



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

***RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN UNDERSTANDING WRITING FROM
SOURCES, ORIGINALITY AND PLAGIARISM IN ACADEMIC WRITING
OF ESL GRADUATE STUDENTS IN SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
PROGRAMS***

HOSSEIN SAADABADIMOTLAGH

FPP 2018 34



**RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN UNDERSTANDING WRITING FROM
SOURCES, ORIGINALITY AND PLAGIARISM IN ACADEMIC WRITING
OF ESL GRADUATE STUDENTS IN SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
PROGRAMS**

By

HOSSEIN SAADABADIMOTLAGH

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia,
in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

December 2017

COPYRIGHT

All material contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs and all other artwork, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia, in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN UNDERSTANDING WRITING FROM
SOURCES, ORIGINALITY AND PLAGIARISM IN ACADEMIC WRITING
OF ESL GRADUATE STUDENTS IN SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
PROGRAMS**

By

HOSSEIN SAADABADIMOTLAGH

December 2017

Chairman : Arshad Abd. Samad, PhD
Faculty : Educational Studies

The actual practice of writing from sources is rarely as straightforward for ESL students as it is usually described and taught. Many factors govern how ESL graduate students appropriate source texts in their writings for academic purposes. Low language proficiency, limited vocabulary, and unfamiliarity with the discourse of the discipline lead ESL graduate students to borrow language from writings of experts in their field to gain authorial identity and discipline membership. However, inadequate knowledge and skill in source citation, coupled with low level of understanding plagiarism makes ESL students vulnerable to the accusation of plagiarism despite their sincere attempt not to do so.

Reviewing the research on plagiarism studies turned out that most cases of accusation of plagiarism in academic writings of ESL students stem in a few reasons including borrowing text from other sources and inadequate citation of the texts they borrow. The literature also indicated that the problem is more challenging among graduate students in science and engineering programs. Therefore, in the present thesis two goals were formulated, and two procedures were followed.

First, a qualitative study was designed to develop a questionnaire that can quantify how Iranian ESL graduate students in science and engineering programs in Malaysian universities think of, and decide on textual borrowing and citation practices. Then, through a quantitative analysis of the results, an attempt was made to develop a quantitative model for predicting originality of language in the academic writings of the participants of the study. The model was then contextualized by comparing with the findings of the qualitative phase and the literature.

Results indicated three groups of respondents with regard to their understanding and view of textual borrowing and source citation. The first group was labeled Basic Academic Practitioners (BAP), who had no idea of or a wrong view of source use. Another group included Informant Academic Practitioners (IAP), who were familiar with the locally accepted norms of source use, and finally, the third group was labeled Advanced Academic Practitioners (AAP) whose members were familiar with the international conventions of writing from sources.

The examination of the relationship between students' understanding of source citation decision and textual borrowing, with the originality of language in their actual academic writing performance through multiple regression analysis indicated no significant relationship between the variables. Results also indicated that neither students' view of textual borrowing nor their view of source citation were significant predictors of originality of language among participants of this study.

The results obtained from this research revealed a distinction between what is actually practiced as academic writing in the Iranian academic contexts and the real nature of academic writing. This study also indicated a need for especial attention to teaching academic writing in terms of materials and methods in the Iranian academia, especially in science and engineering fields.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk Ijazah Doktor Falsafah

**HUBUNGAN ANTARA KEFAHAMAN PENULISAN DARIPADA SUMBER
DAN KEASLIAN SERTA PLAGIARISME DALAM PENULISAN
AKADEMIK PELAJAR PASCASISWAZAH ESL DALAM PROGRAM
SAINS DAN KEJURUTERAAN**

Oleh

HOSSEIN SAADABADIMOTLAGH

Disember 2017

Pengerusi : Arshad Abd. Samad, PhD
Fakulti : Pengajian Pendidikan

Amalan menulis menggunakan rujukan kerap tidak begitu mudah bagi pelajar Bahasa Inggeris sebagai bahasa kedua sebagaimana ia diterangkan dan diajar. Pelbagai faktor mempengaruhi bagaimana pelajar pasca siswazh Bahasa Inggeris sebagai bahasa kedua menggunakan teks rujukan yang bersesuaian dalam penulisan mereka untuk tujuan akademik. Kemahiran bahasa yang rendah, perbendaharaan kata yang terhad, serta kurang fasih dengan wacana disiplin mengakibatkan pelajar pasca siswazah ini meminjam bahasa dari penulisan pakar dalam bidang untuk mendapatkan kepercayaan sebagai penulis (authorial identity) dan keahlian dalam disiplin (discipline membership). Namun, kurang pengetahuan dan kemahiran dalam merujuk dari sumber berserta kefahaman yang rendah tentang isu plagiat membuat pelajar yang menggunakan Bahasa Inggeris sebagai bahasa kedua mudah terpengaruh dan dituduh berplagiat walaupun berusaha dengan ikhlas untuk tidak berbuat demikian.

