CITATION PRACTICES AND TEXTUAL BORROWING STRATEGIES
AMONG EXPERT AND NOVICE ACADEMIC WRITERS

KOBRA MANSOURIZADEH

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the award of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy (Teaching English as a Second Language)

Faculty of Education
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

DECEMBER 2011

Dedicated to the memory of my late father

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I thank the God Almighty for all the blessings showered upon me and the power that he has given me to successfully pass the hurdles of completing my studies.

I offer my sincere gratitude to my supervisor and mentor Associate Professor Dr. Ummul Khair Ahmad for all her intellectual support and continuous guidance during the three years of my doctoral studies. I am extremely indebted to her for always closely reading and critically commenting on my writing, and offering marvelous advice which made me a better writer and thinker. I have always enjoyed our regular meetings and will miss her counsel and more than that, her companionship.

I am grateful to all writers who participated in this study, especially the expert writers who showed interests in my research and willingly shared their knowledge, precious experience and insights. My thanks are also extended to the student writers who had willingly given me their draft papers and graciously took part in the interviews. My genuine thanks also go to the specialist informant of this study who spent hours helping me with the technical information during the period of data analysis.

And finally, I thank my family for all the support. I thank my mother for her unconditional love and continuous prayers for my success. I thank my beloved husband, Dr. Amir Mansourizadeh, for all the encouragement and incomparable support he gave me during the whole process of this journey. He was always ready to offer his unlimited help and advice during all the difficulties and moments of disappointment. I also thank my little hero, my adorable son, Ali Sina, for being so patient during the long hours that I spent working in front of my computer.

ABSTRACT

Citing various source texts and incorporating them appropriately and effectively in one's own writing is a crucial feature of academic writing. Successful and efficient application of citations demands advanced levels of academic literacy and sophisticated understanding of accumulated knowledge in the field which readily pose challenges to beginning academic writers. Inappropriate and inaccurate use of citations may unjustifiably lead inexperienced writers to fall into the traps of plagiarism. Citation preferences have been shown to be discipline-specific and the practices and strategies employed by senior members of the discipline have largely remained occluded. Novice academic writers could perhaps benefit from studying the citation practices and strategies commonly employed by expert writers in their field. A case study was thus designed to investigate the citation and textual borrowing strategies of expert and novice research writers who belong to the same research community. A total of six published journal articles written by expert members and seven unpublished research papers written by research students of the same research group in chemical engineering were collected to form a corpus. In total, 402 citations were identified with the density of 9.26 citations per 1000 words in the experts' papers and 7.57 in the novices' papers. To study the citation practices employed, all citations used were categorized into different types and functions and compared between both sub-corpora. To analyze the textual borrowing strategies, the citations employed in the Introduction sections of the research papers were identified as paraphrases, summaries, generalizations, and exact copying, and the citations were matched and compared with the original source texts. The findings demonstrated that the novice writers mainly used citations in isolation, mainly to attribute while the experts synthesized various sources and strategically employed citations to provide support and justify their claims. The experts also used citations more succinctly with identification function and made greater use of non-integral citation. The findings on textual borrowing strategies in the novice writers' sub-corpus revealed various problems in source use and source documentation. These were manifest in unsuccessful paraphrases, inaccurate summaries and misrepresented generalizations. The novices were also found to be too dependent on the source texts where they used more paraphrases and extensive citations. In contrast, when borrowing texts of others, expert writers employed more summaries than generalizations, and they rarely used paraphrases. The findings were further supported and enriched by semi-structured interviews with six writers about their texts. The results of this study provide better understanding of expert and novice writers' citing behavior and offered various pedagogical implications for advanced academic writing courses.

ABSTRAK

Membuat kutipan daripada pelbagai sumber teks dengan tepat dan berkesan merupakan ciri penting dalam penulisan akademik. Aplikasi kutipan teks akademik yang efisien memerlukan tahap literasi akademik yang tinggi dan pemahaman keseluruhan bidang ilmu yang ampuh dan ianya menjadi cabaran kepada penulis-penulis akademik yang baru. Penggunaan kutipan yang tidak sesuai dan tidak tepat mungkin akan menjerat penulis yang kurang berpengalaman dalam gejala plagiat. Amalan membuat kutipan teks telah terbukti berbeza bergantung kepada bidang; namun masih banyak yang belum diketahui mengenai amalan dan strategi membuat kutipan yang digunakan oleh penulis pakar dalam sesuatu bidang. Penulis akademik novis boleh mendapat faedah daripada kajian ke atas amalan dan strategi membuat kutipan yang digunakan oleh penulis pakar dalam bidang mereka. Oleh itu satu kajian kes telah dirangka untuk mengkaji strategi kutipan dan pinjaman tekstual yang digunakan oleh penulis pakar dan penulis baru daripada bidang pengajian yang sama. Satu korpus yang mengandungi enam artikel jurnal yang diterbitkan hasil tulisan penulis pakar dan tujuh kertas kerja kajian yang belum diterbitkan hasil tulisan pelajar sarjana daripada kumpulan penyelidikan yang sama dalam bidang Kejuruteraan Kimia telah dianalisis. Keseluruhannya, 402 kutipan telah dikenal pasti dengan kepadatan 9.26 kutipan per 1000 perkataan dalam korpus penulis pakar dan 7.57 kutipan dalam korpus penulis novis. Untuk mengkaji amalan kutipan yang digunakan, semua kutipan telah dikategori berdasarkan jenis dan fungsi dan dibandingkan antara kedua-dua sub-korpus. Untuk mengkaji strategi pinjaman tekstual, kutipan yang digunakan dalam bahagian *Pengenalan* kedua-dua korpus telah dikenal pasti sebagai parafrasa, ringkasan, kesimpulan umum dan salinan terus, dan kutipan-kutipan ini dipadankan dengan teks sumber asal. Dapatan menunjukkan penulis novis menggunakan kutipan secara tersisih, umumnya untuk memberi pengiktirafan, manakala penulis pakar membuat sintesis terhadap pelbagai sumber teks dan menggunakan kutipan secara strategik sebagai sokongan dan justifikasi kepada penyataan hasil kajian mereka. Penulis pakar juga menggunakan kutipan secara lebih padat beserta penyataan fungsi dan menggunakan kutipan bukan-integral dengan lebih meluas. Dapatan mengenai strategi pinjaman tekstual dalam sub-korpus penulis novis menunjukkan pelbagai masalah berkaitan penggunaan dan dokumentasi sumber. Semua ini dimanifestasikan dalam bentuk parafrasa yang lemah, ringkasan yang tidak tepat dan kesimpulan umum yang tersasar. Penulis novis juga didapati terlalu bergantung kepada teks sumber asal dan mereka lebih banyak menggunakan parafrasa dan kutipan berbentuk ekstensif. Secara perbandingan, penulis pakar membuat lebih banyak ringkasan daripada kesimpulan umum dan jarang sekali membuat parafrasa apabila meminjam teks penulis lain. Dapatan kajian turut disokong oleh temu bual separa-berstruktur dengan enam penulis mengenai penulisan mereka. Keputusan kajian ini memberi pemahaman yang lebih mendalam mengenai amalan membuat kutipan oleh penulis pakar dan penulis novis dan menawarkan pelbagai implikasi pedagogi untuk kursus penulisan akademik lanjutan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EAP   -   English for Academic Purposes

