL/L2	6.5	4 year degree Business Management	MSc Public Relations
7 Oliver	Algerian	M	27	EFL/L3	6.0	2 year diploma + 4 year degree Business and Management	MSc International Business Economics
8 Nick	Algerian	M	24	EFL/L3	6.0	4 year degree Commercial Science	MSc International Tourism Marketing
Total=8	Total= Chinese (4), Algerian (2) Japanese (1) Sri Lankan (1)	Total= M=6 F=2	Average = 23	Total= EFL/L2 (5) EFL/L3 (2) ESL/L2 (1)	Total= 5.5 (3) 6.0 (3) 6.5 (2)	Total= 3 year diploma (3) 3 year degree (1) 4 year degree (4)	Total= Business (6) Technology (1) Humanities (1)

The nationalities of the eight participants were Chinese[4] (4), Japanese (1), Sri Lankan (1) and Algerian (2). Thus, half of the participants were Chinese. As Chinese students have represented the largest cultural group on the Pre-Master's course since its development in 2004 to the present day, and as mentioned in the introduction, they also form the largest group of international students in UK HE, I considered their higher representation to be entirely appropriate. The participants were of a similar age, between 21-27 at the start of the research. They all had a non-UK undergraduate degree. They used English as a second language (L2) apart from the Algerians who spoke Arabic and French and used English as a third language (L3). All participants had learnt English as a foreign language (EFL) before coming to the UK, except for the Sri Lankan who had learnt it as a second language (ESL) due to the status of English in his country. Thus, almost all participants came from countries which Kachru (1985) calls the 'expanding circle', in that they came from countries which used English as a foreign language, and in which English did not have a special status (Crystal, 2003). As such, they were also highly representative of the Pre-Master's students of that year, in which all 26 were international students, and all were from expanding circle countries, except for the Sri Lankan. In addition, 6 out of the 8 participants were Asian, similarly, 22 out of 26 of the year-round students were Asian (81%). All had a minimum language level of IELTS band 5.5, as per the entry requirements for the programme, but some students had a higher level (6.0 or 6.5). It is important to note that some had a higher language level on entry, as this seems to have a bearing on their performance, though not in all cases.

4.8 Overview of data and time frame of data collection

The main data consists of assignments collected in four stages, from which 1-2 extracts are taken from each participant at each stage. The secondary data set is made up of interviews carried out at each stage with each participant. The four stages followed the logical time sequencing of the university calendar, one each semester over the two year period. This time scale provided for a gap of approximately 6 months between the beginnings of each stage (stage 1 September-December 2008; stage 2 February-May 2009, stage 3 September 2009-January 2010, stage 4 April 2010-Sept 2010), after

---

[4] 'Chinese' refers to students from the People's Republic of China only in this research.

which a certain amount of development was more likely. Participants submitted four written assignments, one each semester, including the dissertation at the end of stage 4 when they finished their Master's study.

4.8.1 Assignments

The assignments were chosen as the key data set, because they are the most direct means of answering the research questions about what students do with sources in their writing and theorising what constitutes competence in source use. As Hyland (2004) argues, gathering a corpus of textual data for language analysis can contribute usefully to the field in a relatively easy way. He suggests that these corpora are readily available and one way for academic writing teachers to research their discipline is to collect the work of their students. Hyland (2004: 141) puts forward the view that research of textual data needs to be 'guided by an intention to understand the workings of some aspect of language'. In this case, the intention was to understand how participants were incorporating sources in their texts through the use of features such as reporting verbs and paraphrasing. According to Hakim (1983), document production can be in three contexts: routine, where documents are produced for standard work or study purposes; regular, where documents are produced with a standard frequency; or special, in which documents are produced for specific research purposes. The work analysed in this research is routine, in that it makes use of documents that are recurring, internal processes of an organisation; in other words, the student assignments. Thus, the written data was not generated for research purposes, it occurred within the normal written output of the participants. I chose to collect data in this way because I concluded it was the most useful and practical means to view students' source use in a real context, as well as providing me with authentic evidence (Mason, 1996).

Table 3 below provides a breakdown of the assignment data used from each participant. It indicates the assignment task type and the word count each student submitted, with a total from each participant.

Table 3: Assignment word length[5] and task type for each participant

Participant	EAP1	EAP2	PG1	PG2	Total words
1 John	620 Case study	3,121 Extended writing project	1,178 Case study	20,439 Dissertation	**25,358**
2 Alice	590 Case study	2,443 Extended writing project	543 Research proposal	8,780[6] Partial dissertation	**12,356**
3 Shaun	539 Case study	2,747 Extended writing project	3,310 Literature review and self-analysis	13,670 Dissertation	**20,266**
4 Yolanda	611 Case study	2,681 Extended writing project	2,006 Project	13,875 Dissertation	**19,173**
5 Mike	601 Case study	2,576 Extended writing project	2,006 Report	18,604 Dissertation	**23,787**
6 Kevin	694 Case study	3,222 Extended writing project	2,383 Essay	12,551 Dissertation	**18,850**
7 Oliver	548 Case study	3,266 Extended writing project	2,466 Research proposal	18,475 Dissertation	**24,755**
8 Nick	607 Case study	2,828 Extended writing project	3,227 Essay	15,857 Dissertation	**22,519**
					Total 167,064
					Average 20,883

The EAP assignments were the same task and length for each participant: EAP1 consisted of a case study of 600 words which had a one paragraph literature review. EAP2 was an extended writing project of 3,000 words which contained a literature review section of about 1,000 words. The Master's assignments (PG1 and PG2) varied much more, as each student was enrolled on a different Master's (see Table 2, above). The assignments for PG1 consisted of a report, essay, case study, research proposal, project or literature review with self-analysis, of a length varying from 500 words to 3,300 words. PG2 was the final dissertation for all participants, which varied the most

---

[5] Word count totals displayed above were calculated as the whole assignment, excluding bibliography, appendices, cover sheets, main title, table of contents, acknowledgements and abstracts, but include all other submitted text including subheadings (as per university guidance on word counts, Southern University, 2009b).

[6] This participant submitted only a partial draft of the final 12,000 word dissertation; hence, the word count is lower.

in length between 12,000 to 20,000 words. Given the large number of words in my data set, I cannot include whole assignments in the Appendix. Instead, I have added the page of the assignment from which each extract was taken to the attached CD-Rom, with the extract highlighted to show the context of the extract. The actual extracts used in the analysis are set out in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Assignment extracts used from each participant

Participant	EAP1	EAP2	PG1	PG2	Total extracts
1 John	J.1 Literature review	J.2 Literature review	J.3.1 Report findings J.3.2 Introduction	J.4 Literature review	5
2 Alice	A.1 Case study	A.2 Literature review	A.3 Background	A.4.1 Method A.4.2 Literature review	5
3 Shaun	S.1 Case study	S.2.1 Literature review S.2.2 Literature review	S.3 Literature review	S.4.1 Literature review S.4.2 Literature review	6
4 Yolanda	Y.1 Case study	Y.2 Literature review	Y.3 Literature review	Y.4.1 Literature review Y.4.2 Analysis	5
5 Mike	M.1 Literature review	M.2.1 Literature review M.2.2 Main research	M.3.1 Background M.3.2 Analysis	M.4 Literature review	6
6 Kevin	K.1 Literature review	K.2.1 Literature review K.2.2 Discussion	K.3.1 Literature review K.3.2 Literature review	K.4 Literature review	6
7 Oliver	O.1 Case study	O.2.1 Literature review O.2.2 Literature review	O.3 Background and academic context	O.4 Literature review	5
8 Nick	N.1 Introduction	N.2 Literature review	N.3 Literature review	N.4.1 Literature review N.4.2 Literature review	5
				Total 43	

As can be seen in Table 4, I chose one to two extracts for each participant in each stage, totalling five or six extracts for each participant. The letters and numbers such as J.3.1 denote the first letter of each name, the stage, and the extract number respectively; in this case, John, stage 3, extract 1. I collected one assignment at each stage, except in stage 4, in which I initially collected two assignments, but cut the first of these (therefore, it is not represented in Tables 3 and 4) to leave the dissertation as PG2. I made this decision based on the large size of the data set at over 20,000 words for most participants with four assignments. In stage 4, I found it more useful to present only the analysis of PG2, the dissertation, as the final and most extensive example of source use in the study.

4.8.2 Interviews

The interview method was chosen to triangulate the assignment data and explore themes and categories in the written data. According to Dörnyei (2007), triangulation is essentially a means of corroborating the same findings through different methods, but this is sometimes used as an umbrella term for mixing methods. As set out above, the main data for this research is the assignment data; therefore, I see the interview data primarily as a means of checking and confirming findings from the assignments. For example, when I noted a participant's choice of reporting verbs in assignments, I asked about this choice in interviews. However, it is also important that this additional data leads towards a fuller understanding of the participants' source use. As found by Kvale and Brinkman (2009), interviews can be a highly flexible means of gathering knowledge; furthermore, they allow the researcher to probe, through individual questions about specific issues. This seems a useful method to link up thoughts and understanding with practice in source use, as demonstrated by Harwood (2009). I found this to be especially beneficial in the interviews in stages 3-4, as will be explained in 4.10.2 below. An overview of the themes and average lengths of the interviews at each stage is presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Interview method, themes and length in each stage

Stage	Method and Themes	Average length (approximate number of minutes)
1	Structured, task-based Analysis of student examples of citation Task to make examples of quotation and paraphrase Reflection on own source use	15
2	As stage 1	15
3	Semi-structured, discourse-based Reflection on recent assignment and one from previous year Experience on undergraduate degree Perspective on future	21
4	Semi-structured, discourse-based Reflection on own use Use of internet Use of L1 Issues emerging from interview 3	24

The interviews in the first year were structured, in that I asked and adhered to set questions (Dörnyei, 2007). According to Fontana and Frey (2003), structured interviews focus on treating all participants the same and establishing a friendly but distant relationship. Therefore, I thought that using them may be a way of decreasing the power relationship of teacher-student in the first year of the study, and creating a different relationship appropriate to the study. Structured interviews also create easily comparable data for the same situation (*ibid*), so again, this is appropriate for the first year of the study when all the students were taking the same programme. These interviews were also task-based, by which I mean they were focused on the participants' responses to given examples of source use and their own use of these examples in writing during the interview (see Appendix 5a and 5b). This task-based method is commonly used as a tool to engage participants in educational research (Bryant, Sheehan and Vigier, 2006). In contrast, the interviews in the second year were semi-structured, as I used a guiding script (see Appendix 5c and 5d) to outline the topics and suggest questions (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009). These interviews did not have tasks, and were discourse-based (Hyland, 2004) in that they were designed around a discussion of participants' own use of sources in assignments, a reflection of how they used sources at different times, and the influences on their source use. In using some discourse-based questions, I employed a similar method and purpose to

Harwood (2009) to elicit the participants' reflections on their own source use in the interview. The difference in interview method was designed in order to gather data that was of a general, comparable nature in the first year, while the participants were new and all attending the same course; in contrast, the interviews in the second year were designed to take into account the different contexts of their postgraduate study, and the later stage of their study, at which point they could reflect more on their development of source use. Therefore, all interviews were focused on source use development over the two years, but the contrasting content and format of the interviews allowed for richer data about their learning, and avoided a repetitive approach where the same questions would be asked each time, which could have led to boredom, ineffective interviews, or interviewee fatigue (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007).

One issue I recognised in the interviews is the balance between reducing any influence or effect from my presence as the interviewer as far as possible, and not limiting my ability to interact (Kvale and Brindmann, 2009). I tried to separate myself to some extent from my role as the tutor, to act in a friendly but detached way as the researcher, by not giving any views (Dörnyei, 2007), although I was aware that the student participants continued to see me primarily as their tutor. Thus, I recognise that my interviews could not be entirely free from the 'interviewer effect', and that I could not entirely escape from the tutor role in interaction, but I took some steps to minimise bias in the questions. My questions were at first scripted, checked and discussed with my supervisor. I also kept a handwritten log of my reflections during the interviews, to note any specific observations, including self-checking. All of the interviews were audio recorded using a digital voice recorder with a high sound quality, which made it easy to transfer the recordings to a computer (Gibson and Brown, 2009).

I decided to transcribe each interview completely and without using additional technology, as a means of getting to know my data and beginning to analyse it. According to Gibson and Brown (2009), my transcription method fits the 'unfocused' or 'broad' approach, in that I aimed to produce a record of the whole interview, but without the details that would be necessary for in-depth discourse analysis. My focus

was on the content of what was said, rather than how it was said; therefore, I omitted hesitations, repetition, paralinguistic features and other features of talk that are represented in focused transcriptions. Thus, I approached the interview transcripts in my role as a researcher attempting to investigate the participants' views and experiences of source use. I checked the transcripts several times against the original recording for accuracy, and also sent each transcript to the participant to check and correct within one week of recording, so that the interview was still fresh in both interviewee's and interviewer's minds. I accept that data gathering is interventionist, in that my assumptions about a correct record of transcription are subjective, but consider that my transcription method suited the purpose of this enquiry.

4.9 Data set

I will now discuss the stages of data collection in detail, in chronological order through stages 1 to 4, charting each semester over the two years.

Stage 1

My preliminary research plan was to collect two assignments in stage 1, comprising first and final drafts and tutor feedback. The first, a case study, was a useful starting point to see how participants used sources at the beginning of the data collection period. At 600 words, it also seemed to be an easily manageable length for the analysis; however, I later realised that using both first and final drafts as well as tutor feedback generated far too much data from one short assignment for this research. I thus chose to only use the final draft as EAP1. Furthermore, I decided to cut the second assignment, an argument essay from the data collection (therefore omitted from Tables 3 and 4 above), as it was produced in class in test conditions, and I thought using it might not reflect participants' ability to use sources outside a test. I later concluded that it was sufficient to collect one assignment in each stage.

I carried out the interviews with participants at mid-semester in the first stage. I decided it would be better to have more practical activities in the interviews at first, to find out what participants knew. Therefore, I designed the first interview around tasks completed in four parts:

1) a comparison between a cited and non-cited example;

2) an analysis of some given student examples of citation use with errors;

3) a short text followed by an analysis of some given student attempts to paraphrase or quote from a text (including examples of plagiarism)

4) a text for the respondent to make his/her own example of a paraphrase/quotation (see Appendix 5a for stage 1 interview questions).

The rationale for this organisation of content was to start with a relatively easy task, to differentiate between a cited and non-cited text to ascertain participants' views of the importance of citation. The second part was more challenging, as it involved an analysis of student examples of source use. In this part, the aim was to see if they could recognise and differentiate between some features of source use (paraphrase, quotation and plagiarism). Finally, the last activity was clearly the most challenging and time-consuming, where participants were required to make their own examples of a quotation and paraphrase from a text. I considered that the previous two activities built towards this more independent exercise. In this way, I followed the recommendation for interview schedules to proceed from easier questions to more difficult ones (Dörnyei, 2007). A fifth section of the interview was not task-based, and asked questions about participants' perception of their own ability to use sources, and any challenges they were experiencing. This was in order to gain some initial personal reflections from respondents on their source use.

One of the early issues in the interviews was the perception from a few participants that the questions were a test, so at the end, they wanted to know how well they had done. This perception was mostly likely due to them seeing the interview as an interaction between the teacher and student, rather than researcher and participant. It also shows how context shapes the interaction and how it is very difficult to break away from hierarchical roles in interviews, even with careful crafting by the interviewer (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009). They were assured that the interview questions were in no way a test, and that they were merely a data collection method. After this happened, I added this assurance to the instructions before starting the interview. In addition, some participants asked me to give them feedback on their

answers in the interviews. Since I had agreed not to give benefits to participants when completing the ethical procedure, to ensure fairness with non-participants, I could not give any further feedback on the interviews. I had to say I would give them further feedback on similar classroom activities instead. I felt awkward about this, because giving them some feedback might have been a natural follow-up to doing a task and is recommended in some research guidelines (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007); however, I recognised that I had to continue with the fairness principle agreed in the ethical procedure.

Stage 2

In stage 2, I collected the 3,000 word extended writing project (EAP2), which serves the purpose of a mini-dissertation in preparation for Master's level work. Therefore, it is a major piece of work produced over a whole semester, and the most important assignment of the Pre-Master's course. I realised the entire assignment would be too much to examine, and decided to focus on the literature review section only. I made this decision because this part tends to have the heaviest amount of source use, as Ridley (2008: 2) reminds writers, 'the 'literature review is the part…where there is extensive reference to related research and theory in your field'. I decided to continue to collect whole assignments, as it would not be practical to collect part assignments, but to limit my analysis to the literature reviews as far as possible (as can be seen in table 4 above showing the extracts).

The Stage 2 interviews (see Appendix 5b), in terms of data collection and tools, mirror those of stage 1 and were undertaken in the same mid-semester time period (weeks 4-8) with the purpose of a direct comparison with stage 1. Therefore, the questions were in four parts:

1) a comparison between a cited and non-cited example;

2) an analysis of some given student examples of citation use with errors;

3) an analysis of some given student attempts to paraphrase or quote from a text (including examples of plagiarism)

4) a text for the respondent to make his/her own example of a paraphrase/quotation.

In part 3 of the interview, participants were also asked about reporting verbs, as by this stage I assumed that it would be appropriate to ask about how they used them. Apart from this change, the interview content was very similar to that of the stage 1 interview; the rationale for this was to compare directly with the data from the previous interview, approximately 4-6 months earlier. Although the tasks were the same, the texts, questions, and order of questions were changed (for example, the order of the cited or non-cited examples). This was in order to avoid repetition and subsequent influences on participant answers.

Stage 3

At the beginning of this stage, I spent some time getting back in touch with participants after the summer break, and to check with them that they were happy to continue. From this point, I did not see the participants at all except for the research interviews because of their move to postgraduate programmes, and thus, it was more difficult to maintain contact. On the other hand, as I was no longer their teacher, the power relations issue may have diminished and my relationship with participants was purely for research purposes.

I attempted to follow the same pattern of data collection of assignments at this stage, but had to allow for differences because students were now enrolled on a number of diverse Master's degrees. I had planned to collect an assignment mid-semester for this stage, but submission times were much later, and most participants were only able to send on their work at the end of the semester. Having decided to focus on the literature review parts of assignments, I asked participants to send me assignments with literature reviews at this stage. This caused some problems, as many of their assignments did not have a specific literature review section, so I had to amend this request to an assignment that had source use in at least one part (PG1).

The interviews at stage 3 (see Appendix 5c) were different to those of the previous two stages, in that they were focused on reflective and individually-based questions. I made these changes for various reasons. Participants had now achieved a higher

English language level (approximately equivalent to IELTS 6.5 or above) by this stage; therefore, I thought they would be able to answer a wider range of questions. At this stage, they would also be able to reflect on prior learning and previous assignments in the research context, which was not possible in the first year. In addition, as they were now studying on a wide range of courses, it was more natural to ask them individually focused questions. Participants were asked to look at an assignment they had recently completed on their postgraduate course (PG1), and sent on to me, and then I asked them about key features of their source use, such as paraphrasing, citation and reporting verbs. I chose these areas to gain their views about their own use of sources in their writing, and triangulate the data analysis I was planning to do on their assignments where I would be looking at the same features. In this method, I followed the think-aloud protocol used by Harwood (2009) in which his participants discussed their own use of citation in a previously published work. I also wanted to get participants to discuss their current source use, so that I could gain more understanding at this stage. Then I asked them to look at their first assignment, the case study (EAP1), which they completed on the Pre-Master's in stage 1, and to discuss the same features, and compare the two. This was also in order to gain participant perspectives on their own development and changes between their current source use, and that of one year previously. I also asked them about their previous experience of teaching and learning of source use during their undergraduate degrees, in order to investigate any differences. Finally, I asked about whether they wanted to develop any area of source use in the future, to gain a further understanding of their perceived needs at this point.

Undoubtedly, the data collection became considerably more difficult from this stage. Geographically, there was a distance between my workplace and the participants' place of study at different campuses, which meant them coming to another campus specifically for interviews. I attempted to arrange the interviews on their campuses, but could not book a regular and quiet space to do so. Participants appeared to be under a great deal of time pressure from their studies, and were often slow to respond; meanwhile, I did not want to exert any pressure because of ethical considerations, so I refrained from sending many reminders. Students submitted assignments at quite different deadlines on their diverse courses, and thus, it was

difficult to establish consistent data collection points. In addition, many students had extensions to deadlines which caused further delay.

Stage 4

This stage became the longest (over 6 months) and biggest period of data collection, as it involved the dissertation (PG2). I collected another long assignment at an earlier point in this stage, but decided to omit it from the final data set because of the limit in the number of extracts I could usefully present and analyse in this study. I focused on the Master's dissertations as the most important assignment which demonstrated how the participants were able to use sources at the end of the two year data collection period. Unfortunately, of the ten whose work I collected over two years, two participants were unable to send assignments in this stage, one of whom was deemed not to have reached the appropriate academic level to start a dissertation. These gaps in data collection could not be predicted, and also nothing could be done to avoid them. However, as the majority of data was collected successfully, these omissions should not have a serious effect on the whole case study. I considered extending my study to collect the missing data, but felt that I had collected a representative sample with the 8 complete sets, which would be enough for me to work with, and additional data would not add much, and might also be subject to other influences.

The interviews at this stage were quite similar to those in stage 3, and can be considered as a follow-on (see Appendix 5d). The subjects of these interviews were a discussion of the definition of plagiarism used at Southern University, a discussion of internet use, questions requesting participants to expand on themes emerging from interview 3, especially those related to their undergraduate source use, and questions about how they perceived the influence of L1. The discussion about the definition was chosen to explore their understandings of plagiarism; the discussion about internet use was intended to get some data to compare to research I had read on the influence of the internet on source use. I was also considering the influence of L1 at this stage from some of my reflections on the source use in the assignments discussed for the stage 3 interviews. The interviews at this stage were longer than the others at approximately 24 minutes and very interesting, as participants discussed the topics more deeply.

4.10 Data analysis

This will be separated into the two forms of data collection, assignment and interview.

4.10.1 Assignment analysis

I treated the assignment data as discourse, using the standard definition from applied linguistics of 'socially-situated language use in any channel or medium' (Cameron, 2001: 8). The assignments were 'socially situated' in the learning environment of the students' programmes in which they communicated their ideas to tutors. Using Cameron's (2001) description of one form of discourse analysis as examining text above the level of the sentence, I looked for patterns and structures which were longer than a sentence in the assignments as evidence of source use. Following Cook (1989), I approached the assignment data as language in a wider textual context, as I analysed the assignments for the features of source use to assess how students used sources. Discourse analysis is important for learning and teaching, as it focuses on communication, rather than artificially constructed sentences (*ibid*). Thus, through discourse analysis, I could examine the students' behaviour in terms of source use, such as how they communicate their position on issues, show their reading and employ their knowledge of academic conventions.

My method of analysis was systematic. First, I read through all the assignments in my data collection, and read relevant literature to inform my analysis. Based on my reading, I identified key features of source use from the data. Then, I selected one to two extracts which had features of source use in the form of source text or citation, for each participant at each stage. Finally, I analysed these texts for the five features of source use and assessed the degree of competence in these features from the extracts. From my assessment of the competence and the strategies students used, I categorised three groups of students: risk takers, safe players and competent users. In brief, I identified these categories for the following reasons: I found the first group took risks through inappropriate use of source material; in contrast, the second group took no risks and used source material very carefully, but with a limited range of features; finally, the last group took no risks and employed a wide range of source use

features. I will discuss the features of source use which led me to categorise them in these ways in depth in the following three chapters.

For my analysis, I chose extracts from the assignments to discuss in order to represent the assignments as a whole. As explained above, I read through the whole assignment for each and analysed all evidence of source use. The tables (6.1-6.8) below for each student indicate the number of extracts (of approximately 100 words) which I analysed before selecting and presenting the extracts. The differences in the number analysed can be explained by the word length of the assignments (see table 3 above). Thus, the number for the dissertation is far greater than for the other assignments.

Table 6.1 Participant 1 John

Assignment number	Assignment task	Number of extracts analysed	Number of extracts presented
EAP1	Case study	3	1
EAP2	Extended writing project	15	1
PG1	Case study	5	2
PG2	Dissertation	82	1

Table 6.2 Participant 2 Alice

Assignment number	Assignment task	Number of extracts analysed	Number of extracts presented
EAP1	Case study	3	1
EAP2	Extended writing project	14	1
PG1	Research proposal	4	1
PG2	Dissertation	60	2

Table 6.3 Participant 3 Shaun

Assignment number	Assignment task	Number of extracts analysed	Number of extracts presented
EAP1	Case study	6	1
EAP2	Extended writing project	27	2
PG1	Literature review and self-analysis	9	1
PG2	Dissertation	81	2

Table 6.4 Participant 4 Yolanda

Assignment number	Assignment task	Number of extracts analysed	Number of extracts presented
EAP1	Case study	5	1
EAP2	Extended writing project	19	1
PG1	Project	15	1
PG2	Dissertation	103	2

Table 6.5 Participant 5 Mike

Assignment number	Assignment task	Number of extracts analysed	Number of extracts presented
EAP1	Case study	5	1
EAP2	Extended writing project	19	2
PG1	Report	11	2
PG2	Dissertation	127	1

Table 6.6 Participant 6 Kevin

Assignment number	Assignment task	Number of extracts analysed	Number of extracts presented
EAP1	Case study	3	1
EAP2	Extended writing project	12	2
PG1	Essay	21	2
PG2	Dissertation	71	1

Table 6.7 Participant 7 Oliver

Assignment number	Assignment task	Number of extracts analysed	Number of extracts presented
EAP1	Case study	5	1
EAP2	Extended writing project	18	2
PG1	Research proposal	11	1
PG2	Dissertation	85	1

Table 6.8 Participant 8 Nick

Assignment number	Assignment task	Number of extracts analysed	Number of extracts presented
EAP1	Case study	6	1
EAP2	Extended writing project	17	1
PG1	Essay	19	1
PG2	Dissertation	73	2

Each extract contains evidence of source use in the form of citation conventions or source text. I took a systematic approach to each extract by choosing sections of text that were approximately 100 words in length, although some were longer where necessary to make a meaningful section or complete a sentence. In my selection of

extracts, I carefully observed the advice of Richards (2009) to avoid overly long quotations and to focus more on making effective use of shorter extracts through detailed discussion. I presented the extracts in tables with the source text on the right, where possible, and added line numbers to help me to reference the text. I drew attention to features of source use: underlining matched source text, highlighting reporting verbs in green and citation in yellow as a means of coding and making some identifiable features clearly visible in the extracts. I decided to include 'according to' within the category of reporting verbs because of its frequent use by participants, although it is obviously a reporting structure for citation, not a verb. To find the sources students used and how they had used them, I made use of *Turnitin* originality reports which had been generated when they submitted their assignments. I also used *Google* to make an additional check of some strings of text. In this way, I could examine some textual similarity in quotations, attempts at paraphrasing and copied text. However, I did not analyse the actual sources and quality of the sources in depth, as my focus was on the use, rather than the choice of sources.

I experienced a number of problems with my analysis. When looking at the citation students used, I checked their lists of references and use of in-text citation. Sometimes I found that their references were incorrect because of a misspelling, a first name instead of surname, or the use of secondary citation signalled as their own citation. Furthermore, at times, the citation was missing, or missing some elements such as page numbers. I had access to the same databases that the students had used at Southern University, which helped me to find most of their sources. On some occasions, however, it was difficult to find the actual source a student had used. This seemed to occur partly because of the time lapse between the student's submission and my analysis, which extended up to three years for some parts. This time lapse meant that some electronic documents had been updated or no longer existed. Sometimes, there were multiple sources for the same text, as matched by *Turnitin* or *Google*, and this meant the original source could not always be established. In addition to checking the library catalogue, I used *Amazon* to find some books, which helped especially to find new publications, but not to consult in detail. When I found errors in formatting citation in student text, I decided to correct them when I presented the

source text beside the sample, but not in the extracts from student work. In these ways, I developed some strategies to deal with identifying sources.

Within the analysis of assignments, I sought some inter-rater reliability by asking some EAP colleagues to check a percentage of my interpretations of source use. This was in order to ensure the interpretation of the source use is consistent with other practices and not subjective to me as the researcher. I recognise that reliability is not the natural concern of qualitative research, but the provision of some inter-rater reliability can be seen as a check that another observer using the same theory and data would have the same interpretation (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994). The check confirmed that other tutors identified the same five features of source use and some interpretation of competence in features such as reporting verbs and citation. However, I felt it was impractical to seek other tutors' interpretation of paraphrasing and avoidance of plagiarism because to do this, it would be necessary to bring in other evidence from *Turnitin*, *Google* and the wide range of sources themselves.

4.10.2 Interview analysis

As I described above, I transcribed my interviews in full in order to analyse what was said. Thus, my interviews were analysed for content only. I treated this content as mining for information throughout all stages. Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) suggest that a researcher examining interview data can be a miner extracting information which is already there, or a traveller exploring and interpreting new information created with those around them. As I was using the interview data primarily to support and understand the assignment data in more depth, I maintained the mining approach to extract useful data from the interviews.

As I had designed, conducted and transcribed all the interviews myself, I was very familiar with the content of the interviews. This made it easier for me to code the interview data related to the five features of my analysis (citation, paraphrasing, reporting verbs, critical engagement and avoidance of plagiarism). I used these features as key terms for the preliminary codes (Dörnyei, 2007) and then added the related terms of 'quotation' and 'reference', which helped me identify some important points in the interview data. This approach fits with the technique for content analysis

presented by Kvale and Brindmann (2009), in which long interview statements can be categorised into a small number of specific themes. As they suggest, this approach facilitates the analysis of long transcripts and enables researchers to make comparisons between participants.

In addition to the identification of these five features and some key terms, I also highlighted some other relevant and interesting issues emerging in the data, because I did not want to miss further interesting insights. I used these strategies to identify useful quotations in the data which I could use next to the assignment extracts to elaborate on and discuss features of source use. For example, I chose quotations where students gave their definitions of plagiarism in stages 1 and 2, or where they provided important insights on their strategies with source use at any stage. In this way, I followed the guidance from Dörnyei (2007) to employ the most useful data from the interviews. Most interview data consists solely of quotations from students; where it is useful to show some dialogue, I have identified the speaker through the first letter of the pseudonym, eg J=John, and I=Interviewer.

4.11 Summary

This chapter has presented the methodology used in this study. I started by introducing the aims and research questions, and presenting an overview of the research design. I examined the rationale for qualitative research using a case study approach and the need for longitudinal research to examine a developmental context. I then moved on to set out the research process, from the initial areas of the ethical process, pilot study and recruitment of participants. I presented details of participants and reasons for their inclusion. Next, I explained the data set of assignments and interviews, and gave the rationale for collecting this data. I discussed these means of data collection at each of the four stages, and then showed the issues encountered and how they were dealt with. Finally, I elaborated on my decisions regarding the methods of using discourse analysis for the assignments and content analysis for the interviews. In designing, carrying out, analysing and writing about this research, I have learnt that the research process involves taking a large number of careful, informed, and important decisions all the way through. As this research is a longitudinal study, it has been particularly important for me to reflect on previous stages, while

concomitantly looking forward to further stages, to connect up these decisions and thus see the research process as ongoing and continuously developmental.

In the following three chapters, I will present the findings and analysis from the assignments and interviews in the form of the three groups of source users who emerged from the data: risk takers, safe players and competent users.

Chapter 5: Risk takers

If you have that expression in your mouth, I'll use it too (Pople, 2011: 21).

5.1 Introduction

In this first chapter of analysis, I will focus on one group of three students who I consider emerged as risk takers in terms of their source use strategies. The progression of the three students through the four stages of data collection will be examined and compared, to establish in which ways they took risks. Finally, the key themes emerging from the data will be discussed. Through the chapter, I aim to explore the ways these students use and develop their source use. In particular, my intention is to analyse their risk taking strategies and try to understand why they took risks.

I have decided to call the group risk takers, as I consider they took risks from an academic perspective, and these risks could lead to accusations of plagiarism and poor practice. The risks they took include copying from unattributed text (CUT), copying from attributed text (CAT), paraphrasing insufficiently, patchwriting, copying from non-academic internet sources, copying from surface parts of a text (such as abstracts) and copying secondary citation without demonstrating it (in other words, copying the synthesis and analysis made by another author). These strategies will be examined through each student's development of source use.

The three students in this group were John (Chinese), Alice (Chinese) and Shaun (Sri Lankan). Their progression over the four stages (Pre-Master's semester 1 and 2, and Master's semester 1 and 2) will be discussed in this order. Extracts will be numbered in order, with the participant's initial, followed by the assignment number (1-4) and a further number (1-2) where more than one extract is used from the same assignment. The extracts will be presented in tables, with matching source text beside, where appropriate. The features will be shown using the following coding: underlining to demonstrate identical text to source, yellow highlighting to show citation and green highlighting to show reporting verbs.

5.2 Participant 1: John

John was a Chinese student who studied business in stage 1 and 2 during the Pre-Master's, and took MSc Business and Enterprise in stages 3 and 4.

Stage 1 (Pre-Master's Semester 1)

Extract J.1 below comes from his 600 word case study assignment about online marketing and Amazon.

Extract J.1

No	John, EAP1 Literature Review	Chen and Lindsay (2000: 224)
1	The use of the internet is making	More encouraging for online shoppers,
2	commerce more efficient, it takes ten	it takes ten times less energy to get a
3	times less energy to get a few books	few books shipped via truck cross-
4	shipped via truck cross-country than	country than it does to drive your SUV
5	it does to drive your SUV to the mall	to the mall. So even if the Net never
6	… So even if the Net never saves a	saves a critter from the endangered
7	critter from the endangered species	species list, you can feel even better
8	list, you can feel even better about	about that book you just ordered on
9	that book you just ordered on	Amazon.
10	Amazon (Chen, 2000)	

I term this example copied attributed text (hereafter referred to as CAT) at the sentence level; in other words, a section of source text where the citation is given, but where the verbatim text should be signalled as a quotation, but is shown as a paraphrase. From the citation format, the reader expects the words to be the writer's own, but the informal and native-like prose such as 'even if the Net never saves a critter' (lines 6-7) reveal this to be web information, which is in sharp contrast to the student's level demonstrated elsewhere in the text. According to Belcher (2006) and Bloch (2012), the use of web information may blur students' sense of authorship: they may not see text on the internet as published material, and its availability and the ease with copying it may lead them to use it inappropriately. John's initial attempts to use sources show that he seemed to be applying what he was being taught in his EAP class at the time, for example by indicating that information had come from a source through employing some non-integral citation. He therefore demonstrated some ability to distinguish between his own ideas and those from someone else, and the

beginning of an understanding that citational support for ideas in his assignments is advisable (Swales, 1990). However, in terms of evidence of citation knowledge, John only cited the first author, Chen, and omitted the second author, Lindsay. At stage 1, he may not have realised that citation norms require two authors to be cited, or that copied text needs to be formatted as a quotation.

In the interview at stage 1, John was asked to provide definitions of a quotation, paraphrase and plagiarism:

> I: Do you know what a quotation is?
> J: If when I write an essay, I want to use some words other people said before so I must use…
> I: Quotation marks?
> J: Yeah, that's it
> I: OK, do you know what a paraphrase is?
> J: I don't know
> I: OK, do you know what plagiarism is?
> J: Plagiarism is…if I use the information from the database but I don't reference it, that's plagiarism, that's it. If I write down the main idea and just change some words, maybe it is paraphrasing, but I don't know if the paraphrasing is plagiarism. (Stage 1, Interview 1, I=Interviewer, J= John)

This interview extract shows he has a limited understanding of each term, and considers plagiarism to be confined to unreferenced sources gained from databases. He was unable to define paraphrasing, and was also very hesitant and unsure of the boundary between acceptable paraphrasing and plagiarism. Thus, from these attempts at defining source use terms, and his use of sources in extract J.1, we can surmise that his source use level was at an early stage of development.

Stage 2 (Pre-Master's semester 2)

Next, looking at his assignments in stage 2, the second semester of his EAP course, John has developed his source use considerably and used a wider range of features. Extract J.2 is from a second draft of his 3,000 word project on the marketing strategies of Nokia.

Extract J.2

No	John, EAP2 Literature Review	Macinnis, Rao and Weiss (2002:391)
1	MacInnis, Rao and Weiss (2002)	A prevailing view is that increased
2	present the popular view that	media weight for frequently purchased
3	increased advertising quantity	brands in mature product categories
4	usually does not mean increases in	usually does not lead to increases in
5	sales for the mature products of	sales. However, the role of advertising
6	frequently chosen brands. However,	executional cues and viewer responses
7	they also point out that whether the	on media weight–induced sales has not
8	advertising quantity has sales impact	yet been examined. The authors find
9	or now depends on the quality of	that whether weight helps or has no
10	the advertising and the responses	sales impact depends on the creative
11	from the audiences.	characteristics of the advertisements
12		and the responses they evoke in
13		viewers.

In extract J.2, he used an example of integral citation (line 1), and some non-evaluative reporting structures: 'present' (line 2) and 'point out' (line 7), and also showed a contrast between the points from the source by linking them with 'however' (line 6), although he could have copied this word from the source (line 5, Macinnis, Rao and Weiss). Another observation about extract J.2 is that John has chosen a section of text from the very beginning of the abstract for the article. This demonstrates his use of time-saving reading skills, which Weller (2010) argues are often taught on EAP programmes, so it is understandable that students put them into practice in this way. At this point, John had received tutor feedback on written drafts at stage 2, which included a discussion of *Turnitin* reports. It is possibly a consequence of this intervention that John did not make use of CAT at a sentence level. He used synonyms for quite a lot of expressions, for example, 'media weight' (lines 1-2, Macinnis, Rao and Weiss) to 'advertising quantity' (line 3, John); 'creative characteristics of the advertisements' (lines 10-11, Macinnis, Rao and Weiss) to 'the quality of the advertising' (line 9-10, John). Some of this rewording is slightly unnatural, but John has attempted to move away from patchwriting and has produced a paraphrase at a minimal revision level (Keck, 2006). I assess this as minimal revision, because the unique links (discussed in 3.2.2), such as 'usually does not' (excluding the general links of 'sales', 'mature products', 'brands' and 'sales impact') to the original text comprise

about 24% of his attempted paraphrase. His text still appears to be quite similar to the original, because he followed the sentence structure of the source text quite closely.

In the interview at stage 2, he gave a different explanation of paraphrasing:

> Paraphrase is [to] understand it, you try to make your own sentence to express what you want to say. (Stage 2, Interview 2, John)

He focused on citation in his definition of plagiarism, which is important to his approach to using sources, in which citation is the essential element:

> I think every time when you use some source without citation should be plagiarism. (Stage 2, Interview 2, John)

John was asked about the biggest challenges of source use:

> I think first should be the understanding of the source because in our writing in most cases we are going to use paraphrasing, [and] if we don't understand the source, we can't write good paraphrases, so that's the challenge. (Stage 2, Interview 2, John)

Therefore, he demonstrated an awareness of the process of writing from sources, and that comprehension of source text needs to come before paraphrasing. This new awareness seems highly significant, because he was linking successful writing to successful reading, which has been acknowledged in research as a key issue (Belcher and Hirvela, 2001). He referred to good paraphrasing as a 'challenge' which shows he found it difficult. In addition, he noted that paraphrasing should be the most frequently used strategy; in other words, he understood that he could not rely on quotations or verbatim text, which shows his development since stage 1. He also drew attention to his progress by criticising his previous semester's work:

> I know last semester I did many bad paraphrasing, now I know we should not do it, try to make good paraphrasing. (Stage 2, Interview 2, John)

He also confirmed his new understanding and ability to use paraphrasing:

> I: How much do you think you have improved in your use of sources in your writing since starting the course?
>
> J: Improved a lot because when we did the interview here, I still remember, I don't know what is paraphrasing, I asked you to explain what does this mean. Now of course I understand them, and I know what [it means], and can use them in the right way. (Stage 2, Interview 2, I=Interviewer, J=John)

His interview comments reveal that he has gained more understanding of the features of source use, in particular how to paraphrase. Extract 2 also bears out his understanding of paraphrase and his attempts to reword source text in an acceptable way. Thus, he has made progress from stage 1 and developed his source use.

Stage 3 (Master's semester 1)

In stage 3, John began his first semester on his Master's course in Business and Enterprise. Extract J.3.1 is from his first assignment, a report on oligopoly using lecture notes.

Extract J.3.1

No	John, PG1 Report Findings
1	According to Carmichael (2005), its pricing strategies should depend on its
2	guess about how its rivals will react… According to the figure of changes in
3	demand in the lecture notes, develop the technology, ceteris paribus, the
4	quantity of demand will increase at the same price. According to the figure of
5	changes in supply in the lecture notes, develop the technology, ceteris paribus,
6	Wondertech will be able to increase its productive capacity… According to Begg
7	and Ward (2007), the trade between the member states is increased because
8	of the abolishment of tariffs and quotas in EU.

In this assignment, John's level of source use seems to have slipped backwards; he used fewer features, with only a small total number of integral citations, no non-integral citations, a very limited number of reporting structures, and repeated 'according to' at the beginning of sentences followed by citation, as in extract J.3.1 (lines 1, 2, 4 and 6). In his interview at stage 3, John was asked about his use of 'according to':

> J: I quite like 'according to'
> I: OK, why do you like that?
> J: It sounds academic. (Stage 3, Interview 3, I=Interviewer, J=John)

Thus, his decision to introduce sources with 'according to' stemmed from his interpretation that it was appropriate in his university context, perhaps as a way to attribute information very clearly. For the reader, however, the repetitive use of 'according to' may seem weak in terms of academic quality. Extract J.3.2 from the

same assignment shows an example of CAT with two sentences from a dictionary definition.

Extract J.3.2

No	John PG1, Introduction	Business and Management Dictionary (2007: 5886)
1	Price war could be a pricing strategy,	Dictionary definition -price war
2	as the definition from Business &	a situation in which two or more
3	Management dictionary (2007)	companies each try to increase their
4	suggests that a price war is a	own share of the market by lowering
5	situation in which two or more	prices. A price war involves companies
6	companies each try to increase their	undercutting each other in an attempt
7	own share of the market by lowering	to encourage more customers to buy
8	prices. It involves companies	their products or services.
9	undercutting each other in an	
10	attempt to encourage more	
11	customers to buy their products or	
12	services.	