Mengimbas penyelidikan tentang isu plagiat, kebanyakan tuduhan memplagiat dalam penulisan akademik pelajar yang menggunakan Bahasa Inggeris sebagai bahasa kedua adalah kerana meminjam teks dari sumber rujukan dan sitatise yang tidak mencukupi. Literatur juga memberi gambaran bahawa masalah ini lebih ketara di kalangan pelajar pasca siswazah dalam program sains dan kejuruteraan. Oleh itu, tesis ini mempunyai dua matlamat utama.

Pertama, suatu soal selidik yang dapat memberi maklumat tentang pandangan pelajar pasca siswazah Iran dari program Sains dan Kejuruteraan di universiti Malaysia yang menggunakan Bahasa Inggeris sebagai bahasa kedua terhadap amalan meminjam teks (textual borrowing) dan sitasi. Seterusnya, suatu model untuk menjangkakan keaslian

bahasa dalam penulisan akademik pelajar pasca siswazah dalam program sains dan kejuruteraan di universiti di Malaysia yang menggunakan Bahasa Inggeris sebagai bahasa kedua.

Dapatan memberi indikasi tiga kumpulan responden berkaitan pandangan terhadap peminjaman teks dan sitasi sumber. Kumpulan pertama diberi label Basic Academic Practitioners (BAP) yang tidak mempunyai kesedaran tentang penggunaan sumber rujukan yang salah. Kumpulan lain termasuk Informant Academic Practitioner (IAP) yang mempunyai kebiasaan dengan norma tempatan berkaitan penggunaan sumber rujukan, dan seterusnya kumpulan ketiga Advanced Academic Practitioners (AAP) yang mempunyai kebiasaan dengan konvensi antarabangsa dalam menulis dari sumber.

Perhubungan antara persepsi pelajar dan kefahaman tentang sitasi sumber dan peminjaman teks serta keaslian bahasa dalam penulisan akademik dikaji melalui regresi menunjukkan tiada kaitan signifikan antara pemboleh ubah. Dapatan juga menunjukkan bahawa pandangan pelajar terhadap peminjaman teks dan sitasi sumber bukan peramal keaslian bahasa dalam kalangan peserta dalam kajian ini.

Dapatan dari kajian ini dibincang dari segi matlamat dan hipotesis kajian dan cadangan diberi untuk pelajar pasca siswazah serta penulis bahan dalam bidang sains dan kejuruteraan.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The present dissertation is the result of cooperation, support, and assistance that I received from a number of people to whom I would like to express my deepest appreciation.

First, I would like to express a special note of appreciation to associate professor Dr. Arshad for encouraging me consistently, supporting me patiently all along the way, reading the manuscript and giving me helpful advice. He carefully read different drafts of this manuscript and provided me with useful advice and constructive comments about the content, form, and the organization of the work. I owe a great deal to him for all his valuable advice, suggestions, and stimulating discussions.

My heartfelt gratitude goes also to Dr. Zoharah Omar and Dr. Roselan Baki who helped me in different phases of the research. Dr. Zoharah provided guidance in research design, statistics and the analysis of the data. She was a real source of encouragement during the entire program. I also owe a lot to Dr. Roselan for teaching me qualitative research and helping me with the first phase of the research. I am thankful especially for his sharp insights concerning data collection and data analysis.

I would also like to express special thanks to all Iranian students at Malaysian universities who, regardless of the level and the field of study, helped me in conducting and completing this work. I would like to acknowledge the cooperation of those students who participated in the process of data collection: those who participated in the pilot study; those who attended the interview sessions; those who completed the questionnaire and provided me with text samples and finally those who helped me find and gather these nice people.

Last, but not least, my heartfelt gratitude goes to my family. They were always helpful and supportive whenever a problem arose during the course of this program. Their constant encouragement always kept me going. And finally, my wife. Language fails to express appreciation and gratitude for her company. Words are incapable of expressing my heartfelt gratitude to all the sacrifices she made through the years of my study and the process of conducting this research. For her, I can just express my love.