EFL   -   English as a Foreign Language

ESB   -   English Speaking Background

ESL   -   English as a Second Language

IELTS   -   International English Language Testing System

ESB   -   Non-English Speaking Background

NNS   -   Non-Native Speakers of English

NS   -   Native Speakers of English

TMS   -   Text Matching Software

TOEFL   -   Test of English as a Foreign Language

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.0   Introduction

Citation is a crucial feature in academic writing, used by academic writers to subtly show their disciplinary knowledge and rhetorically mark their membership of the disciplinary community. Citation is also a device through which academic writers show their scholarly association with the disciplinary communities they belong to. Through citations academic writers are able to exhibit the depth and breadth of their knowledge within their research topic, thus confirm their position as full-fledged members of the discourse community.

Numerous studies on various rhetorical features in academic writing such as hedges (Hyland, 1996a; 1996b, 1997), metadiscourse (Hyland, 1998; 2004), imperatives (Swales *et al.*, 1998), and stance taking (Charles, 2006) have advanced our knowledge and understanding of the conventions and disciplinary nature of academic writing. Citation is one of the rhetorical tools that play an active role in disseminating knowledge within academic communities (Bazerman, 1988). Citation is described as a rhetorical feature which is "central to the social context of persuasion" (Hyland, 1999:342).

Acquiring the skills of appropriate and effective citation practices not only helps academic writers to appropriately integrate other people's ideas and words into their writing, but also create a context for the purpose of the study and present their

research findings more persuasively. Citation, thus has an important role in the construction of knowledge (Hyland, 1999). Indeed, effective and appropriate use of citations requires advanced academic literacy and writing skills; inappropriate use of citations could be interpreted as plagiarism which is a serious offense in academia. Emerging writers need to be instructed on how to strategically and appropriately employ citations in academic writing.

1.1   Background of the Study

Academic writers are required to adhere to specific norms and conventions of their communities in order to be accepted. One of the important communities in academia is scientific communities with their particular established conventions and practices in academic writing. It has long been established that scientific writing is not merely the presentation of facts, but social interaction as well (Bazerman, 1988; Latour and Woolgar, 1979).

Scientific communities are based on the creation of new knowledge or new facts, and constructing knowledge is a 'collective expertise' (Bazerman *et al.*, 2005). Researchers use prior knowledge provided by previous research and build new knowledge based on the old ones. Scientists, based on their research findings, attempt to offer new claims in relation to pre-confirmed and accepted facts already established in the disciplinary community. For their claim to be accepted as new knowledge and become a fact, it needs to be approved by the members of the community. To gain acceptance, the new knowledge needs to be presented persuasively and convincingly in relation to the pre-confirmed knowledge in the field, which is often achieved through citations.

Therefore, it is of crucial importance for beginning research writers to be made aware of and instructed on different types and rhetorical functions of citations in academic writing. Researchers have thus studied different types and functions of citations across various disciplines. Research has documented variations in citation practices across different disciplines (Hyland, 1999, 2000; Thompson, 2005;

Charles, 2006; Harwood, 2009) and interdisciplinary variation (Harwood, 2009) and also between different genres of academic writing (Thompson and Tribble, 2001).

Another very important feature of citations which has been of wide interest among researchers is how to incorporate citations into one's own writing. In fact, writing from different source texts needs complex and advanced levels of academic literacy and linguistic abilities. Academic writers are required to appropriately integrate information from a variety of textual sources in their own writing. They need to possess the sophisticated skills of appropriate textual borrowing strategies and citation practices. Inappropriate textual borrowing and citation practices which is also defined as "textual plagiarism" (Pecorari, 2003), "apparent plagiarism" (Currie, 1998) or "transgressive intertextuality" (Chandrasoma *et al.* 2004) can easily be interpreted and labeled as plagiarism.

Indeed, inappropriate textual borrowing strategies which can lead to plagiarism is a phenomenon which has received a lot of consideration from researchers especially in recent years since it is becoming more common in different fields of higher education (Park, 2003). Many scholars believe that plagiarism is problematic because it may have negative impacts not only on the reputation and credibility of an institution (Park, 2004) but also the students themselves because it prevents them from developing creative and original thoughts which is an essential academic skill (e.g. Carroll, 2004; Samuels and Bast, 2006; Howard, 2007; Hart and Friesner, 2004; McKenzie, 1998; Council of Writing Program Administrators, 2003; MacDonald, 2003). Therefore, failure to address this issue would affect students' learning process, educational success and also their professional career in the future (Dawson & Overfield 2006).

Many researchers have identified low levels of academic literacy and lack of necessary linguistic skills and also developing linguistic resources of non-native student writers as main causes of inappropriate borrowing strategies and citation practices which may consequently result in unintentional plagiarism (Campbell, 1990; Pennycook, 1996; Currie, 1998; Howard, 1995; Pecorari, 2003; Shi, 2004). Therefore, in addition to making students aware of different aspects of plagiarism and the serious penalties, researchers have highly recommended the instruction of

citation skills (McGowan and Lightbody, 2008; Russikoff *et al.*, 2003; Shi, 2010), paraphrasing and summarizing skills (Campbell, 1990; Johns and Mayes, 1990; Hyland, 2001; Shi, 2004; Keck, 2006; Hood, 2008) and appropriate borrowing strategies and source use in general (Petrić, 2004, Pecorari, 2003; Currie, 1998).

In order to understand how students use sources, there is a certain line of study which has focused on student textual borrowing strategies and their reliance on source texts in their academic writing. But most of these studies have investigated student textual borrowing strategies by focusing on controlled tasks and preselected texts (Campbell 1990; Shi, 2004; Keck, 2006). As Pecorari (2003) argues, the findings from the studies which are based only on one preselected source and under controlled task situations should be cautiously attributed to source use in general. There are few studies which have looked at students' use of authentic sources with no controlled condition or limitation such as in theses (e.g. Pecorari, 2003; Pecorari, 2006) or research papers (e.g. Flowerdew and Li, 2007).