This strategy of copying verbatim dictionary definitions (lines 4-12 John, lines 2-8 Business and Management Dictionary) next to the reference and not signalling the quotation was one used by John, as well as the other members of this group below. It may be that the depersonalised nature of many online sources such as dictionaries can result in writers not seeing this as important (Bloch, 2001). As mentioned above, when students use online sources, they may not pay the same attention to authorship (Belcher, 2006). The length of the task may have also influenced the level of source use (1,000 words rather than 3,000 in the stage 2 assignment) and perhaps because it was focused on lecture notes and few sources, John did not make any use of quotations; furthermore, in the interview at stage 3, John said:

> The tutor of this module … said he didn't like quotation. He said just 'if you really want to say something from this book, you just try to use your own words, so try not to use quotation', so I didn't use. (Stage 3, Interview 3, John)

Therefore, it seems that John employed a strategy of avoiding quotations in order to suit the tutor's preference, did not signal copied text with quotation marks or citation formatting using page numbers, and in fact used a patchwriting strategy instead (Pecorari, 2002). This involves a much greater risk of plagiarism, but John did not seem

to focus on this. However, in his interview at stage 3, he discussed his sense that he was better at paraphrasing:

> I: Do you feel you are able to paraphrase easily?
> J: Yeah, [more] easily than last year
> I: OK, how has it become easier?
> J: First of all because we practised a lot last year and for this year for this module we learning like the whole semester, for these ideas, I already have my own opinion on these ideas, then when I read them, I can understand. (Stage 3, Interview 3, I=Interviewer, J=John)

In his comment here, John drew attention to the importance of his own opinion about what he read and the familiarity of information; therefore, the challenge of understanding new texts that he highlighted in stage 2 seems to have diminished. As Willingham (2007) notes, once they have some knowledge about a subject, it is easier for readers to understand and take a position on it. However, despite his assertion in the interview that he understood texts better because of having his own ideas, his overall level of source use shown in the extracts has not progressed since the previous stage, and may even have regressed in terms of copying and using a limited range of vocabulary. He has tried to adapt to his Master's study environment by changing some strategies, for example by avoiding quotations in order to follow his tutor's instructions, but this seems to be leading him to patchwriting and risking plagiarism.

Stage 4 (Master's semester 2)

In this stage, John's assignments were considerably longer. John's final assignment, the 20,000 word dissertation on Chinese Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs), contained a very large amount of citation with synthesis in the form of a list of non-integral citation to show a number of authors on the same topic ('generalisation', according to Hyland, 2004). He used a much larger range of reporting structures: although he still employed 'according to' very frequently, he also used others including evaluative verbs such as 'argue' and 'stress'. However, he used some examples of what I term copied unattributed text (CUT) at a partial sentence level, and a very large amount of CAT. One feature noticeable in his work was using bulleted point text copied exactly from sources, as in extract J.4 below:

Extract J.4

No	John, PG2 Literature Review	Fan (2003:8)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	According to Fan (2003), SMEs play a particularly important role in developing countries where poverty is most severe, because of the following reasons: • SMEs tend to employ poor and low-income workers • SMEs are sometimes the only source of employment in poor regions and rural areas • Self-employment is the only source of income for many poor	SMEs tend to employ poor and low-income workers • SMEs are sometimes the only source of employment in poor regions and rural areas • Self-employment is the only source of income for many poor • SMEs play a particularly important role in developing countries where poverty is most severe

This extract shows that John continued to employ further patchwriting strategies in stage 4. He signalled the use of a source with citation and 'according to' (line 1), then used a section of source text verbatim, followed by a phrase 'because of the following reasons' (lines 4-5) to link into the bulleted points. It may be the case that John considered the bullet points to be acceptable to use verbatim without quotation marks, as if this punctuation signalled its separation from the rest of the text. He has moved the order of the text, beginning with the last bullet point from the source text (line 8, Fan), then retaining the same order as the source text for the other three points. Thus, his use of the source text can be described as near copy (Keck, 2006), and would be an unacceptable attempted paraphrase.

In his interview at stage 4, his comments show he has done more thinking about source use, and has moved away from his strategy in stage 3 of following his tutor's view of quotations to some strong beliefs about quotations of his own:

> It's not good to use lots of quotations, it's like [it] shows you don't want to explain by your own words, so it shows you don't submit a very high quality assignment, and maybe you are lazy. (Stage 4, Interview 4, John)

He had clearly reached an understanding of academic quality in writing, and considered that using quotations was not a good strategy. Making individual decisions about how to use sources has been shown as a common strategy when students are

unsure (Harwood and Petrić, 2012). At the same time, in his interview he explained his worries and doubts about plagiarism at length:

> I've got a question, is it really so strict, in the university, this problem about plagiarism? I mean not the very obvious plagiarism, just copy or just take another dissertation, another work from, as your own. I mean like if you just copied something…then you didn't give the citation or something, …then you will fail, is the question I've got, and I am doing it so…I'm worried about that, that's why I'm asking myself, and I think like, is it like different tutors, they have different opinions on this problem, so maybe this tutor, he will say 'that's fine' if you do it, and another tutor [will] say, 'you can't do that'…I feel like, the first year, I mean, I was studying here, I was very cautious about this problem, but now this year, nobody [mentions] about this problem in all my assignments, so that's why, I ask myself that question, if they don't mind, or they just didn't mention, or they didn't find I've got some problem, I don't know…that would make me know I shouldn't do that, or I can't do it, but now, I'm lost, like…
> (Stage 4, Interview 4, John)

In this revealing interview extract, John expressed his concerns about inconsistency between tutors regarding plagiarism, and the fact that he felt 'lost' because no advice was given to him. This situation was in stark contrast to the continuous feedback he received on the Pre-Master's, and indicated the difficulty for him to develop his source use, as he did not know if he was using the appropriate strategies. John produced assignments in this stage with a large amount of source use, but within this, employed some patchwriting and relied on source use text through CAT and some CUT. He seemed to acknowledge he could be doing something wrong as he said 'I am doing it, so…'. He also employed strategies to try to conform to expectations of source use at that level, but clearly had many concerns about whether he was doing it correctly. Without additional support at stage 4, it seems he was unable to progress to a more competent stage of development.

I will now move on to discuss participant 2, Alice, who developed source use in similar ways to John.

5.3 Participant 2: Alice

Alice was a Chinese student who studied tourism in stages 1 and 2, and then took MSc Trade and Logistics in stages 3 and 4.

Stage 1 (Pre-Master's semester 1)

In stage 1, Alice wrote her first assignment, a 600 word case study, about theme parks using Walt Disney as an example. Extract A.1 comes from her attempt to use source material about the Disney company.

Extract A.1

No	Alice, EAP1 Case Study	Wikipedia
1	Disney Company as the	the Walt Disney Company owns and
2	representative of theme parks owns	operates a series of resorts around the
3	and operates a series of	world including the Walt Disney World
4	entertainment attractions including	Resort, the largest vacation resort in
5	the largest vacation resort in the	the world… the world's most visited
6	world and has the largest amount of	theme park company.
7	attendance.	

In this extract, Alice used a strategy of employing source information from Wikipedia in her text, without citation. At stage 1, she received instruction from the academic writing module that use of Wikipedia for assignments is not acceptable. Therefore, it seems she may have been reluctant to reveal that she was using it, or it may be that she had not yet understood how to cite. Her strategy at stage 1 would seem to be relying on a previous habit of using search engines and Wikipedia rather than academic searches using databases and academic journals, which she was being taught to do at the time. According to Wannemacher (2011), the practice of using Wikipedia for source information is very widespread, especially among younger or novice writers.

While still relying on the source text structure, Alice attempted some paraphrasing at a minimal level; for example, she changed 'resorts' to 'entertainment attractions' (line 2 Wikipedia, line 4 Alice) and changed 'the world's most visited theme park' to 'has the largest amount of attendance' (lines 5-6 Wikipedia, lines 5-6 Alice). This rewording is rather unnatural (eg 'to have attendance'), but does reflect a limited attempt to express some ideas in her own words. Her attempt at paraphrasing would fit with Keck's (2006) categorisation of minimal revision as 45% of her version contains some quite long unique links to the original ('owns and operates a series of', 'including the largest vacation resort in the world'). In the interview in stage 1, where she was given a

task to make a paraphrase and quotation based on a text, she was unable to clearly distinguish between them, and even seemed to be considering that they were the same:

> I: Could you read out your quotation please?
> A: Penec (2003) claimed that 'in the last 50 years there has been no apparent increase in personal happiness in Western nations'.
> I: OK, thank you, sorry was that your quotation or paraphrase?
> A: This is quotation
> I: Now your paraphrase
> A: Paraphrase is just the same way. (Stage 1, Interview 1, I=Interviewer, A=Alice)

Furthermore, in interview 1, she expressed concern about using her own words:

> I: What are the biggest challenges for you in using sources in your academic writing?
> A: The way to use I think maybe the words I use from the writer, because maybe it's much more professional [compared to] my own words and if I change to my words, it'll be a little look not very nice, and it's easier, and I think maybe if I want to use the part of idea, and I'm not sure which one is better or something. (Stage 1, Interview 1, I=Interviewer, A=Alice)

Here Alice emphasised the difference she saw between the published articles she read that use 'professional words' and her own way of using words that she described as 'look not very nice'. She might have been concerned about what she saw as a lack of sophistication in her words (Breeze, 2008). As also reported in a study by Ashworth, Bannister and Thorne (1997), she may have decided to use the words of other sources, because she thought she would get a better grade by using their 'professional' words. Many studies have emphasised the difficulty for novice writers to establish their own voice (Abasi, Akbari and Graves, 2006; Ivanič, 1998; Lillis, 2001). Her comments and citational use in stage 1 thus indicate that her source use is limited.

Stage 2 (Pre-Master's semester 2)

In stage 2, Alice completed a 3,000 word extended writing project about sustainable tourism, using the example of Dartmoor National Park. Extract A.2 comes from her literature review.

Extract A.2

No	Alice, EAP2 Literature Review	Liu (2003: 459 and 462)
1	The study from ==Zhenhua (2003)== …	The role of tourism demand, the nature
2	==includes== the role of tourism demand,	of tourism resources, the imperative of
3	the nature of tourism resources, the	intra-generational equity, the role of
4	role of tourism in promoting	tourism in promoting sociocultural
5	sociocultural progress, and forms of	progress, the measurement of
6	sustainable development. From this	sustainability, and forms of sustainable
7	critical analysis, the sustainable	development….
8	tourism requires both sustainable	
9	growth of tourism's contribution to	Sustainable tourism requires both the
10	the economy and society as well as	sustainable growth of tourism's
11	the sustainable use of resources and	contribution to the economy and
12	environment. (*ibid*)	society and the sustainable use of
13		resources and environment

Extract A.2 demonstrates Alice's strategy for copying source use text. She copied most of the source text, but left out some parts of sentences, possibly parts that she found hard to understand, such as 'imperative of intra-generational equity' (lines 2-3, Liu). She added one reporting verb 'includes', but kept all the examples in the same order, with the same punctuation and linking (lines 2-12), which shows she was relying on the source text structure. She cited in line 1 (though with the first name, Zhenhua rather than the surname, Liu), and also included '*ibid*' (line 12) to attribute the section carefully. It seems reasonable to suggest that she thought she was using references appropriately. This would appear to be an example of where copied text is attributed, or 'when students provide a reference for 'clearly' plagiarised material' (Chanock, 2008: 4). This may be a result not of ignorance of conventions, but of students thinking that they know and understand them, and are using them correctly. As noted by Chanock (2008), the action of providing the reference in the text and bibliography is inconsistent with an intention to cheat. Pecorari (2002) concludes that students may adopt this strategy in their source use without realising a problem with it. One of Chanock's findings was that even if students are conscious of debates in literature, they are often unaware of the dialogic nature of academic source use. This was described by Bakhtin (1981) as how texts are interwoven with complex threads from other texts and used in different ways. When students read a source and then put information from it into their own work, they may not be aware, or may not show, the

dialogic use of texts within this source. This was also found in research by Weller (2010), who emphasises the difficulty for students of critical reading.

In the interview at stage 2, Alice's definitions of paraphrasing and plagiarism both seemed to indicate limited understanding.

> Paraphrase is that if the student want to use the other one's idea or evidence, as evidence, they will change the exact words, but the quotation is just use the exact words… Plagiarism is just use some idea from the other author but didn't say where they come from. (Stage 2, Interview 2, Alice)

Here Alice gave the view that plagiarism means not using citation, which seems to be her main consideration with source use. Thus, her view of plagiarism is comparable to John's at this stage. She defined paraphrasing as changing the exact words, which perhaps indicates she did not know whether she needed to change many words. Alice also showed some confusion about using sources for ideas, and also seemed to think it was acceptable to copy text if the source is referenced, as found by other studies such as Ashworth, Bannister and Thorne (1997).

> I think it's very hard, and sometimes I will just enter the key point of all and enter the software to find the word in the passage. And then, when sometimes I found something I think I can use in my [work] … I would use it, because I really didn't [get many] sources And paraphrase I also think it's very hard, and also difficult to change the author's words. Basically I [don't] have a good command of English. What the author [uses] is just the word, I can't use the other, or maybe I will change the meaning, or not the meaning but change the feeling of author, and I think because reading is a difficult part, also paraphrase is difficult. (Stage 2 interview 2, Alice)

In this interview extract, she explained what can be described as a shortcut reading strategy, such as scanning for key words, reading short sections and using what she found quickly to save time (Weller, 2010). She also showed that she felt she could not use her own words, which has been found by many studies of identity in novice academic writers (Chatterjee, 2007; Ivanič, 1998; McGowan, 2005a). She was worried about changing the meaning or view of authors, a concern voiced by novice writers in Keck's (2010) research. This may account for some of the copied parts of extract A.2 above. As found by Park (2003), she did not seem to understand completely what she needed to do when using sources. This is also demonstrated in the interview in stage 2:

I: Do you have any other comments about using sources in your writing?
A: I think I have a lot of bad habits
I: Bad habits?
A: Yeah, bad habits
I: What kind of bad habits?
A: Because I don't know, I just try, I didn't really [do] the good or right thing sometimes, I will think maybe because I didn't force myself to do something sometimes so I will…just use it right now, maybe later I will forget what part I want to change. (Stage 2, Interview 2, I=Interviewer, A=Alice)

As can be seen at the end of this interview extract 'maybe later I will forget what part I want to change', Alice described what she perceived as bad habits, seeming to suggest that she left paraphrasing till later and might forget to do it. This might be described as 'sloppy paraphrasing' (Schick, 2011) where students accidentally or forgetfully copy from sources.

Stage 3 (Master's semester 1)

During Alice's postgraduate studies in Trade and Logistics, she worked on three assignments about the FedEx expansion in China. Extract A.3 below is from assignment PG1, her 500 word research proposal for the dissertation about the importance of location decision in the logistics industry.

Extract A.3

No	Alice, PG1 Background	Fedex (2009)
1	FedEx Express has launched its new	FEDEX Express, a subsidiary of FedEx
2	hub facility at Guangzhou Baiyun	Corp and the world's largest express
3	International Airport in south China	transportation company, commenced
4	in February 2009. The new FedEx	operations at its new hub facility at
5	Asia-Pacific hub has a US$150 million	Guangzhou Baiyun International Airport
6	capital investment by FedEx and will	in Guangzhou, southern China
7	be the centre point of the company's	recently… The new FedEx Asia-Pacific
8	operations in the region for the next	hub represents a US$ 150 million capital
9	30 years (FedEx, 2009)	investment by FedEx and will be the
10		center-point of the company's
11		operations in the region for the next 30
12		years.

It can be seen that she relied on the source text for almost all of this extract, but did not signal it as a quotation. This may be explained by what she said in the interview at stage 3.

> A: This content basically, I make a little paraphrase, it's their idea, their [conclusion of] that content.
> I: When you say, a little paraphrase, you mean?
> A: Because their structure maybe not like this, they make like, they put the different paragraph to say like that factor is very important, I just get them together. (Stage 3 Interview 3, I=Interviewer, A=Alice)

This seems to indicate that her strategy was to 'get them together'; in other words, put together source information, which she referred to as a 'little paraphrase', perhaps because she was conscious that she was not doing enough. Similarly, Pittam *et al.* (2009) found that students asked how many words they needed to change in order for their paraphrasing to be acceptable, which shows that some students want very clear, quantifiable answers about paraphrasing. It is also notable that the majority of Alice's citations are non-integral, at the end of sentences and sections. In this way, her style of reporting from the literature involves little discussion or critical approach (Weller, 2010).

Stage 4 (Master's semester 2)

In this stage, Alice submitted her dissertation about the determinants of a successful hub location using Fedex as an example. Extract A.4.1 shows her use of a source text for research methods.

Extract A.4.1

No	Alice, PG2 Method	Saunders *et al.*(2007:139)
1	Since <u>case study</u> is a <u>research</u> <u>that</u>	Robson (2002:178) defines <u>case study</u>
2	<u>involves the empirical investigation</u>	'as a strategy for doing <u>research that</u>
3	<u>of a particular contemporary</u>	<u>involves the empirical investigation of a</u>
4	<u>phenomenon within its real-life</u>	<u>particular contemporary phenomenon</u>
5	<u>context, using multiple sources of</u>	<u>within its real-life context, using</u>
6	<u>evidence</u>. (Saunders et el, 2007).	<u>multiple sources of evidence</u>'.

In extract A.4.1, Alice cited a standard text for research methods (Saunders *et al.*, 2007), which is used on all Business degrees at Southern University. It therefore seems

very surprising that she would choose to copy from it verbatim, as she would know it could be easily checked, unless she thought she was following an acceptable practice (Chanock, 2008). Furthermore, extract A.4.1 reveals some occluded features (Pecorari, 2006), because she did not show that Saunders *et al.* (2007) cite a quotation from Robson (2002) in line 1. Alice used the whole quotation as if it was from Saunders *et al.*, but made no reference to the secondary source.

In the interview at this time, Alice was asked to define plagiarism.

> I: How do you define plagiarism?
> A: That [is] when you copy or use others' ideas or thoughts or the sentence words in your own work …without citation. (Stage 4, Interview 4, I=Interviewer, A=Alice)

She acknowledged here that plagiarism is also copying 'sentence words', but perhaps still revealed some ambiguity in her mind that copying is acceptable if there is citation. Extract A.4.2 below shows a new strategy by Alice to copy much longer sections of source text verbatim.

Extract A.4.2

No	Alice, PG2 Literature Review	Lai (2007: 498)
1	From that onward <u>a number of</u>	In this later period <u>a number of</u>
2	<u>firms were combining domestic and</u>	<u>firms were combining domestic and</u>
3	<u>international sourcing through</u>	<u>international sourcing through</u>
4	<u>global supply chains as a means of</u>	<u>global supply chains as a means of</u>
5	<u>achieving a sustainable competitive</u>	<u>achieving a sustainable competitive</u>
6	<u>advantage (Bozarth *et al.*, 1998).</u>	<u>advantage (Bozarth *et al.*, 1998).</u>
7	<u>Firms can better focus on their core</u>	<u>Firms can better focus on their core</u>
8	<u>business, such as manufacturing</u>	<u>business, such as manufacturing and</u>
9	<u>and retailing, by outsourcing their</u>	<u>retailing, by outsourcing their</u>
10	<u>logistics activities to</u> the <u>providers.</u>	<u>logistics activities to</u> 3PL <u>providers.</u>
11	<u>Such outsourcing means that 'firms</u>	<u>Such outsourcing means that 'firms</u>
12	<u>whose core competencies lie</u>	<u>whose core competencies lie</u>
13	<u>elsewhere can concentrate on</u>	<u>elsewhere can concentrate on</u>
14	<u>activities best managed internally</u>	<u>activities best managed internally</u>
15	<u>and gain access to superior logistics</u>	<u>and gain access to superior logistics</u>
16	<u>performance at equal or lower cost'</u>	<u>performance at equal or lower cost'</u>
17	<u>(Bowersox and Daugherty, 1995;</u>	<u>(Bowersox and Daugherty, 1995;</u>
18	<u>Hamel and Prahalad, 1994;</u>	<u>Hamel and Prahalad, 1994;</u>
19	<u>Micklethwait and Wooldrige, 1997;</u>	<u>Micklethwait and Wooldrige, 1997;</u>
20	<u>Pint and Baldwin, 1997).</u>	<u>Pint and Baldwin, 1997).</u>

In this extract from Alice's dissertation, it appears to the reader that Alice used firstly an idea from Bozarth *et al.*, then that she has chosen a quotation from a source, and then synthesized 4 sources on this theme. However, this entire extract matches a text by Lai (2007) who in fact had chosen the idea from Bozarth, used the quotation and made the synthesis. In this way, this extract, like A.4.1, demonstrates the occluded citation features discussed by Pecorari (2006). The reader is likely to assume Alice has crafted the text using the sources as cited, but text-matching software reveals that Alice copied all of this from one source and used both the words and the citation employed by another author. As Pecorari (2006) points out, in common with other writers still developing their understanding of source use, Alice may have thought this was acceptable. This practice can be referred to as 'unsignalled repetition from their sources' (Pecorari, 2006: 22).

Other possibilities for her strategy in extract A.4.2 are that she thought her actions would not be noticed, or that use of these text words looked professional, or that she was making what she called 'a little paraphrase'. Alice changed the phrase beginning the sentence 'In this later period' (Lai, line 1) to 'From that onward' (Alice, line 1), and changed '3PL'(Lai, line 10) to 'the' (Alice, line 10), but otherwise the text is identical, so would be considered an exact copy (Keck, 2006). There are a large number of examples like this in her dissertation, clearly based on a small number of readily available electronic websites. Therefore, it can be seen that Alice employed some of the same strategies for source use that she started with in stage 1, and began to rely on more heavily in stage 4.

In interview 4, she showed that she is very aware of the need for citation.

> I think now I feel very clear about what is plagiarism and I also feel, once you do the citation, it's more helpful for you, for your article. It's not once you copy, or just read something you thought, but it's more powerful for your [paper]. I think citation, it's not a bad thing, it's good, it's better to use citation than plagiarism because the tutor, the supervisor, they like citation, yeah. (Stage 4, Interview 4, Alice)

In these comments, Alice revealed her belief that citation made her work more powerful, and is good because tutors 'like' it. However, as she said that using citation is better than plagiarism, we can infer that she did not differentiate between the practices for quoting and paraphrasing: she thought using citation means avoiding

plagiarism and that not using it results in plagiarism. Thus, it seems she felt her practice of CAT was acceptable, reflecting a limited understanding of plagiarism.

I will now turn to Shaun, the third participant in this group, who demonstrated equally risky practices to Alice and John.

5.4 Participant 3: Shaun

Shaun was a Sri Lankan student, who held an undergraduate degree in law, and studied Law during stage 1, but then changed his field to Business in stage 2, and took MSc Business Management in the second year.

Stage 1 (Pre-Master's semester 1)

In the first stage, Shaun wrote a 600 word case study about child soldiering in Africa. The first extract shows a tendency to copy source text. Extract S.1 is from a later section of Shaun's text and the source text Corbin (2008).

Extract S.1

No	Shaun, EAP1 Case Study	Corbin (2008: 316-317)
1	Since this time, 25,000-30,000	Since this time, 25,000-30,000 children
2	children have been forced into	have been forced into armed conflict by
3	armed conflict by the LRA	the LRA (HumanRights Watch, 2006;
4	(HumanRights Watch, 2006;	Women's Commission for Refugee
5	Women's Commission for Refugee	Women and Children, 2004). Girls have
6	Women and Children, 2004). Girls	comprised 15 per cent (Annan,
7	have comprised 15 per cent (Annan,	Blattman and Horton, 2006) to 30 per
8	Blattman and Horton, 2006) to 30	cent of those abducted (McKay and
9	per cent of those abducted (McKay	Mazurana, 2004).
10	and Mazurana, 2004).	

This extract shows how Shaun, like Alice in A.4.2 above, has used the source text from Corbin completely, word for word with no changes, including the citation used by Corbin. For this section, it is clear that he did copy and paste the text. The fact that he copied the citations used by the source he read leads to the occluded features of intertextuality (Pecorari, 2006), where the reader expects that citations in a text come from the writer's reading of those texts, not another author's reading. It may be that

he did not understand the information, or that he considered this to be an acceptable practice. In interview 1, he gave definitions of quotations, paraphrase and plagiarism:

> S: Quotation, well, if I'm taking their exact words what they have mentioned in the article I have to put them in quotation [marks]
> I: Do you know what a paraphrase is?
> S: No
> I: Do you know what plagiarism is?
> S: It's like if I take exact words what the author has mentioned in this article into my essay then I think it'll be plagiarism. (Stage 1, Interview 1, I=Interviewer, S=Shaun)

Shaun showed a good understanding of quotations, but his definition of plagiarism was quite similar to quotations: 'taking their exact words'. This suggests he was not clear about the differences between quotation and plagiarism, and therefore this may explain some of strategies he used in extract S.1. He said he did not know 'paraphrase' but actually used it in the same interview, below, so possibly misheard the word. He revealed he has some serious concerns about source use:

> Sometimes I feel very nervous with sources because even though I paraphrase them, I am a bit scared whether I have taken the exact words because it is a crime to take someone's words and you get into trouble and it's really serious. (Stage 1, Interview 1, Shaun)

This comment shows that Shaun took plagiarism seriously and was scared about taking 'the exact words'. This fear of taking other's words indicates he had some understanding of plagiarism and its consequences, but he did not seem to know how to avoid it. It is noticeable that he called it 'a crime' and 'you get into trouble'. Despite having some concerns about the seriousness of plagiarism, Shaun's level of source use seems to be similar to that of John and Alice.

Stage 2 (Pre-Master's semester 2)

In stage 2, Shaun changed his field of study to business. He wrote a 3,000 word extended writing project on an analysis of the survival of budget airlines at times of economic crisis.

Extract S.2.1

No	Shaun, EAP2 Literature Review	American Marketing Association (2004)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	According to American Marketing Association (2004) 'Marketing is an organizational function and set of processes for creating, communicating and delivering value to customers and for managing customer relationships in a way that benefits both the oeganization ant the stakeholder'	Marketing is an organizational function and a set of processes for creating, communicating, and delivering value to customers and for managing customer relationships in ways that benefit the organization and its stakeholders

Extract S.2.1 shows Shaun's use of a quotation for a definition from the American Marketing Association. He signalled it as a quotation with quotation marks, and uses integral citation. However, next to the original source, it can be seen that Shaun did not copy the source verbatim, and makes some changes to the text such as changing plural to singular with 'way' and 'benefits' (line 7-8), misspelling of 'organization and' (line 8), removal of possessive 'its' (American Marketing Association, line 7), and a further change from plural to singular 'stakeholder' (line 9). Shaun's tendency to copy but to make errors in word forms and spelling may be similar to Alice, and his tendency to copy dictionary definitions seems similar to John. This seems to be an example of what Pecorari (2013) calls neither a paraphrase nor a quotation. In the following extract from the same assignment, Shaun's rather repetitive use of reporting structures can be seen.

Extract S.2.2

No	Shaun, EAP2 Literature Review
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	According to Cascio (2009) downsizing has to be the last option. One of the alternatives to cutting gown the stuff is to attract and keep clients involves awarding financial benefits to employees who increase their productivity. Jesuthasan (2009) says, during a recession time employer must try your employees to work harder to get in to the market share. According to a survey done by the Towers Perrin has found that because of downsizing two-thirds of stuff employees are really worried and try their best to perform well to keep the jobs secure. The Laird Post, Principle and human capital management leader at global management consultant Booz & Co. in san Francisco states that companies that have good Human Recourses management are able to predict about their needed work force and to make right decisions. Furthermore he states that lot of companies does not have human resources division and they wrong decisions based on random choice or impulse.

In extract S.2.2, like John, Shaun used 'according to' repetitively to begin sentences (lines 1 and 5) and then referred to integral citation, and used 'says' (line 4), 'states' (lines 9 and 12). The reporting structures are thus all non-evaluative and each point is made as a report without evaluative comment. The style of each sentence (cite reference followed by report) is very repetitive and does not show much engagement with sources, although it seems to show more development than extract S.1, and the words were not matched to a source text. However, when I read the HR Focus text he gave for Cascio in his list of references for the EAP2 assignment, I found that all the citations used (Cascio, Jesuthasan, Towers Perrin and Laird Post) had been collected by the authors of the HR Focus article, from interviews with these individuals. In the way that Shaun presents the information, it seems he has read four references and put them together. However, it emerged that he read the article from HR Focus and then re-presented his reading in his assignment here. This could be seen as skilful shortcutting, since it was not matched to source text, but as in previous extracts, there is a lack of clear citation to the actual source in Shaun's writing (East, 2005; Pecorari, 2006). Shaun seems to be aware that he may be copying too much, in interview 2:

> Plagiarism is when you take someone's, like when someone has written a book, and you take that information exactly the same like without changing any words or maybe slightly one or two, and at the same time if you don't mention that [person], if you have taken [that] information from those people's, person's work, and if you try to persuade that that's your work, then that's plagiarism…. Sometimes I feel a bit scared about [plagiarism] because sometimes I have used too many words from the text. (Stage 2, Interview 2, Shaun)

Shaun provided a more complex definition of plagiarism than in stage 1, as he brought in taking words, not citing, and making a source text seem to be one's own work. His admission to being 'scared' is important, as it shows he has not gained in confidence since stage 1.

Stage 3 (Master's semester 1)

In stage 3, Shaun began an MSc in Business Management. His source use at this stage relies on a repetitive format, seen in extract S.3.1 from his 3,000 word self-development tool-kit assignment.

Extract S.3

No	Shaun, PG1 Literature Review
1	Dawson (1992) states internal and external factors will make effects to change
2	the organisation behaviour. Due to the change of these factors the members
3	within the organisation and outside organisation may unpredictably take
4	advantages or disadvantages. Boydell (1986) states that the working
5	environment is continuously changing and you need to make sure to change
6	according to the working environment
7	The CIPD (2009) web site states about the importance of continues professional
8	development.

Extract S.3 contains three instances of integral citation followed by the same reporting verb, 'states' (lines 1, 4 and 7). In interview 3, he explained his rationale for using 'states' so frequently:

> I think it's very easy to use, I think when I do paraphrasing it's very easy to use, then sometimes when I do it differently, I use 'notes the importance of'. (Stage 3, Interview 3, Shaun)

There is no linking or comparing between the citations in extract S.3, and therefore Shaun's source use seems rather like a list of reported points without connection or evaluation. This reflects Shaun's reliance on a small range of features of source use, and perhaps little attention to how he reported from sources. However, in interview 3, he indicated that he was confident about plagiarism.

> I: Do you feel confident about avoiding plagiarism?
> S: Yes, at the moment I do feel very confident
> I: Can you tell me anymore about that, what makes you confident?
> S: Because last year I did loads of work regarding the plagiarism, like the paraphrasing and especially when I did like the mini-dissertation, I remember like [the teacher] did something in the computer and mine was OK, and I did like Ryanair and at that time, I felt like then if I follow this sort of, this kind of work should be OK… I think so, here actually I was more and more concerned like when I with paraphrasing I used to change every single word, yeah now I'm more confident yeah. (Stage 3, Interview 3, I=Interviewer, S=Shaun)

In this interview, Shaun seemed to be suggesting that having done the training to avoid plagiarism in stages 1 and 2, he felt that he did not need to worry or change 'every single word'. Thus, he has made progress in terms of confidence, but not in terms of his actual practice at this stage.

Stage 4 (Master's semester 2)

In stage 4, Shaun wrote his 14,000 word dissertation on the market entry of the Sri Lankan apparel industry. Extract S.4.1 shows how he copied from a source text in the literature review:

Extract S.4.1

No	Shaun, PG2 Literature review	Claude-Gaudillat and Quelin, 2006: 177
1	Capron (1999) argues when	However, firms that make acquisitions
2	organisations make acquisitions they	have to integrate the acquired
3	have to combine the acquired	capabilities into the firm, which also
4	capabilities into their organisation	takes time and can be hazardous
5	and this is an advantage for the firm.	(Capron, 1999). Using acquisitions to
6	Having acquisitions to access	access capabilities can be costly, for
7	capabilities can be costly because of	reasons ranging from legal constraints
8	the reasons that are ranging from	to the necessity of leveraging the
9	legal constraints to the necessity of	acquired capabilities (Hennart, 1988;
10	leveraging the acquired capabilities	Kogut, 1988, 1991; Quelin, 1997)
11	(Hennart, 1988; Kogut, 1988, 1991;	
12	Quelin, 1997)	

Extract S.4.1 begins with a citation, followed by the reporting verb 'argues', then a point which is signalled as a paraphrase from Capron (1999), but in fact appears to be taken from his reading of Claude-Gaudillat and Quelin (2006). The ways in which Shaun has made some synonym substitutions 'combine' for 'integrate', and later 'because of' in place of 'for' and the continuous structure of text suggest that he was in fact using Claude-Gaudillat and Quelin's reading of Capron. More matched text follows, including a list of four synthesised sources, exactly as these authors used them. As shown previously above in extract S.2.2, Shaun seemed to have a shortcut strategy, in which he used information from one source that contained secondary citation and repeated it as if it were his own. He may consider this to be a time-saving strategy, and one that seems to be frequently used by current students (Belcher, 2006; Blum, 2009). He commented on his use of the internet for source information in interview 4:

> I: How much do you think using the internet influences how you use sources?
> S: I think it is very easier than books. I find it is very easy and by using it, you can get up to date source, up to date articles, journals, and it is more

convenient because you haven't got to look in other places, it saves time as well I think. (Stage 4, Interview 4, I=Interviewer, S=Shaun)

Shaun also mentioned that he uses Wikipedia in his study:

I: OK, and do you make use of any particular websites for your study?
S: Er sometimes, to get the simple, basic understanding I do use Wikipedia
I: Do you cite it?
S: No, I don't cite it
I: [Do your tutors] accept Wikipedia?
S: No I don't think so, they don't like it. (Stage 4, Interview 4, I=Interviewer, S=Shaun)

It is interesting to note that Shaun admitted to using Wikipedia, despite the fact that his tutors 'don't like it', and as if to hide it, he did not cite it (like Alice with extract A.1). This strategy may be risky because it could lead to problems of CUT (copied unattributed text) and also be detected easily. Extract S.4.2 below is also from the literature review of Shaun's dissertation.

Extract S.4.2

No	Shaun, PG2 Literature Review
1	Han *et al.* (2001) state that the exogenous barrier incumbents cost advantages.
2	This means that the incumbents may process absolute or variable cost
3	advantages. Schlegelmich & Ambos (2004) state another barrier is, as it build
4	up loyalties and relations among buyers and long-term sellers, there are
5	accompanying obstacles for the entrant trying to access customers. Owing to
6	the cost, any potential supplier will move from one to another suppler,
7	furthermore, training and product design costs may be added on top.
8	According to Karakaya (2002), the existing brand loyalty, cost independent of
9	scale, government policy and the number of competitors are barriers to entry.
10	According to Delmas & Tokat (2005), government policy changes do create
11	negative impacts on the industries.

One thing to note is the amount of citation Shaun used at this stage in almost every sentence. This has increased from his work in stages 1 and 2. However, he used the same style each time, beginning the sentence with citation (often preceded with 'according to'), then made a point from the source, without any linking, so that his text reads rather like an unconnected list of points. In his interview at this stage, he did not seem aware of a problem with coherence, but did indicate why he needed to save time:

This semester I had 6 assignments, 3,000 words each, so nearly 2 months I've been basically staying in the library, so I have really got used to how to paraphrase. (Stage 4, Interview 4, Shaun)

The sheer volume of assignments Shaun had to produce in a short time may explain some of his 'short-cut' strategies at this stage, which prevent him from becoming a more competent user of sources.

5.5 Discussion

Five themes emerging from the risk-taking group will be discussed below: conscious or unconscious risk-taking, use of internet sources, copied attributed text, shortcuts and the role of the tutor.

5.5.1 Conscious or unconscious risk-taking?

It is worth considering whether the group knowingly took risks with their source use, particularly in terms of copying text, or whether they did not realise their practices were risky within the context of their academic studies. As discussed in the literature review, one of the main ways that policy makers, teaching staff and markers distinguish between poor practice and plagiarism is whether a student's actions can be seen as deliberate (Carroll, 2007; Sutherland-Smith, 2008). Therefore, if this group knew that their use of sources was risky, their actions may be more reprehensible and there may be a cause for saying that they were trying to 'cheat the system', while if they did not know they were taking risks, their actions would be more sympathetically viewed, and they could be considered as being in a learning phase (Angélil-Carter, 2000; Sutherland-Smith, 2008). Some tutors in Sutherland-Smith's study consider that plagiarism is intentional by its mere evidence in student work, while others believe it can be intentional or unintentional, to be determined by the tutor through discussing with the student. One of her tutors comments: 'I think there are some naïve students who don't know what they're doing and some who are so desperate that they do whatever they can to try and survive, like a sort of drowning approach to their academic work. Other students…try to do as little work as possible' (Sutherland-Smith, 2008: 131). I suggest there are other many reasons for plagiarism, such as a 'lapse' (Pecorari, 2008), but it is useful to apply these 3 interpretations to the risk takers in this study in more depth.

It seems unlikely that the students in this study were 'naïve', as they had already had the experience of a one year EAP programme with extensive source use instruction and some sessions on their Master's. In their interview comments, they were also able to explain and discuss plagiarism clearly. It seems more likely that they were 'desperate' or doing 'as little work as possible'. Looking at the interview comments from participants, Shaun seemed to openly admit that he took risks in copying: 'sometimes I have used too many words from the text' (Shaun, interview 2). Alice showed more concern, but also admitted her practice may not be acceptable: 'I have a lot of bad habits… maybe later I will forget what part I want to change' (Alice, interview 2) and 'I have used a little paraphrase' (Alice, interview 3). Alice's comments seem to suggest her source use may include 'sloppy paraphrasing' (Schick, 2011) and incorporate some practices previously reported such as forgetting the source or lacking in time management (Pecorari, 2013). Where the attempt to paraphrase is at a patchwriting level, Introna and Hayes (2004) call this 'grey plagiarism', as it is not clear whether it can be seen as acceptable or unacceptable. The admission from both Shaun and Alice that there may be something wrong with their practices suggests that they are conscious of a risk. However, in John's case, in stage 4, he was very worried about the risks, and sought to find out: 'if you just copied something, a paragraph, then you didn't give the citation or something…if you did that, then you will fail?' (John, interview 4). Thus, John's comments suggest he was more 'desperate' and unclear, rather than taking a risk intentionally.

From the assignment data, it is clear that all three copied extensively, especially in stages 3 and 4 (see extracts J.3.2, J.4, A.3, A.4.1, A.4.2, S.4.1) and that Shaun and Alice seemed aware of what they are doing, and thought copying would work. In the case of Alice in particular, the amount of copying in her assignments grew particularly in stages 3 and 4, as she relied on the 'professional' words of the source text she consulted. This bears out the finding from Currie's (1998) research, where the student participant gradually resorted to more and more copying as a means of gaining better grades. It also concurs with the view of Jiang and Sharpling (2011) that students will do whatever is necessary to get the grades they need, and this strategy may work because 'for some [students], surviving the system rather than deriving full benefit from the English-speaking environment [is] their main goal' (Jiang and Sharpling, 2011: 57).

Similarly, Carroll (2013) argues that one reason students plagiarise is from a 'looking forward' strategy, towards beating the system and achieving better grades. From their interview comments, it seems less likely that John, Alice and Shaun thought they could 'beat the system', but they did seem to think or hope they could get by, if they were not noticed.

As the non-native international students in this study are also language learners, it is worth considering risk taking in source use alongside risk taking in language use. There is a body of literature about risk in language learning (Dehbozorgi, 2012; McDonough and Shaw, 2003), where taking risks is largely seen as a good practice to help students make progress. As McDonough and Shaw (2003: 56) suggest, for language learners, 'Success is thought to be based on such factors as checking one's performance in a language, being willing to guess and to 'take risks' with both comprehension and production'. It seems possible that the risk takers were seeking these opportunities in their source use. Dehbozorgi (2012) contends that taking a moderate amount of risk should be encouraged in language learning. He reasons that middle level students tend to take most risk, as low level learners have not yet learnt how to take risks, and high level learners do not need to. If we connect this approach to learning about source use, Alice, Shaun and John can be seen as being at a middle level with their source use; since their source use is not at a competent level, they may have a greater tendency to take risks.

5.5.2 Use of internet sources

There is some evidence of weaker attribution of internet sources, especially with texts such as lists in bullet points or dictionary definitions in the final assignments (see extracts J.4 and A.4.2). All three students made extensive use of internet sources in their assignments through all the stages; Shaun, for example, explained why he preferred to use the internet for source use because it was 'very easy' and 'more convenient [than books] because you haven't got to look in other places, it saves time as well' (Shaun, Interview 4). Some researchers, such as Bloch (2012), East (2005) and Belcher (2006) suggest that the collaborative production and temporary nature of much electronic information makes citation difficult for internet users. For example, the normal requirements of citation of author, year and page number may simply be

unavailable. Similarly, Lunsford and West (1996) argue that the traditional view of the published author has become unclear with the current digital age. Furthermore, Stapleton (2010) argued that internet use influences the composing process of writing, so more time may be dedicated to researching the internet than formulating the text; this may result in less time on formatting citation and paying attention to how much text is copied. Thus, although Shaun felt he was saving time by using internet sources, it may be that he spent more time searching than he realised. Tutors also need to look more closely at the practices of their students to understand exactly what and how students should be taught. Blum (2009) highlights the problem of the wide gulf between tutors educated prior to the internet age, and their current students, who use and learn from all kinds of electronic media. Citation rules may be obvious to the lecturer, but for students, the exact way to attribute sources may not be clear. As discussed in the literature review, tutors and students now have to be aware of rules for formatting citation for a much wider range of sources, and those for electronic media can be particularly complex or unclear.

Furthermore, both Alice (in extract A.1) and Shaun (explained in interview 4) copied from Wikipedia without citing the source. This appears to be because they knew their tutors did not 'like' it. This finding concurs with the report by Norton, Tilley, Newstead and Franklyn-Stokes (2001) that one of most common cheating behaviours that students admitted to was that they had used non-academic sources, but not acknowledged them in the bibliography. Thus, the strategy employed by Alice and Shaun is possibly quite widespread. The ease of use of copying from the internet has been acknowledged as an 'enabling factor' for plagiarism (Pecorari, 2013). Yet Alice and Shaun would have known that any copying of Wikipedia could easily be checked by their tutor, so it is difficult to explain why they did it, unless they thought they could take the risk. According to Nielsen (2012), Wikipedia can be used for scholarly citation, as a huge amount of research is carried out on and through Wikipedia. However, Wikipedia itself reports:

> Most university lecturers discourage students from citing any encyclopedia in academic work, preferring primary sources; some specifically prohibit Wikipedia citations… encyclopedias of any type are not usually appropriate to use as citeable sources, and should not be relied upon as authoritative.