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Arshad Abd Samad, PhD

Associate professor
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Roselan Bin Baki, PhD

Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

Zoharah Binti Omar, PhD

Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

ROBIAH BINTI YUNUS, PhD

Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

Declaration by graduate student

I hereby confirm that:

- this thesis is my original work;
- quotations, illustrations and citations have been duly referenced;
- this thesis has not been submitted previously or concurrently for any other degree at any other institutions;
- intellectual property from the thesis and copyright of thesis are fully-owned by Universiti Putra Malaysia, as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- written permission must be obtained from supervisor and the office of Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) before thesis is published (in the form of written, printed or in electronic form) including books, journals, modules, proceedings, popular writings, seminar papers, manuscripts, posters, reports, lecture notes, learning modules or any other materials as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- there is no plagiarism or data falsification/fabrication in the thesis, and scholarly integrity is upheld as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) and the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012. The thesis has undergone plagiarism detection software.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name and Matric No.: Hossein Saadabadi Motlagh, GS 31666 _____

Declaration by Members of Supervisory Committee

This is to confirm that:

- the research conducted and the writing of this thesis was under our supervision;
- supervision responsibilities as stated in the University Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) are adhered to.

Signature: _____

Name of Chairman
of Supervisory
Committee:

Associate Professor
Dr. Arshad Abd Samad

Signature: _____

Name of Member
of Supervisory
Committee:

Dr. Roselan Bin Baki

Signature: _____

Name of Member
of Supervisory
Committee:

Dr. Zoharah Binti Omar

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
ABSTRAK	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
APPROVAL	vi
DECLARATION	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xiv
 CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	3
1.3 Objectives of the Study	4
1.4 Significance of the study	5
1.5 Definition of key terms	7
 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	 10
2.1 Introduction	10
2.2 Current area of scholarship	10
2.2.1 Writing from sources	15
2.2.2 Writing from sources and originality	16
2.2.3 Writing from sources and ESL Students	16
2.2.4 Writing in a disciplinary discourse	18
2.2.5 Writing from sources among Iranian ESL students	19
2.3 Textual plagiarism or Textual error	23
2.3.1 Sources of textual errors	25
2.3.2 Textual borrowing	25
2.3.3 Source citation	27
2.4 Theoretical framework	28
2.5 Conceptual framework	30
2.6 Conclusion	31
 3 METHODOLOGY	 33
3.1 Introduction	33
3.2 Population and sampling	33
3.2.1 Population	33
3.2.2 Sampling	34
3.3 Research design	34
3.4 Phase 1: The qualitative study: Designing the questionnaire	36
3.4.1 Objectives of the study	36

3.4.2	Participants of the study	36
3.4.3	Data Collection Procedure	37
3.4.4	Analyzing the qualitative data	38
3.4.5	Themes emerging from qualitative analysis	41
3.4.6	Designing the questionnaire	44
3.5	Phase 2: The quantitative study	47
3.5.1	Objectives of the study	47
3.5.2	Instruments of the study	48
3.5.2.1	The Questionnaire	48
3.5.2.2	Turnitin	48
3.5.3	Data collection procedure	50
3.5.4	Data analysis	51
4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	52
4.1	Introduction	52
4.2	Part one: Students Understanding of Writing from Sources	53
4.2.1	Results	53
4.2.1.1	Textual Borrowing	54
4.2.1.2	Source Citation	55
4.2.2	Discussions	56
4.3	Part two: Possible Relationships	58
4.3.1	Results	58
4.3.2	Discussions	61
5	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS	65
5.1	Summary	65
5.2	Conclusions	66
5.3	Implications	68
	REFERENCES	70
	APPENDICES	83
	BIODATA OF STUDENT	96
	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	97

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1 Case Processing Summary for Textual Borrowing	46
3.2 Reliability Statistics for Textual Borrowing	47
3.3 Case Processing Summary for Source citation	47
3.4 Reliability Statistics for Source citation	47
3.5 Turnitin similarity indices ("OriginalityCheck," 2011)	49
4.1 ANOVA	54
4.2 Number of Cases in each Cluster for Textual Borrowing	54
4.3 Final Cluster Centers for Textual Borrowing	54
4.4 ANOVA	55
4.5 Number of Cases in each Cluster for source citation	56
4.6 Descriptive Statistics	59
4.7 Relationship between the originality and the two predictors TBS and SCS	59
4.8 Model Summary	60
4.9 ANOVA ^b	60
4.10 Coefficients	60

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
2.1 Current theme of research regarding plagiarism and originality	24
2.2 Shifting focus from plagiarism to originality	26
3.1 The exploratory sequential design (Creswell & Plano, 2011)	35
3.2 Turnitin sample originality report. ("OriginalityCheck," 2011)	49



LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
1	The Questionnaire (English version)	83
2	The Questionnaire (Persian version)	87
3	Manual for conducting focus groups	91
4	Interview consent letter	93
5	Interview Consent Form (Bilingual)	95