It is also reasonable that novice writers use expert writers' samples as their model in writing (see, Flowerdew and Li, 2007) and several researchers have also stressed the benefits of familiarizing students with appropriate borrowing strategies by investigating expert writers' practices (e.g. Campbell, 1990; Keck, 2006). Johns and Swales (2002) also refer to 'awareness' and 'exposure' as two factors that can help students improve their academic performance. However, while it has been widely recommended that expert writers' practices and strategies in using multiple sources in their writing could have pedagogical implications for novice writers, there seems to be a lack of such studies that have compared the strategies that expert writers apply while they borrow information from existing source texts with the strategies that novice writers adopt.

Moreover, the studies which focused on citation analyses have either investigated published articles written by native English speaking writers in native speaking settings (Harwood, 2009), or theses by native English speaking writers (Thompson, 2000, 2005). Less than adequate research on citation functions has focused on non-native student writers (e.g. see Petrić, 2007), and as far as I am aware, no research has compared the use of citation types and functions in student

and scholarly writing within the same community. As writing academic papers is often seen as evidence of one's scholarship and disciplinary knowledge, novice members of the disciplines are expected to acquire the shared knowledge, culture and practices of the discourse community, also termed as 'community of practice' by Wenger (1998). Therefore, a study comparing the citation practices and textual borrowing of novice writers with that of the experts could be revealing as it will offer valuable pedagogical implications in our interest of assisting emerging research writers in their writing endeavors.

1.2   Statement of the Problem

Academic writing is a literacy practice that is shaped by the disciplinary conventions of specific communities. Academic tasks at post-graduate levels demand more sophisticated skills than simply being able to read and write in the discipline. It demands not only content knowledge of the discipline but also advanced knowledge on rhetorical features of academic writing. It requires knowledge on established and appropriate practices and how to present the writing convincingly and persuasively. Thus, rhetorical and interactive features have long been emphasized in scholarly and scientific writing (see, Swales, 1990, 2004; Myers, 1990).

Since scientific writing is not just manifestation of facts but social interaction within disciplinary communities (Bazerman, 1988; Latour and Woolgar, 1979), the role of rhetorical features become evident. Scientific writers need to have proper rhetorical knowledge to show the significance and value of their research and make their writing more persuasive to their target readers in order to advance the acceptability of their claims. "Persuasion is at the heart of science" (Bazerman, 1988, p.98) and citation is "central to the social context of persuasion" (Hyland, 1999, p. 342)—citation provides various rhetorical choices for the writers.

Academic writers are not only required to acknowledge work of other researchers and to give credit to them through appropriate use of citation, but also

they need to promote their own findings and gain acceptance for their claims through tactical employment of citations. Since rhetorical features are highly occluded, they are not instantly visible for novice writers whose academic skills are in a developmental status. Novice writers might not be able to make full use of citation as a rhetorical device to make their text more persuasive and enhance the acceptability of their research results and promote their writing. Flowerdew (1999), also names abstract aspects of academic writing such as rhetorical features and reporting the literature as the main problems identified for novice non-native writers who are writing for publication. Therefore, there is need to raise students' awareness on how to employ citation advantageously and effectively to promote their own writing.

Also, a citation needs to be appropriately presented and incorporated into writing in order to be accepted and provide the credibility of the claim made. So, it is of equal importance to decide *what* to cite to enhance the acceptability of the claim and *how* to cite the proposition, how to appropriate text from sources. Novice writers, due to low levels of academic literacy and developing writing skills, may not adhere to the appropriate citation conventions in academic writing. These problems may affect the novice writers' textual borrowing strategies which could be manifest as textual plagiarism.

Indeed, inappropriate source use and textual borrowing strategies is a serious problem in academia which needs to be treated because even if unintentional, it might be labeled as plagiarism by professors, administrators or readers in general. There is evidence that plagiarism is increasing in universities (Park, 2003, 2004; McCabe, 2005; McCabe and Trevino, 2002; Marshall and Garry, 2006) and thus it is an issue which has received a lot of concern all over the world. This problem needs to be prevented because it could bring negative effects on students' abilities to develop critical thinking skills (Carroll, 2004; Samuels and Bast, 2006; Hart and Friesner, 2004; McKenzie, 1998). By using inappropriate borrowing strategies, students simply would become over dependant on source texts instead of applying their creativity to become more confident and independent academic writers.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

Based on the statement of the problem, the objectives of the study were specified as follows:

1. To investigate and compare the types and functions of citations practiced by novice and expert academic writers.

2. To investigate and compare the textual borrowing strategies practiced by novice and expert academic writers.

3. To decide on constructive pedagogical implications that can be used in instructing effective citation practices and appropriate textual borrowing strategies in academic writing.

1.4 Research Questions

Following the objectives of the study, there were three research questions addressed in this study:

1. What are the different citation types and functions employed by expert and novice academic writers?

2. What are the different textual borrowing strategies applied by expert and novice academic writers?

3. What are the pedagogical implications that could be gleaned from the comparisons and how can they be implemented in academic writing courses?

1.5   Purpose of the Study

Scholars (Bazerman, 1988; Hyland, 1999) have highlighted the fundamental role of rhetorical features of citations in academic writing specifically in scientific writing. Several studies have also shown that inappropriate textual borrowing which is also interpreted as textual plagiarism (Pecorari, 2003) or source misuse is more common among non-native students because of lack of linguistic abilities (Campbell, 1990; Shi, 2004, Keck, 2006) and among novice writers in general because of being at a developing stage of learning the discourse of their discipline and become members of their community (Currie, 1998; Howard, 1995, 1999). However, the literature of EAP shows lack of studies which have compared the practices of expert writers with those of the novices in the same field. Such studies could identify the problematic strategies in novice writing and suggest more sophisticated scholarly ones.

Therefore, one of the purposes of this study is to carry out an investigation of non-native novice writers' use of citations and the strategies they applied while they integrated the cited texts into their own writing. The other purpose of the study is to investigate the citation practices and textual borrowing strategies which were applied by expert writers in the same field of study. The ultimate aim is to provide useful implications for academic instructions on citation use and appropriate borrowing strategies which ultimately could help students to employ citations more effectively and thus produce research papers, dissertations and theses safe from the accusation of plagiarism.

To achieve this aim, the present study sets out to firstly investigate the types and functions of citations used by novice academic writers in their writings and to compare them with expert writers' citation practices. Secondly, it aims to explore various source use and textual borrowing strategies in the forms of paraphrases, summaries, and generalizations used by novice writers while integrating information from textual sources in their writings and to compare them with more sophisticated strategies applied by the expert writers as samples of scholarly writing. Finally, the study aims to offer some pedagogical implications and insights in teaching the appropriate textual borrowing strategies and effective citation use in academic

writing. Thus it is the purpose of the study to help university students to enrich their writing by gaining a better knowledge of effective citation use and to become more skillful in synthesizing source material into their writing without applying inappropriate textual borrowing strategies.