It is likely that students rarely check the advice given by Wikipedia regarding academic citation and only use it for instant information.

5.5.3 Copying attributed text

One important finding with all three students is the continued, and sometimes increasing practice of copying attributed text or insufficient paraphrasing (see extracts J.1, J.3.2, J.4, A.2, A.3, A.4.2, S.1, S.4.1). According to Chanock (2008) and Holmes (2004), students may do this because they see source use from a monologic view of communicating what they have read (as one writer), whereas university practices are tied to a dialogic view of source use, which includes signalling all quotations. Previous research has also shown that copying but attributing text may be considered acceptable by students (Chanock, 2008; East, 2005), while tutors may not agree on whether it is minor plagiarism or a more serious breach (Price, 2009; Sutherland-Smith, 2008). John may have been copying in his attempt to please the tutor by not using any quotations as he reported in interview 3, which concurs with findings in a study by Harwood and Petrić (2012). Their study revealed that students try different strategies, even those they have not been taught, to try to please their tutor in order to gain good marks, as they recognise the important and powerful position of the tutor.

Another reason for reliance on source text and difficulty paraphrasing can come from a lack of vocabulary, as suggested by John (interview 2). In the same way, Alice felt she should use the 'professional' words she found in sources (interview 1) rather than her own vocabulary resource. This sense of a personal lack of vocabulary can be very limiting to student writers (Leki and Carson, 1994; Thompson, 2005). If students are admitted with a limited vocabulary to degree programmes, it is very likely they will struggle with reading and writing (Schmitt, 2005). A limited vocabulary and a reliance on copying are likely to impact on students' critical engagement with sources. There is very little evidence of any evaluation or authorial stance in the risk takers' extracts; it seems that they relied on the views of the copied texts up to the point Ridley (2008: 132) describes as 'overdependence'.

When students copy but attribute text, as John, Shaun and Alice did, their source use is unclear. Pecorari (2006) also found that sometimes novice writer practices with source

use became blurred. When a reader finds a reference in a text, they assume the writer has read this source, but sometimes with weaker writers, the reference may be to a secondary source within another writer's text; thus, the citations in a text become, as Pecorari defines them, 'occluded features'.

5.5.4 Shortcuts

One of the principles of risk taking is to take shortcuts, for time reasons. With their source use, the risk takers may take shortcuts by selecting parts of specific sections of a text, such as abstracts, introductions, conclusions, or even titles and subheadings (Blum, 2009; Carroll, 2007). For example, John used the conclusion of the article by Pallab (J.1) as a quotation and the beginning of an abstract by Macinnis, Rao and Weiss (J.2). It has been argued that students are taught to make shortcuts in their EAP classes, by using their new faster reading strategies to do key word searches (Weller, 2010). Therefore, tutors should either expect students to adopt the practices they are taught, or consider teaching them more intensive reading strategies to enable them to study the meaning in more depth.

Risk taking shortcuts are likely to focus on time-saving with reading and writing, so could include skimming or scanning the content when reading, with the subsequent risk of not representing the authors' work accurately or well. This seems to be Alice's strategy as she explained in interview 2. Students may use shortcuts in the ways they bring in sources, such as the repetitive use of 'according to' followed by citation, used by John and the use of integral citation and the verb 'states' to start each sentence, used by Shaun. Both John and Alice copied from lists of bullet points, apparently as a time-saving strategy. Even riskier, there is evidence in the extracts that students in this group copied the exact synthesis of citation used by other authors (see extracts A.4.2 and S.4.1); it seems likely that the risk takers did this as a shortcut to reading other sources.

There is a problem of student experience outside academic study in which writing is quite unstructured, and reading experience comes from instant linking to readily available digital text. Students are used to communicating in many ways, mostly electronically such as text messaging, and getting information through *Google*

searching, sometimes referred to as 'the download culture' rather than academic rigour. What students are surrounded by is digital fast means of communication, in contrast to the slow, reflective process of academic writing (Blum, 2009; Murray and Kirton, 2006;). Thus, it appears to some extent understandable that they seek ways to speed up source use.

5.5.5 Tutor role

It is possible that the risky practices in this group may stem from their tutors' instruction. John reported in Interview 3 that his tutor did not like quotes, so he did not use them; he may therefore have been prompted to avoid quotation formatting, so that his tutor could not see quotes in his text, but still used original text. Similarly, Shaun used Wikipedia but did not cite it, because he knew his tutor did not like it. On the other hand, it may be that their tutors suggested copying some source text in the form of standard phrases, but that they had not understood how to do this. Evidence was found by Pecorari and Shaw (2012: 154) that some tutors advocated certain copying of source text:

> Several participants raised the potential value of copying phraseology, where it was appropriate to do so. Lars believed that his students would produce better writing if they engaged in more copying…Victoria suggests that mastery of the target register comes from actively copying strings that inevitably recur in the source material.

I strongly agree that copying in these ways should be encouraged. However, it needs to be made very clear to students through active discussion and practice what kind of copying is acceptable and useful.

According to the risk takers' experiences, their tutors did not give a lot of support with source use, which concurs with the findings from Murray and Kirton (2006) and Hall and Sung (2009). Students may believe that tutors do not always detect copying and therefore they have a better chance of a higher grade if they take the risk of copying (Pecorari, 2013). In research by Currie (1998), the student participant copied 'not with the intent to violate Western cultural norms, but rather with the intent to learn, to keep her head down, and to pass the course' (Currie, 1998: 11). As such, copying might ultimately be seen by some students as a survival strategy (Barks and Watts, 2001).

The reason for CAT might be that these students did not get feedback from the tutor that it was wrong (see John's interview comments in stage 4), and so continued with this strategy. As concluded by Hyland (2001), students need specific information about plagiarism in order to be able to act. Furthermore, Pilcher (2006) found in a study of Chinese postgraduates in the UK that they were used to more support from tutors and tutors always being available, which means Alice and John may have felt unsupported on their Master's. The risk takers seem to show that they developed more knowledge of source use, especially on their EAP programme, but did not use this knowledge in their assignments. It may be the case that they did not transfer their learning, and lacked competence because they did not get enough instruction and practice (Pecorari, 2013). Furthermore, according to Harwood and Petrić (2012), students sometimes make up their own citation rules, which may be seen where John and Alice copied bulleted lists from websites without quotation formatting.

5.6 Summary

This chapter has reviewed the development of source use by John, Alice and Shaun, and focused on this group as risk takers. While there was some evidence of improved practice in stage 2, especially by John, the majority of extracts demonstrate evidence of risk taking strategies, especially in stages 3 and 4. The risk takers copied attributed text, copied unattributed text, paraphrased insufficiently, used patchwriting, copied from surface features of articles such as abstracts, copied from websites such as Wikipedia, and copied the synthesis and analysis of other studies within the sources they used. The interview evidence suggests that students gained some understanding about plagiarism and good practice, but continued to have doubts about university requirements and concerns about their own ability. The extracts from assignments suggest increasingly poor practice in terms of copying and risk taking.

Key themes that emerged from the analysis of the risk taker practices have been discussed: whether the risk taking was intentional, use of internet sources, copied attributed text, shortcuts and the role of the tutor. The next chapter will examine the contrasting group to the risk takers, who will be termed the safe players.

Chapter 6: Safe players

In the stressful situation of having to organise thoughts and manage discourse in a foreign language, many L2 writers prefer to stick to familiar words, to play safe rather than run risks (Breeze, 2008: 64).

6.1 Introduction

In this second chapter of analysis, I will examine a contrasting group to the risk takers, which I have called the safe players. I have given them this name because I consider that the way they used sources could be seen as playing a very careful game, from an academic perspective, in that they follow the rules and take no risks. As with the risk takers, I aim to investigate their source use practices and how they developed, in order to understand their strategies and why they played safe.

Their use of sources was very cautious, but they did not develop their ability very much. In contrast to the risk-taking group described in the previous chapter, they took extra care not to plagiarise, but in doing so, limited their source use to ways they were certain were acceptable. Their safe strategies with source use incorporated following citation rules to the extent of over-citing, using a limited and repetitive range of familiar structures and features, demonstrating a limited authorial voice, and employing a limited vocabulary. These strategies will be discussed through an analysis of the source use development of two students, Yolanda (Chinese,) and Mike (Japanese). I will begin by looking at extracts through the four stages (stages 1-2 on the Pre-Master's, and 3-4 on the Master's) with Yolanda and then move to discuss those of Mike. After this, I will discuss the emerging themes from the analysis of the assignment and interview data for these two participants.

As in the previous chapter, their progression over the four stages (Pre-Master's semester 1 and 2, and Master's semester 1 and 2) will be discussed in this order. Extracts will be numbered in order, with the participant's initial, followed by the assignment number (1-4) and a further number (1-2) where more than one extract is used from the same assignment. The extracts will be presented in tables, with matching source text beside, where appropriate. The features will be shown using the following coding: underlining to demonstrate identical text to source, yellow highlighting to show citation and green highlighting to show reporting verbs.

6.2 Participant 4: Yolanda

Yolanda was studying real estate management in stage 1 on 2 while on the Pre-Master's programme in the first year, but then changed to take her Master's in Digital Media Technology.

Stage 1 (Pre-Master's semester 1)

Yolanda wrote her first assignment, a 600 word case study, about battery recycling in the UK. Extract Y.1 shows an extract from the case study section of this assignment.

Extract Y.1

No	Yolanda, EAP1 Case Study
1	'Battery recycling is a great job for human being, especially for the next
2	generation', Walsh (2008) said. The Saudi National Industrialization Company
3	and a German firm built a factory of battery disposal. They can make the
4	battery separate, machining and purify, finally become alloy. Presidents &
5	Prime Ministers (1995). And more, sending battery are collected to the
6	particular facility and through a variety of processes, we can have recovering
7	material for use again. (Irish Motor Management, 2008).

In this extract, Yolanda attempted to employ some different features of source use. There are 3 citations, one integral (line 2) with a reporting verb ('said'), and two non-integral, although one of these is not accurately formatted in brackets (line 5). There is one quotation (lines 1-2), but no integration of this quotation into the flow of the text, beyond the citation and 'said' (line 2). However, in this example, it can be seen that Yolanda was developing a strategy to attribute her information carefully, sentence by sentence. In interview 1, she acknowledged what she saw as her main problem with source use:

> My vocabulary is very limited and some sources I can't understand and
> although maybe [these] sources [are] very useful for me, I can't understand
> [them] so [they are] very difficult to use. (Stage 1, Interview 1, Yolanda)

Thus, Yolanda showed she had the sense that the sources she found were useful, but she struggled to use them because her limited vocabulary prevented her understanding them fully. In this way, she echoed the difficulty that many international students have of gaining sufficient range of vocabulary to be able to use

sources successfully (Introna and Hayes, 2004; Pecorari, 2003). Yolanda discussed the differences between quotations, paraphrase and plagiarism as follows:

> Quotation is if you see a book and you think this sentence or this idea may be very useful your work and maybe you can use this sentence in your essay or articles but [it's] important if you [quote] this sentence, you should mark in your essay… Paraphrase is just if you write something but you just use any person's idea but you don't mention in your articles or essays and this is cheating.… Plagiarism is just cheating. (Stage 1, Interview 1, Yolanda)

In interview 1, she demonstrated a clear understanding of what quotations are, but did not have a clear understanding of the difference between paraphrasing and plagiarism. However, it may be that this results from simply not understanding these terms at this point in the EAP course.

Stage 2 (Pre-Master's Semester 2)

In stage 2, Yolanda wrote a 3,000 word extended writing project about real estate management during economic crises. The extract below shows some integral citation, some range of reporting structures, some use of both paraphrasing and quotations, and some efforts to link points and synthesize the work of different authors.

Extract Y.2

No	Yolanda, EAP2 Literature Review
1	Real estate management is very important target for economic society.
2	Muhlebach and Alexander stated 'It is especially sensitive to change in the
3	national economy.' (1998, p.4) According to Cooke (2002) in a poor economic
4	situation, businesses take the form of a 'U'. Therefore, the economic trend
5	would drop into the bottom of 'U' in economic downturn. Thus, the real estate
6	industry will be influenced in this crunch period. But Bailey (2003) argues that
7	companies can find more chances to develop than in economic growth period.
8	Woodson (2006) also agrees and describes that difficult market environment
9	like 'open doors of opportunities' (p.50) for real estate industry…For example,
10	the survey shows that the local economy situation would become important
11	element of people choose their property (Burfitt,A and Ferrari, E.D., 2008).
12	Gooder Richard (2000) describes that a piece of marketing demand information
13	can help real estate agencies or companies make more profit from it, especially
14	in this crunch period.

In this extract, Yolanda made some errors in the citation, such as use of initials in citation (line 11) and use of both surname and first name ('Gooder Richard' in line 12). These errors suggest she was still unsure about how to implement integral and non-

integral citation into her text. Yolanda began a strategy of using the reporting verb 'agree' followed by 'and' and another reporting verb such as 'state' or 'add' as a means of synthesizing ideas and making connections within the literature, as can be seen in line 8: 'Woodson (2000) also agrees and describes that'. Yolanda used this strategy to synthesize sources, rather than putting together authors in a bracketed list, or using connecting or contrasting expressions between authors.

Another of her strategies which she began in stage 2 is to use some short quotations with citations. These quotations seem quite general points (for example, in lines 2-3), and it would have been better to paraphrase them. By quoting in this way, Yolanda may have been attempting to play safe; in other words, to put quotation formatting around a few source text words, to avoid running any risk of plagiarising through insufficient paraphrasing. The quotations are carefully formatted with the page numbers given (lines 3 and 9). This extract shows some evidence of range with 5 different reporting structures, a topic sentence, four linking words, some quoting and some paraphrasing, but also some evidence of errors in citation. In interview 2, Yolanda discussed the most difficult areas of source use.

> I: What are the biggest challenges for you in using sources in your writing?
> Y: [Choosing which ones] will be most useful for my writing, is I think the [most] challenging is [choosing] the information…I need [to] practise first, use this sources and to practise my writing skills, about how I can use [these] sources more [effectively] for my writing. (Stage 2, Interview 2, I=Interviewer, Y=Yolanda)

Yolanda's comments indicate that choosing the sources and the information from sources were very difficult for her. She found the decisions about how to use them effectively equally difficult. She also noted that she needed more practice, which was an important consideration as she began stage 3 on her Master's.

Stage 3 (Master's Semester 1)

Yolanda's first assignment on her Master's was a 2,000 word report on perceptions of colour images, in which some of the strategies she developed in stage 2 can be seen.

Extract Y.3

No	Yolanda, PG1 Literature Review
1	Color plays an important role on people's life. It can ' stimulate' human's sense
2	organ and make people feel hungry or full, warm or cool (Hullfish and Fowler,
3	2009). When we watch a color image about food before the lunch time, you
4	will feel much hungrier than before. It shows that color and sensory closely
5	related. Mahnke agree and stated that (1996, p.2) 'color is not the property of
6	objects, spaces, or surface; it is the sensation, caused by certain qualities of
7	light that the eye recognizes and the brain interprets.' However the effect of
8	color on human can divide into psychology and physiology reaction.

Extract Y.3 shows a continuation of Yolanda's strategies of citing each idea carefully (lines 2-3 and 5), using some short quotations (lines 1 and 5-7), and using her strategy of synthesis through joining up two reporting structures 'agree and stated' (line 5). Therefore, she seemed to be transferring the skills she developed on her EAP programme to her Master's. This concurs with the finding by James (2006) that skills from EAP may be transferred especially at the beginning of the new programme. In interview 3, Yolanda discussed this extract and explained why she used quotations, as well as some of the issues for her when paraphrasing.

> Y: This quotation [explains] what the colour is. If I use my own words, I think [it's] not exact I want to say, but if I use quotation, it can be [clear], it can make the things more clearly and [strongly].
> I: Do you feel you have enough vocabulary to do good paraphrasing?
> Y: No, I still need to [look] for some new vocabulary from the internet or somewhere… because [in] some journal and books I can't find it, and I will use it for my own work. A lot of these sources are about technology things, sometimes I can't understand what they want to say, but I just choose something I can make sure is what are they saying… I don't want to make my reader confused about what I want to say. (Stage 3, Interview 3, I=Interviewer, Y=Yolanda)

Yolanda's comments show that she was worried about her lack of vocabulary, but understood the need to be clear to the reader. She reflected that her own words may obscure the meaning, so was in favour of using words from the source as a quotation. She also demonstrated her reliance on the internet as her main source of vocabulary, rather than other reading materials. In her interview, she compared her use of sources with how she used sources on her undergraduate degree.

> I think for undergraduate, the most [of the] work I did is totally rubbish, I want to say, because it [did] not have a lot of my own ideas, just use others' ideas and sometimes just cheating others' work. But for postgraduate study, I think the sources I use are all academic sources, also our teacher [allows] us [to] use some internet sources, but I think the academic one is better. (Stage 3, interview 3, Yolanda)

The strength of Yolanda's conviction that her previous work was 'totally rubbish' because of the quality of sources and the copying, and comparison with her current use of sources reflects how much she felt she had developed her source use. It is also interesting that despite her teacher's agreement for students to use internet sources, she maintained that 'academic' ones are better.

Stage 4 (Master's semester 2)

Extract Y.4.1 from Yolanda's final dissertation gives a detailed example of how Yolanda based some of her text on source material.

Extract Y.4.1

No	Yolanda, PG2 Literature Review	Todorovic (2006: 240)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	After the World War II, the television industry reached unprecedented rate of development, and 'between 1945 and 1985, electronics featured a 400% development rate' (2006, p.240). Especially, in the 1960s Japanese NHK's research began to focus on new technology which they called it called 'television for the next century' (2006, p.240), and this technology was given the name of High Definition Television or HDTV (Todorovic, 2006).	Some empirical estimations made in the mid-1980s showed that between 1945 and 1985, electronics featured a 400% development rate… That tremendous achievement in the field of electronics boosted the development of television technology, and by the end of the 1960s, NHK Labs in Japan started working on a new project then called 'television for the next century'. The goal of that new television system, which was later nicknamed HDTV or High Definition Television was to offer a certain number of very visible quality advantages

Yolanda's text here is based around a source text paragraph, with two quotations from it (lines 4-6 and 10-11, Yolanda). She repeated the citation three times over two sentences, which indicates a tendency to over-cite. Her use of citation seems unusual, as she put the year and page number twice (lines 6-7 and 11), before she gave the author's name (line 14). This appears to be her strategy to repeat citation, rather than using the author's name with the first citation, and then using *ibid*. Around the

quotations, there is evidence of some attempts to paraphrase, such as 'the television industry reached unprecedented rate of development' (lines 1-4, Yolanda) from the original 'that tremendous achievement in the field of electronics boosted the development of television technology' (lines 4-7, Todorovic). In this way, Yolanda may be seen as paraphrasing sufficiently to avoid risks of plagiarism. Yolanda explained her new strategy to help her with vocabulary:

> I found a new way to solve this problem [of understanding sources] because some words it's very hard to understand what's the exact meaning of this words, I just *Google* it with Chinese, my own language, so I can understand it very well. (Stage 4, Interview 4, Yolanda)

Yolanda showed she was happy with her new strategy of using *Google Translate*, which enabled her to understand sources. However, some research in the context of non-native speaker postgraduate students has indicated that overuse of such online search engines is not associated with good practice in academic writing (Stapleton, 2010). In the following extract, it can be seen how she attempted to attribute every point that she made, sentence by sentence, almost all with non-integral citation.

Extract Y.4.2

No	Yolanda, PG2 Analysis
1	Then, in 1953, the NTSC changed its standard again to accommodate colour
2	television broadcasting (Wilson, 2010). Nowadays, the NTSC system is well-
3	developed worldwide, and is used in a great many countries besides the USA,
4	such as Canada, Japan, and some Asian countries (Drury, Markarian and
5	Pickavance, 2001).
6	America began to convert analogue television to digital in the 1980s, and in
7	1998, America was the first to broadcast HDTV, with all six channels being free
8	for viewers (GeLan survey, 2010). Between 2003 and 2006, the growth rate of
9	American HDTV users was over 100% (Zhou, 2009)**.** In 2006, America had 43
10	HDTV channels, and this number had risen to the hundreds by the end of 2009
11	(GeLan survey, 2010). With the development of HDTV broadcasting, 52%
12	households in America currently have HDTV (Poor, 2009).

Extract Y.4.2 shows Yolanda's strategy of citing at the end of each sentence, each time with non-integral citation. She displayed a repetitive strategy of writing some information, then attributing it to one source, ending the sentence, and repeating the same, without review or synthesis. Swales (2014) found that some students adopted this citational strategy all through their work, although it would be expected more in

background and introductory sections before main arguments. Thus, the repetitive style may make her arguments weaker. Her strategy of using citation with every sentence can be seen as extremely cautious in attempting to avoid plagiarism. Yolanda showed her understanding of what plagiarism was in interview 4.

> I think the plagiarism is when you doing your dissertation or something like this, and you need other people's books or articles, and just copy other people's books or articles and just copy our other people's words and use it in your own work, and without the citation or mention where is this source come from. (Stage 4, Interview 4, Yolanda)

Her comments suggest she saw plagiarism as based on copying words without citation. She showed her strategy for dealing with the need to write in an academic way, yet also consulting internet sources:

> The sources which I find [on the internet are] not very academic, so maybe I will change some words to make it more academic, make sure I can use it in my dissertation. (Stage 4, Interview 4, Yolanda)

Furthermore, she indicated what she did to help her with language use:

> When I submitted my internal report, my tutor told me some parts he [felt] confused about these things and he just [gave] me some advice to improve my work to use Chinese website, he also said I can use sources if it's from Chinese websites. (Stage 4, Interview 4, Yolanda)

Yolanda was permitted by her tutor to use websites in her own language; therefore, she adopted this practice to understand the subject more easily and to avoid the risk of plagiarism. She followed exactly what her tutor said and therefore felt her course of action was safe. At this stage of her study where she was completing her dissertation, it was important for her to reach the 'sound landing place' that Pecorari (2013: 61) suggests students need to get to on their journey to acceptable source use. Similar safe playing practices will now be examined in relation to another participant, Mike.

6.3 Participant 5: Mike

Mike was Japanese and a student of marketing; he took MSc Marketing in the second year.

Stage 1 (Pre-Master's semester 1)

Mike's first assignment was a 600 word case study about the global marketing of Harry Potter. Extract M.1 shows his first attempts to use sources using integral citation.

Extract M.1

No	Mike, EAP1 Literature Review
1	This paragraph shows the literature review. This essay refers to four sources.
2	Gunelius (2008) explains the quality of a book to be popular. Brown (2005)
3	argues about the author's life which was unhappy till the success of 'Harry
4	Potter.' Cope and Ziguras (2002) affirm that it is important to translate the
5	book into other languages for selling it in the places where people use other
6	languages. Cope and Mason (2002) argue that the internet provides much
7	information about books for consumers before they purchase. These four
8	studies will be related to this analysis, which are considered as key points
9	about 'Harry Potter.'

In this extract, Mike introduced the paragraph with two sentences (line 1) about the section and number of sources. In this way, he explained the structure, rather than the topic, which shows a misunderstanding of how to contextualise a literature review. There is also an absence of linking between the sentences and points from the sources, so for the reader, it is hard to follow and lacks coherence on the topic. He reported points from each source that seem unrelated to each other, and did not comment on them. He put the character title of Harry Potter in quotation marks, which makes it seem that he was using a quotation. He used four integral citations (lines 2, 4 and 6) followed by a number of reporting verbs, which seem to be randomly chosen, without understanding the meaning or difference between 'argue' and 'explain'. He also used each source in the same way, with the same structure, which shows that he had understood one means of using citation in a sentence, but no more than this one way. He made a summary sentence at the end to explain that he would go into more detail about each source (lines 7-9). Therefore, the extract shows very little understanding of how to use and evaluate sources. As Ridley (2008) advises students, literature reviews should be where writers draw extensively on sources and then make their own position on sources. Mike did not seem able to do that at this point. In interview 1, Mike explained the areas of source use he found easy and difficult:

How to reference is not so big problem I think, because it's just what I have to memorise how to do it, but to read references is my problem because the text of references is usually longer than…newspaper article or something, so it's long for me, so, and the words of English are difficult to understand, it's my biggest problem. (Stage 1, Interview 1, Mike).

His comments show that he felt he had learnt the system of using citation, but struggled with the length and words of articles, in terms of reading and understanding vocabulary, in the same way as Yolanda. The following interview extract shows Mike's understanding of quotations, paraphrasing and plagiarism:

M: Quotation? Quotation means something information on references and when you write essay, you put on the information of references on your essay...
I: OK, yes and can you tell me what is a paraphrase?
M: Paraphrase? Paraphrase? What is it, paraphrase?
I: Do you know paraphrase?
M: Not paragraph? Paragraph, not paragraph?
I: No, paraphrase
M: Ah, it's a several words connected
I: Ah no, it's not like a phrase, paraphrase is when you change the author's words into your own words
M: Ah, OK
I: OK, and do you know what plagiarism is?
M: Plagiarism?
I: Plagiarism
M: Plagiarism?
I: Yes
M: No, plagiarism, not prejudice?
I: No, plagiarism. (Stage 1, Interview 1, I=Interviewer, M=Mike)

This interview extract demonstrates that Mike had no understanding or knowledge of these terms. He attempted a definition of quotation, but clearly confuses it with citation. Similarly, he tried to explain paraphrase with similar sounding words he knew ('paragraph' and 'phrase') and plagiarism as 'prejudice'. In this way, he was drawing on his vocabulary quite inventively, but in doing so, revealed that these key terms related to source use were unknown to him.

Stage 2 (Pre-Master's semester 2)

Mike wrote a 3,000 word report on the marketing strategies used by mainstream cinemas to survive recessions. The extract below shows a little more varied source use compared to the extract in stage 1.

Extract M.2.1

No	Mike, EAP2 Literature Review
1	Frank (2009) states the way to promote the products must be re-examined and
2	it is possible to need to change the marketing tools itself or the way to use
3	them. This is because it is important to retain the existing customers but they
4	spend more time to decide to buy, so 'marketing needs to focus on moving
5	them along that decision chain' (Frank, 2009: 13). He also states the digital
6	marketing, such as e-mail or inline advertising, is important and the use of
7	public relation is useful from the point of the view of a cost-effective way as
8	well as of emphasising brand image and getting customers to make buying
9	decisions. CRM magazine (2008: 27) states 'companies today have the
10	advantage of technology', compared to the business in the time of Great
11	Depression.

He began this section with an integral citation and report from a source (line 1) then made a comment to explain an important point that appears to convey his view (lines 3-4) beginning 'This is because…'. He linked this back to a quotation from the source (lines 4-5), and a further point from the same source (lines 5-9). He then began another sentence with a citation and a quotation (lines 9-10). It is noticeable that he repeated the same use of 'states' in each sentence with integral citation (lines 1, 5 and 9). The extract thus shows some development in terms of his source use, in that he used some quotations, both integral and non-integral citation, and attempted to comment (lines 3-4). However, his level of source use was still limited to rather repetitive use of citation to begin sentences followed by a reporting structure, without linking to other points or other sources, and with very little evaluation. In his interview at this stage, he commented on the progression he felt he had made:

> At first I didn't know how to use the sources in the text at all, so now I feel I have improved very much. Now I know how to use citation in the text, how to write bibliography, but yeah, even now, I need to check, I need to check it. (Stage 2, Interview 2, Mike).

His repetition of 'I need to check, I need to check' reveals his careful attention to source use strategies. The following extract comes from the main research section of the assignment.

Extract M.2.2

No	Mike, EAP2 Main Research	Marketing magazine (2007: 4)
1	Those Rugby World Cup games have	Rugby World cup games are to be
2	been shown for free in 20 locations of	shown for free in Odeon cinemas in
3	Odeon cinemas, such as London, Bath	September and October. The pounds
4	and Liverpool. Marketing (2007) says	1m push, funded by the Rugby
5	that this screening of Rugby World	Football Foundation and National
6	Cup games has been funded by the	Sports Federation and called 'Go play
7	Rugby Football Foundation and	rugby', aims to tempt former players
8	National Sports Federation, and	back to the game. Odeons in 20
9	Odeon has used rugby players on its	locations including Liverpool, Bath and
10	cinema advertisings.	London will show all the games

Extract M.2.2 shows Mike's use of a text from Marketing magazine to discuss how rugby games are broadcast. Mike used key words from the text such as 'Rugby World Cup games' and titles such as 'National Sports Federation', but attempted to make some paraphrases or structural changes of other parts of the text. For example, he included the same cities mentioned in the source text: 'Liverpool, Bath and London' (Marketing magazine, lines 9-10 above) but put them in a different order: London, Bath and Liverpool (lines 3-4). Drawing on Keck (2006), his paraphrasing ability may be assessed as moderate revision in that his paraphrase included only two unique links to 'shown for free in' and 'funded by the'. His restructuring in the order of words from the source also means his textual similarity is less likely to be highlighted by *Turnitin*, as the software only matches words in the same sentence order (Introna and Hayes, 2004).

Mike drew attention to the difficulty he experienced with making decisions about key terms, and when to quote and when to paraphrase in interview 2:

> Sometimes I am not sure which one is plagiarism because sometimes [there are] the key terms or specific terms used in my research or my writing, but I don't know which words are specific terms so sometimes it's difficult…When I want to paraphrase something, I have to remake the sentences, that's difficult for me, it's the biggest challenge I think. (Stage 2, Interview 2, Mike)

This extract shows he understood he should 'remake' sentences. He also outlined his understanding of the differences between quotations, paraphrasing and plagiarism at this stage:

M: Quotation is the phrase or sentence from the source, and you have to write [that] phrase, you must not change any words from the source.

I: And a paraphrase?

M: Paraphrase is…a kind of summary of the source, and you have to understand the meaning of the source, and you have to write the meaning, but you mustn't use the same phrase or same sentence as the source

I: OK, now can you tell me what plagiarism is?

M: Plagiarism is a kind of cheating, plagiarism is to write the same thing as written on the source, and if you don't put citation and that phrase is same as the source, that is plagiarism. (Stage 2, Interview 2, I=Interviewer, M=Mike)

His definitions of quotations, paraphrase and plagiarism showed a great deal of development since stage 1. He had developed an understanding of the terms in line with the regulations of his educational context at Southern University.

Stage 3 (Master's semester 1)

In stage 3, Mike commenced his MSc Marketing. His first assignment was a 2,000 word external and internal market analysis of GlaxoSmithKline. Extract M.3.1 demonstrates his preference for non-integral citation.

Extract M.3.1

No	Mike, PG1 Background
1	This company had a 3.6% value share in the world wide market in 2007
2	(Euromonitor, 2008), and a 3.4% value share in 2008. (Euromonitor, 2009a)
3	When it comes to the OTC health care market only in the UK, GlaxoSmithKline
4	lost the first position in 2006, because of Reckitt Benckiser's acquisition of
5	Boots Healthcare International. (Euromonitor, 2009c) According to
6	Euromonitor (2009d), GlaxoSmithKline had a 10.5% share in the UK market in
7	2008.

This extract contains very careful attribution of each point, including part-sentences, with citation in lines 2, 5 and 6. It is noticeable that all citations are to the same source (Euromonitor) and mostly of the same year, although Mike showed his knowledge of how to differentiate citations of different studies in the same year by using a letter (a, c, d) after the year. His careful approach to citation is reflected in this extract, as well as his tendency to use sources in a repetitive way. In his interview in stage 3, he commented on this:

I don't have confidence about the number of sources I used there, because sometimes I'm afraid I used the same sources a lot. (Stage 3, Interview 3, Mike)

It may be that his tendency to use 'the same sources a lot' fits with Schmitt's (2005) assessment of over-citation as a middle stage of development. Furthermore, he might have used a small number of sources because he still found reading very time-consuming, as he noted in interview 1. The following extract from the same assignment shows Mike's preference for non-evaluative reporting structures.

Extract M.3.2

No	Mike, PG1 Analysis
1	Strategic direction (2004) states the company has been successful to increase
2	the number of licensing deals with smaller researching companies. Moreover,
3	Euromonitor (2009b) says GlaxoSmithKline has done acquisitions almost every
4	year since this company was established in 2000. This means the company
5	imports the new technology and the new knowledge to improve its R&D.

Extract M.3.2 includes two integral citations at the beginning of sentences which are followed by 'states' or 'says' and a point that is reported from the source. His use of 'states' and 'says' after organisations or publications sounds a little unnatural, as these verbs are more likely to be used with individual authors. In interview 3, Mike discussed his preferences for reporting structures.

M: I use a lot of 'states'
I: Why do you think you use that one?
M: I'm not quite sure but I think it's familiar for me to use 'state'… because before I came to England, I know the verb 'say', but 'state' is quite new for me because last year I learnt it
I: OK
M: So I think it is because of the time to learn it, it's as new information for me, new information is usually interesting for me. (Stage 3, Interview 3, I=Interviewer, M=Mike)

As Hyland (2004) has commented, it is easier for novice academic writers to use non-evaluative reporting verbs such as 'state', rather than evaluative reporting verbs that require critical engagement with sources. The preference for non-evaluative reporting verbs is likely to show that a writer is more comfortable with a report of what they have read, than trying to react to it and construct their own argument from it.

Furthermore, Mike made the point that he liked to use 'state' because he saw it as part of his learning. He explained why he did not use any quotations, unlike Yolanda.

> M: Quotations, actually I didn't use any quotations in my writing.
> I: Can you tell me why?
> M: Mm, because I want to use information for, from the sources on this assignment…and that information is not, you know, written by one sentence or two sentences, so I have to summarise the information. (Stage 3, Interview 3, I=Interviewer, M=Mike)

Mike thus showed a good understanding of when to use quotations and when to use paraphrasing; he had realised that paraphrasing helped him convey more information in fewer words. However, he also discussed the difficulty with paraphrasing:

> I think there are two ways of worrying about it, one aspect is about the words, because I must not use the words on the original sources so I have to change it, or I have to change the structure of grammar. And the second aspect is I must not change the meaning of the information, but sometimes if I want to change the words, the meaning is slightly different, so it takes long time to do. (Stage 3, Interview 3, Mike)

In his comments, he showed an insightful understanding of the requirements of paraphrasing, and the difficulty for him, as a non-native speaker, to choose the right words to convey the meaning correctly. It is notable that he described it as 'two ways of worrying about it' which reveals his anxiety with source use.

Stage 4 (Master's semester 2)

In stage 4, Mike completed an 18,000 word dissertation about Dove's marketing strategy in the UK. His tendency to rely on non-integral citation is also demonstrated in the following extract.

Extract M.4

No	Mike, PG2 Literature review
1	Brands are considered the most valuable assets which belong to a firm (Dacin
2	and Smith, 1994). Therefore, brand management is an essential task for a firm
3	(Fischer *et al.*, 2010). One of the most important parts of brand management is
4	brand image management (Gupta, 2003). Brand image management takes a
5	critical role in terms of firm's marketing strategy (Roth, 1995). This is because
6	organisations can improve their competitive advantages by managing brand
7	image (Chowdhury *et al.*, 2002). However, a brand image held in consumers'
8	minds is shaped by cultures of consumers (Gupta, 2003). In other words, a
9	brand image can be different if the cultures of consumers are different.

In this extract, it can be seen that Mike used non-integral citation at the end of each sentence, one after the other, for six sentences, until the final sentence where he made a summary of the source information. There is a logical sequencing of ideas through linking words such as 'therefore', 'this is because', 'however', 'in other words'. His source use remained quite repetitive, however, as he continued to use the pattern of a sentence based on source information, followed by one citation and full stop. It is notable that he used each citation separately for each point and did not synthesise or compare sources. He discussed his style of citation in interview 4.

> M: In English, the subject is usually in the beginning of the sentence, but in Japanese, the subject can be almost the end of the sentence or in the middle, because we can know that word is [the] subject because of their form of the word…
> I: OK, so how does that affect how you are using sources in English?
> M: I remember, for me, it was a bit weird to use, you know, someone says, you know this information always the person's name is…in the beginning of the sentence, so…I am accustomed to it, I always use the subject in the end, …so I can't change the structure of the sentence, you know, for readers, it's a bit boring, so I can't be flexible, you know, I don't know how to be flexible about writing in English, you know, citation or paraphrasing.
> I: And are you more comfortable with putting the author in brackets at the end?
> M: Yes, actually. (Stage 4, Interview 4, I=Interviewer, M=Mike)

It is clear that Mike was aware that he used the same structure many times, and he suggested that he was influenced by his L1 in the way he made sentences (as discussed in 2.3.2), preferring to put the author's name at the end rather than the beginning. This is in contrast to his preference in stage 1 and 2, where he may have been following new instruction in his EAP classes (see extracts M.1, M.2.1 and M.2.2). He also showed concern about his repetitive style that may bore the reader.

The large number of sources used by Mike may be seen as over-citation. In his interview, Mike commented on the number of his sources he was using:

> M: I'm using more number of sources for each report and each dissertation I mean
> I: Why do you do that?
> M: Because the report must be based on the evidence and if the number of evidence increases, the report will be more convincing. (Stage 4, Interview 4, I=Interviewer, M=Mike)

Thus, Mike was clearly aware and justified his use of a large amount of citation as a means to make his arguments convincing.

In Mike's approach to source use, he shared common practices with Yolanda from his careful attention to citation and use of a repetitive and limited range. Therefore, I will now move to discuss the emerging themes from the features they had in common.

6.4 Discussion

Five themes emerge from the above analysis of the safe players: the use of over-citation, the repetitive and limited range of features, lack of critical engagement, lack of vocabulary, and a tendency to play a game with a focus on safety.

6.4.1 Over-citation

Both Yolanda and Mike seemed to be engaged in a practice which I would call 'hyper-citation' in that they attempted to attribute absolutely every idea. According to Schmitt (2005: 69), international students may go through a learning stage continuum of

no citation ➔ over-citation ➔ appropriate citation.

Therefore, in Schmitt's view, if students have a starting point of writing without citation, students are likely to move to citing too much before they get the amount right. Although I would argue that not all students go through a stage of over-citation, I agree that Yolanda and Mike seemed to be in this stage. They tended to use the same style of rather excessive and repetitive non-integral citation (see Y.4.2 and M.4) which Swales (2014: 135) calls 'parenthetical plonking', presumably because they concluded that the use of bracketed citation for each point is safe. To make progress along the continuum, Schmitt (2005) emphasises that students need a great deal of practice with source use and clear feedback. The practice of excessive attribution was also examined by Blum (2009) who pursues the difficulty of showing ownership of ideas, reporting one of her student participants: 'you can't cite every single sentence that you write' (p.57). In contrast to this student, Yolanda and Mike did seem to be trying to cite every sentence they wrote. It is generally not advised to students to attempt to establish the ownership of each idea, as it can result in text that appears to be so full of citation that it may be hard to read. Sutherland-Smith (2008) argues that the constant 'peppering' of text with citations can interfere with coherence. Similarly, Thompson (2005)

suggests that tutors may find students who over-cite do not demonstrate their own opinion clearly. Yolanda and Mike's practice also lends support to Petrić's (2012) suggestion that some students could be overly cautious with citation, repeating the source where it was not necessary. Furthermore, Petrić (2012: 110) puts forward the view that when unsure, 'students may… develop their own personal theories of citing', which could account for Yolanda and Mike's approach. The same explanation was offered by Pecorari (2013: 35) in that the 'process of learning how to use sources may be an uneven one, and along the way, students may develop ideas and conceptions with which their teachers and other gatekeepers would not agree'. These ideas might include rewriting everything used from a source, over-citing or using page numbers for paraphrased text, as the safe players do.

Another reason for over-citation found by Harwood and Petrić (2012: 18) was that students may try to show their range of reading by over-citing to '[perform] the industrious student'. In this way, they hope to impress the tutor-reader and gain more marks. Some evidence for this strategy might be seen in interview 4 where Mike suggested that using a lot of citation will make his report more 'convincing' to the reader.

6.4.2 Repetitive and limited range of features

Yolanda and Mike developed some strategies for source use in stages 1 and 2, such as using a small number of non-evaluative reporting structures ('say' or 'state') which they felt familiar with. Thompson and Ye (1991) suggest that these non-evaluative reporting verbs are easier to use for writers with little experience of academic expectations in Anglophone HE. Both Yolanda and Mike used a large number of non-integral citations, generally one per sentence. In Yolanda's case, she used a repetitive means of synthesising through the structure 'agrees and states'. Her reason for using this may be that she found it easier than grouping non-integral citations together as lists of authors who agree, which Hyland (2004) terms 'generalisation'. She may also have found it easier to do this than use a wider range of reporting verbs to show similarity or difference between sources.

In Mike's case, it appears that his tendency to keep to the practice of writing sentences with non-integral citation at the end was based on a transfer of sentence structure in his L1, Japanese. Thus, like Yolanda, he may tend to use this strategy because of a lack of confidence to try structures he is unfamiliar with. Both students continued these strategies until the end of their study and seemed to rely on this repetitive range. By using a 'tried and tested' method, they can be said to be avoiding risk, and seemed to prefer to use a repetitive range that they judged to be acceptable, rather than attempting any development of their range.

It seems important to consider whether this level of citation use is acceptable to tutors, or whether it is essential for students to use a wider range of citation forms and functions. Some research has shown that a student's level of source use at Master's level does correlate with the grades they achieve. As reported in the literature review, Petrić (2007) found that using a smaller number of citations, with a smaller range of functions, led to lower marks for Master's dissertations, and conversely that a greater range and number of citations led to higher marks. Thus, use of citation can have a direct impact on the grade received. However, Ridley (2008) explains that a wider range of reporting verbs, especially evaluative ones, is needed more for social sciences where knowledge is more fluid, while a smaller range is sufficient for hard sciences. This means that while Mike would have needed this range for business as a social science subject, Yolanda may not have needed to produce such a range in her field of digital media as a technology subject. Therefore, the acceptability of the small range of reporting verbs is likely to depend on the discipline of the student.

6.4.3 Lack of critical engagement

Yolanda and Mike seemed to lack critical engagement and kept their own voice quite hidden in their academic writing. By adopting a great deal of non-integral citation at the end of sentences, especially prevalent in their assignments on their Master's degrees, they did not engage in the debates about topics in their fields or establish main arguments (Swales, 2014). It may be that they were not comfortable with a new argumentative style in a different academic environment, as found by Hall and Sung (2009). As a consequence, they did not mark out their own research space, as recommended by Swales and Feak (2004). According to Pittam *et al*. (2009), current

students frequently have difficulty bringing in an authorial voice to their writing due to a lack of confidence, understanding and knowledge. While both Yolanda and Mike tried to develop their knowledge through extensive reading practices evident in their citation, they had difficulty with understanding and evaluating sources and lacked confidence in themselves. Hyland (2002) suggests a lack of disciplinary knowledge can prevent non-native speaker writers from evaluating sources effectively. Their difficulties with demonstrating critical engagement can also be compared to the problems faced by participants in research by Ivanič (1998) which highlighted that developing a voice in academic argument is extremely difficult for novice writers.