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Recent surveys provide evidence for the increasing raise of the rate of plagiarism in academic writings of university students. (Appiah, 2016; Eret & Ok, 2014; George, 2016; Ghajarzadeh, Mohammadifar, & Safari, 2013; Hosseini et al., 2009; Maurer, Kappe, & Zaka, 2006). There is no doubt in the importance of academic ethics, especially originality of language and idea. However, the contradictory and controversial issue here is the prevalence and the growing rate of such academic misconducts as plagiarism, despite the wide attention given to and the rich body of research on the topic. As designated by Löfström and Kupila (2013), there are three factors resulting in plagiarism among university students. He labeled these factors “intentional”-- deliberative behaviors to gain unattempted academic benefits--, “contextual”--factors like time pressure and load of tasks and commitments that make students plagiarize--, and finally, “unintentional” which includes items that reflect inadequate knowledge and competence in writing from sources (Löfström & Kupila, 2013; Stearns, 1992).

Regardless of intentional and contextual cases where personal motivations to gain unattempted academic benefits, and tendency to use shortcuts to academic progress are involved, experience and literature provide evidence to certify that most of the cases that are considered plagiarism are in fact unconscious and unintentional (Amiri & Razmjoo, 2016; George, 2016; Yasami & Yarmohammadi, 2014) rather than utilizing and building on existing literature. Unintentional plagiarism is rooted in a number of grounds such as diversity in the definition of plagiarism (Amiri & Razmjoo, 2016; Gullifer & Tyson, 2010), deficiencies in educational system (Yasami & Yarmohammadi, 2014), inadequate proficiency in English as a second language (Hinkel, 2004; Pecorari & Petrić, 2014; Petric, 2004; Petrić, 2012; Shi, 2012, 2012a; Stearns, 1992), and lack of awareness and proper understanding of the nature academic writing (Adam, 2015b; Howard, Serviss, & Rodrigue, 2010; Li & Casanave, 2012; Löfström & Kupila, 2013; Pecorari & Petrić, 2014).

Many cases of unintentional plagiarism are the results of diversity in, and uncertainty about what constitute plagiarism, and therefore different understanding of the nature of plagiarism (Amiri & Razmjoo, 2016; Bahadori, Izadi, & Hoseinpourfard, 2012; Gullifer & Tyson, 2010; Li & Casanave, 2012; Roig, 1997). Literature behind plagiarism studies is filled with convincing arguments that support students' unawareness of the different types of plagiarism (Marshall & Garry, 2006; Okoro, 2011). According to Marshall and Garry (2006), it is not easy for students to know plagiarism, nor is there any agreement on possible types of plagiarism. While plagiarism is typically defined as the failure to acknowledge the author of the source

text, there are many cases of plagiarism with the original text being acknowledged (Marshall & Garry, 2005; Roig, 1997).

Deficiencies in the educational system is another area of controversy concerning the roots of unintentional plagiarism (Yasami & Yarmohammadi, 2014). This point, although generally ignored in the literature, has sometimes been the focus of some scholars. According to Gilmore (2010), lecturers are unsure of their definitions of plagiarism, and hence have different attitudes towards treating it. Stearns (1992), also, accuses the educational system regarding the occurrence of unintentional plagiarism. She believes that failure of the educational system to teach correct habits of referencing coupled with lecturers' reliance on plagiarism push students, especially ESL students who face the western conventions of plagiarism, to establish their own perception of plagiarism. This is especially true with students outside of the western academia who mostly experience writing project reports rather than writing longer, more interpretive writing in academic style. When coupled with deficiency in English as a second language, contribute to the establishment of a different academic culture towards plagiarism (Lyon, 2009).

Another source of unintentional plagiarism is students' low proficiency in English. Academic science is now international, and it is communicated through English as the lingua franca of international academic communication. Studies show that few of ESL students can read and communicate accurately and effectively in English, despite their adequate English proficiency score in international tests of English proficiency. In fact, different studies indicate IELTS' very low predictive power compared to students' vocabulary knowledge and writing skill (Liu, 1993; Yixin & Daller, 2014; Zare-ee & Khalili, 2016). Inadequate proficiency in English in general, and particularly in the disciplinary discourse, leads ESL students towards borrowing language from related sources to express their own ideas so that they can prove their professionalism and membership in the community of their discipline (Aşık-Dizdar & Bygrave, 2014; Heitman & Litewka, 2011). Although borrowing from sources is a common strategy in academic writing especially among ESL students, it is more likely to encounter students with the accusation of plagiarism (Currie, 1998; Doro, 2017; Flowerdew & Li, 2007; Keck, 2006; Shi, 2012a; Suh, 2011).