1.6   Theoretical Framework

One important theory behind this study is the concept of intertextuality. Intertextuality which was firstly introduced by Kristeva (1986) based on Mikhail Bakhtin's (1981) notion of dialogism, broadly refers to interconnectedness between different texts (see Lesic-Thomas, 2005). It refers to the process of creating new text by organizing and incorporating the previous existing texts, that is new meaning may be created by interrelating various texts. Bakhtin (1986) sees others' words as an important element in construction of each new utterance. Thus, our utterances or texts are constructed on the existing prior texts. Each text is based on the prior text and may serve as a basis for the future texts. Therefore, they form a chain of meaning in which each text/utterance is linked to the preceding and following meaning. Bakhtin (1986) asserts that there is no "my own word" because words are "consecrated by something higher and impersonal", thus "the author's quests for his own word are basically quests for genre and style, quests for an authorial position" (p. 149).

Later, this concept had been served as a theoretical basis in discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1992a, 1992b). Fairclough (1992a, p. 270) explains that "[t]he concept of intertextuality points to the productivity of texts, to how texts can transform prior texts and restructure existing conventions (genres, discourses) to generate new ones"; therefore, it could be considered as a "major focus in discourse analysis". However, this productivity or creation of new text is constrained by specific social practices and conventions such as different genres and discourses. Based on the relation between intertextuality and the existing conventions, Fairclough makes a distinction between 'manifest intertextuality' where the relation between different texts is explicit and 'constitutive intertextualty' where the relation is not evident.

Citation can be positioned in the framework of 'manifest intertextuality'. In manifest intertextuality or where citation is used, the intertextual relation between diverse texts could be simple and clear by using quotation or it can be more complex when the writer uses his own words to incorporate other texts more skillfully. Fairclough (1992a) discusses that intertextuality is a social practice as well as a linguistic practice. Thus, rhetorical features have a role in intertextuality and subsequently in citation which is used as a tool to interrelate diverse texts. Intertextuality may be practiced differently within different conventions or different genres and discourses— it might be very explicit or fused stylistically. Prior text is incorporated in the new text in a meaningful way to serve the purposes of the writer and enrich his/her writing.

However, the existence of intertextuality and interconnectedness between various texts stems for various problems for novice academic writers. Citing various texts and blending them together in order to create new text of one's own requires developed academic writing skills and academic literacy. Novice writers due to developmental status of learning academic skills may not be aware of various rhetorical features of citations, they also may adopt inappropriate textual borrowing strategies and citation practices which can easily be interpreted or labeled as textual plagiarism.

Another theoretical framework which serves as the basis for this study is the theory of *situated learning* developed by Lave and Wenger (1991) and was elaborated further by Wenger (1998; 2000) in the form of different social groups or communities of practice. Based on situated learning, learning is a socio-cultural process described as 'legitimate peripheral participation'. This theory has its origin in Vygotsky's (1978) social development theory which implies that mind is developed through social interaction where a learner learns through collaboration with more knowledgeable people in a specific learning context. The theory of situated learning express that learning is situated—it is a process that happens within a particular social group with specific culture, practices and identity.

Based on this theory, learning is a social practice that depends on the context within which the activity or the practice happens (Lave and Wenger, 1991);

meaningful learning takes place in specific social contexts through authentic activities. It happens as the result of participating in social communities that is communities of practice (Wenger, 1998; 2000). By participating in different processes and being involved in social practices, the learners or newcomers become more competent and gradually could take the role of experts as they move from peripheral positions to more central positions in the communities (Lave and Wenger, 1991). The relation between novice and expert or apprenticeship can well be positioned in the framework of the theory of situated learning. Learning requires engagement in certain practices and activities where newcomers have access to the expertise of the mature members of the community. To insert Figure 1.1

Based on this theory, within different social groups or communities of practice, members share knowledge over a specific domain of interest and learning or competence of these practices gradually takes place (Wenger, 2000). Newcomers will gain experience and knowledge from the expertise of the mature members of their community as they are involved in producing artifacts and adopting the situated practices which are specific of their community (Wenger, 1998). To construct their knowledge and become competent of the established practices and culture of their community, new learners or apprentices need to have access to the expertise of the expert members or the mentors in their community. This access could be provided in the form of artifacts that is specific to that social group. For instance in a community of engineering the dominant artifact of major interest and importance is a research paper.

The established academic writing conventions of a specific social group or community of practice are well embedded in research papers produced by mature members of the community. However, some of these academic practices which form the culture and identity of that established community are not instantly visible and evident for the novice or the beginner research writer. Since visibility plays an important role in successful apprenticeship (Lave and Wenger, 1991), these practices may not immediately be available for use.

The novice research writers in each academic community could be helped to understand and improve their knowledge of the appreciated academic writing

practices, by making these practices evident and perceptible for them. Many intricacies of citations are not visible at the surface level of text. This is the reason that citation is described as an occluded feature of academic writing (Pecorari, 2003; 2006); the exact relation between the citation and the cited text is only known to the writer (Pecorari, 2006). It needs further scrutiny beyond the surface level to highlight and show those citation practices that have been structurally applied and organized by expert writers, hence, to make them visible and available for use by novice writers of the same community.

1.7 Scope of the Study

This study includes only non-native second language writers in a non-native setting with the same cultural and educational background. It investigates master's students' textual borrowing strategies and citation practices in their sample research papers. This study also investigates samples of published research papers of expert writers who had published numerous papers in their field with a lot of experience in academic writing and who were already established members of their academic community.

The expert writers chosen for this study are also non-native academic writers who are senior research writers, as it is insightfully asserted by Swales (2004) that

> "the more important distinction in today's research world is in consequence no longer between NSs and NNSs of English but between experienced or "senior" researcher/scholars and less experience or "junior" ones" (p.56).

The junior members could benefit from the writing practices of their senior members. There could be academic conventions specific to the community applied by expert writers which can provide tremendous learning opportunities for the novice writers of the same community.

The novice writers and expert writers are also from the same discipline (Chemical Engineering) in order to control the intervening factor of the existence of any textual borrowing strategies and citation practices which might be appropriated differently within different disciplines. This research focuses on student writing in the field of Engineering because it has been demonstrated that in the fields of Science and Engineering, students are required to complete fewer writing assignments compared to Humanities and Social Science students (Cooper and Bikowski, 2007). Nonetheless, students of Engineering and Science are expected to be familiar with and capable of using the appropriate academic writing strategies in completing their thesis particularly at post-graduate levels. They are also strongly encouraged to publish the findings of their research in academic journals in their field.

1.8   Significance of the Study

The results from this study could be highly significant for both instructors and students of academic writing especially second language novice writers since appropriate and effective writing is an essential skill that students need to master at any stage of learning particularly at post-graduate levels. It has been found that research papers and report writing are the most common writing tasks required by professors at graduate levels (Cooper and Bikowski, 2007) and as the findings of this study will provide helpful implications for effective and appropriate source use, therefore, it will be of particular importance for post-graduate students. Research on the rhetorical functions of citations (Petrić, 2007) has also shown that theses in which the student writers have used citations more strategically have been graded higher. Therefore, awareness of the rhetorical features of citations could have a role in students' academic success.