6.4.4 Lack of vocabulary

Like the risk takers, Yolanda and Mike felt that their limited vocabulary was an ongoing problem. However, in contrast to the risk takers, they sought some 'safe' solutions to this problem by checking internet translations, using short quotations around key words and partial sentences and trying to avoid plagiarising. This continuing preoccupation with lack of vocabulary appears to be representative of international students' experiences on degrees in the UK. A study by Clark and Ishida (2005) indicated that those who had gained access to their degrees via a course in EAP may have a weaker vocabulary than those who were directly placed on the degree. It may be that generic EAP programmes simply cannot cover enough discipline-specific vocabulary for students' needs. Similarly, Pilcher (2006) found that Chinese Master's students still struggled with language use on Master's degrees in the UK, even after taking an EAP course prior to postgraduate study. As both Mike and Yolanda commented, it was difficult for them to read and write effectively from sources because of their limited vocabulary range. It has been shown in research that vocabulary level is directly linked to reading ability; for example, Schmitt and Schmitt (2012) found a correlation between improvement of vocabulary at an intermediate level and reading test scores. The work of Nation (2006) has contributed to an understanding of the importance of teaching high-frequency vocabulary, so that students are equipped with the language they need. It is arguable whether international students can achieve the vocabulary level required to write effectively from sources without extensive teaching and practice. As discussed in the literature

review, Howard contends that we are asking an impossible task of international students to use sources without patchwriting (Davis, 2012a).

However, Yolanda devised strategies for dealing with her lack of vocabulary by consulting the internet for relevant vocabulary on websites, using Chinese websites, and using *Google Translate*. She showed that she was attempting to follow her tutor's advice to consult Chinese websites. Her comments about advice from a tutor indicate that she seemed to have been receiving the 'repeated, mentored practice' that Howard (2008: 93) recommends, and therefore was able to use sources in an acceptable way, if limited in range.

6.4.5 Playing the game

It seems Yolanda and Mike developed their source use as a kind of safe game. For example, with extract Y.4.1, Yolanda's text is clearly based on the matched page of a source text, but she quoted and attributed almost every word she used from the text. Thus, she can be seen as playing safe, and also perhaps, 'playing the game' in that she has understood how to avoid plagiarism, and carefully followed this strategy.

Yolanda's and Mike's efforts to 'play a game' fit with some recent research into source use, as outlined in the introduction. Leask (2006) argues that using sources effectively and avoiding plagiarism is about learning to 'play a game', often with new rules, which may be different academic conventions to those students have previously used. Leask argues that teachers need to communicate rules effectively, because learners may have been efficient in a previous academic setting, but not in an unfamiliar culture where they need to learn new rules. Carroll (2007) strongly advocates the reinforcement through extra support for students to understand how they are assessed and how they need to use sources to succeed in the academic game. As discussed in the literature review, universities are responsible for supporting students with new learning about source use. Handa and Power (2005: 65) argue very strongly on this point: 'rather than shifting blame to the players who have not yet learnt the rules, … institutions are responsible for initiating and inducting their students, both local and international to enable successful participation'. Furthermore, Pecorari (2013) argues that it is essential for student 'players' to learn to 'play the game'; thus,

it seems the practices of the safe players help them to survive in their academic context.

However, the examples of Yolanda and Mike indicate that students may not achieve a competent level of source use, even at the end of a Master's. It seems important to consider whether it is essential for students to achieve competence in source use, or whether they will still gain satisfactory grades with a lower level of source use. Breeze (2008) found that lower level students may play safe with vocabulary, use what they know and avoid anything too complex. As noted in the epigraph for this chapter, L2 writers may adopt a safe strategy because of the stress of 'managing discourse' in another language (Breeze, 2008: 64). Similarly, Brown and Holloway (2008) suggest that international students sometimes experience panic when needing to access new language in their studies, which causes great stress. After a time, it may be that they develop safe strategies to cope with language and study problems, as Yolanda and Mike did.

6.5 Summary

This chapter has analysed the source use development of Yolanda and Mike, whose strategies can be seen as playing safe. They used a small range of features, but carefully attributed everything they wrote. In this way, they ran no risks of plagiarism, and therefore provide a contrasting approach to the previous group described in chapter 5, the risk takers. They played safe by over-citing, using a repetitive and limited range of source text features, with a limited amount of critical engagement, limited vocabulary and caution in their approach. However, in their safe practices, they did not appear to develop competence with source use because of their limited range of features. An analysis of this competence will be made in the next chapter with the final group for analysis, the competent users.

Chapter 7: Competent users

[Academic] writers need to be capable of using sources in an effective and appropriate way. (Pecorari, 2008: 54)

7.1 Introduction

In this third and final chapter of analysis, I will focus on the three students from the cohort who I consider emerged as competent users of sources. As in the previous two chapters, I will examine their source use in extracts over the four stages of data collection, and then discuss the key themes emerging. The aim of my investigation is again to explore their source use and the strategies they develop, but with this group, I intend to take my analysis further towards understanding what constitutes competence in source use in terms of knowledge and practices.

I define this group of students as competent users because of their ability to use sources effectively and appropriately, by following rules for citation and source use and avoiding plagiarism, but also by using a wide range of features of source use that enable them to construct knowledge, critically evaluate and engage with sources. During the first two stages while on the Pre-Master's they developed their source use from different starting points, and progressed slightly differently; what they had in common was their level in stages 3 and 4 during their Master's degree which I assess as competent.

The three students in this group were Kevin (Chinese), Oliver (Algerian) and Nick (Algerian). As with the previous two groups, their progression over stages 1-4 (Pre-Master's semester 1 and 2, and Master's semester 1 and 2) will be discussed in this order. Extracts will be numbered in order, with the participant's initial, followed by the assignment number (1-4) and a further number (1-2) where more than one extract is used from the same assignment. The extracts will be presented in tables, with matching source text beside, where appropriate. The features will be shown using the following coding: underlining to demonstrate identical text to source, yellow highlighting to show citation and green highlighting to show reporting verbs.

7.2 Participant 6: Kevin

Kevin was from China and a student of media during stages 1 and 2 during his Pre-Master's year. He studied MSc Public Relations in his second year through stages 3 and 4.

Stage 1 (Pre-Master's Semester 1)

Kevin's first EAP assignment was a 600 word case study assignment on the topic of broadcasts of radical protest, using *Greenpeace* as an example. Extract K.1 indicates his knowledge of source use, even at stage one, as he employed quotations, some review and comments on sources.

Extract K.1

No	Kevin, EAP1 Literature Review
1	Usually, radical ecology groups will employ one type of communication
2	strategies called 'image events' to achieve their goals. ''Image events are
3	staged acts of protest designed for media dissemination.' (Delicath and Deluca,
4	2003:315) Hutchins and Lester (2006:438) have pointed out that 'Without the
5	widespread awareness generated by news coverage, environmental action and
6	values lose both legitimacy and effect, failing to appear on mainstream political
7	and cultural agendas and register in the collective mind.' Anderson has tried to
8	analyze the effects of radical protests in 1992, he stated that radical protest will
9	make the media mobilize the public exerting social pressure on a related
10	department or an organization, and then compelled them to accomplish a goal
11	or a mission. Uppal (2005:1) agreed with Anderson, and he said that 'It is the
12	news media that help disseminate the information that can assist in mobilizing
13	the public.' The evidence from the literature shows that…

Extract K.1 demonstrates Kevin's ability to use a range of academic conventions. The extract has three quotations (lines 2-3, 4-7 and 11-13), correctly cited with page numbers. The number of quotations in this short extract indicates some reliance on source text, although Kevin used it skilfully. He used both integral and non-integral citation, and a range of reporting structures ('pointed out', 'stated', 'agreed' and 'said'). In this way, he created a literature review that included synthesis (eg 'Uppal agreed with Anderson', line 11) and evaluation 'The evidence from the literature shows that' (line 13). As emphasised by Ridley (2008), an important aspect of a

literature review is the writer's engagement with sources in showing both an understanding of literature and a response to it. Kevin seems to be demonstrating both of these skills in this extract.

In interview 1, Kevin attempted definitions of quotations, paraphrase and plagiarism.

> K: Quotation means citing the author's own words; it means completely, no personal opinion.
> I: OK, can you tell me what a paraphrase is?
> K: Paraphrase? Did you mean express the same opinion but in different words?
> I: OK, yeah and do you know what plagiarism is?
> K: Sorry I don't know. (Stage 1, Interview 1, I= Interviewer, K= Kevin)

In this interview, he showed his understanding of quotations and paraphrase, but was unfamiliar with the term plagiarism. He discussed his strategies to improve source use:

> K: I think I should train… I mean practise as much as possible…
> I: And how can you do that?
> K: For example, find out a topic and try to write essay about specific topic by myself and compel myself to find source and use the source. (Stage 1, Interview 1, I=Interviewer, K=Kevin)

His comments indicate that he had a very strict approach with himself regarding how he should improve his use of sources. His strategies to practise a lot and to 'compel' himself to find sources demonstrate his seriousness and diligence in this aspect.

Stage 2 (Pre-Master's Semester 2)

The following extract is from his 3,000 word extended writing project about the differences in gender communication in a professional setting.

Extract K.2

No	Kevin, EAP2 Literature Review
1	The differences of communication styles in men and women have been
2	observed in previous studies. Tannen (1990) found that women appear to
3	express their viewpoints mildly while men seem to express their stances in
4	forceful way. In addition, male employees tend to use the type of speech which
5	is full of assertion and declaration whereas female employees tend to use the
6	type of speech that is qualified and mitigated (Mulac, 1998; Gray, 2002; Liska *et*
7	*al*., 1981). The reasons for this phenomenon are complicated. Erickson *et al*.
8	(1978) explained that there is a direct correlation between speech style and
9	social status.

Kevin used a topic sentence to establish the research context in his first sentence 'The differences…have been observed in previous studies'. He employed non-evaluative reporting structures 'found' (line 2) and 'explained' (line 8), and synthesis in the form of a non-integral citation list (line 6-7) and an extension of evidence and comment in line 7 'the reasons for this phenomenon are complicated'. Thus, there is evidence of his voice and comment on what he has read. His use of citation shows some sophistication, as he included both specification of the results of other studies and his own stance on the subject (Swales, 1990). He seemed sensitive to the range of citation functions such as exemplification or debate (Harwood, 2009). Therefore, he can be said to have reached a competent level of source use already on the EAP course. In his interview in stage 2, Kevin gave a clear summary of quotations, paraphrases and plagiarism.

> Quotation I think I will use the [exact] words of other authors' in my text or writing, and paraphrase I think, … I will change the structure of the sentence or some words and then use them… I mean I keep…the main idea the same as the original text, and then use them in my paper or writing. Of course in quotation I must use speech mark to make it [clear] as a quotation…Plagiarism means, I use the other author, if an author use another author's words or main idea without [acknowledging] the original, the source of the main idea or the context, I think this is plagiarism. (Stage 2, Interview 2, Kevin)

Kevin's definition of plagiarism focuses on lack of citation, which was also emphasised by the students in the other two groups, the risk takers and the safe players. However, unlike the students in the other two groups, he demonstrated an ability not only to cite carefully, but also to use sources flexibly, as can be seen in the extract above. Nevertheless, Kevin still found some challenges to his use of sources at this stage:

> K: In my writing, usually a lot of sources will offer me very detailed information… I think the biggest challenge is how to clarify different resources
> I: How do you think you could improve your use of sources in your writing?
> K: I think before I start my writing, I will clarify my resource clearly and organise them I mean, clearly…If I want to write a topic, I will make a plan first, reasons, method and background. And I will clarify my resource into different groups and then…when I finish these steps, I will start to write. (Stage 2, Interview 2, I=Interviewer, K=Kevin)

This interview extract reflects Kevin's strategy of categorising sources for different parts of his project and planning each carefully.

Stage 3 (Master's Semester 1)

In stage 3, Kevin began his MSc Public Relations. Extract K.3.1 is from his 2,500 word report on social theory.

Extract K.3.1

No	Kevin, PG1 Literature Review
1	Some sociologists tried to defined social theory from its nature (McIntosh and
2	Punch, 2005; Calhoun *et al.*, 2003). Specifically, in McIntosh and Punch's (2005)
3	opinions, social theory is a proposition that is used to explain phenomena and
4	events in our society and Calhoun *et al.* (2003: 1) advocated that social theory
5	is 'a guide to sociological inquiry and an attempt to bring order to its results.'
6	From the discussion above, it is clear that there are many definitions given to
7	'social theory' in terms of different research position of different scholars. As
8	Joas and Knobl (2009:2), who reviewed a huge amount of literature about the
9	definition of social theory, concluded that:
10	The concept of theory itself is highly contentious. Any attempt... to work
11	out the lowest common denominator of the theories produced by the
12	leading figures of sociology would come to nothing. It would remain
13	impossible to answer the question 'what is [social] theory'.

In this extract, he made varied use of a large amount of citation, a range of reporting structures, paraphrasing, and clear attribution, even though some of his language is a little unnatural at times. He used quotations carefully with accurate formatting, ellipsis, and indicated his own change of the text in the quotation with appropriate brackets. The demonstration of these skills indicates that his level of source use was competent. He made more use of integral than non-integral citation in this extract, through which he used considerable argumentation in reporting structures such as 'advocated' (line 4), which may be seen as a more complex evaluative reporting verb (Hyland, 2002). He rounded up his review skilfully in the phrase 'from the discussion above, it is clear that…' (line 6), then followed with a long quotation. In interview 3, Kevin explained his rationale for using the quotation in extract K.3.1.

> Because this quotation supports my point of view and is a long quotation, so I [separated] it in independent paragraph…I think when I need arguments that support my point of view or explain my point of view, then I will use quotations. (Stage 3, Interview 3, Kevin)

His comments in this extract reflect his clear understanding of the purpose of quotations, both for support and expansion of his argument. The following extract shows his use of paraphrasing in the same assignment.

Extract K.3.2

No	Kevin, PG1 Literature Review
1	Bentele and Wehmeier (2007) suggested that Structuration Theory has been
2	applied to public relations. They said the value of such theory lied in the benefit
3	that it explains the evolution of public relations from a social-historical
4	perspective. In addition, it could also change our understanding of systems
5	theory and its function in PR theory.

In Interview 3, Kevin discussed why he chose to use a paraphrase in extract K.3.2.

> K: Because these 2 authors explain the topic related to the structuration theory and this point of view is related to the point of view I want to express in the public relations field … I understand their point of view, and I can explain in my own words so I use paraphrasing.
> I: OK, how do you feel about your vocabulary nowadays?
> K: I think I can paraphrase many points of view in my own words now, and I feel more confident with paraphrasing…Nowadays, I feel more confident and I can use the sources as I want now. (Stage 3, Interview 3, I=Interviewer, K=Kevin)

In this interview, he showed self-assurance in his use of quotations and paraphrase. His comments indicate that he felt able to understand and paraphrase what he read, which is important for effective source use. His last comment that he 'can use the sources as [he wants] now' seems highly significant, as it is a confident self-evaluation of his ability.

Stage 4 (Master's Semester 2)

The following extract comes from Kevin's final assignment, his 12,500 word dissertation on the communication practices of a local government council.

Extract K.4

No	Kevin, PG2 Literature Review
1	Leeper (2001, p.99) extended the argument and suggested that
2	communitarianism could be considered as a meta-theory for public relations.
3	He also advocated that communitarianism and symmetrical models are based
4	on interactive epistemology… a function of theory is change oriented and
5	idealistic (*Ibid.*, p.100), thus, he suggested that 'strong parallels [exist] between
6	the communitarian worldview and the symmetrical models' (*Ibid.*, p.100). In
7	addition, he suggested that the application of communitarianism could be
8	extended to issues such as corporate social responsibility, publics, and ethics
9	(pp.100-102). In conclusion, Leeper (1996, p.165) argued that
10	communitarianism is 'effective in setting standards to meet the realities of
	today's interdependence looks at responsibility as an ethical base.'

Kevin used seven citations in the extract, including references to '*ibid*' and 'he', and put page numbers for both quotations and paraphrases. In this way, he attributed every sentence, and used quotation formatting throughout. The references are to two different authors of the same name, but it seems that he was over-citing here in his attention to detail. As mentioned with the safe players, according to Schmitt (2005: 69), over-citation may be a middle stage of development with source use, before a student adopts an appropriate amount of citation. However, Kevin's level of source use was also extremely sophisticated, as he was able to engage with debates in the literature, to review effectively and to draw on sources to support his points. It may be that with his dissertation, he felt a greater need to be sure of avoiding plagiarism, and he adopted the page number as a safety strategy for all citations in order to avoid any possible accusation of plagiarism, even though referencing regulations only require page numbers with quotations. He demonstrated his sense of confidence in his ability to paraphrase and avoid plagiarism in his interview in stage 4:

> I know how to paraphrase them and how to give clear citations, so I'm not afraid of being criticised of plagiarism… I know I have a lot of other words to learn, but so far I think I have learnt quite a lot of words to help me paraphrase and avoid plagiarism, so I feel quite confident. (Stage 4, Interview 4, Kevin)

Kevin's confidence in his source use seems well-founded for the reasons I have discussed above. I will now move to the second member of the competent user group, Oliver.

7.3 Participant 7: Oliver

Oliver was from Algeria and studied business during the four stages. His Master's degree was International Business Economics. Like Kevin, by stage 2, he was able to use sources effectively and appeared to sustain a high level of source use from this point.

Stage 1 (Pre-Master's Semester 1)

Oliver wrote his first assignment, a 600 word case study about the relocation of manufacturing using LEGO as an example.

Extract O.1

No	Oliver, EAP1 Case Study
1	Bregar (2008) mentioned that in 2006, LEGO decided to cut the production
2	costs with signing an agreement with FLEXTRONICS (Manufacturer of cell
3	phones, computer…etc) to move a huge number of machinery to Mexico and
4	Hungary because the considerable lost in 1998 to 2004. LEGO stated that they
5	are going to make over the agreement in 2009 as Iqbal Padda, vice president in
6	charge of the supply chain, Bregar (2008), said: 'Jointly, we have now come to
7	the conclusion that it is more optimal for the LEGO group to manage the global
8	manufacturing set up ourselves'

In extract O.1, Oliver used three examples of citation, with a quite complicated attribution between lines 4-7 to LEGO, the vice president Padda, and Bregar, who published the quotation. In stage 1, Oliver had not yet been taught how to attribute the words of someone's speech published by another, but displayed careful attention to attribute all parties. In this short extract, Oliver already used three reporting verbs (lines 1, 4 and 6), a quotation (lines 6-8), no page number, but also some attempt to integrate into text. In interview 1, he seemed to show a limited understanding of critical engagement:

> I: How do you think you could improve in your use of sources in your academic writing?
> O: I think…writing objectively without introducing my views, which is really important, because I think all the students when they are writing, they include [their] own views, which is completely wrong [at] postgraduate level.
> I: So you think you should try to avoid putting your views?
> O: Yeah, I have to learn how to write…objectively. (Stage 1, Interview 1, I=Interviewer, O=Oliver)

164

Oliver's comments here reflect the difficulty for students of making decisions about how to incorporate their own views and views from sources. A number of studies have been made of double voicing (Baynham, 1999), referring to the need for a writer to show their views and the views of published authors, and the complexity of establishing authorial identity as a student (Pittam *et al.*, 2009). Oliver demonstrated his understanding of quotations, paraphrase and plagiarism in the following interview extract:

> You can use a quotation when you are using references. It could be citation, it could be your own words… I didn't study this kind of thing before, but I think I've got general idea, and I think quotation is using specific meaning in literature review. Paraphrase is when you take what people say … and also sources and you put it in your own words. [Plagiarism is] when you take exactly what people say in articles, or journals or books, anything like that and you don't mention the reference, and there are limitation of ten words maximum or something. (Stage 1, Interview 1, Oliver)

Oliver's definitions show that he had a clear understanding of a paraphrase, but seemed to have mixed up quotations with citations, perhaps because as he explained, he had not studied this area previously. His view that plagiarism was copying but not citing, and his comment about using no more than ten words shows his limited understanding, at least in terms of his current educational setting, at this stage. However, it is clear that he has an understanding of the importance of avoiding plagiarism:

> I think the biggest challenge is to use the sources without making mistakes. When I'm saying mistakes, it's plagiarism. (Stage 1, Interview 1, Oliver)

In this interview comment, Oliver connected plagiarism to making mistakes, in other words non-intentional plagiarism. His view at stage 1 seems to be that it was very hard for students to avoid plagiarism because they were likely to make mistakes.

Stage 2 (Pre-Master's Semester 2)

In stage 2, Oliver's assignment EAP2 was an extended writing project of 3,000 words about the effectiveness of football teams in the Premier League in dealing with recession. The extract below from his literature review reflects progress in his ability to use sources.

Extract O.2.1

No	Oliver, EAP2 Literature Review
1	Guzmain and Morrow (2007) focus on the special and the strong relationship
2	between the football clubs and its stakeholders (usually club's supporters)
3	which is the bases of a successful management strategy. Therefore, English
4	football clubs have become professional clubs entering the international
5	exchange market… (Haas, 2003). However, Emery and Weed (2006) shows
6	evidences that the football management strategies is really poor, described as a
7	failure and doesn't achieve much success as they note that 'The issue for clubs
8	outside the top flight is not profit maximization, but financial survival' (Boon
9	and Jones, 2002 from Emery and Weed, 2006).

In this extract, Oliver continued to use frequent citation, a range of reporting verbs, though still mainly non-evaluative, and a combination of paraphrase and quotation. Oliver displayed his understanding of the need to draw on a range of sources and to synthesize, as well as his knowledge about how to attribute secondary citation in 'Boon and Jones, 2002 from Emery and Weed, 2006' (lines 8-9). As he drew on literature, he linked ideas by using connectives such as 'therefore' (line 3), 'however' (line 5), 'as' (line 7), making his use of literature coherent to the reader. In his interview in stage 2, he provided clear definitions of quotations, paraphrase and plagiarism:

> Quotation is when you take exactly the author's words and you put it between quotation marks, and well personally, I wouldn't put more than ten words, which is not a rule, according to the teacher. And a paraphrase is when you read a text or a sentence, you understand it, and you rewrite it with your own words and your own structure. [Plagiarism is] simple, when you copy and paste and you take exactly what somebody else wrote and repeat it, you put it in your own work, without any citation, without any bibliography or references. (Stage 2, Interview 2, Oliver)

His definitions show the progress he has made in his understanding by stage 2 and his confidence in differentiating between the terms. He also indicated some sense of individual strategies about source use, in imposing his own word limit on the length of quotations. The limit of ten words for a quotation seems to be a clearer explanation of what he was trying to suggest in interview 1 above. It is also striking that in stage 2, his first word to describe plagiarism is 'simple'. As in stage 1, he defined plagiarism as

copying words and not putting citation. Extract O.2.2 below shows more of Oliver's ability to use sources flexibly and to evaluate what he reads.

Extract O.2.2

No	Oliver, EAP2 Literature Review
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Preliminary work on estimating the financial value of the premier league was undertaken by Haugen and Hervik (2002) who describe it as 'The world most profitable investment project'. To back up this statement, findings show that the London Stock Exchange is currently trading 20 English football clubs and this makes a considerable increase in investments which are involved within the football business in England. Recent evidence suggests that the top 20 top ranking of the richest football clubs in world includes 6 English clubs which has an important and huge impact on the UK's economy. Important point analysed in this research is the fact that the financial value of a football club is closely related to its sports performance (*ibid*).

This extract shows further development of Oliver's ability to use sources. He began with an evaluation of a specific study (Haugen and Hervik, 2002), and evidence in a quote (lines 2-3). He provided further critical analysis of the study as he tried to examine the evidence for the claim in the quote, and presumably referred to it again as 'recent evidence', and made a further point to show what he considered to be an important finding in the research (lines 8-10) and again attributes it to the source through using '*ibid*' (line 10). Thus, he demonstrated his understanding of the need to carefully attribute all information and his intention to make his source use clear to the reader. As in the previous extracts, he continued to use more integral than non-integral citation, and a wide range of reporting verbs to create his style of argumentation. In his interview in stage 2, he indicated a change in his thinking about the challenges of source use.

> I think the biggest challenge is to develop my personal knowledge using all the sources and these articles which is very interesting for me. I have to do a lot of reading. (Stage 2, Interview 2, Oliver)

Therefore, he has moved away from thinking that plagiarism was his biggest challenge, and focused instead on developing his knowledge through reading sources. It seems that he was no longer worried about plagiarism.

Stage 3 (Master's Semester 1)

In stage 3, Oliver progressed to his MSc International Business Economics. His assignment PG1 is a research proposal of 2,000 words about Virgin Atlantic business strategy. The extract below comes from a section where he was grounding his study within current research.

Extract O.3

No	Oliver, PG1 Background and Academic Context
1	Kontsas and Mylonakis (2009) argue that there are two main elements affecting
2	this industry which are capacity and prices as they called it 'Competitive market
3	variables'. They also highlight the fact that most companies have to re-direct
4	their business strategy to a strategy of cost elimination. While Aircraft value
5	news (2009) announce, 'Values expected to decline by 15-25% over next two
6	years' which represent a huge loss and show the real difficult position this
7	industry is in. However, Virgin Atlantic is described as one of the most
8	successful British companies and a strong competitor to challenge British
9	airways. Even if, according to Brownsell (2009), British airways and American
10	Airlines tried an alliance in order to be more efficient.

In this extract, Oliver began with an overview of the field, and made further use of frequent integral citation, a range of reporting structures, and one quotation, with many other points paraphrased. His extensive use of integral citation may be connected to his style of argumentation; as an Algerian, he had studied his undergraduate degree in French with some of the French academic conventions and emphasis on creating debate in writing (Plantin, 2002). The quotation in this extract is in fact the title of an article. Using surface parts of source text such as titles, abstracts, introductions and subheadings has been found to be a shortcut for key ideas sometimes used by student writers (Blum, 2009). This approach may come from the strategies for faster reading taught on EAP programmes (Weller, 2010). As discussed with the risk takers, this strategy would result in limited learning about a subject, although it is a time-saving method to gain information. In the case of Oliver, it seems that a small amount of shortcutting did not impact negatively on his overall ability to use sources.

In his interview in stage 3, Oliver commented on his reason for paraphrasing in extract O.3:

> Yeah, here the author is Kontsas (2009) the idea was about the elements affecting the industry, or in this case, the airline industry… Here I've used paraphrasing to, basically use author's view and at the same time give it a kind of a personal direction, so that's why I've used [paraphrasing]. (Stage 3, Interview 3, Oliver)

This comment shows Oliver had a strong sense of the purpose of paraphrasing and how to fit an author's view with his own. This was also shown in his understanding of the purpose of reporting structures:

> I: Do you have any favourite reporting verbs?
> O: 'Discusses'
> I: Why do you like that one?
> O: Because it shows kind of debate within the coming paragraph, it could be between 2 ideas or 2 authors. (Stage 3, Interview 3, I=Interviewer, O=Oliver)

Oliver's explanation about his preference for 'discusses' reflects his approach to evaluate themes in literature from a range of sources and authors, which is clearly appropriate for his academic field of business.

Stage 4 (Master's semester 2)

In stage 4, Oliver wrote his 20,000 word dissertation about the effect of brand and pricing on consumer car purchasing behaviour in times of recession. The following extract from the literature review of the dissertation demonstrates careful attribution.

Extract O.4

No	Oliver, PG2 Literature Review
1	On the other hand, Nunes and Cespedes (2003) point out that consumers are
2	no longer following the five stages developed by Armstrong *et al*. (2009) and by
3	Lancaster and Massingham (1999). Nunes and Cespedes (2003) suggest that
4	consumers are divided into categories which are differentiated by the nature of
5	the products, but also by the way those consumers exploit the information
6	channels that leads to the purchase (For instance; internet). They highlight the
7	fact that 'what makes shopping behaviour new and profoundly challenging is
8	that customers today are no longer marching through those five stages in the
9	context of a single channel. Instead, they are using all the available channels,
10	entering different ones to fulfil their needs at different stages' (*ibid*, p.99).

In this extract, Oliver made use of six citations, all as integral citation, except one use of *ibid* (line 10). There is evidence in this extract of Oliver's ability to contrast and put together sources. He began the extract with a contrasting expression 'on the other hand' (line 1). In lines 2-3, he indicated that two studies were linked, but also that research has moved on. In this way, Oliver demonstrated his good understanding of debates within literature, as he commented in interview 3. In his interview in stage 4, he was clearly confident about his ability to use sources and his definition of plagiarism.

> I: You said this is talking about stealing but in a nice way. Do you think a definition of plagiarism should have the word stealing?
> O: Yeah, I think, especially to make students aware of the importance of plagiarism. (Stage 4, Interview 4, I=Interviewer, O=Oliver)

In this comment, Oliver provided an interesting contribution to academic debates about using criminal terms such as 'stealing' in definitions of plagiarism (see 3.2.5). Finally, he was asked about improvements to his source use:

> I: So what kind of changes have you made?
> O: I mean, especially in the quality of my writing. I mean my writing is not perfect but it is readable I think, and I can bring, and make an interpretation of ideas of people and use it, in my own way, which is really important. So basically I'm learning through my writing and my work
> I: Has there been anything that has particularly changed since starting your Master's, since the beginning of the Master's?
> O: To be honest, everything I've learnt was in my Pre-Master's. When you start your Master's degree, nobody tell[s] you anything about plagiarism. Well we've got one session about this, but it's in the main theatre, and nobody really care[s] about this, so some people are sleeping….Honestly I don't need to improve anymore, because now I have to write my dissertation, I'm kind of fed up of writing, so I'm gonna stop for a while I think. I mean if I take a percentage in satisfaction, I'm 100% satisfied, for myself. (Stage 4, Interview 4, I=Interviewer, O=Oliver)

It is noticeable here that Oliver considered he had not learnt more about sources on his Master's degree, and felt that he had received very little instruction about source use during his Master's. However, he continued to make improvements to his source use through practice, and demonstrated, like Kevin, a high level of confidence in his ability to use sources effectively. He also seemed to indicate that his confidence and competence to a level where he feels 'I don't need to improve anymore' mean that he has reached a saturation point of learning about sources as he said he was 'fed up of

writing'. Thus, one aspect of competence with source use may be that students feel they have no more to learn and in addition, no desire to learn more.

I will now move to the third member of this group, Nick.

7.4 Participant 8: Nick

Like Oliver, Nick was from Algeria. He studied tourism during the 4 stages; his Master's degree was International Tourism Marketing. In the first stage, Nick relied on patchwriting, but at the same time, showed an understanding of argument and research. In stage 2, he manipulated sources effectively and thereafter sustained a high level of source use to the end of the period.

Stage 1 (Pre-Master's Semester 1)

Nick wrote his first assignment, a 600 word case study, about pro-poor tourism (strategies favouring the poor), using South Africa as an example. The extract below shows how he used sections of text copied from sources and linked with some of his own words.

Extract N.1

No	Nick, EAP1 Introduction	Source texts: Harrison, 2008; Chok, Macbeth and Warren, 2007; Ashley and Haysom, 2006; Pro-poor tourism (1999).
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	This essay analyses the approach of 'pro-poor tourism'(PPT) and outlines some different aspects of it, by analyzing some characteristics and advantages of PPT. With a particular focus on Southern Africa study case. The focus on tourism as an alleviator of poverty is not new. Forecasts of high tourism growth in developing nations, where widespread poverty exists, has led to considerable interest in tourism as a tool for poverty alleviation. PPT is an approach to tourism that increases net benefit to the poor Economic benefits are only one component of this, as social, environmental and cultural costs and benefits also need to be taken into account.'(s2)	 The focus on tourism as an alleviator of poverty is not new (Harrison, 2008) Forecasts of high tourism growth in developing nations, where widespread poverty exists , has led to considerable interest in tourism as a tool for poverty alleviation. (Chok, Macbeth and Warren 2007) PPT is an approach to tourism that increases net benefit to the poor (Ashley and Haysom, 2006) Economic benefits are only one component…social, environmental and cultural costs and benefits also need to be taken into account.'(s2) (Propoortourism.org.uk)

Extract N.1 is Nick's introductory paragraph, which he constructed through patchwriting. It is very striking that even for his introduction, in which he should be laying out independently the structure of his work, he chose to rely on copying text from sources. Apart from his first sentence, linked to a sentence fragment (lines 1-7), the entire introduction is copied. Nick copied sentences from four different sources without citation, although there is one set of quotation marks at the end, followed by some sort of symbol in brackets '(s2)' (line 24). Surprisingly, the sentences fit quite logically together, and therefore, while copying may seem to be an action that requires little thought, the logical connections between the sentences from four different sources require some skill and linguistic ability. It is interesting to note that the sentences copied were taken from beginning sections of the sources. The first one

from Harrison is at the start of a section; the second from Chok, Macbeth and Warren is the first sentence of the abstract; the next from Ashley and Haysom is the first sentence of a section called 'Background', and the last is under a question subheading 'What is pro-poor tourism?' In this way, he used shortcuts in reading in the same way as Oliver and seemed to follow a strategy for writing the introduction by looking for and copying general sentences that start off a topic. He may have used this strategy because he believed that this would enable him to write using the discourse of the topic (Hyland, 2004), or because he did not yet know how to write an introduction to this topic himself. As discussed in the literature review, according to Howard (2008), when a writer does not know or understand enough about a topic, they are very likely to patchwrite, because this is all they can do with the reading. However, the fact that Nick's introduction fits logically together does suggest he had a good understanding of what he read. As Howard (1995: 799) suggests, 'Patchwriting can actually help the learner begin to understand the unfamiliar material' as a temporary and transitory phase of learning.

In interview 1, Nick gave definitions of quotations, paraphrase and plagiarism as follows:

> Quotation. I'm not really sure but I think it's like a group of words, it's like sentence phrase which has specific sense in specific context. Paraphrase I think means …one sentence you are going to write it in your own way, without using authors' words or someone's words or the same words. You are going to use your own words or different words from the source… [Plagiarism is] when someone copy something and he doesn't have the right to copy this source. I think that's what plagiarism is, without putting any of the source. (Stage 1, Interview 1, Nick)

Nick showed that he understood the meaning of paraphrasing, and possibly quotations, although his definition was not very clear. He defined plagiarism as copying something 'without the right' and seemed to hold the view that 'putting the source' might give a writer permission to copy; in other words, copying attributed text is acceptable. Similarly, the rights and responsibilities of students and their educational communities were researched by Fountain and Fitzgerald (2008). Examining the problem of plagiarism within the context of religiously affiliated universities in the US, they found a need to address the problem through encouraging students to write about and discuss plagiarism very openly. Thus, Nick may have been trying to clarify his

view of rights in this interview. He also commented on the amount of time needed to put sources into writing:

> Sometimes it takes really a long time … to write them. It takes one hour and a half to write them. You write them really carefully and you have to see which one is a quote. Sometimes you find mistakes and yeah sometimes you confuse. (Stage 1, Interview 1, Nick)

His comments seem to show his concern about the time needed on source use, and may be the reason for some shortcutting strategies. He was also worried about making mistakes and getting confused. Thus, his ability in stage 1 to use sources seems quite limited. His comment about making mistakes that may cause problems with source use or plagiarism is similar to the view given by Oliver at this stage.

Stage 2 (Pre-Master's Semester 2)

In stage 2, Nick produced a 3,000 word research report about the ethics of marketing, in which he displayed a much higher level of source use.

Extract N.2

No.	Nick, EAP2 Literature Review
1	Oliver (2008) also emphasises this point by stating that advertisements create
2	a sense of dissatisfaction among consumers with their possessions so that they
3	will want to buy new products or better ones. He also says that unethical
4	practices are due to slight capitalist tendencies that foster unhappiness and
5	even causes to people to suffer from depression and personality disorder. In
6	addition to that, Mintel (2007) report conducted a survey that demonstrates
7	that 63% among 2052 respondents who are more than 18 years old think
8	companies are concerned about ethical issues, specifically green issues just
9	because they would like to seem credible with their customers.

In this extract, Nick used mostly integral citation which may create a more argumentative style. He began to show his repertoire of reporting structures, which were sophisticated and complex, such as 'emphasises this point by stating' and 'as X states'. These phrases enabled him to draw on his broad linguistic resource to develop the CARS model of a research space created by Swales (1990), as discussed in 3.2.1. This commonly used model in academic writing shows how a new piece of research fits with other known work, and adds to the body of literature. His ability to create this

demonstrates an understanding of research and source use that is considerably greater than in stage 1. The extract contains no CUT or CAT, which also displays considerable development from his assignment in stage 1. In interview 2, he indicated his sense that his source use was improving.

> I think for me the most difficult part is especially when I have to really organise, take notes and compare them, evaluate the sources, and organise my structure, according to what I've found… but when you do that, when you start writing, it will come, yeah. (Stage 2, Interview 2, Nick)

Similarly, the definitions he gave in interview 2 of quotation, paraphrase and plagiarism, demonstrate significant development of knowledge.

> Quotation is when I use the author's own words, use I mean to support my ideas, without changing the words, and I put them between speech marks, and paraphrase, I [want] to use an idea from a source, but I use my own words, I change the author's words into my own words, personal words. Plagiarism, that's when for example, you use someone else's ideas without [acknowledging] them, or without putting the source.. I think there are a lot of ways to plagiarise maybe, I think that's the most common that I know. Or maybe when you use, you rely on the author's idea, and or maybe the author didn't say that exactly but you'd like to, he said what you'd like to say, so maybe you change his words on purpose. But I know we can plagiarise without intention, because I have heard this definition as well, even you do it not on purpose…sometimes it happens. (Stage 2, Interview 2, Nick)

His reflections reveal a more developed understanding of plagiarism; he was aware that plagiarism could happen in various ways and could be unintentional, although he also noted lack of citation was the most common form of plagiarism.

Stage 3 (Master's Semester 1)

Nick began his MSc International Tourism Marketing at this point. His first assignment was a 4,000 word report on tourist consumer behaviour.

Extract N.3

No.	Nick, PG1 Literature Review
1	Other authors including Correia and Pimpao (2008) distinguish between
2	internal motivators that include psychological desire and needs 'push drivers'
3	(knowledge, social and recreational motivations) and external factors 'pull
4	drivers' (core attractions, facilities and landscapes motivations) that are the
5	emotional aspect towards destinations 'attributes. Correia et al. (2007) stress
6	the correlation between intrinsic and extrinsic motives (pull and push factors).
7	They also state that the most relevant motives for tourists to travel to exotic
8	destinations are knowledge and socialization. Empirical study reveals that
9	tourists seeking intellectual or social rewards consider significantly the pull
10	motives, especially facilities and core attractions respectively rather than
11	emphasising on landscapes features.

In this extract, there is evidence of his range of reporting structures again ('distinguish', 'stress', 'reveals'). There is also evidence of a style to engage with sources through integral citation (lines 1 and 5), including knowledge of '*et al.*' for more than 3 authors. Nick did not use any quotations, as he explains in interview 3:

> I: So why did you not use any quotations?
> N: Because…of course I know we can use the appropriate [quotation] if the sentence is strong and definitely we shouldn't overuse them, so I didn't think about them basically, I just automatically paraphrased. (Stage 3, Interview 3, I=Interviewer, N=Nick)

His explanation of why he did not use quotations is notably different to John's in the risk taker group. While John said he avoided quotations because his tutor did not like them, Nick said he just paraphrased automatically, and also explained that he knew when to use quotations and how much to use them. Thus, he seems to have developed knowledge and understanding of quotations and paraphrasing.

He also reflected on his decisions about reporting structures.

> I: Do you have any favourite reporting verbs?
> N: I think now actually I'm trying to… maybe I used like 'state' or 'points out'…, but I'm trying to use as many as possible
> I: OK, why?
> N: Always like to not repeat yourself, or I know of course there are subtle meanings between them. (Stage 3, Interview 3, I=Interviewer, N=Nick)

Again, he alluded to his knowledge, in this case about the different meanings of reporting verbs. His assertion that he is 'trying to use as many as possible' seems to coincide with his practice at this stage and in stage 4.

One very important reflection in stage 3 is about plagiarism:

> I: At that time did you feel confident about avoiding plagiarism?
> N: At that time? Actually, if I maybe really focus on every single detail, I would make sure of that…you feel quite confident, even 99%. But you never know, if you miss a point or maybe you...
> I: When you say you never know, you mean there is always a risk?
> N: Yeah, even sometimes you think there is no risk at all, and you make sure that everything is OK, but…maybe it's your thoughts, maybe it's not your main idea, maybe it's not your own way to write, or things like that, especially that one, maybe if someone thinks it's not your own way to write, this criteria for example you can't control it exactly. (Stage 3, Interview 3, I=Interviewer, N=Nick)

Like Kevin and Oliver, Nick employed a range of features of source use, and demonstrated a high level of confidence in his ability to avoid plagiarism ('99%') but some doubts remained for him. His last comment indicates his view of the risk of plagiarism, especially when 'someone thinks it's not your own way to write'. Thus, he highlights one of the key issues in any evaluation of text, especially concerning plagiarism, that decisions lie in the hands of the reader, rather than the writer. His view concurs with Pecorari's (2008) argument (discussed in 3.2.5) that the tutor-reader controls the interpretation of student writing.

Stage 4 (Master's semester 2)

Nick's final assignment was his 20,000 word dissertation on trust building as an anti-terrorism strategy for international hotels in Muslim countries. The following extract comes from his literature review.

Extract N.4.1

No.	Nick, PG2 Literature Review
1	According to Cetron (2004), guests in general, especially foreign should be
2	identified before checking in comprehensively and employees in hotels ought
3	to be aware of some unusual behaviour among guests including paying in cash
4	or requesting about other nationalities when it is inappropriate. NaCTO (2010)
5	endorses the important role of reconnaissance and provides some examples
6	comprising of suspicious customers who might take photos of some sensitive
7	places in the hotel or guests having maps and sophisticated camera
8	equipments as well as asking peculiar questions related to security measures
9	and so on. Paraskevas and Arendall (2007) also argue that technology and
10	communication can play a crucial role in the field of detection; however it
11	should be discreet and disguised to customers. Furthermore, they state that
12	terrorists' behaviour cannot be ordinary even if they can dissimulate it and
13	pretend to be natural.

He seemed to be continuing the same strategies with integral citation and reporting structures in this extract. He attributed each point clearly, and used a range of reporting structures, including the less common verb 'endorses' (line 5). At this point, Nick showed greater confidence and less concern about the possible risk of plagiarism in his interview.