It is also evident that being able to publish papers especially for post-graduate students is of great importance and sometimes it is a requirement for graduation (see also Flowerdew and Li, 2007). Undoubtedly, applying appropriate textual borrowing and effective citation practices will help students' writings not to

be labeled as plagiarism and to be more persuasive and of higher quality, hence advance acceptability. It is hoped that the findings of this research could raise student writers' awareness not only on how to use citation appropriately while borrowing text from other sources to avoid falling in the trap of plagiarism, but also how to employ citation advantageously and effectively to promote their writing and provide a better opportunity of getting published. Finally, this study is of significance since it provides beneficial pedagogical implications on instruction of citations for academic writing instructors to apply in their academic writing courses.

1.9 Glossary of Terms

There are some key expressions used in this research, which are defined as follows:

Citation: refers to "the attribution of propositional context to another source" (Hyland, 1999, p. 341).

Citation Function: refers to the author's reason of using a specific citation. (Teufel et al, 2006)

Citation Types: refers to integral and non-integral citations (Swales, 1990).

Textual Borrowing strategies: refers to strategies used in order to integrate information from other source texts in one's own writing which can be appropriate or inappropriate.

Paraphrase: refers to occasions where the citation is attributed to only one source and is corresponded to one or more contiguous sentences from that source text with lexical or syntactical changes.

Summary: refers to occasions where the citation is ascribed to only one source but condenses a longer excerpt or different parts of the source text, or represents the focus or method of the study in a few words.

Generalization: refers to occasions where the citation credits multiple sources.

Plagiarism: refers to inappropriate incorporation of other writers' ideas and words in one's own writing which can be intentional or unintentional.

Source misuse: this term is used to describe the application of inappropriate referencing and textual borrowing strategies while using textual sources.

Patchwriting: means "copying from a source text and then deleting some words, altering grammatical structures, or plugging in one-for-one synonym-substitutions" (Howard 1992, p. 233)

Novice writers: in this study, the term novice writers is used to refer to non-native master's students who use English for academic writing.

Expert writers: in this study, the term expert writers is used to refer to well cited second language writers with multiple numbers of publication in their field who are already established members of their community.

1.10 Summary of the Chapter

This chapter has introduced the background of this research and the problems based on which the study is designed. The research questions and the objectives of the study were specified and based on the objectives the purposes of the study were elaborated. The theories on which the study is grounded were discussed. The scope of the study was also identified. The significance of the study for academic writing courses was highlighted. The chapter ended by presenting the operational definitions of the terms used in the literature review and in the rest of the thesis. In the next chapter, I will present a review of the literature related to this line of research in academic writing.

REFERENCES

Abasi, A. R., Akbari, N. & Graves, B. (2006). Discourse appropriation, construction of identities, and the complex issue of plagiarism: ESL student writing in graduate school. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 15, 102-117.

Abasi, A. R. & Akbari, N. (2008). Are we encouraging patchwriting? Reconsidering the role of pedagogical context in ESL students' transgressive intertextuality. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27, 267-284.

Abasi, A. R. & Graves, B. (2008). Academic literacy and plagiarism: Conversations with international graduate students and disciplinary professors. *Journal of English for Academic purposes.* 7, 221-133.

Adler-Kassner, L., Anson, C. M. & Howard, R. M. (2008). Framing Plagiarism. In Caroline Eisner and Martha Vicinus (Eds.). *Originality, Imitation, and Plagiarism: Teaching Writing in the Digital Age* (pp.231-246). Ann Arbor, U Michigan press.

Ahmad, U. K., Mansourizadeh, K. & Koh, G. M. A. (2009). Non-native university students' perception of plagiarism. Paper presented at *the International Conference on English Language Teaching (ICELT): Profiting from Learners and Teacher Investment in ELT*. Nov. 10-11, Melaka, Malaysia.

American Psychological Association. (2001). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association.* Washington, DC: The American Psychological Association.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Barry, E. S. (2006). Can paraphrasing practice help students define plagiarism? *College Student Journal*, 40 (2), 377-384.

Bazerman, C. (1988). *Shaping written knowledge*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Bazerman, C., Little, J., Bethel, L., Chavkin, T., Fouquette, D., & Garufis, J. (2005). *Reference guide to writing across the curriculum.* West Lafayette, Indiana: Parlor Press.

Becher, T. (1989). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual inquiry and the cultures of disciplines.* Milton Keynes, SRHE/ Open University Press.

Biber, D. & Gray, B. (2010). Challenging stereotypes about academic writing: Complexity, elaboration, explicitness. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes,* 9, 2-20.

Bloch, J., & Chi, L. (1995). A comparison of the use of citations in Chinese and English academic discourse. In D. Belcher, & G. Braine (Eds.). *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy* (pp. 231–273). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Braine, G. (2002). Academic literacy and the non-native speaker graduate student. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 1, 59-68.

Bretag, T., Horrocks, S. & Smith, J. (2002). Developing classroom practices to support NESB students in information systems courses: Some preliminary findings. *International Educational Journal*, 3(4), 57-69.

Campbell, C. (1990). Writing with others' words: Using background reading text in academic compositions. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 211–230). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carroll, J. (2004). Institutional issues in *deterring, detecting and dealing with student plagiarism.* Joint Information Systems Committee. *JISC Briefing paper*. Retrieved January 28, 2009 from: http://www.jisc.ac.uk/uploaded_documents/plagFinal.pdf

Carroll, J. & Appleton, J. (2001). *Plagiarism: A good practice guide, Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC)*, Oxford Brookes University. Retrieved January 11, 2009, from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.23.6967

Celik, C. (2009). Perceptions of university students on academic honesty as related to gender, university type and major in Turkey. *The Journal of American Academy of Business,* 14(2), 271-278.

Chandrasoma, R., Thompson, C., & Pennycook, A. (2004). Beyond plagiarism: Transgressive and nontransgressive intertextuality. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education,* 3, 171–194.

Charles, M. (2006). Phraseological patterns in reporting clauses used in citation: A corpus-based study of theses in two disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25, 310-331.

Clarke, R. (2006). Plagiarism by academics: More complex than it seems. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 7 (2), 91-121.

Cooper, A. & Bikowski, D. (2007). Writing at the graduate level: What tasks do professors actually require? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 6, 206-221.

Coulson, J. M., Richarson, J. F., Backhurst, J. R., Harker, J. H. (1999, sixth edition). *Coulson and Richardson's chemical engineering: Fluid flow, heat transfer and mass transfer.* Butter worth –Heinemann, Oxford.

Council of Writing Program Administrators (2003). *Plagiarism: WPA statement on best policies.* Retrieved February 22, 2009 from http://www.wpacouncil.org/positions/index.html

Cronin, B, and Shaw, D. (2002). Identity creators and image makers: Using citation analysis and thick description to put authors in their place. *Scientometrics,* 54, 31-49.

Currie, P. (1998). Staying out of trouble: Apparent plagiarism and academic survival. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 1–18.

Dawson, M. M. & Overfield, J. A. (2006). Plagiarism: Do students know what it is? *Bioscience Education e-journal*, vol. 8. Retrieved February 2, 2009, from: http://www.bioscience.heacademy.ac.uk/journal/vol8/beej-8-1a.pdf

Deakin University Study Support. *Summarising, paraphrasing, and quoting*. Retrieved March,20, 2009, from: http://www.deakin.edu.au/current-students/study-support/study-skills/handouts/ideas.php#summary

De Szendeffy, J. (2004). *Computer assisted language learning: A practical guide for teachers.* University of Michigan Press.

Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1). *Plagiarism.* Retrieved February 15, 2009, From Dictionary.com website: http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/plagiarism

Dong, Y. R. (1996). Learning how to use citation for knowledge transformation: Non-native doctoral students' dissertation writing in science. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 30 (4), 428-457.

Dovey, T. (2010). Facilitating writing from sources: A focus on both process and product. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9(1), 45-60.

Eastman, K. L., Eastman, J. K. & Iyer, R. (2008). Academic dishonesty: An exploratory study examining whether insurance students are different from other college students. *Risk Management and Insurance Review*, 11 (1), 209-226.

Edwards, V. & Ran, A. (2006). *Meeting the needs of Chinese students in British Higher Education.* The University of Reading. Retrieved January 25, 2009, from
http://ncll.org.uk/10_about/50_research/10_research_projects/MeetingTheNeeds.pdf

ElMalik, A. T. & Nesi, H. (2008). Publishing research in a second language: The case of Sudanese contributors to international medical journals. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7, 87-96.

Emerson, L., Rees, M. & MacKay, B. (2005). Scaffolding academic integrity: Creating a learning context for teaching referencing skills. *Journal of University Teaching and Practice*, 2(3a), 12-24. Retrieved February 25, 2009, from http://jutlp.uow.edu.au/2005_v02_i03a/emerson005.html

Fairclough, N. (1992a). Intertextuality in critical discourse analysis. *Linguistics and Education*, 4, 269-293.

Fairclough, M. (1992b). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Flowerdew, J. (1999). Writing for Scholarly Publication in English: The Case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(2), 123-145.

Flowerdew, J. & Li, Y. (2007). Language re-use among Chinese apprentice scientists writing for publication. *Applied Linguistics*, 28 (3), 440-465.

Gastaldello, K. Melot, C., Kahn, R.J. , Vanherweghem, J.L. , Vincent, J.L., Tielemans, C. (2000). Comparison of cellulose diacetate and polysulfone membranes in the outcome of acute renal failure: A prospective randomized study, *Nephrol. Dial. Transplant*. 15, 224–230.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., Airasian, P. (2008). *Educational Research: Competence for Analysis and Applications* (Ninth edition). London: Pearson Education Ltd.

Goddard, R. & Rudzki, R. (2006). Using an electronic text-matching tool (Turnitin) to detect plagiarism in a New Zealand university. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice,* 2 (3), 59-63. Retrieved January 28, 2009, from http://jutlp.uow.edu.au/2005_v02_i03b/pdf/goddard_006.pdf

Granitz, N. & Loewy, D. (2007). Applying ethical theories: Interpreting and responding to student plagiarism. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 72, 293-306.

Gu, Q. & Brooks, J. (2008). Beyond the accusation of plagiarism. *System*, 36, 337-352.

Hart, M. & Friesner, T. (2004). Plagiarism and poor academic practice – a threat to the extension of e-earning in Higher education? *Electronic Journal on e-learning, 2 (*1), 89-96. Retrieved January 11, 2009 from http://www.ejel.org/volume-2/vol2-issue1/issue1-art25-hart-friesner.pdf

Harvey, J. & Robson, S. (2006). The Accidental Plagiarist: An institutional approach to distinguishing between a deliberate attempt to deceive and poor academic practice. Proceedings of the *2nd International Plagiarism Conference, 19-21 June*. Retrieved February 25, 2009, from http://www.jiscpas.ac.uk/conference2006/proceedings.html

Harwood, N. (2009). An interview-based study of the functions of citation in academic writing across two disciplines. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41, 497-518.

Hewings, A. , Lillis, T. & Vladimirou, D. (2010). Who's citing whose writings? A corpus base study of citations as interpersonal resource in English medium national and English medium international journals. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* (2010), doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2010.02.005

Hood, S. (2008). Summary writing in academic contexts: Implicating meaning in processes of change. *Linguistics and Education*, 19, 351-365.

Howard, R. M. (1992). A Plagiarism Pentimento. *Journal of Teaching Writing,* 11(2), 233-45.

Howard, R. (1995). Plagiarisms, authorships, and the academic death penalty. *College English,* 57, 788–806.

Howard, R. M. (1999). The New Abolitionism Comes to Plagiarism. In L. Buranen and A. M. Roy (Eds.). *Perspectives on Plagiarism and Intellectual Property in a Postmodern World.* Albany: State University of New York Press, (pp. 87-98).

Howard, R. M. (2000). Sexuality, Textuality: The cultural work of plagiarism. *College English*, 62 (4), 473-491.

Howard, R. M. (2001, March 17). Plagiarism: What should a teacher do? Paper presented at *the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Denver, CO.* Retrieved January 1, 2009 from http://wrthoward.syr.edu/Papers/CCCC2001.html

Howard, R. M. (2002). Don't police plagiarism: Just TEACH! *Education Digest*, 67 (5), 46-49.

Howard, R. M. (2007). Understanding "Internet Plagiarism". *Computers and Composition*, 24, 3-15.

Hyland, F. (2001). Dealing with plagiarism while giving feedback. *ELT Journal*, 55(4), 354-381.

Hyland, K. (1996a). Nurturing hedges in the ESP curriculum. *System*, 24 (4), 477-490.

Hyland, K. (1996b). Writing without conviction? Hedging in science research articles. *Applied Linguistics*, 17 (4). 433- 454.

Hyland, K. (1997). Science claims and community values: Articulating an academic culture. *Language & Communication*, 17 (1), 19-31.

Hyland, K. (1998). Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of academic metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 437-455.

Hyland, K. (1999). Academic attribution: Citation and the construction of disciplinary knowledge. *Applied Linguistics*, 20 (3), 341-367.

Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing.* Harlow: Longman.