> N: Well, now I think I know when I write something, I know it's completely paraphrased so I'm not really concerned, so I know the reader is not going to say, it's my idea [or] the text, it's not gonna be the same at all, it's gonna be completely different, so now maybe my confidence with respect to the subject, it's more. Maybe another form, maybe if you forget something, if you are paraphrasing and putting the word the same. I am not worried about this aspect of plagiarism
> I: Is there any other aspect of plagiarism that might still worry you?
> N: Well maybe I don't know, if you don't put the author, or maybe you make a mistake, instead of putting one author you put another one, or something like that. (Stage 4, Interview 4, I=Interviewer, N=Nick)

The following extract, also from the literature review, demonstrates more of his source use skills.

Extract N.4.2

No.	Nick, PG2 Literature Review
1	Holcomb *et al*. (2007) argue that hotels do not display a specific framework of
2	their relationships with communities. Trustworthy relationship with local
3	community is of crucial importance, Child (2001) reports that a high level of
4	trust reduces cultural disparity and enhances mutual understanding and
5	solidarity among different actors to deal with unfamiliar circumstances.
6	Furthermore, trust has a positive correlation with ensuring a safe environment
7	since Luria (2010) concludes that having a trustworthy social relationship with
8	leaders improve the security performance of followers or subordinates with
9	regard to their duties in particular. This means, even employees and other
10	actors can cooperate effectively to mitigate the terrorist risks.

Extract N.4.2 reflects Nick's greater ease with sources, as he was able to put citation at relevant points, including mid-sentence (lines 3 and 7) and use a further range of reporting structures. He linked his information coherently through connectives such as 'furthermore' (line 6) and demonstrated his interpretation in 'this means…' (line 9). At this stage, Nick also gave his view that students should be able to manage source use appropriately on their own.

> Well [in] the second semester, we are expected to do these things more properly, to use the guidelines much more properly. They are not going to tell you how again. Basically I mean, you are supposed to know. (Stage 4, Interview 4, Nick)

Nick, like Oliver, felt that he was not given much support about source use, but his main concerns related to plagiarism seem to be fewer than in the earlier stages, and he had a great deal more confidence.

7.5 Discussion

Five themes emerged from the source use displayed by this group: confidence, range of language, range of features and knowledge of citation, attention to rules to avoid plagiarism and critical engagement.

7.5.1 Confidence

Kevin, Oliver and Nick all declared that they were confident about using sources in interview 4. Kevin said he knew how to paraphrase and use citations, so he was 'not afraid of being criticised of plagiarism' and felt 'quite confident'. Oliver said his writing was 'not perfect but it is readable', he felt he did not need to improve anymore and was '100% satisfied, for myself'. Nick said 'when I write something, I know it's completely paraphrased so I'm not really concerned', so he was not afraid of accusations of plagiarism. All of these affirmations of confidence in their ability indicate that the three students evaluated themselves highly. These assertions contrast sharply with the concerns expressed by the risk takers and safe players reviewed in the previous two chapters. It is notable that all three competent users connect their confidence to how the reader will respond to their work; in other words, they confidently expect their readers to find their source use acceptable and without plagiarism.

In stages 1 and 2, the competent user group had worries about making mistakes, but they all progressed and became confident in stages 3 and 4. Many studies have found that a lack of confidence in students' ability to paraphrase or use sources contributes to a low level of skills (Ivanič, 1998; Pecorari, 2003; Sutherland-Smith, 2008). Growing confidence in source use ability seems likely to impact on ability, as was the case of the research participant in Spack's (1997) study, who became more confident of her source use with greater practice and understanding that she needed to see source use as a means of constructing knowledge. This was expressed by Oliver in stage 2, when he realised constructing knowledge was his main challenge, rather than avoiding plagiarism. This finding about confidence endorses Pecorari's view (2013: 136) that 'a good academic writer is a confident, authoritative one'. It is clear that all the members of this group had confidence, expressed in a strong authorial voice.

7.5.2 Range of language

All three participants used a wide range of language with their source use. They used a large number of reporting structures, especially evaluative reporting verbs. They also appeared to paraphrase effectively; while I acknowledge that I cannot find definite

proof of effective paraphrasing, I did not find any examples of text matches through *Turnitin* or *Google* in their assignments. They had confidence in their ability to paraphrase. As confirmed in findings by Schmitt and Schmitt (2012) and Nation (2006), a large linguistic range helps students to read and write effectively, without copying. While Keck's (2006) study of paraphrasing gave some evidence that some non-native speakers are less likely to paraphrase well, compared to native speakers, it is clear that higher level non-native speakers are still well equipped to do so.

An ability to paraphrase effectively is essential to avoid plagiarism, particularly since most attention to plagiarism is focused on words. As discussed in 3.2.2, Angélil-Carter (2000) found that markers are lenient if ideas are copied, but are angered by word-for-word copying. Elsewhere (Davis, 2013) I have argued that the widespread use of text-matching tools can encourage tutors to concentrate on words as the main form of plagiarism, rather than ideas. Therefore, it has become increasingly important for non-native speaker students to have a wide range of vocabulary to enable them to paraphrase effectively and avoid copying.

The range of language that a student possesses needs to suit their discipline. As reported with the safe players, more evaluative reporting verbs are important for social sciences (Ridley, 2008). As all of the students in this group were studying social sciences, it is important for their competence in language that they were able to use many evaluative reporting verbs.

In terms of competence in their range of language, it is useful to draw a link to the IELTS band 6.0 score which defines a 'competent user' as one who:

> has generally effective command of the language despite some inaccuracies, inappropriacies and misunderstandings. Can use and understand fairly complex language, particularly in familiar situations. (IELTS, 2014)

Although these students would have had the equivalent of a slightly higher band score than this at the end of their Master's (6.5-7.0), it is important to note that according to the relevant language assessment of IELTS, a competent user is well below an expert user. In the same way with source use at this level, I interpret 'competent' to mean possessing the ability to do something effectively, but for some inappropriate elements still to be present.

7.5.3 Range of features and knowledge of citation

All participants also employed a range of features of source use. They used different forms of citation, and skilfully linked ideas and evidence from sources in ways that make sense to the reader. They were able to synthesise sources and engage in debate. Similarly, Jamieson (2008: 82) argues that there needs to be a 'broad interaction with sources' to be competent in source use. In other words, it is not enough just to use sources in a few repetitive ways; competence includes a range of uses of integral and non-integral citation, such as signposting and justifying arguments. As discussed in the literature review, Harwood's (2009) study of the functions of citation used by experts suggests that there could be up to eleven different functions. The students in this group used many of these, such as showing their position, building an idea and aligning themselves to research. Using a greater range of citation functions is consistent with higher ability. In the same way as the Master's students in Petrić's (2007) research who achieved a higher grade in their degree, the competent users employed citation for evaluation and synthesis.

Oliver, Kevin and Nick demonstrated an in-depth knowledge of citation use. For example, they indicated their familiarity with formatting conventions such as use of ellipsis (K.3.1), use of *ibid* (O.4), use of synthesised lists of citation (K.2). They were also familiar with the use of secondary citation (O.2.1) and made it clear where all source information originated from. Each of these participants had some lack of clarity or problems with citation in stage 1, especially Nick (see N.1), but after that, each one cited very clearly. It seems likely that they developed their knowledge very quickly because they started at a more advanced point.

7.5.4 Attention to rules to avoid plagiarism

Like the safe players, the competent users paid careful attention to academic conventions in order to avoid plagiarism. Kevin left nothing to chance and cited absolutely every point, and even included page numbers with paraphrased information. In the final stage, Nick said he was 'not worried' about plagiarism rules and Oliver stated that he did not need to improve any more. Their attention to these rules contrasted with their earlier practice and knowledge in stage 1. They each

mentioned the potential for making mistakes, which they considered normal, while they were learning. It is clear from Nick's extract (N.1) in stage 1, that he did make mistakes with plagiarism, but learnt quickly how he needed to avoid it. Many studies have examined the problems of inadvertent plagiarism when students have not yet gained the skills or had enough practice (Chanock, 2008; Davis, 2007; Pecorari, 2008; Pecorari, 2013). These studies indicate that students need time to get it wrong before getting it right. The three students in this group seem to have had that opportunity, and then were able to follow the rules effectively by stage 4.

Nevertheless, Nick contended that however careful a writer was to avoid plagiarism, there may still be a risk 'if someone thinks it's not your own way to write, this criteria for example you can't control it exactly' (Interview 3). Therefore, while all the competent users followed the rules carefully, they could not eliminate the risk that an expert reader might decide that their work was not their own and accuse them of plagiarism. Some attention has been paid to this in the literature (discussed in 3.2.5). For example, Cook (1989: 50) argues that 'there are times when readers do have rights to affect written discourse'. When the reader is a tutor, they can affect student written work in their decisions about plagiarism. As Pecorari (2008) explains, there may be a lack of agreement between the student writer and tutor-reader about whether the source use is appropriate or plagiarised. Sutherland-Smith (2008) also highlights the 'tutor-readers' who control the interpretation of student text. This position of power on the reader's side is a key concept in plagiarism. There is evidently an imbalance of knowledge between the expert reader (tutor of academic writing or subject specialism), and the novice writer (student, not yet familiar with UK higher education academic conventions). Even though there was no evidence of plagiarism found in their extracts in the later stages, at least one of the group still had a concern about not being able to control what a reader thought of their work.

7.5.5 Critical engagement with sources

As outlined in the literature review (3.3.5), a framework of competence through an authorial voice in academic writing includes 'selecting and reporting evidence (sources or data) critically' (Argent and Alexander, 2013: 197). The definition of criticality is further expanded by Ridley (2008: 119) as including some evaluation 'agreeing with,

confirming or defending a finding or point of view through an analysis of its merits and limitations' and construction of knowledge 'synthesizing and reformulating arguments from two or more sources to create a new or more developed point of view' to contribute to the literature. This evaluation and critical review is a requirement of their Master's programmes and an expectation their tutors have: 'we want them to critically evaluate what they find' (Davis, 2012a: 25). The competent users all displayed a facility with argumentation and critical review and thus could be said to be fulfilling this requirement. The skills for demonstrating criticality in writing are also very closely connected to a critical approach to reading. Nunan (1992: 217) defines what a writer does in a literature review as: 'extracts and synthesizes the main points, issues, findings and research methods which emerge from a critical review of the readings'. The competent users demonstrated their ability to read critically in their synthesis of source use and in their evaluative comments in their writing.

The style of argumentation demonstrated by this group is different to the safe players and risk takers. The competent users displayed far more individual arguments which they supported from the literature with many instances of evaluation in every extract from stage 2 (see Appendix 6d). The style of argumentation may be partly influenced by culture and academic background in the case of the Algerian students, Oliver and Nick. This is because in Algeria, they studied in both French and Arabic, and to some extent, followed the French academic writing style which focuses on personal argumentation (Plantin, 2002). However, Kevin, as a Chinese student, did not have this background, yet was also able to use personal arguments. As found by Hall and Sung (2009), Chinese postgraduate students are likely to come from diverse academic backgrounds, and therefore we cannot generalise about their competence or experience. In the case of Kevin, it is clear he had been used to creating individual arguments with source use before starting his programme in the UK. According to Hyland (2004), the style of argumentation used by the competent users is also suited to disciplines in the 'soft' sciences, as they rely on debate and not hard facts. So, it is evident that the competent users incorporated sources in an appropriate way for their disciplines.

In the way that the competent users used sources, greater engagement can be seen with the debates in research. All three in this group tended to use more integral citation to compare and contrast different authors' views and evaluate their studies. They used a wide range of reporting structures with this integral citation. This approach contrasts with that of the safe players who tended to rely on non-integral citation and to report from studies, rather than engage and debate with them. The engagement with sources also fits with the current emphasis by universities on graduate attributes which include competence in source use. The engagement with sources shown by these competent users also reflects some studies of how students construct knowledge. For example, the participant in the research by Spack (1997) constructs knowledge from her use of sources to make it original and Sutherland-Smith (2008: 146) states that 'students' construction of meaning is when learning takes place'. Furthermore, a student respondent in Blum's US-based research explains 'You have to be unique in…something you say – at least the way you tie everyone else's stuff together' (Blum, 2009: 54). The competent users have understood this need to be unique and demonstrate it in the way they make use of sources.

7.6 Summary

This chapter has analysed the source use strategies of Kevin, Oliver and Nick, and discussed the ways in which their ability to use sources reached a competent level. In stage 1 and to some extent, 2, they each had some problems with source use, such as using occluded features of citation, patchwriting, copying attributed text (CAT) or using a limited range, and thus had some similarities with the previous two groups of risk takers and safe players. However, from stage 2 onwards and throughout stages 3 and 4 on their Master's degrees, the students in this group demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of plagiarism and how to avoid it, and used a wide range of features of source use. They displayed confidence in their understanding and they employed a wide range of language in their source use, and approached citation attentively and flexibly. They also revealed a deep engagement with sources through their critical evaluation and arguments. In these ways, this group demonstrated that they were competent users of sources. As highlighted with the comparison to the IELTS 'competent user', my evaluation of these students as competent does not mean they

should be compared to the expert scholar. I will build on the evidence from the competent users to define descriptors of competence in the next chapter.

Chapter 8: Descriptors of competence in source use and implications for practice

8.1 Introduction

The last three chapters have provided an analysis of data from eight participants as they developed their use of sources over a two year period. The first two groups, risk takers and safe players, experienced problems and limitations in their source use, while the final group, the competent users, reached a level in which they displayed good skills in source use, without noticeable problems or limitations. Therefore, from the analysis of the competent users (Kevin from China, Nick and Oliver from Algeria), this chapter aims to theorise competence in source use by creating a framework of descriptors for the key features of source use which emerged. I have chosen to call them descriptors, based on definitions widely used in frameworks of competence in EAP, such as BALEAP *Can Do* statements (BALEAP, 2013) and IELTS bands (IELTS, 2014).

I will draw on the assignment and interview data of the competent users to establish what constitutes competence in source use in greater detail, building on and comparing the data to what has been found in previous studies. Based on the literature review and my analysis of the data from the competent users, I found five main features of source use:

- citation

- paraphrasing

- reporting verbs

- critical engagement

- avoidance of plagiarism.

I will examine and define these features, through descriptors of competence in source use, with evidence for each descriptor emerging from this study. Each feature will be discussed in terms of use, through the perspective of students as users of sources. In this way, I aim to contribute to the definition and understanding of competence in source use, particularly in terms of accuracy, range and understanding of the features.

While I acknowledge a certain overlap of the features, I will show each separately in order to highlight the main descriptors of competence for each. With each feature, I will then discuss the existing definitions of competence in source use and how this study builds on them.

The second part of this chapter will set out the implications for practice which have emerged from this study. These will be based on the analysis of the main findings in the last three chapters and will inform the teaching and learning context of source use. The implications will be for three overlapping areas of HE pedagogy and practice: EAP teaching, postgraduate teaching and university policy making.

8.2 Descriptors of competence in source use

I will set out the descriptors for each of the five features of source use separately below: citation, paraphrasing, reporting verbs, critical engagement and avoidance of plagiarism. The descriptors will be discussed using the study findings (by referring to assignment and interview numbers, and further analysis in Appendix 6) and by comparing them to other research.

8.2.1 Citation

The first feature to be examined is citation. I will use three descriptors to theorise what is meant by competence in citation: accuracy, range and understanding.

Firstly, to be competent at using citation, it is necessary to format all citations accurately. In the extracts from stage 2 onwards, all competent users used citation accurately by following the details of the conventions of Southern University's referencing system (in this case, Harvard), as can be seen in Appendix 6a. The competent users followed the referencing system correctly in the following ways: using a surname and year and using page numbers for quotations (K.3.1); using both surnames for studies by two authors (N.4.1); using first author and *et al.* for references with three or more authors (N.3); using *ibid* for repeat citation (O.4); using secondary citation for one reference within another to avoid any occluded references (O.2.1); and using a bracketed list of authors separated by colons to show multiple studies on a theme or agreement (K.2). As Kevin stated in interview 2, 'I will clarify my resource

clearly' (by resource, I assume he means source), and in the extract K.4 from his dissertation, it is clear that he was formatting citation precisely with names, years, page numbers and use of *ibid*.

In this way, the competent users followed the referencing system exactly and demonstrated that they have absorbed all the specific rules, following guides available during their study, such as Williams and Carroll (2009) and Pears and Shields (2008), and the library referencing guide (Southern University, 2008a). This is expected in the learning outcomes on the students' Pre-Master's programme, for example 'Appropriately cite secondary sources' is a learning outcome in semester 1 for an academic writing module (Southern University, 2008b). It is also expected by Master's tutors at Southern University, as I reported elsewhere:

> We expect them to use the Harvard referencing system pretty much perfectly, so we pretty much expect that the moment they submit their first proper assessed bit of coursework that they can use the referencing system correctly, that means the whole shebang, so if they have made quotes, that they are in quotation marks with page numbers, that references at the end are properly formatted. (Davis (2012: 25)

The tutors' comments here indicate that it is taken for granted that postgraduate students can use 'the whole shebang' of the referencing system completely accurately.

The second descriptor for citation emerging from the data is the ability to use a range of citation methods and functions. The range of methods covers six areas: using integral/non-integral citation equally flexibly, though using more integral citation (see K.3.1); using indented longer quotations as a block (K.3.1); using citations for journal, book and web sources (N.4); showing skill in using different kinds of prominence with citation, for example through using integral citation with more controversial arguments (O.3); using non-integral citation when agreeing with the author (O.2.1); and using different types of citation for author prominent, date prominent or research study prominent source use (K.4). Overall, the competent users made more use of integral rather than non-integral citation, with the proportion of integral citations in the extracts for Kevin, Oliver and Nick at 65%, 79% and 100% respectively (see Appendix 6a).

In their Master's dissertations, the competent users supported all their main points with citation, using a range of different functions. This is similar to the students with

higher graded dissertations in the study by Petrić (2007), who used citation for a wide range of functions, such as linking between sources and evaluation. Hyland (2004: 22) argues that 'citation choices carry different rhetorical and social meanings'. The competent users chose a range of citation for different purposes. Other research has focused on defining types of citation, such as distinguishing between integral/non-integral uses (Swales, 1990; Swales and Feak, 2004; Thompson, 2001). From this study, competence in citation can be seen in the range of micro-skills demonstrated by the competent users.

The competent users in this study used a large amount of citation, possibly to the point of over-citation, especially in the case of Kevin (see K.3.1). In her continuum of development in citation, Schmitt (2005) asserts that students may employ over-citation before using the appropriate amount of citation; therefore, in her view, it is an interim, middle stage of development. This seems to be the case with the safe players, who used a great deal of citation but with a limited range and limited functions. However, I suggest that citing a great deal did not seem to weaken Kevin's source use and agree with Swales' (2014: 135) conclusion that a writer who uses a 'nods all round to previous researchers' approach could still be a competent writer.

The third descriptor for the feature of citation is understanding. This understanding is of the differences in citation methods for different functions, such as exemplification, counter-argument and synthesis, as found by Harwood (2009), who studied academics' use of citation. The competent users also understood about integrating citation into the flow of the text, including through the linking of ideas through cohesive devices such as 'furthermore' to expand on a point they raised with the previous citation. Their understanding is shown both in their use of sources (see extracts K.4, O.4, N.4.1 and N.4.2) and in their comments on their source use. For example, Kevin explained in interview 3 'when I need arguments that support my point of view or explain my point of view, then I will use quotations'; in this comment, he made it clear that he had an understanding about different kinds of citation. The finding that it is important for students to understand that citations are not a surface feature, but are integral to building arguments was previously demonstrated by McCulloch (2012) in her study of Japanese postgraduate students, and Petrić (2007) with postgraduate students from

Central Europe. The understanding of how to use citation is also connected to paraphrasing source text, which will be reviewed in the next section.

8.2.2 Paraphrasing

The descriptors of competence in paraphrasing incorporate the accuracy of conveying the author's message and understanding of the purpose of paraphrasing, but rather than range, the other important factor is the extent of revision (Keck, 2006).

The accuracy of a paraphrase in conveying the author's message can be assessed by comparing the student's text to an original text. However, a comparison of all of the extracts from the students' assignments to original texts was not possible as each student wrote different assignments using different, usually multiple texts. Therefore, to analyse and compare accuracy in their attempts, I draw on the interview data from stage 2 (see Appendix 6b.1) where the participants were asked to paraphrase a short text. Each one of the competent users accurately conveys the author's main message.

The second descriptor of paraphrasing is extensive revision of the original. Like the reporting structures, the ability to do this is connected with the source users' lexical and phraseological resource, in this context, both of general academic English and of discipline-specific lexis. In interview 4, Nick said 'I know when I write something, I know it's completely paraphrased so I am not really concerned'; thus, in his words, 'completely paraphrased' equals competent. By 'completely', I consider that he meant the 'substantial revision' of lexis and syntax proposed by Keck (2006) in which there are no unique links to the original text. As discussed in the literature review, Keck suggests there are three other levels of revision in attempted paraphrases: near copy, minimal revision and moderate revision, and found that some non-native speakers tend to revise less than native speakers. I suggested in the literature review that a moderate revision (containing 1-19% of unique links) would be acceptable at Master's level, based on the view that it would be unlikely to be matched on *Turnitin* and that creating a substantial revision might be very time-consuming and unnecessary. Therefore, I have included both 'moderate revisions' and 'substantial revisions' in the acceptable category (see Appendix 6b.2). Following the categories of Keck (2006), the attempts to paraphrase in interview 2 by Kevin, Oliver and Nick (referred to above

related to accuracy, see Appendix 6b.1) can be categorised into moderate, substantial and minimal respectively. This means Kevin's and Oliver's are acceptable; in particular, Oliver's contains no unique links to the original text, only general links to key terms such as 'economists'. However, Nick's attempt is a minimal revision, showing more reliance on one section of the source text in this example.

In their assignment extracts, all competent users seemed to make substantial revisions from stage 2. Although Nick began stage 1 and the interview in stage 2 with source use that can be categorised as exact copy and minimal revision, he progressed soon after to the level of the others in his assignments. For the extracts of each competent user in stages 2, 3, and 4, unique links to source text could not be found via *Turnitin* or *Google*. Furthermore, the competent users were confident of their ability to paraphrase, for example, Kevin stated in interview 4 'I know how to paraphrase'. The comments seem to match the data, in that extracts from the competent users after stage 1 appear to be paraphrased effectively. This result contrasts greatly with the risk takers, whose extracts can mainly be categorised as exact copy or near copy, including at stage 4 (see Appendix 6b.2).

Other studies have tended to focus on students' problems with paraphrasing and analysed where they have not paraphrased sufficiently; for example, Pecorari (2003) compares the original text and student text side by side, and shows the similarity between them. Comparing student text and original published text on a *Turnitin* originality report is an easy and convenient means of showing inadequate paraphrasing (Davis, 2007). Therefore, I have employed this where possible in my analysis of extracts, especially with the exact copy, near copy and minimal revision examples, which mostly occurred among the risk taking group. However, with paraphrases that are more extensive, and where many texts are drawn upon and synthesised, it is not possible to compare the paraphrase to the original. Therefore, I have to assume the extent of paraphrasing among the competent users from the absence of evidence to the contrary, rather than clearly demonstrate it.

The third descriptor is understanding the purpose of paraphrasing. This was shown by the competent users, when they reflected on their source use in interview 3. Kevin said 'I understand their point of view, and I can explain in my own words so I use

paraphrasing', and Oliver stated 'Here I've used paraphrasing to, basically use author's view and at the same time give it a kind of a personal direction, so that's why I've used [paraphrasing]'. Thus, the competent users gave their view that they paraphrased when they could explain the text and understand it, and use the source in their own way. By drawing on sources to support and build knowledge in their own way, they seemed to have achieved what Hirvela and Du (2013) called 'knowledge transforming' in their method of paraphrasing, rather than only 'knowledge telling'. Oliver demonstrated this in his paraphrase (see Appendix 6b.1) by giving the author's view and then saying 'this is the reason'. Competence in paraphrasing clearly requires an extensive resource of academic language (Pecorari, 2002). This linguistic resource is also essential for the use of reporting verbs, which will be the focus of the next section.

8.2.3 Reporting verbs

The descriptors for competence in reporting verbs are similar to citations: using them accurately, with a range, and understanding. In this case, using reporting verbs accurately is related to understanding their meaning. For example, Nick approached reporting verbs with the understanding that he also needed the knowledge to use them accurately, as he realised that 'there are subtle meanings between them' (Interview 3). Similarly, Oliver showed his preference for 'discusses', because he said he thought it reflected debate in the literature (Interview 3). Thus, competence involves knowing and understanding the meaning of reporting verbs, which enables students to use them accurately. This finding fits with a descriptor of competence for authorial voice from Argent and Alexander (2013: 197), 'Integrating the evidence into your argument, with the appropriate signals'; these signals include the accurate use of reporting verbs.

The range of reporting verbs is important for competence, and seems to reflect the general language resource of the writer. Thompson and Ye (1991) highlighted the difficulties experienced by non-native speakers in using reporting verbs. In their research, they found over 400 different verbs in 100 journal articles, and analysed the layers of reporting in writer (the person writing a new text) and author (the person cited by the author) acts. They show how the writer's choice of reporting verbs can reflect different levels of commitment to information, and the importance of

193

developing teaching material because of the 'complex ways in which evaluation runs through often extensive stretches of text' (Thompson and Ye, 1991: 371).

The competent users utilised a large variety of different reporting verbs in their texts, and tended to use verbs such as 'argues', 'claims' and 'advocates'. For example, Nick commented in interview 3 that it is important to use a range of reporting verbs: 'I'm trying to use as many as possible…always like to not repeat yourself'. In stage four, they used the following reporting structures: 'extended the argument', 'advocated', 'suggested' 'argued' (extract K.4); 'point out', 'suggest', 'highlight' (extract O.4); 'according to' 'endorses' 'argues' 'state', 'reports', 'concludes' (extracts N.4.1 and N.4.2). All employed reporting verbs that I identify as less frequently used, such as 'advocated', 'highlight' and 'endorses'. None repeat the same verb consecutively and all use a wide range of evaluative and non-evaluative reporting verbs, flexibly and appropriately. In Appendix 6c, I have set out the reporting verbs used by all participants in the extracts. As can be seen, the competent users employed a far greater number of different reporting verbs (between 12-13 different verbs in the 5-6 extracts) compared to the other two groups (between 1-7 different verbs in the 5-6 extracts, average total 5). Of the two types of verbs, they tended to prefer evaluative verbs which are more sophisticated and support argumentation and debate about the literature, and enabled them to develop their own research space. Hyland (2004) argues that students of social sciences, such as the competent users, need to use evaluative reporting verbs both to represent their discursive discipline and to signal their position. Clearly, the competent users were able to do this effectively. The ability to understand and use a range of reporting verbs also connects to their ability to critically engage with sources, which I now turn to in the next section.

8.2.4 Critical engagement

Critical engagement can be broken down into two descriptors: incorporating evaluation of sources and showing one's own stance on a subject with confidence. Evaluation of sources can be seen where writers comment on evidence from sources by discussing what it means and giving their view of it; it may be seen in the use of evaluative reporting verbs and ways of presenting citation. Showing one's stance can be seen where writers indicate who they agree or disagree with and what their overall

view is on an issue. Based on these descriptors, I have set out the instances of evaluation and evidence of stance for each extract in Appendix 6d. I calculated these instances by examining citations, use of evaluative reporting verbs and the presence of an authorial voice, following Ridley's (2008) assessment of critical writing strategies and Hyland's (2009) examination of stance.

It is clear that the competent users employ far more evaluation and evidence of stance in their extracts than the other groups, as both are present in almost every extract. In stages 2, 3 and 4, they make their interpretation of what different authors think very clear. For example, in O.3, Oliver demonstrated his critical engagement by interpreting evidence from a source, 'Aircraft value news', and contrasting this evidence with his informed view from other studies. He used a quotation from the source, showed what it means and his interpretation of its implication, and then contrasted it with a different view. This example also reflects his ability to synthesize sources, and to compare and contrast authors' views. Similarly, in extract N.3, Nick set out his position by contrasting different studies, 'other studies… distinguish' and then moved to his position supported by evidence 'empirical study reveals…' This makes his own stance evident, in relation to other studies, and shows his use of sources to support his own argument. Competent users also understand the importance of critical engagement, demonstrated by Oliver above in the reporting verbs section, when he explained that he liked to use 'discusses' to reflect his understanding of debates in the literature.

The currently available descriptors of critical engagement within EAP and postgraduate education focus on critical actions and use of voice. The BALEAP (2013) *Can Do* framework suggests that when using sources, students need to 'adopt [a] critical stance towards source materials'. Similarly, Argent and Alexander (2013: 197) set out one criterion for having a clear authorial voice: 'Selecting and reporting evidence (sources or data) critically'. However, it is important to build on these descriptors to establish what competence in criticality means.

Regarding building knowledge and understanding source use for their own purposes, in interview 4, Oliver explained how he used sources in an individual way for his own learning: '**I can bring, and make an interpretation of ideas of people and use it, in my

own way, which is really important. So basically I'm learning through my writing and my work'. This comment and his source use in O.4 indicate that he can 'develop and establish [his] own individual voice' (BALEAP, 2013). Oliver's ability to use his own voice contrasts with the problems of some of the non-native speaker students in McCulloch's (2012) study, who had a weak voice, and lacked evaluation, which made their source use ineffective. Pittam *et al.* (2009) and Hyland (2006) argue that it is very difficult for students to establish their authorial identity in their use of voice; however, the competent users appear to have overcome this barrier. Elsewhere I have discussed postgraduate tutors' expectations for students to use their voice:

> We want them to…debate issues, and as they progress through the programme, to increase that ability to debate, so that when they get to something like the dissertation, they are comfortable with the issue of debating, especially in the literature review, so within that debating, we will be comparing, contrasting different perspectives that writers will have in relation to a theory, a model, about how an organisation has been successful or perhaps why an organisation has failed. Not everyone may agree on those things. So linked also into that is the ability to synthesise information from that pool of resources that they've looked at. …We say 'we want you to think independently, we want you to challenge the theories, the models, the concepts'. (Davis, 2012a: 25)

The competent users have matched this expectation.

As further evidence of their ability to use their voice, competent users were able to discuss and use the meta-discourse associated with source use in words such as 'interpretation', 'plagiarism', 'paraphrase' quite easily and to reflect on why they used citation, paraphrasing or quotations in their own work (as in interview 3). The competent users were also able to explain why they used a range of reporting verbs, why they needed to be original, and what steps were required to avoid plagiarism. They felt their source use was good enough and were confident using sources, and therefore did not feel the need for further instruction or support with source use. As Oliver said in interview 4, 'Honestly I don't need to improve anymore, because now I have to write my dissertation, I'm kind of fed up of writing, so I'm gonna stop for a while I think. I mean if I take a percentage in satisfaction, I'm 100% satisfied, for myself'. Similarly, Kevin said in interview 3, 'I can use the sources as I want now'. Nick made the additional point in interview 4 that knowledge was expected, and students could not have any more instruction 'the second semester, we are expected to do these things more properly, to use the guidelines much more properly. They are not

going to tell you how again'. Thus, all three competent users demonstrate that they have reached a self-assessed proficient level for their purposes at Master's level.

8.2.5 Avoidance of plagiarism

The feature of avoidance of plagiarism breaks down into three descriptors: accuracy of attribution in terms of making the source of ideas and words clear and appropriate, avoidance of inappropriate copying of words or ideas, and understanding the need to attribute to avoid plagiarism. This means signalling words and ideas from other sources through appropriate citation, including distinguishing between quotations and paraphrased text. The competent users were very careful to attribute words and ideas, as can be seen in the extracts, especially at stages 3 and 4. They avoided inappropriate source use in the form of both Copying Unattributed Text (CUT) which is usually considered the most evident form of plagiarism (Carroll, 2007), and Copying Attributed Text (CAT) where words are attributed as paraphrased text, but are in fact copied and should be shown as a quotation. In this way, the competent users have mastered the university practices of attribution, in contrast to many students in Chanock's (2008) study of attribution problems. Furthermore, avoidance of plagiarism also means avoiding 'sloppy referencing' where citation is forgotten. In interview 4, Nick said he was 'not worried' about plagiarism; Oliver said 'I don't need to improve any more'; and Kevin explained 'I know how to paraphrase them and how to give clear citations, so I'm not afraid of being criticised of plagiarism'. These claims appear to be substantiated in the written extracts at stage 4, which were not found to contain plagiarism (see K.4, O.4, N.4.1 and N.4.2, and Appendix 6b.2).

All the competent users understood they had to attribute clearly and correctly to avoid plagiarism; as Nick said about attribution in interview 4: 'you are supposed to know'. The BALEAP (2013) *Can Do* descriptor concisely states 'Avoid plagiarism'; however, I argue that the descriptor of avoiding plagiarism needs to include understanding how and why. This understanding helps the competent users to avoid risk and have confidence in their writing. As Williams and Carroll (2009: 2) encourage students in their referencing guide, 'When you really understand how to draw on other people's ideas and words, then the problem of plagiarism just disappears'. In my view, understanding a definition is not enough on its own to avoid plagiarism, but the in-

depth understanding that Williams and Carroll allude to, combined with accuracy in attribution, could lead to competence. The competent users seem to demonstrate sufficient knowledge and understanding to avoid plagiarism.

All the competent users were able to discuss their own source use reflectively in detail and with sophistication, which shows they had a good understanding of the features of source use. For example, as reported in chapter 7, Nick showed that he understood the need to control any risk of plagiarism, but that he was unable to control the risk that the reader may interpret his work as plagiarism:

> Sometimes you think there is no risk at all, and you make sure that everything is OK, but… maybe it's not your own way to write, or things like that, especially that one, maybe if someone thinks it's not your own way to write, this criteria for example you can't control it exactly. (Stage 3, Interview 3, Nick).

In these comments, Nick was able to go beyond a simple definition of plagiarism, by discussing some of the more complex concerns that may arise within plagiarism. He understood that even when the writer checks everything, there may be a risk that the expert reader interprets the writer's source use as plagiarism. He thus showed his understanding of the importance of the tutor-reader in relation to his source use (Weller, 2010), as he recognised that he could not control their interpretation of his writing. However, he was competent in his own practices.

8.2.6 Summary

As discussed above, competence in the features of source use can be demonstrated in a very large number of skills. In other words, to be competent at using sources, a student needs to master a large number of micro-skills, not all of which have been taught or practised, many of which are assumed. Examples of assumed skills could be using sources to build knowledge, being able to reflect on the reasons for choosing quotations, the understanding of attribution and the ability to paraphrase effectively. These skills may need a long period of development to reach a competent level. The discussion above has focused on the five skills of citation, paraphrasing, reporting verbs, critical engagement and avoidance of plagiarism. It has drawn on evidence from the competent users, which indicates how they were able to use each one of these features competently. In this way, the study can contribute to the body of literature on source use skills by demonstrating in more detail the features of competence. The key

contribution of the study in terms of definitions of these features will be demonstrated in the next chapter, the conclusion. The next section of this chapter will examine the implications for practice arising from this study.

8.3 Implications for practice

The implications for practice will focus on four important teaching and learning issues about source use that emerge from this study. These are: the need for continuous teaching of source use; the benefits and limitations of EAP teaching of source use for postgraduate degrees; student engagement with plagiarism definitions; the impact of language and previous education. The implications in these four issues will concern three areas: EAP, postgraduate education and institutional policy.

8.3.1 The need for continuous teaching of source use

In general, the participants in this study reported a lack of support with source use on their Master's degrees. While the competent users reached a level at which they did not need further instruction, the risk takers and safe players in this study needed more support until the end of their degrees. This need for more continuous source use instruction was recently endorsed by the Quality Assurance Agency guidelines, which state that teachers should '[ensure]that students understand what constitutes good academic practice [in using sources]…Messages and good habits need to be reinforced throughout the period of study, including through using formative assessment' (QAA, 2012: 25). Thus, I support the guideline for source use instruction to be provided 'throughout the period of study'. This contrasts with much of current postgraduate teaching in Anglophone universities where it is only provided at the beginning and needs to be internalised quickly (McGowan, 2005a). Although Hyland (2009) noted a recent shift towards some more pedagogical support for postgraduate students' development through writing and research training, the support with source use is still patchy and needs to be more continuously available (Hall and Sung, 2009). In order to examine this need for continuous teaching of source use, I will draw on and discuss two models of learning development: the apprenticeship model (Lave and Wenger, 1991) and the scaffolding model based on the Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1978).

In the apprenticeship model, a novice learns by watching an expert and engaging in 'legitimate peripheral participation' through easier tasks to gradually develop their skills within a 'community of practice'. This is a useful analogy, bringing together the themes of participation in a community, and learning as a skill to attain by watching, absorbing, imitating those who are familiar with the skill. Ivanič (1998: 4) draws attention to the need for novice writers to use and copy the work of more established writers by stating 'the only way an apprentice member of a community can learn to become a full member is by copying, adapting and synthesizing from the work of other members'. Pecorari (2002) suggests that postgraduate students can follow the apprenticeship model in their source use, as they gradually become situated in their community of practice. As their competence grows, the balance in the apprenticeship between observing and practising shifts more towards engagement and use of the key skills. If students do not acquire the necessary skills in the apprenticeship, however, they may not become competent users of sources.

Some critiques of the apprenticeship model have noted ways in which it may not be useful for learning source use. Weller (2010) applies the apprenticeship model to a comparison of student and tutor perspectives about critical reading. She finds that students could imitate lecturers in close reading tasks, but they could not learn more complex critical analysis from exposure to expert lecturer reading, because this was not easily clear and demonstrable. The lecturers' critical reading came from their context as experts, which novice students struggled to reach. Hyland (2006) points out another limitation: that an apprenticeship suggests achieving membership and a clear goal, so while it may be suited to learning a trade, these actions may not fit with development of disciplinary knowledge. Carroll (2007) also debates whether tutors should induct students to avoiding plagiarism or give them an apprenticeship in which they showed leniency towards problems of plagiarism for a period of time, for example with first year undergraduate students. She concludes that this period could enable them to learn, but it may also mean students put off learning and engage in bad study habits. In a recent innovative study, Ireland and English (2011) disagree, and suggest that students should have the opportunity to plagiarise in their first experiences of academic writing and then learn from their mistakes, as an apprenticeship. Giving students this opportunity to be apprentices before being experts seems a very positive

and refreshing approach to learning appropriate source use and avoiding plagiarism; however, it may meet with resistance from staff who expect students to follow the university regulations from the beginning of their studies.

Many other studies of source use have been informed by the Vygotskyan theoretical conceptualisation of learning development (Chatterjee, 2007; Cotterall and Cohen, 2003; Guerin and Picard, 2012). The key element in this conceptualisation is the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which Vygotsky (1978: 86) defines as 'the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined by problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers'. In other words, the ZPD is the gap between what the learner can do independently and what they can do with support. Thus, the learner is dependent on others and social interaction, to achieve higher goals, termed the 'upper boundary' of development. According to Dunn and Lantolf (1998), the ZPD is a means of bringing all learning and development together with the learner, the teacher, the class, peers, and co-constructing the resources. This view is applied to the context of source use by Barks and Watts (2001: 264) who argue 'effective textual borrowing hinges on various players, including the graduate student writer, EAP instructor, and content area instructor. Student writers cannot use sources effectively in their academic writing without a clear understanding of their writing tasks or without effective reading-to-write strategies.' It is clear that all the 'players': EAP tutors, postgraduate subject tutors and students need to work together to link up these areas of literacy and enable effective learning to take place; source use cannot be learnt effectively without these links and without the social context of learning.

One very important model of practice which developed from the ZPD is scaffolding (Wood, Bruner and Ross, 1976). Scaffolding can be understood in a number of ways that support learning development. This is a very useful model for academic writing, in which learning comes from communication with a tutor and other learners. In this way, there is a shift of focus from self-study or individual learning from one other person, to learning within a class through interaction. For learning about source use, this means discussing plagiarism as a group and giving peer feedback on source use in

an assignment as a key area of learning (Ireland and English, 2011). Thus, social interaction becomes a tool for development, in which a more informed individual can help a less informed one (Lantolf, 2000; Lantolf and Appell, 1994).

Vygotskyan theory is helpful to apply to the process of learning source use. Hyland (2003) suggests that when tutors of writing follow a genre orientation, they tend to use the ZPD concept in a process of contextualizing-modelling-negotiating-constructing. He suggests that initially, their teaching is very interventionist, then, gradually they allow the learner more independence to write their own texts. Scaffolded teaching of academic writing can lead to continuous development through formative stages of instruction, including modelling the writing process (Cotterall and Cohen, 2003). Chatterjee (2007) suggests that international students need scaffolded support in their learning of language, their subject and how to avoid plagiarism. Thus, it is clear that Vygotskyan theory is highly influential in studies of writing development, especially for international students. However, it needs to be remembered that Vygotsky was writing in the context of children's learning, rather than in higher education, therefore a focus towards learning from the teacher as expert is more understandable. His theory has been used for many learning contexts, but as a social theory of learning, it does not include development from self-study. Teaching about source use needs to include how to use sources on one's own, so the ZPD cannot be applied to all areas of source use development. This is important for the safe players and risk takers, because they were not able to use sources effectively without further help.

Looking at the five features of source use focused on in this study, it is clear some can be taught through scaffolding and practised. Citation can be taught through an analysis of a given exemplar, and then an exercise to practise different examples of citation in a text. Paraphrasing can be taught through techniques of making changes of word class, word order and substitution words, and exercises comparing a range of attempts to paraphrase an original text. Thus, different ways of consciousness-raising can be used in classroom instruction with some features. However, another feature of source use, critical engagement, is very hard to teach, because it involves knowledge of a subject and individual responses to reading (Willingham, 2007). Students can be given tasks

such as analysing the effect of using different responses to source information in a given text and moving them around, but, it is much more difficult for students to gain an ability to engage critically in a short space of time. This kind of activity can be combined with a comparison of the use of reporting verbs. In addition to classes and workshops, scaffolding support for avoiding plagiarism can be provided effectively through formative feedback in one-to-one tutorials (Davis and Carroll, 2009).

Elsewhere, I have highlighted the problems with providing this extra support in the context of Southern University (Davis, 2012a), in which lack of time for teaching source use on postgraduate programmes is considered the main factor. One participant said: 'To me, formative feedback is the most important thing, but it's also the hardest thing to do, because you just don't have the time to do it, it isn't scheduled' (Davis, 2012a: 27). This tutor feels that even though they see the need for extra input for students, they cannot provide it because of workload pressures. This may relate to the ratio of the large number of students allocated to staff which means individual attention to students is limited. In a similar study of postgraduate students' source use by Hall and Sung (2009), the authors argued that workload problems prevented the provision of further essential support for international students on Master's courses.