Hyland, K. (2003). Self-citation and self-reference: credibility and promotion in academic publication. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology.* 54(3), 251-259.

Hyland, K. (2004). Disciplinary interactions: Metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing.* 13, 133-151.

Hyland, K. (2010). Constructing proximity: relating to readers in popular and professional science. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* (2010), doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2010.02.003.

Hyland, K. & Hyland, F. (2006): Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39, 83-101.

Hyland, T. A. (2009). Drawing a line in the sand: Identifying the border zone between self and other in EL1 and EL2 citation practices. *Assessing Writing*, 14, 62-74.

Introna, L., Hayes, N., Blair, L., & Wood, E. (2003). *Cultural attitudes towards plagiarism: Developing a better understanding of the needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds relating to issues of plagiarism.* August Lancaster University. Retrieved 20 February, 2009, from http://www.jiscpas.ac.uk/images/bin/lancplagiarismreport.pdf

Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing.* Amsterdam, Benjamins.

Iyer, R. & Eastman, J. K. (2006). Academic dishonesty: Are business students different from other college students? *Journal of Education for Business*, 82 (2), 101-110.

Johns, A. M. & Mayes, P. (1990). An analysis of summary protocols of university ESL students. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 253–271.

Johns, A. M. & Swales, J. M. (2002). Literacy and disciplinary practices: Opening and closing perspectives. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 1, 13 – 28.

Keck, C. (2006). The use of paraphrases in summary writing: A comparison of L1 and L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15, 261-278.

Kelly, G. J & Bazerman, C. (2003). How students argue scientific claims: A rhetorical semantic analysis. *Applied Linguistics,* 24(1), 28-55.

Kenny, D. (2007). Student plagiarism and professional practice. *Nurse Education Today*, 27, 14-18.

Keuskamp, D. & Sliuzas, R. (2007). Plagiarism prevention or detection? The contribution of text-matching software to education about academic integrity. *Journal of Academic Language & Learning*, 1 (1), A91- A99.

Kim, B.H., Ok, J.G., Kim, Y.H., and Chu, C.N. (2007). Electrical Discharge Machining of Carbon Nanofiber for Uniform Field Emission. *Annals of the CIRP*, 56(1), 233-236.

Kristeva, J. (1986). Word, Dialogue, and novel. In T. Moi (Ed.), *The Kristeva Reader* (pp. 34-61). Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.

Landau, J. D., Druen, P. B. & Arcuri, J. A. (2002). Methods for helping students avoid plagiarism. *Teaching of Psychology*, 29 (2), 112-115.

Latour, B. & Woolgar, S. (1979). *Laboratory life: The social construction of scientific facts.* Beverly Hills: Sage.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Leatherman, C. (1999). At Texas A&M, conflicting charges of misconduct tear a program apart, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 5 November, 46 (11), pp. A18–A21.

Lesic-Thomas, A. (2005). Behind Bakhtin: Russian formalism and Kristeva's Intertextuality. P*aragraph,* 28 (3), 1-20.

Li, H., Li, J., and Gu, C. (2005). Local field emission from individual vertical carbon nanofibers grown on tungsten filament. *Carbon*. 43, 849–853.

Liu, D. (2005). Plagiarism in ESOL students: Is cultural conditioning truly the major culprit? *ELT Journal*, 59 (3), 234-241.

Love, P. G. & Simmons, J. (1998). Factors influencing cheating and plagiarism among graduate students in a college of education. *College student Journal*, 32(4), 539-550.

MacDonald, D. (2003). Originality and the paraphrasing machine. *College Teaching*, 51 (4), 166-168 (Commentary).

Macdonald, R. & Carroll, J. (2006). Plagiarism – a complex issue requiring a holistic institutional approach. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31 (2), 233-245.

Mansourizadeh, K. & Ahmad, U. K. (2009). The issues of plagiarism and patchwriting among non-native graduate students. In *Issues in language teaching and learning amongst non-native speakers: language competence and performance.* Vol. 1. 2nd International Conference ILLANS 2009. pp. 173-183. Shah Alam: UPENA. 2009.

Mansourizadeh, K. & Ahmad, U. K. (2010). Supporting research through citations: Expert versus novice academic practices. In Proceedings of *the 3ʳᵈ Malaysian International Conference on Academic Strategies in English Language Teaching: Maximizing ELT Potential for Diversity and Intelligibility*. PP. 1-17, *Universiti Teknologi Mara, 15-16 Dec., Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.*

Mansourizadeh, K. & Ahmad, U. K. (2011). Citation practices among non-native expert and novice scientific writers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes,* 10 (3), 152-161.

Marshall, S. & Garry, M. (2005). How well do students really understand plagiarism? In Goss, H. (Ed.), Proceedings of *the 22nd annual conference of the Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education (ASCILITE)* (pp. 457-467). Brisbane, Australia, 4-7th December. Accessed January 25, 2009 from http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/brisbane05/blogs/proceedings/52_Marshall.pdf

Marshall, S. & Garry, M. (2006). NESB and ESB students' attitudes and perceptions of plagiarism. *International Journal for Educational Integrity 2* (1), 26-37.

McCabe, D. L. (2005). Cheating among college and university students: A North American perspective. *International Journal for Educational Integrity,* 1(1), 1-11.

McCabe, D. L. & Trevino, L. K. (2002). Honesty and honor codes. *Academe*, 88 (1), 37–42.

McGowan, U. (2005). Academic integrity: An awareness and development issue for students and staff. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*. 2 (3a), 48-57.

McGowan, S. & Lightbody, M. (2008). Repeating plagiarism education for EAL students within a discipline context. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 4(1), 16-30.

McKenzie, J. (1998). The New Plagiarism: Seven antidotes to prevent highway robbery in an electronic age. In From Now On*: The Educational Technology Journal,* **7** (8) [Online] Retrieved February 22, 2009 from http://fno.org/may98/cov98may.html

Mitchell, T. & Carroll, J. (2008). Academic and research misconduct in the PhD: Issues for students and supervisors. *Nurse Education Today*, 28, 218-226.

Myers, G. (1990). *Writing biology: Texts in the social construction of scientific knowledge.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Myers, S. (1998). Questioning author(ity): ESL/EFL, science, and teaching about plagiarism. *TESL-EJ*, 3(2), Retrieved 4/2/2010 from http://tesl-ej.org/ej10/a2.html.

Oshima, A. & Hogue, A. (2006). *Writing academic English, 4th ed.* (The Longman academic series, level 4). White Plains, NY: Pearson Longman.

Ouellette, M. A. (2008). Weaving strands of writer identity: Self as author and the NNES "plagiarist". *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 17, 225-273.

Paltridge, B. (2004). State of the art review: Academic writing. *Language Teaching*, 37(2), 87-105.

Park, C. (2003). In other (people's) words: plagiarism by university students-literature and lessons. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education,* 28, 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), 291-366.

Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second-language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 317–345.

Pecorari, D. (2006). Visible and occluded citation features in postgraduate second-language writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25, 4-29.

Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, 201–230.

Petrić, B. (2004). A pedagogical perspective on plagiarism. *NovELTy*, 11 (1), 4-18.

Petrić, B. (2007). Rhetorical functions of citations in high- and low-rated master's theses. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 6, 238-253.

Phan Le Ha. (2006). Plagiarism and overseas students: Stereotypes again? *ELT Journal*, 60(1), 76-78.

Pickard, V. (1995). Citing previous writers: what can we say instead of "say"? *Hongkong Papers in Linguistics and Language Teaching, 18,* 89-102.

Purdue University Online Writing Lab. *Quoting, Paraphrasing, and Summarizing*. Retrieved March, 20, 2009, from: http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/563/01/

Robillard, A. E. & Howard, R. M. (2008). Introduction: Plagiarisms. In Rebecca Moore Howard and Amy E. Robillard (Eds.). *Pluralizing plagiarism: Identities, Contexts, Pedagogies* (pp. 1-7). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Boynton/Cook.

Roig, M. (1999). When college students' attempts at paraphrasing become instances of potential plagiarism. *Psychological Reports*, 84, 973-982.

Roig, M. (2001). Plagiarism and paraphrasing criteria of college and university professors. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11 (3), 307-323.

Russikoff, K., Fucaloro, L. & Salkauskiene, D. (2003). Plagiarism as a cross-cultural phenomenon. *The CAL Poly Pomona Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 16, 109-120.

Samuels, L. B. & Bast, C. M. (2006). Strategies to help legal studies students avoid plagiarism. *Journal of Legal Studies Education*, 23 (2), 151-167.

Shi, L. (2004). Textual borrowing in second-language writing. *Written Communication*, 21, 171–200.

Shi, L. (2010). Textual appropriation and citing behaviours of university undergraduates. *Applied Linguistics*, 31 (1), 1-24.

Sims, R. L. (2002). The effectiveness of a plagiarism policy: A longitudinal study of student views. *Teaching Business Ethics*, 6 (4), 477-482.

Smith, J. M., Van Ness H. C., Abbott, M. M (2001). *Introduction to chemical engineering thermodynamics: sixth edition on SI units.* McGraw Hill, New York.

Sowden, C. (2005). Plagiarism and the culture of multilingual students in higher education abroad. *ELT Journal*, 59, 226-233.

Sutherland-Smith, W. (2005). Pandora's box: Academic perceptions of student plagiarism in writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. 4, 83-95.

Swales, J.M. (1986). Citation analysis and discourse analysis. *Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 39-56.

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Setting.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research Genres: Explorations and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. M., Ahmad, U. K., Chang, Y. Y., Chavez, D., Dressen, D. F., Seymour, R. (1998). Consider this: The role of imperatives in scholarly writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(1), 97-121.

Swales, J.M. & Feak, C. B. (2004). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills.* 2 nd ed. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Swales, J. & C. Feak. (2010). "From text to task: Putting research on abstracts to work" in M. Ruiz-Garrido, J.C. Palmer-Silveira & I. Fortanet-Gómez (eds.), *English for Professional and Academic Purposes*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. PP. 167-180.

Tadros, A. (1993). The pragmatics of text averral and attribution in academic texts. In M. Hoey (Ed.), *Data, description, discourse* (pp. 98–114). London: Harper Collins.

Tardy, C. (2005). "It's like a story": Rhetorical knowledge development in advanced academic literacy. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4, 325-338.

Teufel, S., Siddharthan, A., & Tidhar, D. (2006). Automatic classification of citation function. In Proceedings of *the 2006 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 103–110, Sydney, Australia, July. Association for Computational Linguistics.

The American Heritage® New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy, Third Edition. *Plagiarism.* Retrieved February 15, 2009, from Dictionary.com website: http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/plagiarism

The Coventry University Center for Academic Writing. *Integrating Sources into Your Own Argument in an Academic Paper.* Retrieved March, 19, 2009, from: http://home.ched.coventry.ac.uk/caw/harvard/harvard08.htm

Thompson, C. (2002, July). Discourses on plagiarism: To discipline and punish or to teach and learn? Paper presented at *the Australia and New Zealand Communication Association 23rd annual conference, Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia.* Retrieved 12 February 2009 from http://praxis.massey.ac.nz/fileadmin/praxis/papers/CThompsonPaper.pdf

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*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 12 pages. Retrieved 22 January 2009 from http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/article/viewFile/18/8

Thompson, P. (2000). Citation practices in PhD theses. In L.Burnard & T. McEnery (Eds.). *Rethinking language pedagogy from a corpus perspective* (pp. 91-101). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Thompson, P. (2005). Points of focus and position: Intertextual reference in PhD theses. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4, 307-323.

Thompson, P. & Tribble, C. (2001). Looking at citations: Using corpora in English for academic purposes. *Language Learning & Technology*, 5 (3), 91-105.

Tong, Q. S. (2008). Between knowledge and 'plagiarism,' or, how the Chinese language was studied in the West. *Language Sciences*, 30, 499-511.

Townley, C. & Parsell, M. (2004). Technology and academic virtue: Student plagiarism through the looking glass. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 6, 271-277.

Veit, R. & Gould, C. (2007). *Writing, Reading, and Research* (7th ed.). New York: Pearson/Longman.

Walker, A. L. (2008). Preventing unintentional plagiarism: A method for strengthening paraphrasing skills. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 35 (4), 387-395.

Walker, J. (1998). Student plagiarism in universities: what are we going to do about it? *Higher Education Research and Development*, 17, 89-106.

Ward, R.A., Buscariku, A., Schimidt, B., Stefoni, S. Gurland, H. J., Klinkmann, H. (1997). A comparison of dialysers with low-flux membranes: Significant difference in spite of many similarities, *Nephrol. Dial. Transplant*. 12, 965–972.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Wenger, E. (2000). Communities of practice and social learning systems. *Organization*, 7 (2), 225-246.

Wette, R. (2010). Evaluating student learning in a university-level EAP unit on writing using sources. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19, 158-177.

Wheeler, G. (2008). Plagiarism in the Japanese universities: Truly a cultural matter? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(1), 17-29.

White, H. D. (2004). Citation analysis and discourse analysis revisited. *Applied Linguistics,* 25, 89–116.

Yamada, K. (2003). What prevents ESL/EFL writers from avoiding plagiarism?: Analysis of 10 North-American college websites. *System,* 31, 247-258.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, M.A: Harvard University Press.

Young, K. M. & Leinhardt, G. (1998). Writing from primary documents: A way of knowing in History. *Written Communication*, 15 (1), 25-68.