It is difficult to teach source use over a short space of time. Pecorari (2013: 60-61) contends that 'explaining all that a writer needs to know about using sources is an impossibly ambitious enterprise'. It is necessary to dedicate time for teaching, practising, getting feedback, practising again in order to learn about source use (Davis and Carroll, 2009). Taking the time to give formative feedback for students to learn about plagiarism seems to be effective and save time in the long run (Carroll, 2007; Davis and Carroll, 2009; Gardner, 2004; Ireland and English, 2011). One study found spoken feedback given on a one-to-one basis may be one of the most useful means to discuss issues such as plagiarism, since by its very communicative nature, involving both student and tutor, it can have a clear formative purpose (Gardner, 2004).

However, it seems to be the view of some subject tutors that learning about source use should go on elsewhere. In my study at Southern University (Davis, 2012a: 27), two tutors explained their views on this:

> T1: Some students will try, and get completely lost in trying to paraphrase, because they then run into grammatical structure issues and then you'll, as a marker, you are trying to read through this, and I just don't understand what this paragraph indicates and recently, I've said 'I think you need to go to [the EAP department]'.
> T2: It is not part of the normal module leader's role to say 'We are now going to tell you about sourcing and referencing', you know, because we've got stuff to teach. How much there is on sourcing and so on, I wouldn't like to say, nor when it appears in the syllabus.

I also reported the views of named plagiarism education experts, including Jude Carroll, who argued that directing students elsewhere to learn about using sources is very tempting for busy subject tutors:

> I think that that it's very easy to ghettoise plagiarism as an issue, so it's very easy to send it to student support, it's very easy to send it to English language support people... there's a very strong temptation amongst academics, who are just bombarded, to say 'Could I just send this student away to be fixed, and when this student is (what I used to call) 'oven ready', send them back to me and then I'll teach them'. That attitude has not gone away, it really hasn't. The 'oven ready' student is every academic's dream. (Davis, 2012a: 27)

In response to this tendency among subject tutors who do not want to teach these skills, I agree with Schmitt (2005) that any tutor who expects students to produce effective source use in a text must ensure that students have the opportunity to learn to do this. McGowan (2005b) makes a similar argument that accusing students of misuse of sources when there is inadequate teaching of source use is evidently a case of 'putting the cart before the horse'.

Therefore, the implication for this study is that teaching about and support with source use needs to be available throughout the period of study, and it must be decided who is to provide it. Extra time should be scheduled for subject tutors on Master's degrees or EAP tutors to teach it; in either case, it should be an integrated part of the instruction provided all the way through the programme. If the number of students involved prohibits individual attention, other solutions need to be provided through group or peer work, or online teaching facilities (such as use of plagiarism quizzes, interactive tutorials, GradeMark or PeerMark). As highlighted by Husain and Waterfield (2006) as part of a Royal Literary Fund study, universities are not only businesses, they need to support the students they recruit and a writing policy focusing on all aspects of academic writing including source use instruction and support, is important. As universities increase their focus on international students, it seems more likely that these resources could be made available.

8.3.2 The benefits and limitations of EAP teaching of source use

The participants in this study all went through an EAP programme at Pre-Master's level and moved onto a Master's degree. At the end of the Pre-Master's, they should have achieved learning outcomes such as 'Research, select, incorporate and accurately cite appropriate documentation for your writing purpose; articulate a clear point of view in writing'. Therefore, it could be expected that students have achieved some of the skills they need for source use before their Master's, and that they would be able to go on to use them. However, it seems only the competent users transferred all the necessary skills. As Oliver said in interview 4, 'To be honest, everything I've learnt was in my Pre-Master's. When you start your Master's degree, nobody [tells] you anything about plagiarism.' The safe players appeared to have transferred some skills from their EAP classes such as paraphrasing and attributing carefully, but the risk takers did not. Thus, the implication is to examine in greater depth both the benefits of studying about source use on EAP courses and the limitations to its effectiveness.

Regarding the benefits, the students in each group acknowledged some ways in which their EAP studies helped them with source use on their Master's; for example, Oliver 'learnt everything' and John 'was very cautious' about plagiarism at that time. Other studies have also found some evidence of transfer between EAP and Master's subject degrees: for example, Martala (2006) found that learning about referencing was transferred, but problems with criticality remained; Pilcher (2006) generally found that Master's students who had taken a pre-sessional programme knew more about plagiarism. Furthermore, Storch and Tapper (2009) found that tutorial feedback on writing during a pre-sessional EAP programme was an important factor for students' later development.

However, the limitations of EAP teaching of source use need to be considered. Firstly, at Southern University, as in most universities, the EAP course is a generic one for all disciplines, and the tutors are not subject specialists in any area outside EAP and applied linguistics. As such, they cannot cover the knowledge of the students' subjects when they teach source use, nor the discipline-specific elements of source use. They might miss problems with students' source use, such as plagiarism, from lack of familiarity with the subject and sources for the subject. To reduce the impact of this

situation, greater liaison could take place between EAP tutors and postgraduate tutors, including an exchange about subject and source use knowledge, and input from all tutors on both programmes.

Secondly, the students in this study did not all reach a competent level at the end of the EAP programme; the safe players and risk takers remained at a lower level. More could be done to help them achieve competence, so that they are better equipped for Master's level. Consciousness-raising activities in reading tasks would help the safe players, for example by practising deconstructing texts to see how authors create their position, or why they use 'I' or citation in some places in the text (Hyland, 2004). It would be useful to get students to compare intensive and extensive reading when using sources themselves, to consider different ways to use texts. This kind of activity would encourage more critical thinking and engagement with sources, so that these students could move away from their 'safe' zone and use more argumentation. Thirdly, the risk takers in this study did not learn enough, or transfer enough about their learning about plagiarism to their Master's. At the end of the EAP programme, Alice admitted she had a lot of 'bad habits' related to source use, such as forgetting to paraphrase and Shaun said sometimes he 'feels a bit scared'. This suggests that the EAP programme has not provided the plagiarism education (see definition in the literature review) that these students needed. As recommended by Petrić (2007), EAP programmes should pay more attention to source use and citation, for example by teaching evaluative language. The teaching of evaluative reporting verbs is also advocated by Thompson and Ye (1991). Overall, much more focus in EAP needs to be on source use, as Leki and Carson (1994: 95) argued already two decades ago:

> We are convinced that EAP writing classes need to move away from writing tasks that require students only to tap their own opinions and experiences and toward work that encourages students to integrate those opinions and experiences with external sources of information and argument.

Furthermore, a survey or plagiarism quiz before the end of the EAP programme could be used to assess students' level of understanding about plagiarism, and continuing problems or concerns could be addressed through individual support.

The issue of how much learning students transfer from EAP study to further study is crucial in the case of source use. As Spack (1997) argued, we cannot assume that

learning on a study skills course will be transferred to a subject course. In a study by James (2006), it was found that EAP is more effective when the tasks are similar and there is a short time between the EAP instruction and using it in the subject degree. This would mean that at the beginning of a Master's degree, students who had previously taken an EAP pre-sessional course might transfer more of their learning, but by the end of the Master's, they may not continue to transfer their learning. This may account for the writing of the risk takers, who copied to a much greater extent in their dissertations. Thus, EAP tutors need to work more with postgraduate tutors to enable effective and sustainable learning transfer to take place.

8.3.3 The need to engage students with definitions of source use and plagiarism

This study has found that the competent users were able to discuss their use of sources in detail, to reflect on their decisions, to discuss at length what plagiarism means and display a full understanding of source use. However, the risk takers continued to have doubts; for example, in interview 4, John said he felt 'lost' and was not sure whether he was plagiarising. The safe players also continued to worry about their source use: Yolanda wanted her tutor to check it for plagiarism. Thus, a further implication from this study is that tutors need to facilitate more student engagement with the definitions of what good source use is, and what plagiarism is and is not. It has been argued that this is particularly important with students from different cultures, with regard to plagiarism:

> In intercultural interactions we cannot assume that simply explaining the rules will suffice—no matter how simple or complex the explanation. Nor can we assume that punishment will deter; for, if the concept itself is not understood and/or students don't know what to do, or can't do what they have to do to avoid it, no deterrent will be effective. (Leask, 2006: 192)

Leask's claims make clear that plagiarism education cannot be absorbed through osmosis. Educators should not rely on rules or punishments for plagiarism, but rather on facilitating the understanding of what plagiarism is. A further argument is about the accessibility of plagiarism definitions, as Pecorari (2001: 237) points out:

> It is perhaps fair to wonder whether definitions found in documents students are unlikely to read closely are intended primarily to inform students or to serve as the basis for taking actions against those who have violated the rules.

I contend that these definitions should not only be made easily accessible to students, but that instruction about source use should include discussions about what the definitions mean, and how they relate to each student's own source use. This could be done, for example, through a discussion of their source use using *Turnitin* originality reports at a formative stage of their writing (Davis, 2007; Davis and Carroll, 2009). These discussions between tutors and students can also help to clarify what each understands by plagiarism and help them towards having a definition of plagiarism that is equally transparent to both sides. This would be especially useful to the risk takers, so that they gained greater awareness of what they were doing, and what tutors wanted them to do.

At Southern University where this study takes place, plagiarism definitions are provided in the general postgraduate handbooks and in the library guidance, which includes the PLATO interactive tutorial. However, the plagiarism definitions are not discussed and there seems to be little instruction and reflection on individual source use outside of EAP classes. Therefore, the provision of these learning opportunities would be strongly recommended, especially on postgraduate degrees. Furthermore, as Hyland (2001) argues, tutorial feedback needs to be very direct about what plagiarism is, and how students can avoid it in their own work.

However, it is not enough to focus on plagiarism definitions; students also need to be given opportunities to engage with definitions of source use to understand what they need to do. Jamieson (2008: 80) makes a strong argument about this:

> As long as our pedagogy, policies, textbooks, software programs, and scholarship continue to focus on the misuse of sources and ignore the larger *intention* (italics in original) of source use itself, we will continue to fail to address the problem of plagiarism in any discipline.

Thus, educators may be missing the point if they focus on misuse; beneficial learning for students can come from focusing on how to use sources well, which will then reduce the problem of plagiarism. Day (2008) and Jamieson (2008) suggest that tutors need to see plagiarism as a discipline in itself, in order to theorise and discuss differences. With this emphasis, meaningful and effective pedagogy could take place in the area of source use, rather than building on the negative consequences of plagiarism and fear about study. These negative consequences are counter-productive

to learning and seem to have affected both the risk takers and the safe players. McGowan and Lightbody (2008) assert that source use is usually taught in an abstract way in Anglophone institutes, in which the system and rules are presented, after which students need to apply them independently. With a lack of support at this stage, students may be more likely to plagiarise, so this abstract way of teaching is ineffective. In contrast, plagiarism education addresses not only the rules of referencing and how to use sources, but also the competence to use sources without plagiarising (Pecorari, 2008; 2013). In this way, good source use and avoiding plagiarism can join up as part of the same approach.

8.3.4 The importance of language level and educational background

Anglophone universities admit a very large number of international students to postgraduate programmes; thus, a final implication is to give greater consideration to the language level and educational backgrounds of these international postgraduate students. Most are non-native speakers of English, who are admitted to Pre-Master's programmes with an IELTS score of 5.5, with the expectation that it will rise to IELTS 6.5 in all skills at the end of two semesters, in order for them to progress effectively to Master's. Whether these minimum language requirements set by UKVI and universities are actually adequate can be debated elsewhere, but for the purposes of EAP and Master's programmes, tutors must manage the students admitted at this level and support them through their studies. To do so, institutions need to support both EAP and Master's programme tutors by making adequate workload planning to cover these requirements.

This study has shown some problems with source use related to language, for example, Alice in stage 2 acknowledges she does not have a 'good command of English' in order to paraphrase well. It is acknowledged that while students are likely to have the prior experience of studying English for the IELTS test, the writing students do for this test bears little relation to the kind of academic writing they need to do at university (Moore and Morton, 2005). Similarly, Chatterjee (2007) noted that for international students, gaining competence in both academic literacy and appropriate academic language are very challenging. Therefore, tutors who expect students to

master appropriate academic language must also provide them with the support to be able to use it. Tutors need to be aware of the language resource of international students, and help students increase their ability to write academically, for example through acquiring and learning to utilise formulaic phrases from Academic Phrasebank (Morley, 2005) and through developing their own discipline-specific corpus of key vocabulary (Lee and Swales, 2006). This could help students such as the risk takers who may rely on source text because of the sense that they do not have the words to say it themselves.

One teaching strategy to help students begin to use the discourse of their discipline in an acceptable way is to borrow standard phrases. Swales and Feak (2004: 172) recommend borrowing common words from sources as a language learning strategy:

> Of course, borrowing the words and phrases of others can be a useful language learning strategy. Certainly you would not be plagiarizing if you borrowed items that are commonly or frequently used in academic English or that are part of common knowledge.

This position on using the words of others may be contentious: some scholars consider re-use of other authors' words to be an acceptable practice (for example, Flowerdew and Li, 2007), and some connect this with plagiarism (for example, Maddox, 2005). I agree that this type of borrowing for rhetorical functions and structure seems to offer useful and justifiable scaffolding for non-native speaker writers (Schmitt, 2005). Elsewhere, I have advocated borrowing standard phrases as a practice that should be encouraged, as it enables developing writers to participate in the discourse of the subject (Davis and Morley, 2013).

In addition to language issues, most international postgraduate students experience difficulties because of a change of educational context. As they have usually completed an undergraduate degree in their own countries, they come from very different educational backgrounds with different academic conventions to those found in UK HE. It is very common for definitions, policies and punishments for plagiarism to be completely different in other countries, and therefore these students need a lot more time to understand and assimilate the differences (Spack, 1997; Hayes and Introna, 2005; McGowan, 2005b). In a study by Hall and Sung (2009), students reported that they lacked culturally based academic practices. Therefore, one useful activity for EAP

Pre-Master's programmes could be a discussion of students' own definitions of plagiarism and their experiences of source use on their undergraduate degrees, compared with their peers and their current institution.

8.4 Summary

The first part of this chapter has discussed the contribution of this study towards defining competence in source use, using the final chapter of analysis, the competent users. It has examined what constitutes competence in source use through descriptors of the features of citation, paraphrasing, reporting verbs, critical engagement and avoidance of plagiarism. In examining these features from the assignment and interview data, this study has established descriptors of competence for source use. The descriptors of competence build on the existing body of literature on source use and contribute more knowledge about the accuracy, range and understanding that students need to have within these skills in order to use sources effectively at Master's level.

The second part of this chapter has presented four implications for practice based on the teaching and learning of source use in the context of international postgraduate students of UK HE. Two implications relate to EAP and Master's pedagogy: the need for continuous teaching of source use on both EAP and Master's programmes, and the benefits and limitations of EAP in terms of source use teaching. Two other implications suggest tutors and institutions should pay greater attention to the needs of students: the need to engage students with definitions and policies of plagiarism, and the importance of students' language and educational background in their learning. Thus, the implications for practice are intended for institutions and their approaches to international postgraduate students, as well as for EAP and postgraduate subject tutors.

In the concluding chapter, I will sum up my answers to the research questions regarding international postgraduates' source use, competence in source use and implications for practice. I will also acknowledge the limitations of my study and make recommendations for further research, and end with some final thoughts on this study.

Chapter 9: Conclusion

9.1 Introduction

In this final chapter, I aim to set out the key contributions of this study to research into source use by reflecting on the answers to the research questions and evaluating the study. It is divided into two parts. Firstly, I will return to the research questions and answer them through a summary and discussion of the main findings from the study. Secondly, I will acknowledge the limitations within the study, and based on them, make some recommendations for further research, before concluding with some final thoughts about the study.

9.2 Research questions and main findings

These are the three overarching research questions of this study:

1. How do international students use sources on a Pre-Master's and Master's course in the UK?

2. What constitutes a competent user of sources at postgraduate level?

3. What are the implications for practice for EAP, postgraduate subject tutors and for universities?

I will answer each research question separately below by referring to the findings and analysis. I will discuss the source use of the participants in detail for the first question, set out my understanding of competence for the second, and reflect on the implications for each of the three areas for the third question.

1. How do international students use sources on a Pre-Master's and Master's course in the UK?

The data collected from eight postgraduate students' assignments and interviews over the two year period through their Pre-Master's EAP and Master's programmes showed development and diversity. As has been discussed through the analysis chapters five to seven, I found that the participants in the study all developed their source use during the Pre-Master's EAP programme, but did not all make further progress within the postgraduate programme. Furthermore, they did not have the same starting point or

ending point, and developed some different strategies with source use, some successful and some not. For these reasons, one main finding to come out of this study is that not all international postgraduate students reach the level of competence in source use required in their Master's. Those students who do reach the level needed, I term 'competent users' as they demonstrated an ability to use sources in effective ways and to avoid plagiarism. Those who do not reach the level, I term 'safe players' and 'risk takers'. The safe players use sources carefully, attribute assiduously and take great care to avoid plagiarism, but use a restricted range of source use features: for example, they use a small number of reporting structures and rely on the use of non-integral citation to provide evidence. More problematically, the risk takers make inappropriate use of source text through inaccurate formatting of citation and take risks with plagiarism by copying attributed text (CAT) and copying unattributed text (CUT). For both groups, these practices may arise from lack of support, lack of learning transfer, or because they either try risky strategies that lead them to plagiarise or try safe strategies that limit their source use. I will go into more detail about each group below, as I sum up the findings from the analysis of the risk takers, safe players and competent users.

Risk taker practices

The risk taker group consisted of John (Chinese), Alice (Chinese) and Shaun (Sri Lankan).The risk takers' source use varied over the period of the study. During their EAP programme, they started by copying unattributed text (CUT), but presumably based on the instruction and feedback they received on the programme, they took more care to follow university regulations regarding use of citation and avoidance of plagiarism, and reduced the amount of CUT in stage 2. However, once on their Master's degrees, it seems they did not transfer this knowledge, and relied on increasingly risky practices, culminating in a great deal of CUT and CAT (Copying Attributed Text) in their dissertations. It is not completely clear whether the plagiarism visible in their assignments at this stage is intentional or unintentional; it may be 'grey plagiarism' as Introna and Hayes (2004) suggest. In other words, it is hard to make a definite interpretation of intention. Alice suggested she had 'bad habits' with source use (interview 2) which may be an acknowledgement that she was not careful to

attribute, such as when she copied from a website in her dissertation. On the other hand, John said he was 'lost' (interview 4) meaning he really did not know whether his practice of using CAT in his dissertation was acceptable. Shaun admitted to feeling 'a bit scared' in both interview 1 and 2, though he said he was 'very confident' in interview 3, which suggests that where he copied lists from a website into sentences, he felt this practice was not a problem. Thus, all three risk takers engage in CAT and CUT, but their intentionality to plagiarise cannot be completely established.

A further practice noticeable among the risk takers is their weaker attribution of internet sources. In their work, there are examples of CAT and CUT copied from websites, especially from bulleted lists and definitions. They used Wikipedia and appeared not to cite it because they knew that their tutors did not agree with its use in student work. Their copying from websites may be a time-saving strategy, along with some of their shortcuts in reading (Weller, 2010), where they use text from abstracts, subheadings, introductions to make their assignments, rather than a slow building of arguments. It could be that the risk takers felt under such pressure from the demands of their course work that they considered taking shortcuts to be acceptable or necessary (Errey, 2002).

Another reason for risk taking seems to be the lack of support students receive on their Master's programmes. The risk takers did not seem to know what was expected and considered that plagiarism may be viewed differently: John said 'different tutors, they have different opinions' (interview 4), so he was unsure what was expected. A further problem may be the risk takers' interpretation of instructions. John reported that his tutor 'said he didn't like quotation…so I didn't use' (interview 3). This may have led him to think he must avoid quotation formatting, and should paraphrase, but in fact, he copied text which should be shown as quotations. The risk takers were also unable to define the terms related to plagiarism clearly and to discuss the meta-discourse easily, which indicated a lack of understanding.

Safe player practices

The safe player group comprised of Yolanda (Chinese) and Mike (Japanese). In contrast to the risk takers, the safe players did not leave anything to chance. They used the

strategy of over-citation, in which they cited almost every sentence and included page numbers for paraphrases. As previously discussed, over-citing could be a strategy some students follow while developing source use, before gaining a competent level (Schmitt, 2005). A reason for over-citing may be that the safe players wanted to show their tutors how careful they were, and how well they were following university regulations.

The safe players were very concerned about vocabulary and their perceived lack of it when paraphrasing. Using their safety strategy, they attempted to change every word when paraphrasing. They asked their tutors for help with textmatching tools (Yolanda, interview 3). In their careful approach to study, they tried to understand every word, and used, for example, tools such as *Google Translate* (Yolanda), to understand source material.

The safe players kept to a limited range of source use features, using their own 'tried and tested' language and functions, for example by using the same reporting structures and mostly non-integral citation. As Mike admitted, this was the extent of his ability: 'I don't know how to be flexible about writing in English, you know, citation or paraphrasing' (interview 4). This lack of range means that the safe players did not demonstrate sophistication in their source use (Breeze, 2008). It also meant that they did not engage very much in critical review or debates within the literature, so their source use tended to lack argumentation and a clear authorial voice. In this way, they can be described as playing the game and following the rules, but without range and understanding.

Competent user practices

The competent user group comprised of Kevin (Chinese), Oliver (Algerian) and Nick (Algerian). Their source use was accurate, varied and used with understanding. Like the safe players, they paid great attention to the attribution of words and ideas, and avoided plagiarism. Unlike the safe players, they were able to combine their understanding of avoiding plagiarism with a wide range of source use features. They used a range of citation, with different functions and attention to range within the forms of citation. This finding builds on the evidence from Petrić's (2007) study, in

215

which higher level postgraduate students used a greater range of citation. The competent users in this study also used a range of language to paraphrase, demonstrated comprehension of what they read, and showed their understanding of the purpose of paraphrasing. With a wide linguistic resource, they made use of an extensive range of reporting verbs, which contributed to their ability to engage with source use through argumentation and critical review. When asked about their source use, they displayed a level of confidence in their ability, for example Oliver (interview 4) declared: 'Honestly I don't need to improve anymore', and Kevin asserted: 'When I write something, I know it's completely paraphrased so I'm not really concerned' (interview 4). Therefore, their development of source use can be seen as competent, in no need of further improvement or support from tutors, unlike the risk takers and safe players.

The analysis of the different practices of risk takers, safe players and competent users over a two year period extends knowledge about the development of source use, such as the impacts and limitations of EAP courses, the ways international students interact with the guidance they receive and the decisions they make. Previous studies have not analysed the development of source use for this length of time, with this number of participants and for all key features.

2. What constitutes a competent user of sources at postgraduate level?

To answer this question, in chapter eight, I defined competence according to the findings from the competent user group. I considered what competence consisted of in the five key features of source use:

- citation
- paraphrasing
- reporting verbs
- critical engagement
- avoidance of plagiarism.

I looked at existing frameworks of competence in source use: the BALEAP (2013) *Can Do* framework and the framework for authorial voice in academic writing by Argent and Alexander (2013). These frameworks are important in defining the source use

required at this level of study; however, they state the overarching requirement of source use, rather than the breakdown and level of skills. Therefore, my research adds to these by providing more detail of what competence in source use requires, by examining ability in the key features and giving a breakdown of the microskills required. No other research has been found that examines competence in source use in this way. Thus, the study extends both the understanding of competence in theory and the theorisation of practice. The following table sums up the features of competence in source use.

Table 7: Descriptors of competence in source use

Feature	Descriptor of competence
Citation	Ability to format all citations accurately Ability to use a wide range of methods and functions of citation Understanding of different uses of citation
Paraphrasing	Understanding of the original text and ability to convey its meaning Ability to substantially revise the original text Understanding of the purpose of paraphrasing
Reporting verbs	Ability to use reporting verbs accurately Ability to use a range of reporting verbs and structures Understanding of different meanings of reporting verbs
Critical engagement	Ability to incorporate evaluation in use of source material Ability to establish a confident stance on a subject
Avoidance of plagiarism	Ability to make the source of information clear through appropriate attribution Understanding of what plagiarism is, and the metadiscourse of plagiarism

As can be seen in Table 7 above, I have defined competence in the five features of source use especially in terms of accuracy, range and understanding. Thus, firstly, I have defined competence in citation as an ability to format all citations accurately, the ability to use a wide range of different methods and functions of citation, and the demonstration of understanding what these different uses mean. Secondly, I have defined paraphrasing as understanding and accurately conveying the meaning of the original source text, making a substantial revision of the original text and understanding the purpose of paraphrasing. Thirdly, I have defined competence in use of reporting verbs as an ability to use them accurately, which with this feature,

connects with understanding their meaning, and to use a range of them appropriately. Fourthly, I have defined critical engagement as incorporating evaluation in the use of source material and establishing a confident stance on a subject. Finally, with avoidance of plagiarism, I have defined this feature as accurately making the source of information clear through attribution, and understanding plagiarism and the metadiscourse of plagiarism. In these descriptors, I set out a theorisation of the competence in source use in practice. These descriptors build on existing theories of competence in separate features of source use, and bring these areas of competence together.

3. What are the implications for practice for EAP, postgraduate subject tutors and universities?

The previous chapter has discussed the implications for practice in detail. I will now sum up the implications for the three areas of EAP, the postgraduate disciplines and universities, from the perspectives of actions necessary for each sector. There is a need for continuous support for students with source use throughout the period of their study. While the competent users were able to use sources effectively on their own, the risk takers and safe players needed guidance to avoid plagiarism and to use a wider range of features. These students may need help with the amount of citation to use, the different functions of citation, the use of words from sources, the methods to synthesise, the use of internet sources and the range of reporting verbs. There may be a lack of teaching time scheduled to provide support with source use at Master's level, or there may be a reluctance to teach it, but this study shows that it needs to be available. Thus, universities need to ensure that either EAP or subject tutors are available to provide support with source use at Master's level.

The benefits and limitations of teaching source use on EAP programmes need to be assessed. The study has confirmed one of the findings of Martala (2006) that international students make progress with source use during their EAP programmes. However, the risk takers did not transfer enough of this development to their Master's programmes, and both the safe players and risk takers did not develop enough competence. Some research has suggested that study skills must take place within the student's discipline (Hyland, 2004). However, where this is not possible because of

generic Pre-Master's provision, I suggest that EAP and subject tutors work more together to provide joined-up plagiarism education, that EAP have a stronger focus on source use and that more attention is made by both EAP and subject tutors to learning transfer between the programmes.

There is a need to engage international students with definitions of source use and plagiarism. Universities need to make them easily and automatically available to students, as called for by Pecorari (2001). I contend that EAP tutors and subject tutors need to provide opportunities for students to engage in the discourse of plagiarism education by discussing definitions and comparing them to definitions they have previously known. Feedback from EAP and subject tutors needs to be explicit about plagiarism (Hyland, 2001), so that students have important learning opportunities. One method of being explicit and direct is to use *Turnitin* reports formatively in tutorials on first drafts, so that source use can be discussed directly with students before assessment (Davis and Yeang, 2008).

A further implication of the study is that universities need to take into account the language level and different educational culture of international students. Teaching time must be allocated in EAP classes to expanding students' vocabulary and practising paraphrasing. Time also needs to be given for students to assimilate the academic conventions of their UK HE environment.

The four implications for tutors and universities that international students need more support with source use, that they need to engage with definitions of plagiarism, that EAP is limited, and that the previous language and education level of students needs to be taken into account, have not been suggested together in previous studies, to my knowledge. Thus, the answer to this research question brings together important implications for the teaching and learning context of source use.

9.3 Limitations and suggestions for further research

In this section, I will begin by acknowledging the limitations of this study in five main areas: the scope and context, the comparability of data, my position, the method and the analysis. With each limitation, I will make suggestions for further research, which could reduce the impact of the limitation and build on this study.

The scope of this study was limited in terms of participants and research context in that it involved only one UK university, one EAP programme, and a small number of Master's programmes at the same university. I focused on a cohort of participants, who represented only a few nationalities, with four Chinese, two Algerian, one Japanese and one Sri Lankan. Since I wanted to focus only on students who took the Pre-Master's programme and Master's programme at Southern University, the study was limited to available participants, and over half were Chinese at the time of the study. The students in this research represented very few disciplines, as almost all were business students, with one student of another social science, and one technology student. This was again because the majority of students on the programme studied business, so other disciplines could not be represented. Following ethical guidelines, I was obliged to allow students to drop out without reason, and in fact five did withdraw from the study after the first year and two before the end of the second year, so the number was reduced from fifteen participants at the start of the study to eight at the end. This problem of attrition is common among longitudinal studies (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007). However, a larger number of students, from different disciplines and different universities would yield more extensive results. It would also be interesting to carry out further research into the source use of international students from specific cultures of which a growing number are studying at postgraduate level in the UK, such as Saudi or Turkish students.

There is a difference in terms of the data collected between the two years. In the first year, the students did the same assignments on the same writing modules and therefore the data can easily be compared. However, once on the Master's programmes, the assignments students took were different and some had disciplinary differences in source use (for example, the technology student could use Wikipedia and could write in a more descriptive and less analytical way than the business students). This limitation of the comparability of the data cannot be removed in a study of pre-sessional EAP and different subsequent degrees. However, for greater comparability of source use, it would be possible to track postgraduate students from only one discipline, as, for example, in Kinzley's (2011) study of Chinese undergraduate students of media and communication. I consider that the descriptors of competence in source use that I establish in this study could be applied to other disciplines: some

features such as paraphrasing and avoidance of plagiarism are not subject to disciplinary differences. Others, such as choice of reporting verbs and choice of citation function can vary according to disciplines (Hyland, 2004); therefore, further disciplinary-based studies would be useful.

In this study, I acknowledge my own position as researcher. I am a lecturer in EAP and have worked on and run the Pre-Master's programme at Southern University for many years. This influences my interpretation of the data, as I see it from an EAP perspective; therefore, I focus more on the source use skills than the content knowledge within the extracts and draw on my knowledge of EAP in my analysis of the features of source use. There is also an imbalance of information available to me for this two year study, in that I know the EAP programme very thoroughly and have access to all aspects of it, but I cannot know the same amount about the Master's programmes, even though I liaised with postgraduate tutors as much as I could (see my study elsewhere, Davis, 2012a). A joint study involving an EAP tutor and a postgraduate tutor co-researching and co-analysing might be a useful means of combining knowledge and expertise in the research context of Pre-Master's and Master's study. I also strove to reduce the 'researcher effect'; in other words, the influence I would have on the study data through my intrusion into the development of student learning, by collecting data completely outside the classroom and not commencing any analysis until after the Exam Boards had met. However, this effect cannot be removed, particularly with the qualitative method used in the study (Dörnyei, 2007), and I acknowledge my own effect on the data gathered. Nevertheless, my own effect as an EAP specialist contributes to an in-depth study of source use using thorough knowledge of the context. In doing this, I have paid great attention to presenting a truthful and plausible account of my data which leads to trustworthy conclusions.

In terms of data method, the study uses qualitative analysis, in order to gain insights into source use practices, since this area of research would benefit from greater clarity. I decided against a quantitative analysis of the assignment data, because of the small number of participants, the differences between the participants and between the data at different stages, and my desire to include the interview data which added more

insights to my understanding of the students' source use. However, I acknowledge that a quantitative analysis of the assignment data would also be useful to chart the development of source use and examine stages. This could be done on the existing data, as the total word count for the assignments is over 150,000, and the average word count per participant is over 20,000; therefore, it presents a fairly large corpus for further numerical and linguistic analysis. It would be possible, for example, to undertake a concordancing analysis of citations or reporting verbs in the assignments, using a tool such as Wordsmith, as has been used in other studies of student text, for example, Hyland (2008). Elsewhere (Davis, 2013), I admitted that it is difficult to assess competence, especially when only a limited number of examples can be shown. I adopted the strategy of using the extracts as representations of the rest of the data, and thus could examine a large number of features. However, a quantitative analysis of the existing data would add different outcomes to the data and could contribute to establishing different levels of competence in the features of source use. Thus, in further research, the use of this data as corpora to measure instances of the features of source use could be a means of testing hypotheses based on the findings of this exploratory study.

Within the features of source use analysed, each one presented challenges, but in particular, the analysis of paraphrasing was problematic. I consider it a key feature of source use, so it needed to be part of my analysis; however, it is very difficult to analyse paraphrasing when it appears to be at an advanced level and to come from a range of texts. Other studies which have looked at paraphrasing have tended to look at student problems with the paraphrasing of one source text, where the student text and original source text can be presented side by side for analysis (Pecorari, 2003). I did this with some of the weaker attempts to paraphrase, especially in stages 1 and 2 and with the risk takers, and was able to categorise some levels of attempted paraphrase according to Keck (2006) by calculating the number of unique links to the matched source text. However, I found I could not do it, even by trying to present multiple source texts, in the later stages and especially with the competent users. Keck (2006) gave all participants the same texts to paraphrase from, which makes the comparisons straightforward and useful. However, the students in this study did not have source texts provided for them, as the data was collected from their real

assignments, so I could not compare this in all cases. Separately, I did set a paraphrasing task as parts of interviews one and two, which gave me some limited data (see Appendix 6b.1), but I did not use it in interviews three and four. Therefore, with the main assignment data, especially in stages 3 and 4, I acknowledge that the analysis of paraphrasing is made more from the perspective of evidence of poor paraphrasing not being found, rather than evidence of good paraphrasing being found. Even by checking *Turnitin* reports and *Google* hits thoroughly, I could not be sure that that I found all the sources that students used. I could only surmise the level of paraphrasing based on lack of textual similarity, comments by students, apparent development and my understanding of how texts are put together. However, I included the data on paraphrasing as it was useful to assess the extent of revisions where possible, and because I consider that competence in paraphrasing is an essential feature of source use.

9.4 Concluding remarks

This study has made an important contribution to research into source use. Through its longitudinal design, it has been able to explore and analyse the continuous development of source use strategies and perspectives of a group of international postgraduate students at a UK university. From the establishment of descriptors of competence in the five features of citation, reporting verbs, paraphrasing, critical engagement and avoidance of plagiarism, it has provided a model to define competence at Master's level. This will be of interest to scholars of source use and instructors of EAP and postgraduate subjects. From the implications for practice, it has set out the need for universities to provide continuous support with source use, to engage students in practices to avoid plagiarism, and to take into account the linguistic and educational differences of international students. Thus, the study offers key insights to research and practice in source use by international postgraduate students for UK HE.

References

Abasi, A., Akbari, N. and Graves, B. (2006). 'Discourse appropriation, construction of identities, and the complex issue of plagiarism: ESL students writing in graduate school'. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15, 102-117.

Abhayawansa, S. and Fonseca, L. (2010). 'Conceptions of learning and approaches to learning – a phenomenographic study of a group of overseas accounting students from Sri Lanka'. *Accounting Education*, 19 (5), 527-550.

Al Fadda, H. (2012). 'Difficulties in Academic Writing: From the perspective of King Saud university postgraduate students'. *English Language Teaching*, 5 (2), 123-130.

Andrews, R. (2003). *Research questions*. London: Continuum.

Angélil-Carter, S. (2000). *Stolen Language? Plagiarism in Writing*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Anson, C. (2008). 'We never wanted to be cops: plagiarism, institutional paranoia and shared responsibility'. In R.M Howard and A.E.Robillard (Eds.) *Pluralizing plagiarism: identities, contexts, pedagogies,* pp.140-157. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Argent, S. and Alexander, O. (2013). *Access EAP: Frameworks*. Reading: Garnet.

Ashworth, P., Bannister, P. and Thorne, P. (1997). 'Guilty in whose eyes? University students' perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in academic work and assessment'. *Studies in Higher Education,* 22, 187-203.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bailey, S. (2006). *Academic writing: a handbook for international students*. 2nd Ed. Abingdon: Routledge.

Bailey, S. (2011). *Academic writing: a handbook for international students*. 3rd Ed. Abingdon: Routledge.

BALEAP (2013). *Can Do* statements, available at http://www.baleap.org.uk/bids/index.aspx Last accessed 19/1/2014.

Ballard, B. and Clanchy, J. (1997). *Teaching international students: a brief guide for lecturers and supervisors*. Deakin, ACT: IDP Education Australia.

Barks, D. and Watts, P. (2001). 'Textual borrowing strategies for graduate ESL writers'. In D. Belcher and A. Hirvela (Eds.) *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections*, pp.246-267. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Baynham, M. (1999). 'Double-voicing and the scholarly 'I': On incorporating the words of others in academic discourse'. *Text,* 19, 485-504.

Behrens, R. (2010). 'Learning from student plagiarism complaints'. Paper presented at *Institutional policies and procedures for managing student plagiarism.* ASKe, Oxford Brookes University, 25 May.

Belcher, D. (2006). 'Cyberdiscourse, evolving notions of authorship, and the teaching of writing'. In M. Hewings (Ed.) *Academic writing in context,* pp.140-149. London: Continuum.

Belcher, D. and Hirvela, A. (Eds.) (2001). *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Bennett, R. (2005). 'Factors associated with student plagiarism in a post-1992 university'. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education,* 30 (2), 137-162.

Biggs, J. B. (1979). 'Individual differences in study processes and the quality of learning outcomes', *Higher Education*, 8 (4), 381–394.

Biggs, J. (1999). *Teaching for quality learning at university*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Bloch, J. (2001). '(E)Merging literacies and the challenge of textual ownership'. In D. Belcher and A. Hirvela (Eds.) *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections,* pp.209-228. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Bloch, J. (2012). *Plagiarism, intellectual property and the teaching of L2 writing*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Blum, S. (2009). *My word! Plagiarism and College Culture*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). 'The forms of capital'. In J. Richardson (Ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education,* pp.241-258. New York: Greenwood.

Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J.-C. (1994). 'Introduction: language and the relationship to language in the teaching situation'. In P. Bourdieu, J.-C. Passeron and M. de Saint Martin (Eds.) *Academic Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Braine, G. (2002). 'Academic literacy and the non-native speaker graduate student'. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 1, 59-68.

Breeze, R. (2008). 'Researching simplicity and sophistication in student writing'. *International Journal of English Studies*, 8 (1), 51-66.

British Educational Research Association (BERA) (2004). *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research* Available at http://www.bera.ac.uk/publications/pdfs/ETHICA1.PDF?PHPSESSID=2fea641ae7addc37267acf5b849640d0 Last accessed 14/11/2010.

Brown, L. and Holloway, I. (2008). 'The initial stage of the international sojourn: excitement or culture shock?' *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 36 (1), 33-49.

Bryant, M., Sheehan, D. and Vigier, M. (2006). 'Embedding Language Learning in the Business School Curriculum and Mission'. *Global Business Languages,* 11 (7). Available at: http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/gbl/vol11/iss1/7 Last accessed 1/7/2014.

Bull, J., Coughlin, E., Collins, C. and Sharp, D. (2001). *Technical review of plagiarism detection software report*. [Online] Joint Information Systems Committee, 1-36. Available at http://www.jisc.ac.uk/uploaded_documents/luton.pdf Last accessed 14/7/2014.

Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. London: Sage.

Canale, M. and Swain, M. (1980). 'Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing'. *Applied Linguistics*, 1 (1), 1-47.

Carroll, J. (2005a). ''Lightening the load': Teaching in English, learning in English'. In J. Carroll and J. Ryan (Eds.) *Teaching International Students: Improving Learning for All*, pp.35-42. London: Routledge.

Carroll, J. (2005b). 'Strategies for becoming more explicit'. In J. Carroll and J. Ryan (Eds.) *Teaching International Students: Improving Learning for All,* pp.26-34. London: Routledge.

Carroll, J. (2007). A *Handbook for Deterring Plagiarism in Higher Education*, 2nd Ed. Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff and learning Development.

Carroll, J. (2013). 'Why do students plagiarise?' 22/5/2013 Webinar, Plagiarismadvice.org. Available at http://www.plagiarismadvice.org/resources/webinar-series/item/why-do-students-plagiarise-webinar Last accessed 22/5/2013.

Carroll, J. and Appleton, J. (2005). 'Towards consistent penalty decisions for breaches of academic regulations in one UK university', *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 1 (1), Available at http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/journals/index.php/IJEI/issue/view/3 Last accessed 1/7/14.

Carroll, J. and Ryan, J. (2005). 'Canaries in the coalmine: International students in Western universities'. In Carroll, J. and Ryan, J. (Eds.) *Teaching international students: improving learning for all*, pp.3-10. London: Routledge.

Chanock, K. (2008). 'When students reference plagiarised materials – what can we learn (and what can we do) about their understanding of attribution?' *International Journal for Educational Integrity,* 4 (1), 3-16.

Charles, M. (2006). 'The construction of stance in reporting clauses: a cross-disciplinary study of theses'. *Applied Linguistics*, 27 (3), 492-518.

Chatterjee, M. (2007). 'Learning to avoid plagiarism'. *International Journal of Learning,* 13 (10), 87-94.

Cheng, X. (2000). 'Asian students' reticence revisited'. *System* 28, 435-446.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Choudaha, R. and Chang, L. (2012). Trends in international student mobility. *WES Research and Advisory Services*. Available at http://www.uis.unesco.org/Library/Documents/research-trends-international-student-mobility-education-2012-en.pdf Last accessed 3/7/14.

Clark, N. (2006). Education in Algeria. *World Education News and Reviews (WENR)*, 19(2), Available at http://www.wes.org/ewenr/06apr/practical_algeria.htm Last accessed 14/7/2014.

Clark, M.K. and Ishida, S. (2005). 'Vocabulary knowledge differences between placed and promoted EAP students'. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes,* 4, 225-238.

Clifford, V. and Joseph, C. (2005). *Report of the internationalisation of the curriculum project*. Melbourne, Higher Education Development Unit, Monash university. Available at: http://www.brookes.ac.uk/services/ocsld/ioc/definitions.html Last accessed 14/7/2014.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* 6th Ed. Abingdon: Routledge.

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cortazzi, M. and Jin, L. (1996). 'Cultures of learning: Language classrooms in China'. In H. Coleman (Ed.) *Society and the language classroom*, pp. 169-206. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cotterall, S. and Cohen, R. (2003). 'Scaffolding for second language writers: Producing an academic essay'. *ELT Journal,* 57 (2), 158-166.

Cottrell, S. (2011). *Critical thinking skills: Developing effective analysis and argument*. 2nd Ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cox, L. (2010). *E-mail to Mary Davis*, 19 November.

Cresswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Cresswell, J. (2006). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among 5 approaches*. 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London: Sage.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language*, 2nd Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Currie, P. (1998). 'Staying out of trouble: Apparent plagiarism and academic survival'. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 7 (1), 1-18*.*

Davis, M. (2007). 'The role of Turnitin in the formative process of academic writing: a tool for learning and unlearning?' *Brookes e-Journal of Learning and Teaching*, 2 (1). Available at:
http://bejlt.brookes.ac.uk/article/the_role_of_turnitin_within_the_formative_process_of_academic_writing/ Last assessed 14/7/2014.

Davis, M. (2008). 'The ethics involved in researching one's own students', Paper presented at the *IOE Doctoral Conference*, 20 June.

Davis, M. (2010a). 'Exploring the stages of development of source use as part of plagiarism education in international postgraduate writing'. Paper presented at the *IOE Doctoral Conference*, 18 June.

Davis, M. (2010b). 'Tracking the development of plagiarism education through postgraduate preparation and study: the experience of international students in UK HE'. Paper presented at *Sustainable Writing Development: Approaches and Challenges,* Writing Development in Higher Education, London Metropolitan University, 28-30 June.

Davis, M. (2011a). 'The role of EAP in plagiarism education at postgraduate level'. Paper presented at *EAP within the Higher Education garden: cross pollination between disciplines, departments and research,* BALEAP Conference, Portsmouth, 10-12 April.

Davis, M. (2011b). 'BALEAP Tracking Studies Working Party: Current Work and Future Directions'. Paper presented with working party, *EAP within the Higher Education garden: Cross pollination between disciplines, departments and research*, BALEAP Conference, Portsmouth, 10-12 April, 2011.

Davis, M. (2012a). 'International postgraduate students' experiences of plagiarism education in the UK: Student, tutor and expert perspectives'. *International Journal of Educational Integrity,* 8 (2), 21-33. Available at http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/article/view/807/601 Last accessed 14/7/14.

Davis, M. (2012b). 'International postgraduate students' experiences of plagiarism education in the UK: student, tutor and expert perspectives'. Paper presented at the *5th Biennial Plagiarism Conference*, Newcastle, 16-18 July.

Davis, M. (2012c). 'Tracking the development of source use'. Paper presented at *BALEAP PIM on Tracking*, University of Kent at Canterbury, 25 February.

Davis, M. (2013). 'The development of source use in international postgraduate writing'. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes: Special Issue on Source Use in L2 Academic Writing,* 12 (2), 125-135. Available at http://authors.elsevier.com/sd/article/S1475158512000823 Last accessed 14/7/14.

Davis, M. and Carroll, J. (2009). 'Formative feedback within plagiarism education: Is there a role for text-matching software?' *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 5 (2). Available at:
http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/article/viewFile/614/471 Last accessed 14/7/14.

Davis, M. and Morley, J. (2013). **'**Use your own words!' Exploring the boundaries of plagiarism in re-usable phrases'. Paper published in *EAP within the Higher Education garden: Cross pollination between disciplines, departments and research,* BALEAP 2011 Conference Proceedings, Portsmouth, pp.85-94.

Davis, M. and Yeang, F. (2008). 'Encouraging international and dyslexic students to develop better learning strategies for writing through the use of Turnitin'. *Brookes e-Journal of Learning and Teaching*, 2 (3). Available at: http://bejlt.brookes.ac.uk/article/encouraging_international_and_dyslexic_students_to_develop_better_learning/ Last accessed 14/7/14.

Day, K. (2008). 'Time is not on our side'. In R.M. Howard and A.E. Robillard (Eds.) *Pluralizing plagiarism: identities, contexts, pedagogies,* pp.43-61. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

De Bono, E. (1984). Critical thinking is not enough. *Educational Leadership*, 42 (1), 16-17.

De Vaus, D. (2002). *Surveys in Social Research*, 5th Ed. London: Routledge.

De Vita, G. and Case, P. (2003). 'Rethinking the internationalization agenda in UK Higher Education', *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 27 (4), 383-398.

Dehbozorgi, E. (2012). 'Effects of attitude towards language learning and risk-taking on EFL student's proficiency'. *International Journal of English Linguistics,* 2 (2), 41-48.

Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.) (1994). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dorji, L. (1997). 'A study of the skills required by Japanese students intending to enter British universities: A comparative analysis of Japanese students' learning styles and British EFL teaching styles'. *The Japanese Learner*, 11, 1-14.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dunn, W.E. and Lantolf, J.P. (1998). 'Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development and Krashen's i + 1: Incommensurable constructs; incommensurable theories'. *Language Learning,* 48 (3), 411-442.

East, J. (2005). 'Proper acknowledgement?' *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice,* 2 (3a), 1-11. Available at: http://jutlp.uow.edu.au/2005_v02_i03a/east005.html Last accessed 14/7/2014.

Ennis, R. (1985). 'A logical basis for measuring critical thinking'. *Educational Leadership*, 43 (2), 44-48.

Errey, L. (2002). 'Plagiarism: something fishy? …Or just a fish out of water?' *Teaching Forum*, 50, 17-20.

Flowerdew, J. and Li, Y. (2007). 'Language re-use among Chinese apprentice scientists writing for publication'. *Applied Linguistics*, 28, 440-465.

Flowerdew, J. and Miller, L. (1995). 'On the notion of culture in L2 Lectures'. *TESOL Quarterly,* 29 (2), 345-373.

Fontana, A. and Frey, J. (2003). 'The interview: from structured questions to negotiated text'. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.) *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* 2nd Ed., pp.61-106. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Fountain, T.K. and Fitzgerald, L. (2008).''Thou shalt not plagiarize'? Appeals to textual authority and community at religiously affiliated and secular colleges'. In R.M. Howard and A.E. Robillard, (Eds.). *Pluralizing plagiarism: identities, contexts, pedagogies,* pp.101-123*.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Fullbright Sri Lanka (2012). The educational system of Sri Lanka. Available at http://www.fulbrightsrilanka.com/?page_id=609 Last accessed 14/7/2014.

Gardner, S. (2004). Knock-on effects of mode change on academic discourse. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes,* 3 (1), 23–38.

Gibson, W. and Brown, A. (2009). *Working with qualitative data*. London: Sage.

Gourlay, L. and Deane, J. (2012). 'Loss, responsibility, blame? Staff discourses of student plagiarism'. *Innovation in Education and Teaching International*, 49 (1), 19-29.

Graddol, D. (2006). *English next?* London: The British Council.

Gray, P. and Leather, S. (1999). *Safety and Challenge for Japanese Learners of English*, London: First Person Publishing.

Guerin, C. and Picard, M. (2012). 'Try it on: voice, concordancing and textmatching in doctoral writing'*. International Journal of Educational Integrity*, 8 (2), 34-45.

Hakim, C. (1983). 'Research based on administrative records'. *Sociological Review* 31 (3), 489-510.

Hall, G. and Sung, T. W.-C. (2009). 'Mind the gap? A case-study of the differing perceptions of international students and their lecturers on postgraduate business programmes'. *International Journal of Management Education,* 8 (1), 53-62.

Halliday, F. (1999). 'The chimera of the 'international university''. *International Affairs*, 75 (1), 99-120.

Hammersley, M. and Traianou, A. (2007). *Ethics and Educational Research*. London: TLRP. Available at http://www.bera.ac.uk/ethics-and-educational-research/ Last accessed 4/1/2011.

Handa, N. and Power, C. (2005). 'Land and discover! A case study investigating the cultural context of plagiarism'. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 2 (3b), 64-84.

Harumi, S. (2011). 'Classroom silence: voices from Japanese EFL learners'. *ELT Journal*, 65 (3), 260-269.

Harwood, N. (2009). 'An interview-based study of the functions of citations in academic writing across two disciplines'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41 (3), 497-518.

Harwood, N. and Petrić, B. (2012). 'Performance in the citing behaviour of two student writers'. *Written Communication*, 29 (1), 55-103.

Hayes, N. and Introna, L. (2003). *Alienation and Plagiarism: Coping with otherness in our assessment practice*. Lancaster University working paper. Available online at http://www.lums.co.uk/publications/viewpdf/239/ Last accessed 14/7/2014.

Hayes, N. and Introna, L. (2005). 'Plagiarism, alienation and fairness: towards an inclusive educational practice'. *Ethics and Behaviour*, 15 (3), 213-231.

HESA (2009/10). HESA Student Record (2009/10). Available at http://www.hesa.ac.uk/requests Last accessed 28/6/14.

HESA (2010). Statistics – Students and qualifiers at UK HE institution. Available at http://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1897&Itemid=239 Last accessed 29/5/2011.

Hinds, J. (1987). 'Reader versus writer responsibility. A new typology of language'. In U. Connor and R. B. Kaplan (Eds.) *Writing Across Languages: Analysis of L2 Text,* pp.141-152. Reading, MA: Addison-Welsey.

Hirvela, A. and Du, Q. (2013). ''Why am I paraphrasing?' Undergraduate ESL writers' engagement with source-based academic writing and reading'. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes: Special Issue on Source Use in L2 Academic Writing,* 12 (2), 87-98.

Holmes, P. (2004). 'Negotiating differences in learning and intercultural communication'. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 67 (3), 294-307.

Howard, R.M. (1993). 'A plagiarism pentimento'. *Journal of Teaching Writing,* 11 (3), 233-246.

Howard, R. M. (1995). 'Plagiarisms, authorship, and the academic death penalty'. *College English*, 57 (7), 788–806.

Howard, R. M. (1999). *Standing in the shadow of giants: Plagiarists, authors, collaborators*. Stanford, CT: Ablex.

Howard, R.M. (2008). 'Plagiarizing (from) graduate students'. In R.M. Howard and A.E. Robillard (Eds.) *Pluralizing plagiarism: identities, contexts, pedagogies,* pp.92-100. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Husain, S. and Waterfield, R. (2006). 'The first year of higher education'. In S. Davies, D. Swinburne and G. Williams (Eds.) *Writing Matters,* pp.27-84. London: Royal Literary Fund.

Hyland, F. (2001). 'Dealing with plagiarism when giving feedback'. *ELT Journal*, 55 (4), 375-381.

Hyland, K. (1999). 'Academic attribution: citation and the construction of disciplinary knowledge'. *Applied Linguistics*, 20 (3), 341-367.

Hyland, K. (2002). 'Activity and evaluation: Reporting practices in academic writing'. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.) *Academic discourse,* pp.115-130. Harlow: Longman.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes: An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.

Hyland, K. (2008). 'Academic clusters: Text patterning in published and postgraduate writing'. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 18 (1), 41-62.

Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse: English in a global context*. London: Continuum.

Hymes, D. (1972). 'On communicative competence'. In J.B.Pride and J. Holmes (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics*, pp.269-93. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

IELTS (2014). *IELTS Band Scores*. Available at: http://www.ielts.org/institutions/test_format_and_results/ielts_band_scores.aspx Last accessed 14/7/2014.

Introna, L. and Hayes, N. (2004). 'Plagiarism, detection and intentionality: On the (un)construction of plagiarists'. In A. Smith and F. Duggan (Eds.) *Plagiarism: Prevention, Practice and Policy Conference Proceedings* pp.83-95, Plagiarism Advisory Service, Newcastle, 28 -30 June.

IOE (2007). *MPhil/PhD Student handbook 2007/8*. Institute of Education, University of London.

Ireland, C. and English, J. (2011). 'Let them plagiarise: Developing academic English in a safe environment'. *Journal of Academic Writing*, 1 (1), 165-172.

Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and Identity: The Discoursal Construction of Identity in Academic Writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Iyer-O'Sullivan, R. (2013). 'I can't say it any better: Critical reading as a threshold concept in helping postgraduate Arab students become critical and original writers'. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 9 (2), 3-14.

James, M.A. (2006). 'Transfer of learning from a university content-based EAP course'. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40 (4), 783-806.

Jamieson, S. (2008). 'One size does not fit all'. In R.M. Howard and A.E. Robillard (Eds.) *Pluralizing plagiarism: identities, contexts, pedagogies,* pp.77-91. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Jiang, X. and Sharpling, G. (2011). 'The impact of assessment change on language learning strategies: The views of a small group of Chinese graduate students studying in the UK'. *Asian EFL Journal*, 13 (4), 33-68.

Jin, L. and Cortazzi, M. (2006). 'Changing practices in Chinese cultures of learning'. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 19 (1), 5-20.

Jordan, R.R. (1997). *English for academic purposes: a guide and resource book for teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B.B. (1985). 'Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle'. In R. Quirk and H. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures,* pp.11-36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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. (2010). 'How do university students attempt to avoid plagiarism? A grammatical analysis of undergraduate paraphrasing strategies.' *Writing and Pedagogy*, 2 (2), 193-222.

Keck, C. (2014). 'Copying, paraphrasing, and academic writing development: A re-examination of L1 and L2 summarization practices'. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 25, 2-22.

Kennedy, P. (2002). 'Learning cultures and learning styles: Myth-understandings about adult (Hong Kong) Chinese learners'. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 21 (5), 430-445.

Kinzley, S. (2011). *The impact of a university pre-sessional course on the academic writing behaviours of a group of Chinese undergraduate students studying for a degree in media and cultural studies.* Unpublished doctoral thesis. Lancaster University.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2004). 'Some thoughts on the Chinese learner and the teaching of writing'. *The East Asian Learner*, 1 (1), 6-15.

Klein, D. (2011). 'Why learners choose plagiarism: A review of literature'. *Interdisciplinary Journal of E-learning and Learning Objects*, 7, 97-110.

Kvale, S. and Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Inter Views: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Kwan, B.S.C. (2006). 'The schematic structure of literature reviews in doctoral theses of applied linguistics'. *English for Specific Purposes,* 25, 30-55.

Kwan, B.S.C. (2008). The nexus of reading, writing and researching in the doctoral undertaking of humanities and social sciences: Implications for literature reviewing. *English for Specific Purposes,* 27, 42-56.

Lantolf, J.P. (2000). 'Second Language Learning as a mediated process'. *Language Teaching,* 33, 79-96.

Lantolf, J.P. and Appel, G. (Eds.) (1994). *Vygotskian approaches to second language research.* Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Larkham, P. and Manns, S. (2002). 'Plagiarism and its treatment in higher education'. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 26 (4), 339-349.

Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lea, M.R. and Street, B.V. (2000). 'Student writing and staff feedback in higher education: an academic literacies approach'. In M.R. Lea and B. Stierer (Eds.) *Student Writing in Higher Education: New Contexts.* Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Leask, B. (2006). 'Plagiarism, cultural diversity and metaphor - implications for academic staff development'. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 31 (2), 183-199. Available at: http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~db=all~content=a727297182 Last assessed 14/7/14.

Leask, B. (2009). 'Using formal and informal curricula to improve interactions between home and international students'. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13 (2), 205-221.

Lee, D. and Swales, J. (2006). 'A corpus-based EAP course for NNS doctoral students: Moving from available specialized corpora to self-compiled corpora'. *English for Specific Purposes,* 25 (1), 56-75.

Lee, J. (2013). 'The false halo of internationalisation'. *Centre for International Education*, 72, 5-7.

Lee, R.M. (1993). *Doing research on sensitive topics*. London: Sage.

Lee, S.H. (2010). 'Attribution in high- and low-graded persuasive essays by tertiary students'. *Functions of Language*, 17 (2), 181-206.

Leki, I. and Carson, J.G. (1994). 'Students' perceptions of EAP writing instruction and writing needs across the disciplines'. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28 (1), 81-100.

Liao, M.-T. and Tseng, C.-Y. (2010). 'Students' behaviours and views of paraphrasing and inappropriate textual borrowing in an EFL academic setting'. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 14 (2), 187-211.

Lillis, T. (2001). *Student Writing: Access, Regulation, Desire*. London: Routledge.

Little, A. and Evans, J. (2005). 'The growth of foreign qualifications suppliers in Sri Lanka: De facto centralisation?' *Compare: a Journal of Comparative Education*, 35 (2), 181–191.

Lunsford, A. and West, S. (1996). 'Intellectual property and composition studies'. *College composition and communications*, 47, 383-411.

Macdonald, R. and Carroll, J. (2006) 'Plagiarism: A complex issue requiring a holistic approach'. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31 (2), 233-245.

Maddox, J. (1995). 'Plagiarism is worse than mere theft'. *Nature*, 376, 721.

Malone, S. (2003). 'Ethics at home: Informed consent in your own backyard'. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16 (6), 797-815.

Marsh, B. (2007). *Plagiarism: Alchemy and remedy in Higher Education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Martala, M. (2006). 'Tracking pre-sessional students' writing abilities at the University of Hertfordshire'. In A. Gillett and L. Wray (Eds.) *Assessing the Effectiveness of EAP Programmes*, pp.40-55. London: BALEAP.

Mason, J. (1996). *Qualitative researching*. London: Sage.

Maxwell, A., Curtis, G. and Vardanega, L. (2008). 'Does culture influence understanding and perceived seriousness of plagiarism?' *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 4 (2), 25-40.

McCabe, D., Feghali, T. and Abdallah, H. (2008). 'Academic dishonesty in the Middle East: individual and contextual factors'. *Research in Higher Education*, 49 (5), 451-467.

McCulloch, S. (2012). 'Citations in search of a purpose; source use and authorial voice in L2 student writing'. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 8 (1), 55-69.

McDonough, J. and Shaw, C. (2003). *Materials and methods in ELT* (2nd Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

McGowan, S. and Lightbody, M. (2008). 'Another chance to practice: Repeating plagiarism education for EAL students within a discipline context'. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 4 (1), 16-30.

McGowan, U. (2005a). 'Does educational integrity mean teaching students NOT to 'use their own words'?' *International Journal for Educational Integrity,* 1 (1).

McGowan, U. (2005b). 'Plagiarism Detection and Prevention: Are We Putting the Cart before the horse?' *Proceedings from HERDSA Conference*, 287-293.

McKinley, J. (2013). 'Displaying critical thinking in EFL academic writing: A discussion of Japanese to English contrastive rhetoric'. *RELC Journal*, 44 (2), 195-208.

Moore, T. and Morton, J. (2005). 'Dimensions of difference: a comparison of university writing and IELTS writing'. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4, 43-66.

Morley, J. (2005). Academic Phrasebank. Available at http://www.phrasebank.manchester.ac.uk/ Last accessed 14/7/2014.

Murray, N. and Kirton, B. (2006). 'An Analysis of the Current Situation'. In S. Davies, D. Swinburne and G. Williams (Eds.) *Writing Matters,* pp.7-14. London: Royal Literary Fund.

Nation, I.S.P. (2006). 'How large a vocabulary is needed for reading and listening?' *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63 (1), 59-82.

Nayak, R.R. and Venkatraman, S. (2010). 'A pilot study into international students' academic culture: the context of Indian business students in an Australian university'. *E-Journal of Business Education & Scholarship of Teaching*, 4 (2), 1-12.

Nielsen, F. A. (2012). Wikipedia research and tools: Review and comments. November 7, 2012, 1-52. Available at http://www2.imm.dtu.dk/pubdb/views/edoc_download.../imm6012.pdf Last accessed 14/7/14.

Norton, L., Tilley, A., Newstead, S. and Franklyn-Stokes, A. (2001). 'The pressures of assessment in undergraduate courses and their effect on student behaviours'. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 26, 269-284.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

OECD (2011).*Table C3.6. Number of foreign students in tertiary education, by country of origin and destination (2009).* Available at http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932464562 Last accessed 14/7/2014.

Park, C. (2003). 'In other (people's) words: plagiarism by university students – literature and lessons'. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28 (5), 471-488.

Park, C. (2004). 'Rebels without a clause: Towards an institutional framework for dealing with plagiarism by students'. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 28 (3), 291-306.

Pears, R. and Shields, G. (2008). *Cite them right: The essential referencing guide*. 7th ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pears, R. and Shields, G. (2013). *Cite them right: The essential referencing guide.* 9th ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pecorari, D. (1998). 'Process citing: avoiding plagiarism in student writing'. *The Japanese Learner,* October, 16, 1-4*.*

Pecorari, D. (2000). 'Intercultural contact and academic values: The example of plagiarism'. In D. Lynch and A. Pilbeam (Eds.), *Heritage and progress: From the past to the future in intercultural understanding. Proceedings of the 1998 SIETAR Europa Congress,* pp. 57-64. Bath, UK: LTS Training and Consulting & SEITAR Europa.

Pecorari, D. (2001). 'Plagiarism and international students: how the English-speaking university responds'. In D. Belcher and A. Hirvela (Eds.) *Linking Literacies: Perspectives on L2 Reading-Writing Connections,* 229-245. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Pecorari, D. (2002). *Original reproductions: an investigation of the source use of postgraduate second language writers*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Birmingham.

Pecorari, D. (2003). 'Good and original: plagiarism and patchworking in academic second language writing'. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 12, 317-345.

Pecorari, D. (2006). 'Visible and occluded features in postgraduate second-language writing'. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25, 4-29.

Pecorari, D. (2008). *Academic writing and plagiarism: a linguistic analysis*. London: Continuum.

Pecorari, D. (2013). *Teaching to avoid plagiarism: how to promote good source use.* Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Pecorari, D. and Shaw, P. (2012). 'Types of student intertextuality and faculty attitudes'. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 149-164.

Pedersen, A.-M. (2011). 'Writing across languages, disciplines and sources: Second language writers in Jordan'. *Across the Disciplines*, 8 (1), 5.

Pennycook, A. (1996). 'Borrowing other's words: text, ownership, memory and plagiarism'. *TESOL Quarterly,* 30, 210-230.

Petrić, B. (2007). 'Rhetorical functions of citations in high- and low-rated master's theses'. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 6,* 238-253.

Petrić, B. (2012). 'Legitimate textual borrowing: direct quotation in L2 student writing'. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 102-117.

Petrić, B. and Harwood, N. (2013). Task requirements, task representation and self-reported citation functions: An exploratory study of a successful L2 student's writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes: Special Issue on Source Use in L2 Academic Writing,* 12 (2), 110-124.

Pilcher, N. (2006). 'Mainland Chinese postgraduate students during their Master's dissertations: some reflections and thoughts on the effectiveness of EAP from the student's perspective'. In A. Gillett and L. Wray (Eds.) *Assessing the Effectiveness of EAP Programmes*, pp.56-71. London: BALEAP.

Pittam, G., Elander, J., Lusher, J., Fox, P. and Payne, N. (2009). 'Student beliefs and attitudes about authorial identity in academic writing'. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34 (2), 153-170.

Plantin, C. (2002). Argumentation and discourse analysis: the French situation and global perspectives. *Discourse studies*, 4 (3), 343-369.

Pople, I. (2011). *Saving spaces*. Todmorden: Arc Publications.

Price, J. (2009). *Plagiarism in Higher Education*: *Consensus and consistency when punishing student cases.* Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Southampton.

QAA (2012). Understanding assessment: its role in safeguarding academic standards and quality in HE – A guide for early career staff. Available at

http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/CircularLetters/Pages/CL-15-12.aspx Last accessed 14/7/2014.

Ragen, B.A. (1987). 'A lesson of Biden's plagiarism'. *New York Times*, A39.

Richards, L. (2009). *Handling qualitative data,* 2nd ed. London: Sage.

Ridley, D. (2006). 'Tracking a cohort of pre-sessional students at Sheffield Hallam University'. In A. J. Gillett & L. Wray (eds.), *Assessing the effectiveness of EAP programmes,* pp.24-39. London: BALEAP.

Ridley, D. (2008). *The Literature Review*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Ritchie, J. S. (1989). 'Beginning writers: Diverse voices and individual identity'. *College Composition and Communication,* 40 (2), 152-174.

Robson, S. and Turner, Y. (2007). 'Teaching is a Co-Learning Experience: Academics' Reflecting on Learning and Teaching in an 'Internationalized' Faculty.' *Teaching in Higher Education*, 12 (1), 41-54.

Russikoff, K. Fucaloro, L. and Salkauskiene, D. (2003). 'Plagiarism as a cross-cultural phenomenon', *CAL Poly Pomona Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 16, 109-120.

Ryan, J. and Hellmundt, S. (2005). 'Maximising international students' 'cultural capital''. In J. Carroll and J. Ryan (Eds.). *Teaching international students: improving learning for all,* pp.13-16. London: Routledge.

Satyanarayana, K. (2010). 'Plagiarism: a scourge affecting the Indian science'. *Indian Journal of Medical Research,* 131 (3), 373-376.

Schick, K. (2011). 'Citation obsession! Get over it!' *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 58 (11).

Schmitt, D. (2005). 'Writing in the international classroom' in J. Carroll and J. Ryan (Eds.), *Teaching International Students: improving learning for all*, pp.63-74. Abingdon: Routledge.

Schmitt, N. and Schmitt, D. (2012). 'A reassment of frequency and vocabulary size in L2 vocabulary teaching'. *Language Teaching*, 1-20.

Scollon, R. (1995). Plagiarism and ideology: identity in intercultural discourse. *Language and Society,* 24 (1), 1028.

Shaw, P. (1992). 'Reasons for the correlation of voice, tense, and sentence function in reporting verbs'. *Applied Linguistics,* 13*,* 302-319.

Shaw, P. and Liu, E. T.-K. (1998). 'What develops in the development of second language writing'. *Applied Linguistics*, 19, 225-254.

Sherman, J. (1992). 'Your own thoughts in your own words'. *ELT Journal* 46 (2), 190-198.

Shi, L. (2008). 'Textual appropriation and citing behaviours of university undergraduates'. *Applied Linguistics*. December amn045, 1-24.

Southern University (2007). What is it like being a postgrad at Southern? *Teaching News.* Spring.

Southern University (2008a). *Library Referencing guide*.

Southern University (2008b). U70352 *Academic writing student handbook.* Student handbook for Pre-Master's Diploma.

Southern University (2009a). *University strategy 2010 to 2020*.

Southern University (2009b). Business School. *Student Handbook for MSc International Business Economics*, 2009-10.

Southern University (2009c) *Student Regulations – Specific regulations B16* Cheating.

Southern University (2010a). *The economic contribution of Southern University*.

Southern University (2010b). *The Business School-postgraduate-international*.

Southern University (2010c) *Annual Accounts 2008-2009.*

Southern University (2010d) *International - Country information*.

Southern University (2010e). *Strategy for enhancing the student experience 2010-2015*.

Southern University (2010f) *Upgrade Study Advice Service*. Study Skills A-Z.

Sowden, C. (2003). 'Understanding academic competence in overseas students in the UK'. *ELT Journal*, 57 (4), 377-385.

Sowton, C. (2012). *50 steps to improving your academic writing*. Reading: Garnet.

Spack, R. (1997). 'The acquisition of academic literacy in a second language: A longitudinal case study'. *Written Communication,* 14 (1), 3-62.

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Stapleton, P. (2010). 'Writing in an electronic age: a case study of L2 composing processes'. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9, 295-307.

Storch, N. and Tapper, J. (2009). 'The impact of an EAP course on postgraduate writing'. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 8 (3), 207-223.

Sturman, A. (1994), 'Case study methods'. In J.P. Keeves (Ed.) *Educational Research Methodology and Measurement: an international handbook,* 2nd Ed. Oxford: Pergamon.

Sutherland-Smith, W. (2008). *Plagiarism, the internet and student learning: Improving academic integrity*. New York: Routledge.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: CUP.

Swales, J. (2014). 'Variation in citational practice in a corpus of student biology papers: From parenthetical plonking to intertextual storytelling'. *Written Communication* 31 (1), 118-141.

Swales, J. and Feak, C. (2004). *Academic writing for graduate students,* 2nd Ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Thompson, C. (2005). 'Authority is everything: A study of the politics of textual ownership and knowledge in the formation of student writer identities'. *International Journal for Educational Integrity,* 1 (1). Available at: http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/issue/view/3 Last accessed 14/7/2014.

Thompson, G. & Ye, Y. (1991). 'Evaluation in the reporting verbs used in academic papers'. *Applied Linguistics,* 12 (4), 365-82.

Thompson, P. (2001). *A pedagogically motivated corpus-based investigation of PhD thesis: Macrostructure, citation practices and uses of modal verbs.* Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Reading.

Toh, G. (2011). 'Facilitating critical reading in the teaching of English for Academic Purposes in a Japanese EAP Classroom'. *TESL Reporter*, 44 (1 and 2), 42-50.

UK Council for International Student Affairs (UKCISA) (2010). *International students in the UK: facts, figures - and fiction*. Available at http://www.ukcisa.org.uk/files/pdf/about/international_education_facts_figures.pdf Last accessed 14/7/14.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wallace, C. (2003). *Critical reading in language education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wallace, M. and Wray, A. (2011). *Critical reading and writing for postgraduates*. 2nd Ed. London: Sage.

Walsh, S. (2002). 'SUNY-Albany classicist loses chairmanship after being accused of plagiarism'. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 48 (26), 12.

Wannemacher, K. (2011). 'Experiences and perspectives of Wikipedia'. *International Journal of Management in Education*, 5 (11), 79-92.

Waters, A. and Waters, M. (1995). *Study tasks in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weller, S. (2010). 'Comparing lecturer and student accounts of reading in the humanities'. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 9 (1), 85-104.

WHO African region – Algeria statistics summary (2002 – present). Available at http://www.who.int/gho/countries/en/ Last accessed 14/7/2014.

WHO South Eastern Asian region – Sri Lanka statistics summary (2002-present). Available at http://www.who.int/gho/countries/en/ Last accessed 14/7/2014.

Wikipedia – Citing Wikipedia. Available at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia Last accessed 14/7/2014.

Williams, K. (2009). *Getting critical*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Williams, K. and Carroll, J. (2009). *Referencing and understanding plagiarism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Willingham, D. (2007). 'Critical thinking: why is it so hard to teach?' *American Educator*, Summer, 8-19.

Wood, D., Bruner, J.S. and Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17 (2), 89-100.

World Fact Book CIA. Japan Available at https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ja.html Last accessed 14/7/2014.

Wray, L. (2008). 'Jack's story: study of a Chinese postgraduate student at a UK university'. *The East Asian Learner*, 4 (1), 20-35.

Yeo, S. and Chien, R. (2005). The seriousness of plagiarism incidents: Making consistent decisions across a university. *Proceedings of the 2nd Asia-Pacific Educational Integrity Conference*, University of Newcastle, Australia, 2-3 December. Available at http://www.newcastle.edu.au/conference/apeic/papers_pdf/yeo%20and%20chien.pdf Last accessed 14/7/14.

Yin, R. (2003). *Case study research: design and methods,* 3rd Ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Zepke, N. and Leach L. (2005). 'Integration and adaptation: approaches to the student retention and achievement puzzle'. *Active Learning in Higher Education* 6 (1), 46-59.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Communication on ethical process

Time frame of communication on ethical process 30/3/08 -29/5/08

Date	Actor and Action
30/3	R-SRO Submission of draft ethics forms
31/3	SRO-R Acknowledged forms, answered questions, gave feedback date
7/4	SRO-R Feedback, requested changes and hard copy of application
9/4	R-SRO Explained changes and sent signed application + requested forms
11/4	SRO-R Acknowledged hard copy of signed form
11/4	SR-R Made further request for changes
12/4	R-SR Responded to request
12/4	R-SRO New drafts of forms sent by e-mail and hard copy
22/4	SRO-R Confirmed forms sent to UREC
7/5	UREC Meeting
15/5	CEC-R Discussed application by phone
15/5	CEC-R Set out conditions in letter – email and hard copy
15/5	R-CEC Responded to conditions, sent revised documents
23/5	R-CEC Requested acknowledgement of revisions
29/5	CEC-R Full approval given in letter – email and hard copy

(*R=Researcher, SRO=School Research Officer, SR=Senior Researcher, CEC=Chair, Ethics Committee, UREC=University Research Ethics Committee*)

Appendix 2: Pilot study

Appendix 2a: Information for participants

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Mary Davis as part of her PhD study at the Institute of Education, University of London, supervised by Prof. Ken Hyland. Before you decide whether or not to take part, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully.

Study title: **Learning and teaching about the use of other authors' words in non-native academic writing: how do international postgraduate students incorporate others' text into their text?**

Purpose of the study

The aim of the study is to examine how students make use of other authors' words in their academic writing assignments during their Pre-Master's and Master's programmes. Through this study, the researcher aims to improve the instruction and materials available to future students. The researcher requests permission to access 1 (1st and final drafts of) written assignment (EWP) by the participants during the Pre-Master's programme. The researcher would also like to conduct 1 interview with participants in the middle of the semester.

Why have I been invited to participate?

The researcher would like to begin a pilot study of a number of Pre-Master's students who plan to continue onto Master's courses at Southern University.

Do I have to take part?

Your participation is entirely voluntary and you are under no obligation to participate. You are also under no obligation to answer questions in the interview that you find offensive. Should you decide to end your participation, you may do so at any time without penalty.

What will happen to me if I take part?

You will have the opportunity to discuss your use of other authors' words with the researcher. Your written assignments will be analysed by the researcher. You will be asked for a small time commitment of approximately 30 minutes for one interview. You will also be asked to complete a questionnaire at the end of the study (time approximately 20 minutes).

What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?

The researcher will analyse your written assignments, but this should not be a disadvantage or risk in any way. Taking part will not affect your assignments, your marks or your progress on the Pre-Master's or Master's course in any way. Taking part in interviews should also not be a disadvantage or risk in any way and involves an approximate time of 30 minutes in total. You will be part of a small case study, but you will not be identified in the data.

What are the possible benefits of taking part?

Taking part means you will have 1-1 interviews with the researcher which may lead you to more reflection. However, in fairness to both participants and non-participants, the researcher cannot offer any specific benefits.

Will what I say in this study be kept confidential?

All responses to this survey are confidential. Your identity will remain anonymous and no identifying information from use of electronic versions of assignments will be recorded. The interviews will be made on a 1-1 basis with the researcher, who is solely responsible for transcribing them. No identifying data will be transcribed in the data and real names will not be used. Data generated by the study will be retained in accordance with the university's policy on Academic Integrity. The data generated in the course of the research will be kept securely in paper or electronic form for a period of five years after the completion of the research project.

What should I do if I want to take part?

Ask any questions to the researcher, take your own time to read this information and then read the consent forms, and if you agree, initial or tick the boxes as instructed and sign. The researcher will give you more information.

What will happen to the results of the research study?

The results will be used as the primary research findings for the researcher's doctoral thesis. They will be disseminated and published. A transcript of the interviews will be sent to participants to confirm authenticity and a summary of findings will be sent to participants. The complete study will be available to be consulted at the Library of IOE, University of London in Summer 2013.

Who is organizing and funding the research?

The researcher is organizing the research herself, and is mainly self-funded, with a percentage funded by Southern University.

Who has reviewed the study?

The researcher's supervisor, Prof. Ken Hyland at the Institute of Education, University of London and the University Research Ethics Committee at Southern University.

Contact for further information

Please contact the researcher Mary Davis at email address and office address provided. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact the chair of the University Research Ethics Committee at Southern University at email address provided.

Thank you

Thank you for taking the time to read the information

This study has been approved by the University Research Ethics Committee of Southern University, Registration Number 080332.

Appendix 2b: Consent Form

Full title of Project: **Learning and teaching about the use of other authors' words in non-native academic writing: how do international postgraduate students incorporate others' text into their text?**

Name, position and contact address of researcher: Mary Davis, University teacher at email address and office address provided.

	Please initial box	
1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet for the above study and have had the opportunity to ask questions.	☐	
2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving reason.	☐	
3. I agree to take part in the above study.	☐	

	Please tick box	
	Yes	**No**
4. I agree to the interview being audio recorded.	☐	☐
5. I agree to the use of anonymised quotes in publications (*The number of students in the study is small, but every effort will be made to ensure the confidentiality of participants. There are, however, legal limitations to confidentiality in freedom to information claims.*)	☐	☐
6. I agree for the researcher to access and analyse 1 (1st & final drafts of) written assignments (the Extended Writing Project) during the Pre-Master's course.	☐	☐

_____   _____   _____
Name of Participant   Date   Signature

_____   _____   _____

Name of Researcher   Date   Signature

Appendix 2c: Interview Questions

Instructions:

Thank you very much for coming today. We are going to have an interview for 30 minutes in 5 parts. I will ask you some questions about using literature in your writing, using some written examples. Please answer these as you wish. This interview is not in any way a test. If you don't understand the question, please ask. If you don't know the answer, please say you don't know.

Do you have any questions before we start? Are you happy to start the tape now?

PART 1:

Read the following 2 sentences and tell me which one you would take more seriously, and why

1. The number of international students in UK higher education has increased considerably in the last year.

2. The number of international students in UK higher education has increased by 12% since last year, according to the most recent government report (HEFCE, 2008)

> **RATIONALE: To establish whether participants can see importance of citation and differentiate between examples that are acknowledged or not acknowledged, as well as note the specific information in the second example**

PART 2:

Read the following sentences. Would you write any of them differently?

Global warming is considered a serious issue (Clarke, 2003) but it is not yet on the global agenda (Clarke, 2003).

Emma (2004) argues that awareness of global warming has grown significantly in developed countries.

D. Jones (2000) examines the lack of progress on global warming issues in Europe.

According to Smith (1998), she states that the UK policy on global warming has changed.

Follow on questions:

How would you make any changes to these sentences?

Can you identify any reporting verbs above? What do they mean?

Do you know any other reporting verbs?

Can you think of any differences between them?

RATIONALE: To find out whether participants are able to see errors in use of citation and to correct them. To estimate their knowledge of reporting verbs

PART 3:

Before we read the next part, can you tell me what you think is the difference between a paraphrase and a quotation?

Now can you tell me what plagiarism is? Why is it important to avoid?

Now read the following article. Can you identify examples of paraphrases, quotations or plagiarism in the sentences that follow from student essays on the topic of fitness in the UK?

From 'Fitness Failures' by Nathan Dempsey, 1999, p 101.

Despite the government fitness campaign, a large proportion of British people still fail to exercise regularly. In particular, people who begin exercise programmes because of an identified health risk are likely to drop out within three to four months. While the encouragement and support from friends, family or a club is considered crucial, sports psychologists have been trying to develop exercise programmes that will keep people exercising, but without success.

1. Dempsey (1999) states that the UK government's promotion of fitness is unsuccessful, despite the efforts of sports psychologists.

2. The encouragement and support of friends, family or a club is considered crucial to keep people exercising (Dempsey, 1999).

3. Dempsey (1999:101) argues that 'people who begin exercise programmes because of an identified health risk are likely to drop out within three to four months'.

4. Dempsey (1999) claims that government attempts to improve fitness in the UK do not work because there is a high drop out rate from exercise programmes.

5. The government has attempted to promote fitness but a 'large proportion of British people fail to exercise regularly' (Dempsey, 1999:101).

6. British people are not good at keeping to exercise routines; even those with an identified health risk tend to give up within a few months and sports psychologists have not succeeded in making the right exercise programmes.

What helped you to decide which are paraphrases and which are quotations?

What helped you to decide which are plagiarism?

Follow on question (where appropriate): what would you do differently (eg in examples 2 and 6)?

PART 4

Read the following text. Can you make a quotation and a paraphrase using the text, as if you were writing an essay on this topic?

Four Asian Tigers by H. Chan (1997) p.97

Over the past 20 years, Hong Kong, Korea, Singapore and Taiwan had remarkably rapid and sustained economic growth, earning them the nickname the four tigers. Because of the new investment opportunities they provide and because their experiences may offer lessons for less developed economies, they have attracted considerable attention from the financial and policy communities, as well as from economists who have renewed interest in research in theories of economic growth.

Final questions:

What are the biggest challenges for you in using sources in your writing?

How do you think you could improve your use of sources in your writing?

How much do you think you have improved in your use of sources in your writing since the beginning of the course?

Do you have any other comments about using sources in your writing?

Thank you very much

Appendix 3: Main study recruitment

Appendix 3a: Recruitment flyer

Invitation

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Mary Davis as part of her PhD study at the Institute of Education, University of London, supervised by Prof. Ken Hyland. If you are interested, please come to a meeting on Thursday 2nd October at 12pm in DEM 3.

Study title

Learning and teaching about the use of sources in non-native academic writing: how do international postgraduate students develop their use of sources?

Aim of the study

The aim of the study is to examine how students develop their use of sources in their academic writing assignments during their Pre-Master's and Master's programmes. Through this study, the researcher aims to improve the instruction and materials available to future students.

Appendix 3b: Script of information for research meeting, 2/10/08

Welcome! The purpose of this meeting is to tell you about my research and to invite you to participate.

As you will have seen from the invitation, like you, I am a student. I am taking my PhD at the University of London. To do this, I need to carry out primary research, that is original research of my own, involving research participants who are students -that could be you- and also teaching staff. My topic is learning and teaching of the use of sources (that means books, journals etc) in academic writing: how do international students develop their use of sources in writing (so I am only looking at writing). The purpose of the study is to improve the courses and teaching on the Pre-Master's for future students.

If you would like to participate in my research, I'd like to make it clear that I would guarantee a minimum of time commitments for you, and confidentiality as far as possible.

What I would ask you to do is 3 things:

1. to participate in one interview lasting 30 minutes each semester over the next 2 years (4 in total)
2. to give me permission to analyse 3 of your written assignments per year, including first drafts
3. to complete one questionnaire at the end of each semester (10 minutes)

Participation in the study will not affect your progression or your marks or my teaching you in any way. The research will not be discussed in class time and will be kept quite separate to your study.

In fairness to both participants and non-participants, I cannot offer specific advantages for participating in this study. All I can say is that I think you may find it interesting to be involved in postgraduate research.

To participate, I am asking you to be involved for 2 years – one year on the Pre-Master's and one year at PG. This means anyone who is definitely planning to study at Southern next year or has a 2 year offer, I would be very keen for you to participate. If you are possibly thinking about studying at Southern, I would also be happy for you to participate. If in the end you go on to another university next year, don't worry, that is not a problem and should not affect your decision about where you study. If, on the other hand, you are absolutely sure you will not be studying at Southern for postgraduate, then I would suggest you do not participate.

I would now like to give out the information letter and ask you to read it. Please ask any questions.

Now, if you would like to participate, I'd like to ask you to sign the consent forms, which I will copy for you, so that you have a record of what we have agreed. You can also take the consent forms away and sign later, if you prefer.

Appendix 3c: Information for participants

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Mary Davis as part of her PhD study at the Institute of Education, University of London, supervised by Prof. Ken Hyland. Before you decide whether or not to take part, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully.

Study title: **Learning and teaching about the use of sources in non-native academic writing: how do international postgraduate students develop their use of sources?**

Purpose of the study

The aim of the study is to examine how students develop their use of sources in their academic writing assignments during their Pre-Master's and Master's programmes. Through this study, the researcher aims to improve the instruction and materials available to future students. The researcher requests permission to access 3 (1st and final drafts of) academic writing assignments by the participants during the Pre-Master's programme, and 3 during the Master's programme. The researcher would also like to conduct 1 interview with participants in the middle of each semester of the Pre-Master's and Master's programme.

Why have I been invited to participate?

The researcher would like to focus on a number of Pre-Master's students who plan to continue onto Master's courses at Southern.

Do I have to take part?

Your participation is entirely voluntary and you are under no obligation to participate. You are also under no obligation to answer questions in the interview that you find offensive. Should you decide to end your participation, you may do so at any time without penalty.

What will happen to me if I take part?

You will be asked for a small time commitment of approximately 30 minutes for one recorded interview each semester (4 in total) to discuss your use of sources with the researcher. Your written assignments will be analysed by the researcher. You will also be asked to complete a questionnaire at the end of the study (for approximately 20 minutes).

What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?

The researcher will analyse your written assignments, but this will not be a disadvantage or risk in any way. Taking part will not affect your assignments, your marks or your progress on the Pre-Master's or Master's course in any way. Taking part in interviews should also not be a disadvantage or risk in any way and involves an approximate time of 30 minutes each semester with a total of 2 hours. You will be part of a small case study, but you will not be identified in the data.

What are the possible benefits of taking part?

Taking part means you will have 1-1 interviews with the researcher which may lead you to more reflection. However, in fairness to both participants and non-participants, the researcher cannot offer any specific benefits.

Will what I say in this study be kept confidential?

All responses to this survey are confidential. Your identity will remain anonymous and no identifying information from use of electronic versions of assignments will be recorded. The interviews will be made on a 1-1 basis with the researcher, who is solely responsible for transcribing them. No identifying data will be transcribed in the data and real names will not be used. Data generated by the study will be retained in accordance with the university's policy on Academic Integrity. The data generated in the course of the research will be kept securely in paper or electronic form for a period of five years after the completion of the research project.

What should I do if I want to take part?

Ask any questions to the researcher, take your own time to read this information and then read the consent forms, and if you agree, initial or tick the boxes as instructed and sign. The researcher will give you more information.

What will happen to the results of the research study?

The results will be used as the primary research findings for the researcher's doctoral thesis. They will be disseminated and published. A transcript of the interviews will be sent to participants to confirm authenticity and a summary of findings will be sent to participants. The complete study will be available to be consulted at the Library of IOE, University of London in Summer 2013.

Who is organizing and funding the research?

The researcher is organizing the research herself, and is mainly self-funded, with a percentage funded by Southern University

Who has reviewed the study?

The researcher's supervisor, Prof. Ken Hyland at the Institute of Education, University of London and the University Research Ethics Committee at Southern University

Contact for further information

Please contact the researcher Mary Davis at email address and office address provided.

If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact the chair of the University Research Ethics Committee at Southern University at email address provided.

Thank you Thank you for taking the time to read the information. This study has been approved by the University Research Ethics Committee of Southern University, Registration Number 080332.

Appendix 3d: Consent Form

Full title of Project: **Learning and teaching about the use of sources in non-native academic writing: how do international postgraduate students develop their use of sources?**

Name, position and contact address of researcher: Mary Davis, University teacher, at email address and office address provided.

	Please initial box	
2. I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet for the above study and have had the opportunity to ask questions.	☐	
3. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving reason.	☐	
3. I agree to take part in the above study.	☐	
	Please tick box **Yes**	**No**
4. I agree to the four interviews being audio recorded.	☐	☐
7. I agree to the use of anonymised quotes in publications (*The number of students in the study is small, but every effort will be made to ensure the confidentiality of participants. There are, however, legal limitations to confidentiality in freedom to information claims.*)	☐	☐
8. I agree for the researcher to access and analyse 3 (1st & final drafts of) written assignments during the Pre-Master's course and 3 during the Master's course.	☐	☐

_____   _____   _____
Name of Participant   Date   Signature

_____   _____   _____

Name of Researcher   Date   Signature

Appendix 4: References used in extracts by students

References (used by John)

Begg, D. and Ward, D. (2007). *Economics for Business*, Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill.

Business and Management Dictionary (2007). Price war. *Bloomsbury Business Library,* 5886.

Carmichael, F. (2005). *A Guide to Game Theory*, Harlow, Essex: FT/Prentice Hall.

Chen, C. Y. and Lindsay, G. (2000). 'Will Amazon(.com) Save the Amazon?' *Fortune,* 141 (6), 224.

Fan, Q. (2003). *Importance of SMEs and the role of public support in promoting SME development.* The World Bank. Available at: http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/49256/fan.pdf Last accessed 22/2/2010.

MacInnis, D. J., Rao, A. G. and Weiss, A.M. (2002). 'Assessing when increased media weight of real-world advertisements helps sales'. *Journal of marketing research,* 39 (4), 391-407.

References (used by Alice)

Fedex (2009) Fedex in China. Available at: http://news.van.fedex.com/intl/cn?node=12727 Last accessed 3/1/2010.

Lai, I.K.W. (2007). 'The strategic changes by adopting internet-based interorganizational systems'. *Management Research News*, 30 (7), 495-509.

Liu, Z. M. (2003). 'Sustainable Tourism Development: A Critique'. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 11 (6), 459-475. (*cited as Zhenhua*)

Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2007). *Research Methods for Business Students.* 4th ed. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Wikipedia (no date). The Walt Disney Company. Available at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Walt_Disney_Company Last accessed 15/10/2008.

References (used by Shaun)

American Marketing Association (2004). Definition of marketing. Available at: www.marketingpower.com Last accessed 20/3/2009.

Capron, L. (1999). 'The long-term performance of horizontal acquisitions'. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20 (11), 987–1018.

CIPD (2009). Available at: http://www.cipd.co.uk/community/ Last accessed 17/12/2010.

Claude-Gaudillat, V. and Quelin, B. (2006). Innovation, new market and governance choices of entry: the internet brokerage market case. *Industry and Innovation*, 13(2), 173-187.

Corbin, J.N. (2008). *Returning home: resettlement of formerly abducted children in Northern Uganda*. Overseas Development Institute. Oxford: Blackwell.

Dawson, S. (1992). *Analysing Organisations*. London: Macmillan.

Delmas, M. and Tokat, Y. (2005). 'Deregulation, governance structures, and efficiency: the US electric utility sector'. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26 (5), 441-60.

Han, J.K., Kim, N. and Kim, H.B. (2001). 'Entry barriers: a dull-, one-, or two-edged sword for incumbents? Unraveling the paradox from a contingency perspective'. *Journal of Marketing*, 65, 1-14.

HR Focus (2009). 'Maximize productivity, minimize layoffs'. *HR Focus*, April, 86 (4), 1-15. (*contains references to Cascio, Jesuhathan, Towers Perrin, Laird Post*)

Karakaya, F. (2002). 'Barriers to entry in industrial markets'. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 17 (5), 379-88.

Pedler, M., Burgoyne, J. and Boydell, T. (1986). *A manager's guide to self-development*. New York: McGraw-Hill. (*cited as Boydell*)

Schlegelmilch, B.B. and Ambos, B. (2004). 'Multi-utility: strategic option in deregulated markets? An empirical assessment using conjoint analysis'. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 12, 57-68.

References (used by Yolanda)

Bailey, D. (2003). 'Globalisation, regions and cluster policies: the case of the rover task force'. *Policy Studies* 24 (2), 67-85.

Burfitt, A. and Ferrari, E. D. (2008). 'The housing and neighbourhood impacts of knowledge-based economic development following industrial closure'. *Policy Studies,* 29 (3), 293-304.

Cooke, H. (2002). 'Survival strategies for corporate real estate in uncertain times'. *Journal of Real Estate,* 4 (4), 365-374.

Drury, G., Maekarian, G. and Pickavance, K. (2001). *Coding and modulation for digital television*. Norwell, Massachusetts: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

GeLan Survey. (2010). How foreign countries develop their HDTV. [Online] Available at http://dvb.lmtw.com/Market/201005/56494_2.html Last accessed 1/7/2010.

Gooder, R. D. (2000). *Real estate rainmaker.* Toronto: Wiley.

Hullfish, S. and Fowler, J. (2009). *Color correction for video*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Focal.

Irish Motor Management (2008). *Battery recycling scheme*, July-August, p.25.

Mahnke, F.H. (1996). *Color, environment and human response*. New York: International Thomson Publishing.

Muhlebach, R.F. and Alexander, A. A. (1998). *Business strategies for real estate management companies*. Chicago: Institute of Real Estate Management.

Poor, A. (2009). 'The TV You Want Today'. *PC World,* 27 (12), 89-96.

Presidents and Prime Ministers. (1995). *Lead recycling*. May-June, 4 (3), 22.

Todorovic, A.L. (2006). *Television technology demystified*. Oxford: Focal Press.

Walsh, J. (2008). 'Tommy backs Makita battery recycling push'. *Builders Merchants Journal,* July, 48.

Wilson, T.V. (2010). *How HDTV works*. [Online]. Available at http://electronics.howstuffworks.com/hdtv.htm Last accessed 2/7/2010.

Woodson, R. (2006). *Be a successful property manager*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Zhou, Y.F. (2009). *Media marketing: HDTV report*. [Online]. Available at http://www.bokee.net/blogmodule/weblogcomment_viewEntry/2806270.html Last accessed 2/7/2010.

References (used by Mike)

Brown, S. (2005). *Wizard!: Harry Potter's brand magic.* London: Cyan Communications.

Chowdhury, J., Lukas, B. A. and Menon, A. (2002). 'Antecedents and outcomes of new product development speed: An interdisciplinary conceptual framework'. *Industrial Marketing Management,* 31 (4), 317-328.

Cope, B. and Mason, D. (2002). *New Markets for Printed Books: Emerging Markets for Books, from Creator to Consumer*. Altona, Australia: Common Ground Publishing.

Cope, B. and Ziguras, C. (2002). *The International Publishing Services Market: Emerging Markets for Books, from Creator to Consumer*. Altona, Australia: Common Ground Publishing.

CRM Magazine (2008). 'Make marketing your megaphone!' 13 (2), 24-29.

Dacin, P. A. and Smith, D. C. (1994). 'The effect of brand portfolio characteristics on consumer evaluations and brand extensions'. *Journal of Marketing Research,* 31 (2), 229-242.

Euromonitor (2008). 'GlaxoSmithKline in OTC Healthcare'. *Euromonitor international,* October. [Online]. Available at:

http://www.portal.euromonitor.com/PORTAL/Magazines/Welcome.aspx Last accessed 30/11/2009.

Euromonitor (2009a). 'GlaxoSmithKline in OTC Healthcare'. *Euromonitor international.* August. [Online]. Available at http://www.portal.euromonitor.com/PORTAL/Magazines/Welcome.aspx Last accessed 30/11/2009.

Euromonitor (2009b). 'GlaxoSmithKline Plc: company factfile'. *Euromonitor international,* November. [Online]. Available at http://www.portal.euromonitor.com/PORTAL/Magazines/Welcome.aspx Last accessed 30/11/2009.

Euromonitor (2009c). 'GlaxoSmithKline Plc - OTC Healthcare - United Kingdom'. *Euromonitor international,* April. [Online]. Available at http://www.portal.euromonitor.com/PORTAL/Magazines/Welcome.aspx Last accessed 30/11/2009.

Euromonitor (2009d). 'OTC Healthcare - United Kingdom'. *Euromonitor international,* April. [Online]. Available at http://www.portal.euromonitor.com/PORTAL/Magazines/Welcome.aspx Last accessed 30/11/2009.

Fischer, M., Volckner, F. and Sattler, H. (2010). 'How important are brands? A cross-category, cross-country study'. *Journal of Marketing Research*. 47 (5), 823-829.

Frank, N. J. (2009). 'Get your head in the game'. *Marketing News* 43 (3), 10-13.

Gunelius, S. (2008). *Harry Potter: the story of a global business phenomenon.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gupta, V. (2003). 'Cultural dimensions and international marketing'. *IIMB Management Review,* 15 (3), 69-73.

Marketing (2007). 'Odeon to screen Rugby World Cup'. *Marketing*, 29/8, 4.

Roth, M. S. (1995). The effects of culture and socioeconomics on the performance of global brand image strategies. *Journal of Marketing Research,* 32 (2), 163-175.

Strategic Direction (2004). 'Innovation at GlaxoSmithKline: Is it the safest way?' *Strategic Direction,* 20 (7), 16-18.

References (used by Kevin)

Anderson, D. S. (1992). 'Identifying and Responding to Activist Publics: A Case Study'. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 4* (3), 151-165.

Bentele, G. and Wehmeier, S. (2007). 'Applying sociology to public relations: a commentary'. *Public Relations Review,* 33 (3), 294-300.

Calhoun, C. *et al.* (eds.) (2003). *Classical sociological theory.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Delicath, J. W. and Deluca, K. M. (2003). 'Image Events, the Public Sphere, and Argumentative Practice: The Case of Radical Environmental Groups'. *Argumentation,* 17 (3), 315-334.

Erickson, B., *et al.* (1978). 'Speech style and impression formation in a court setting: the effects of 'powerful' and 'powerless' speech'. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology,* 14, 266-279.

Gray, J. (2002). *Men are from Mars, women are from Venus*. New York: Thorsons Publishers.

Hutchins, B. and Lester, L. (2006). 'Environmental protest and tap-dancing with the media in the information age'. *Media, Culture & Society* 28 (3), 433-452.

Joas, H. and Knobl, W. (2009). *Social theory: twenty introductory lectures.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leeper, K.A. (1996). Public relations ethics and communitarianism: A preliminary investigation. *Public Relations Review*, Summer, 22 (2), 163-179.

Leeper, R. V. (2001). 'In search of a metatheory for public relations: An argument for communitarianism'. In R. L. Heath (ed.) *Handbook of Public Relations* (pp. 92-104). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Liska, J., Mechling, E. W., and Stathas, S. (1981). 'Differences in subjects' perceptions of gender and believability between users of deferential and nondeferential language'. *Communication Quarterly,* 29 (1), 40-48.

McIntosh, I. and Punch, S. (2005). *Get set for sociology.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Mulac, A. (1998). 'The gender-linked language effect: do language differences really make a difference?' In D.J. Canary and K. Dindia (eds.) *Sex differences and similarities in communication: critical essays and empirical investigations of sex and gender in interaction (*pp.127-153). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation.* New York: William Morrow.

Uppal, C. (2005). 'Presenting news to mobilize people: A comparative analysis of news coverage of environmental activism in India and the US'. In *International Communication Association 2005 Annual Meeting Conference Proceedings,* 1-28, New York.

References (used by Oliver)

Aviation Today (2009). 'Values expected to decline by 15-25%'. *Aircraft Value News*, 3/8/09. Available at: http://www.aviationtoday.com/avn/Values-Expected-to-Decline-by-15-25-Percent-Over-Next-Two-Years_34043.html Last accessed 25/10/2009.

Armstrong, G., Kotler, P., Harker, M. and Brennan, R. (2009). *Marketing: An Introduction*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Bregar, B. (2008). Lego taking back production. *Plastics news,* 20 (18), 3-20.

Brownsell, A. (2009). 'Virgin Atlantic celebrates 25th anniversary by recreating debut flight'. *Marketing Magazine, 22/6*. Available at http://www.marketingmagazine.co.uk/news/914734/Virgin-Atlantic-celebrates-25th-anniversary-recreating-debut-flight/. Last accessed 1/11/2009.

Emery, R. and Weed, M. (2006). 'Fighting for survival? The financial management of football clubs outside the top flight in England'. *Managing Leisure,* 11 (1), 1-21.

Guzmain, I. and Morrow, S. (2007). 'Measuring efficiency and productivity in professional football teams: evidence from the English Premier League'. *Central European Journal of Operations Research,* 15 (4), 309-328.

Haas, D. J. (2003). 'Productive Efficiency of English Football Teams Data Envelopment Analysis Approach'. *Managerial and Decision Economics,* 24 (5), 403-410.

Haugen, K. K. and Hervik, A. (2002). 'Estimating the value of the Premier League or the world's most profitable investment project'. *Applied Economics Letters,* 9 (2), 117-120.

Kontsas, S. and Mylonakis, J. (2009). 'A dynamic measurement model of the European Airline Industry using competitive market power variables'. *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics,* 31, 129-140.

Lancaster, G. and Massingham, L. (1999). *Essentials of Marketing,* 3rd ed. London: McGraw Hill.

Nunes, P.F. and Cespedes, F.V. (2003). 'The Customer Has Escaped'. *Harvard Business Review,* 81 (11), 96-105.

References (used by Nick)

Ashley, C. and Haysom, G. (2006). 'From philanthropy to a different way of doing business: strategies and challenges in integrating pro-poor approaches into tourism business'. *Development Southern Africa*, 23 (2), 1-16.

Cetron, M. J. (2004). 'Hospitality in the Age of terror'. *HSMAI Marketing Review*. [Online]. Available at http://www.hospitalitynet.org/indepth/154000357/112000418.search?query=terrorism+and+hospitality Last accessed 25/5/2010.

Child, J. (2001) 'Trust the Fundamental Bond in Global Collaboration', *Organizational Dynamics*, 29 (4), 274-288.

Chok, S., Macbeth, J., Warren, C. (2007). 'Tourism as a tool for poverty alleviation: a critical analysis of 'pro-poor tourism' and implications for sustainability'. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10 (2/3), 144-165.

Correia, A. and Pimpao, A. (2008). 'Decision-making processes of Portuguese tourists travelling to South America and Africa'. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 2 (4), 330-373.

Correia, A., Valle, P. O. D. and Moco, C. (2007). 'Why people travel to exotic places'. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 1 (1), 45-61.

Harrison, D. (2008).'Pro-poor Tourism: a critique'. *Third World Quarterly,* 29 (5), 851-868.

Holcomb, J, L., Upchurch, R, S. and Okumus, F. (2007).' Corporate social responsibility: What are top hotels reporting?*' International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 19 (9), 461-475.

Luria, G. (2010) 'The social aspects of safety management: Trust and safety climate' *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 42 (4), 1288-1295.

Mintel (2007). Green and ethical consumers. *Mintel UK,* April. [Online]. Available at: http://academic.mintel.com/sinatra/oxygen_academic/search_results/show&/display/id=221206/display/id=221206 Last accessed on 17/3/2009.

NaCTO. (2010).'*Counter Terrorism Protective Security Advise for hotels and restaurants*'. [Online]. Available at http://www.google.co.uk/search?hl=en&source=hp&q=counter+terrorism+protective+security+advise+&meta=&aq=f&aqi=&aql=&oq Last accessed 14/6/2010.

Oliver, J. (2008). It is more than enough to make you sick. *Marketing*, 23 January, 26-28.

Paraskevas, A. and Arendell, B. (2007). 'A strategic framework for terrorism prevention and mitigation in tourism destinations', *Tourism Management*, 28 (6), 1560-1573.

Pro-poor tourism (1999). *Tourism and poverty elimination: untapped potential.* Department for International Development, April. Available at http://www.propoortourism.org.uk Last accessed 20/10/2009.

Appendix 5: Interview questions

Appendix 5a: Stage 1 Interview questions

Instructions:

Thank you very much for coming today. We are going to have an interview for 30 minutes in 5 parts. I will ask you some questions about using literature in your writing, using some written examples. Please answer these as you wish. This interview is not in any way a test. If you don't understand the question, please ask. If you don't know the answer, please say you don't know. Do you have any questions before we start? Are you happy to start the tape now?

PART 1:

Read the following 2 sentences and tell me which one you would take more seriously, and why

1. Tesco dominates the retail market and is much stronger than other companies in the UK.

2. In 2007, Tesco reached 99.5% of the British Isles and received 1 pound in seven spent by all UK consumers (Mintel, 2008).

> **RATIONALE: To establish whether participants can see importance of citation and differentiate between examples that are acknowledged or not acknowledged, as well as note the specific information in the second example**

PART 2:

Read the following sentences. Would you write any of them differently?

1. Part time jobs for students can provide very useful financial benefits (Universities UK, 2008) but students need to realise the effect of working on their studies (Universities UK, 2008).

2. John (2004) says that the number of students taking part time jobs has doubled since the 1980s.

3. According to Tyler (1998), he says that part time jobs provide useful learning for students.

Follow on questions:

How would you make any changes to these sentences?

> **RATIONALE: To find out whether participants are able to see errors in use of citation and to correct them. (Reporting verbs focus cut as not taught/unfamiliar at this stage)**

PART 3:

Before we read the next part, can you tell me what you think is the difference between a paraphrase and a quotation?

Now can you tell me what plagiarism is? Why is it important to avoid?

Now read the following article. Can you identify examples of paraphrases, quotations or plagiarism in the sentences that follow from student essays on the topic of e-learning in the UK?

Bright, R. (2003) *The New Classroom*. Harlow: Pearson Education (p.35)

Since the 1990s, internet-based teaching (also known as e-learning) has been growing in popularity, as a rival to traditional classroom teaching. Nowadays up to a third of courses are offered by colleges and universities online in the UK. However, it is still unknown whether these courses are as effective as the face-to-face classes with teachers and students present.

1. Bright (2003) states that teaching through the internet is very popular now, but it is not clear if it is as good as traditional teaching methods.

2. Since the 1990s, internet-based teaching has been growing in popularity (Bright, 2003).

3. Bright (2003:35) argues that 'it is still unknown whether these courses are as effective as the face-to-face classes with teachers and students present'.

4. Bright (2003) claims that the effectiveness of e-learning is still unknown.

5. Nowadays up to a third of courses are offered by colleges and universities online in the UK. However, it is still unknown whether these courses are as effective as the face-to-face classes with teachers and students present.

What helped you to decide which are paraphrases and which are quotations?

What helped you to decide which are plagiarism?

Follow on question (where appropriate): what would you do differently (eg in examples 2 and 5)?

RATIONALE: To find out if participants can recognize and differentiate between examples of paraphrasing, quotations and plagiarism, and different citation styles. To examine whether they are able to correct examples of plagiarism.

PART 4

Read the following text. Can you make a quotation and a paraphrase using the text, as if you were writing an essay on this topic?

Penec, A. (2003). The measurement of happiness. *Applied Econometrics* 44, pp.18-27.

In the last 50 years there has been no apparent increase in personal happiness in Western nations, despite steadily growing economies. In both Europe and the USA, surveys have found no greater level of happiness since the 1950s, which seems strange since wealthier people generally claim to be happier than poorer people…Individually, more money does seem to increase happiness, but when everyone gets richer, no one appears to feel better.

> **RATIONALE: To find out if participants can make their own appropriate quotations and paraphrases from a given text**

PART 5

Final questions:

What are the biggest challenges for you in using sources in your writing?

How do you think you could improve your use of sources in your writing?

How much do you think you have improved in your use of sources in your writing since the beginning of the course?

Do you have any other comments about using sources in your writing?

> **RATIONALE: To find out participants' views of their main challenges in using sources, whether they can give some possible strategies, whether they think they are making progress**

Thank you very much

Appendix 5b: Stage 2 Interview questions

Instructions:

Thank you very much for coming today. We are going to have an interview for 30 minutes in 5 parts. I will ask you some questions about using literature in your writing, using some written examples. Please answer these as you wish. This interview is not in any way a test. If you don't understand the question, please ask. If you don't know the answer, please say you don't know. Do you have any questions before we start? Are you happy to start the tape now?

PART 1:

Read the following 2 sentences and tell me which one you would take more seriously, and why

1. The number of international students in UK higher education has increased by 12% since last year, according to the most recent government report (HEFCE, 2008)

2. The number of international students in UK higher education has increased considerably in the last year.

Source: self made

> **RATIONALE: To establish whether participants can see importance of citation and differentiate between examples that are acknowledged or not acknowledged, as well as note the specific information in the first example (order change from interview 1)**

PART 2:

Read the following sentences. Would you write any of them differently?

1. Emma (2004) argues that awareness of global warming has grown significantly in developed countries.

2. According to Smith (1998), she states that the UK policy on global warming has changed.

3. D. Jones (2000) examines the lack of progress on global warming issues in Europe.

4. Global warming is considered a serious issue (Clarke, 2003) but it is not yet on the global agenda (Clarke, 2003).

Source: self-made

Follow on questions:

How would you make any changes to these sentences?

Can you identify any reporting verbs above? What do they mean?

Do you know any other reporting verbs?

Can you think of any differences between them?

> **RATIONALE: To find out whether participants are able to see errors in use of citation and to correct them. To estimate their knowledge of reporting verbs**

PART 3:

Before we read the next part, can you tell me what you think is the difference between a paraphrase and a quotation?

Now can you tell me what plagiarism is? Why is it important to avoid?

Now read the following article. Can you identify examples of paraphrases, quotations or plagiarism in the sentences that follow from student essays on the topic of fitness in the UK?

From 'Fitness Failures' by Nathan Dempsey, 1999, p 101.

Despite the government fitness campaign, a large proportion of British people still fail to exercise regularly. In particular, people who begin exercise programmes because of an identified health risk are likely to drop out within three to four months. While the encouragement and support from friends, family or a club is considered crucial, sports psychologists have been trying to develop exercise programmes that will keep people exercising, but without success.

1. Dempsey (1999) states that the UK government's promotion of fitness is unsuccessful, despite the efforts of sports psychologists.

2. The encouragement and support of friends, family or a club is considered crucial to keep people exercising (Dempsey, 1999).

3. Dempsey (1999:101) argues that 'people who begin exercise programmes because of an identified health risk are likely to drop out within three to four months'.

4. British people are not good at keeping to exercise routines; even those with an identified health risk tend to give up within a few months and sports psychologists have not succeeded in making the right exercise programmes.

5. Dempsey (1999) claims that government attempts to improve fitness in the UK do not work because there is a high drop out rate from exercise programmes.

6. The government has attempted to promote fitness but a 'large proportion of British people fail to exercise regularly' (Dempsey, 1999:101).

Source: self-made

What helped you to decide which are paraphrases and which are quotations?

What helped you to decide which are plagiarism?

Follow on question (where appropriate): what would you do differently (eg in examples 2 and 4)?

> **RATIONALE: To find out if participants can recognize and differentiate between examples of paraphrasing, quotations and plagiarism, and different citation styles. To examine whether they are able to correct examples of plagiarism.**

PART 4

Read the following text. Can you make a quotation and a paraphrase using the text, as if you were writing an essay on this topic?

Chan, H (1997) 'Banking System Developments in the Four Asian Tigers' Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco *Economic Letter* 97-22. Viewed 18/05/04 at http://www.frbsf.org/econrsrch/wklyltr/el97-22.html

Over the past 20 years, Hong Kong, Korea, Singapore and Taiwan had remarkably rapid and sustained economic growth, earning them the nickname the four tigers. Because of the new investment opportunities they provide and because their experiences may offer lessons for less developed economies, they have attracted considerable attention from the financial and policy communities, as well as from economists who have renewed interest in research in theories of economic growth.

(source: as above in McCormack, J. and Slaght, J. (2005) Extended Writing and Research Skills. Reading: Garnett)

> **RATIONALE: To find out if participants can make their own appropriate quotations and paraphrases from a given text**

Final questions, part 5:

What are the biggest challenges for you in using sources in your writing?

How do you think you could improve your use of sources in your writing?

How much do you think you have improved in your use of sources in your writing since the beginning of the course?

Do you have any other comments about using sources in your writing?

> **RATIONALE: To find out participants' views of their main challenges in using sources, whether they can give some possible strategies, whether they think they are making progress**

Thank you very much

Appendix 5c: Stage 3 Interview questions

Instructions:

Thank you very much for coming today. We are going to have an interview for 30 minutes in 4 parts. I will ask you some questions about using sources in your writing, using some of your own written assignments. Please answer these as you wish. Do you have any questions before we start? Are you happy to start the tape now?

PART 1:

In the first part, I would like you to have a look at your how you have used sources in your recent assignment and I am going to ask you some questions about it

1. Can you give me an example of a quotation in your text?
2. Can you show me where you have paraphrased text?
3. How do you feel about your vocabulary for paraphrasing?
4. Can you show me any examples of reporting verbs? Do you have any favourite reporting verbs?
5. Can you show me any examples of citation in your text? How do you feel about using citation now?
6. Do you feel confident about avoiding plagiarism?
7. Is it easy to distinguish between where you use your words and the words of other authors?
8. What do you think about the amount you are using sources? Enough, too little, too much?
9. What do you think about the quality of your sources?
10. What do you think overall about your skill in using sources? Sophisticated/high level? Or still need to improve a lot?

> **RATIONALE: To examine student perceptions of their current ability to use sources towards the end of the first semester of Master's**

PART 2:

Now have a look at this assignment which you did last year on the Pre-Master's for the case study assignment

11. Can you show me any examples of use of quotations?
12. Can you show me any examples of where you have paraphrased text?
13. What do you think about your vocabulary for paraphrasing then?
14. Can you show me some examples of reporting verbs?
15. How did you feel about using citation in your text? Is it enough? Is it accurate?
16. At the time did you feel confident about avoiding plagiarism?
17. Is it easy to distinguish between where you use your words and the words of other authors?

18. What do you think about the amount you were using sources? Enough, too little, too much?
19. What do you think about the quality of your sources?
20. How do you rate your skill at using sources overall?
21. How do you think your use of sources has changed since last year? – what are you doing differently with quotations, paraphrasing, citation, plagiarism, argument, quality and amount of source use, reporting verbs, distinguishing between your words and the words of others?

RATIONALE: To get participants to reflect on how they used sources one year ago, on the Pre-Master's Diploma first assignment. To examine their source use them, with current insights. To compare source use then and now and examine any differences

PART 3: BEFORE COMING TO THE UK

Now just a few final questions about the past and future

22. How did you use sources in your undergraduate degree?
23. How is it different to how you use sources in the UK?

RATIONALE: To get participants to consider their previous use of sources before coming to the UK, and to see whether trends regarding source use from their previous education make be reflected in their current source use.

PART 4: FUTURE

24. Do you want to change or improve your use of sources now? If so, how?

RATIONALE: To establish any perceptions of lack of knowledge, ongoing needs at this stage.

Thank you very much

Appendix 5d: Stage 4 Interview questions

<u>**Plagiarism definition at Southern University**</u>

Look at the following definition of plagiarism at Southern University

'Plagiarism – taking or using another person's thoughts, writings or inventions as your own'

1. What do you understand by this?

2. Do you think it is a clear definition?

3. If so, why? If not, how could it be improved?

4. How do you define plagiarism?

5. How is plagiarism defined in your country?

> **RATIONALE: To gather students' perceptions of the university's plagiarism definition, to ascertain their definition at this stage, compared to previously, and to compare definitions in their home countries**

<u>**Computer/internet use**</u>

1. How long have you been using the internet?

2. On average how many hours a day do you use the internet for study/other use?

3. What kind of sources do you consult that are not available electronically?

4. How often do you consult sources that are not available electronically?

5. How does using the computer influence how you use sources?

6. How does using the internet influence how you use sources?

> **Rationale: to research the perceived relationship between the internet and source use and the influences**

<u>**Questions arising from last interview**</u>

1. *In your last interview, you said (not exact quotations)*

2. *Can you comment on why you said?*

3. *Can you say more about what you meant by?*

> **Rationale: to explore specific details from the previous interview, to gain a more in-depth investigation of the case study**

Reflections and thinking about current position

1. How much has your use of sources changed since you began your Master's/ your Pre-Master's?

2. Are there any areas you still want to improve?

3. How do you feel about doing your Master's dissertation now, with regard to how you are using sources?

> **Rationale: to examine participants' perspective and reflections for the end of the Master's stage**

Appendix 6: Further analysis of source use features

Appendix 6a: Citation

Use of citation in assignment extracts by each participant

Participant	EAP1	EAP2	PG1	PG2	Total citations	Categories of citation	Number with accurate formatting
1 John	J.1 I=1 (0)	J.2 I=1 (1)	J.3.1 I=2 (2) J.3.2 I=1 (0)	J.4 I=1 (0)	6	Non-integral 0 Integral 6 (100%)	3/6
2 Alice	A.1 0	A.2 I=1 (0) + NI=1 (1)	A.3 NI=1 (0)	A.4.1 NI=1 (0) A.4.2 NI=5 (0)	9	Non-integral 8 Integral 1(11%)	1/9
3 Shaun	S.1 NI=4 (0)	S.2.1 I=1 (1) S.2.2 I=5 (0)	S.3 I=3 (3)	S.4.1 I=1 + NI=4 (0) S.4.2 I=4 (4)	22	Non-integral 8 Integral 14 (64%)	8/22
4 Yolanda	Y.1 I=2 (2) + NI=1 (1)	Y.2 I=5 (4) + NI=3 (2)	Y.3 I=1 (1) + NI=2 (2)	Y.4.1 NI=3 (3) Y.4.2 NI=6 (6)	23	Non-integral 15 Integral 8 (35%)	21/23
5 Mike	M.1 I=4 (4)	M.2.1 I=3 (3) + NI=1 (1) M.2.2 = I=1 (1)	M.3.1 I=1 (1) + NI=3 (3) M.3.2 I=2 (2)	M.4 NI=6 (6)	21	Non-integral 10 Integral 11 (52%)	21/21
6 Kevin	K.1 I=5(5) + NI=1 (1)	K.2 I=2 (2)+ NI=3 (3)	K.3.1 I=3 (3) + NI=2 (2) K.3.2 I=2 (2)	K.4 I=5 (5) + NI=3 (3)	26	Non-integral 9 Integral 17 (65%)	26/26
7 Oliver	O.1 I=3 (3)	O.2.1 I=2 (2) + NI=2 (2) O.2.2 I=1 (1) + NI=1 (1)	O.3 I=4 (4)	O.4 I=5 + NI=1	19	Non-integral 4 Integral 15 (79%)	19/19
8 Nick	N.1 0	N.2 I=3 (3)	N.3 I=3 (3)	N.4.1 I=4 (4) N.4.2 I=3 (3)	13	Non-integral 0 Integral 13 (100%)	13/13

Key NI= Non-integral citation, I= Integral citation.

The number of integral citations includes references back to the last cited author/s of 'he', 'she' and 'they'. The non-integral citations include references to the last cited author using 'ibid'. The number in brackets indicates number of correctly formatted citations in the extract.

Appendix 6b: Paraphrasing

Appendix 6b.1: Examples of paraphrasing Stage 2

Original source text:	Attempts to paraphrase:
Over the past 20 years, Hong Kong, Korea, Singapore and Taiwan had remarkably rapid and sustained economic growth, earning them the nickname the four tigers. Because of the new investment opportunities they provide and because their experiences may offer lessons for less developed economies, they have attracted considerable attention from the financial and policy communities, as well as from economists who have renewed interest in research in theories of economic growth. (Chan, 1997)	Chan (1997) said the reason why <u>Hong Kong, Korea, Singapore and Taiwan</u> were called <u>four tiger</u> was because their <u>economic growth</u> in the <u>past 20 years</u> increased rapidly. (Kevin) According to Chan (1997), some Asian countries have been really successful in an <u>economic</u> view especially with <u>investment</u> and financial <u>opportunities</u>, and this is the reason why some research decided to undertake new <u>theories</u> concerning the <u>economic</u> development. (Oliver) Research in <u>theories of economic growth</u> have drawn a wide <u>attention</u> and <u>interest</u> among <u>economists</u> (Chan, 1997). (Nick)

Underlined text in the student attempts to paraphrase column on the right indicates identical text to the original. From these underlined words, I consider Kevin has one unique link 'past 20 years', therefore 11% of his paraphrase is contained within unique links (moderate revision). Oliver has no unique links, only general links to main terms such as 'economists', therefore his version is substantial revision. Nick uses three unique links 'theories of economic growth', 'attention', 'interest', and therefore 40% of his paraphrase is contained within unique links (minimal revision).

Appendix 6b.2: Paraphrasing and plagiarism

Evidence of paraphrasing and plagiarism in extracts by each participant

(Key EC= Exact Copy, NC = Near Copy, MinR= Minimal Revision, ModR= Moderate Revision, SR= Substantial Revision – extracts assessed according to Keck, 2006)

Partici pant	EAP1	EAP2	PG1	PG2	Total of exact copies (EC)	Total of near copies (NC)	Total of minimal revisions (MinR)	Total of acceptable paraphrases (substantial SR or moderate revisions ModR)
1 John	J.1 = EC	J.2= MinR	J.3.1 = SR J.3.2= NC	J.4 = EC	**2**	**1**	**1**	1/5
2 Alice	A.1 = MinR	A.2 = NC	A.3 = EC	A.4.1= NC A.4.2= EC	**2**	**2**	**1**	0/5
3 Shaun	S.1 = EC	S.2.1 = n/a S.2.2 = SR	S.3= SR	S.4.1 = NC S.4.2 = SR	**1**	**1**	**0**	3/5
4 Yolan da	Y.1 = SR	Y.2 = SR	Y.3= SR	Y.4.1 = SR Y.4.2 =SR	**0**	**0**	**0**	5/5
5 Mike	M.1= SR	M.2.1 = SR M.2.2 = ModR	M.3.1 = SR M.3.2= SR	M.4= SR	**0**	**0**	**0**	5/5
6 Kevin	K.1 = SR	K.2 =SR	K.3.1= SR K.3.2 =SR	K.4 =SR	**0**	**0**	**0**	5/5
7 Oliver	O.1 = SR	O.2.1 =SR O.2.2 =SR	O.3 =SR	O.4 =SR	**0**	**0**	**0**	5/5
8 Nick	N.1 = EC	N.2 = SR	N.3 = SR	N.4.1 = SR N.4.2= SR	**1**	**0**	**0**	4/5

Appendix 6c: Reporting verbs

Reporting verbs in assignment extracts by each participant

(Key: *Non-evaluative* in italics, **evaluative** in bold)

Participant	EAP1	EAP2	PG1	PG2	Total of different verbs and structures	Categories of reporting verbs
1 John	J.1 = 0	J.2 = *Present Point out*	J.3.1 = *According to* x4 J.3.2= **Suggests**	J.4 = *According to*	4	**Non-evaluative** 3 **Evaluative** 1
2 Alice	A.1 =0	A.2 = *Includes*	A.3 0	A.4.1= 0 A.4.2= 0	1	**Non-evaluative** 1
3 Shaun	S.1 =0	S.2.1 = *According to* S.2.2 = *According to* x2 *Says States* x2	S.3 = *States* x3	S.4.1 = **Argues** S.4.2 = *States* x2 *According to* x2	4	**Non-evaluative** 3 **Evaluative** 1
4 Yolanda	Y.1 = *Said*	Y.2 = *Stated According to Describes* **Argues** *Agrees and describes*	Y.3 = *Agree and stated*	Y.4.1 = 0 Y.4.2 = 0	7	**Non-evaluative** 6 **Evaluative** 1
5 Mike	M.1 = *Explains* **Argue/s** x 2 **Affirm**	M.2.1 = *States* x 3 M.2.2 = *Says*	M.3.1 = *According to* M.3.2 = *States Says*	M.4= 0	6	**Non-evaluative** 4 **Evaluative** 2
6 Kevin	K.1 = *Pointed out Stated Agreed Said*	K.2 = *Found Explained*	K.3.1 = **In –'s opinion Advocated As- concluded** K.3.2 = **Suggested** *Said*	K.4 = **Extended the argument Advocated Suggested (x3) Argued**	13	**Non-evaluative** 6 **Evaluative** 7
7 Oliver	O.1 = *Mentioned Stated Said*	O.2.1 = **Focus** *Shows evidence* O.2.2 = *Describe* **Suggests**	O.3 = **Argue** *Announce According to*	O.4 = *Point out* **Suggest Highlight**	12	**Non-evaluative** 8 **Evaluative** 4
8 Nick	N.1 = 0	N.2 = **Empathises this point by stating** *Says Demonstrates*	N.3 = **Distinguishes Stress** *State* **Empirical study reveals**	N.4.1 = *According to* **Endorses Argue** *State* N.4.2 **Argue** *Reports* **Concludes**	12	**Non-evaluative** 5 **Evaluative** 7

Appendix 6d: Critical engagement

Evidence of critical engagement in assignment extracts by each participant

Particip ant	EAP1	EAP2	PG1	PG2	Total	Elements of critical engagement	Number of extracts with critical engagement
1 John	J.1 = Eval=0 Stance=0	J.2= Eval=0 Stance=0	J.3.1 = Eval=0 Stance=0 J.3.2= Eval=1 Stance=1	J.4 = Eval=0 Stance=0	2	Evaluation= 1 Stance = 1	1/5
2 Alice	A.1 = Eval=0 Stance=0	A.2 = Eval=0 Stance=0	A.3 = Eval=0 Stance=0	A.4.1= Eval=0 Stance=0 A.4.2= Eval=0 Stance=0	0	Evaluation=0 Stance = 0	0/5
3 Shaun	S.1 = Eval=0 Stance=0	S.2.1 = Eval=0 Stance=0 S.2.2 = Eval=0 Stance=1	S.3= Eval=0 Stance=0	S.4.1 = Eval=1 Stance=0 S.4.2 = Eval=0 Stance=0	2	Evaluation=1St ance=1	2/6
4 Yolanda	Y.1 = Eval=0 Stance=0	Y.2 = Eval=3 Stance=1	Y.3= Eval=2 Stance=2	Y.4.1 = Eval=0 Stance=0 Y.4.2 = Eval=0 Stance=0	8	Evaluation=5 Stance = 3	2/5
5 Mike	M.1= Eval=3 Stance=1	M.2.1 = Eval=0 Stance=1 M.2.2 = Eval=0 Stance=0	M.3.1 = Eval=0 Stance=0 M.3.2 Eval=0 Stance=1	M.4= Eval=0 Stance=1	7	Evaluation=3 Stance = 4	4/6
6 Kevin	K.1 = Eval=3 Stance=1	K.2.1 Eval=1 Stance=2	K.3.1 Eval=5 Stance=1 K.3.2 Eval=1 Stance=0	K.4 Eval=5 Stance=0	19	Evaluation= 15 Stance = 4	5/5
7 Oliver	O.1 = Eval=0 Stance=0	O.2.1 Eval=2 Stance=1 O.2.2 Eval=4 Stance=2	O.3 Eval=4 Stance=1	O.4 Eval=5 Stance=0	19	Evaluation= 15 Stance = 4	4/5
8 Nick	N.1 = Eval=0 Stance=1	N.2 = Eval=3 Stance=0	N.3 = Eval=3 Stance=1	N.4.1 = Eval=4 Stance=0 N.4.2 = Eval=2 Stance=1	15	Evaluation= 12 Stance = 3	5/5

Eval = Evaluation, calculated by number of occasions in the extract which give some opinion on sources through citation or evaluative reporting verbs (eg K.4 'He also advocated')
Stance = Calculated by the number of occasions in the extract which demonstrate the participant's view or interpretation of a source (eg N.4.2 'this means…'), excluding the features for evaluation (ie of citation or evaluative reporting verbs).