On top of all reasons is students' lack of awareness and appropriate understanding of the nature academic writing. Writing for academic purposes is in fact an assemblage of materials from different sources (Bazerman, 2004; Hirvela & Du, 2013; Johnson-Eilola & Selber, 2007; Pecorari & Shaw, 2012); therefore, the way students view borrowing text from other sources, and the way they cite those sources, and finally, their skill in assembling an original text from borrowed fragments can include a series of errors that can be considered plagiarism (Howard et al., 2010; Li & Casanave, 2012; Pecorari, 2003; Pecorari & Petrić, 2014; Shi, 2004). Such errors can also result from incorporating new ideas that come to writer's mind into the text being written while these ideas are similar to or the same as the available thoughts and ideas (Amsberry, 2009; Chandrasoma, Thompson, & Pennycook, 2004; Currie, 1998; Moody, 2007; Pennycook, 1996; Shi, 2004, 2006; Thompson, 2009).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

A survey of students' comments and a review of the literature related to plagiarism show that most textual plagiarism in academic writing among ESL students aims at improving the quality of writing (Howard, 1993; Leary, 2010; Yilmaz, 2007). These students borrow from other resources to improve the quality of their product, but quite unintentionally, they convey a disapproving image of themselves as plagiarizers. This point is even more prominent when students of science and engineering are concerned. For scientists, the most important part of any article is the findings that should be original, and that for those whose L1 is not English, using beautiful sentences from other sources to provide background information is not inappropriate (Yilmaz, 2007). He says:

Borrowing sentences in the part of a paper that simply helps to better introduce the problem should not be seen as plagiarism. Even if our introductions are not entirely original, our results are — and these are the most important part of any scientific paper (Yilmaz, 2007, p. 658).

In other words, for ESL students textual borrowing is a technique to improve failure to write well rather than refusal to engage legitimately in the writing process at all (Deckert, 1993; Pecorari, 2010; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2005; Shi, 2006). In fact, textual borrowing among ESL students is either a learning or developmental issue resulted from limited L2 proficiency (Keck, 2006; Shi, 2012a), or lack of skill in properly assembling what they borrow from others' sources to form their own text (Johnson-Eilola & Selber, 2007). In addition, the accusation of plagiarism is based on the assumption that there are fixed rules or standards for textual borrowing (Shi, 2012a); however, qualitative study of beliefs of ESL students and their supervisors concerning textual borrowing, plagiarism, and originality of composition indicate variation and ambiguity in definitions and views about these concepts. Despite years of debate about plagiarism, originality and academic integrity, there is still no clear-cut definition for these concepts (Amiri & Razmjoo, 2016; Sharkey, 1992), and this has resulted in a plurality in understanding and using the related rules.

Iranian graduate students who study abroad are not exceptions from what described in the literature regarding academic writing behavior among ESL students. They use textual borrowing, when they lack the necessary language and structure that they need to express an idea, or when their own words are not good enough. Naturally, therefore, they usually suffer from and complain of being accused of plagiarism despite their sincere attempt not to do so.

Informal interviews as well as anecdotal evidence report that the feeling of anxiety that these students experience is the result of lack of a clear or accurate picture of plagiarism. When they are asked about plagiarism in general, they know it as a misconduct and that it is forbidden. They say that they respect academic integrity, and seriously avoid all instances of plagiarism to keep originality. The same respondents

when faced the actual instances of plagiarism, they failed to distinguish between plagiarized and original instances. Sensitivity to avoid plagiarism that these students report is sometimes so high that prevents them from writing, and even results in writers block (Lyon, 2009). These students claimed that the stress caused by this uncertainty has led to writing anxiety and that it has made writing a stressful task that sometimes makes them think of giving up education. In fact these students do not mean to plagiarize; neither do they have any concept of what constitute plagiarism at the time they are doing it; rather, they consider it a simple borrowing of some text and use it as a technique and a composition skill that help them overcome writing problems. This is an epidemic procedure among these students, and thus, logically, there should be something other than the incentive to cheat that motivates the process (LoCastro & Masuko, 2002); one point that the present research aims to investigate.

In fact, an investigation in the Iranian socio-cultural and educational backgrounds can provide us with important evidence for the above-mentioned claim, and show that these students do not consider plagiarism as defined by western academia, plagiarism; rather, they know it as a habit behavior that, according to Spigelman (1998), shaped throughout their lifetimes. In the Iranian undergraduate programs, to pass their courses, it is just enough for students to show adequate understanding of the content of the course. Therefore in their written assignments they are allowed to synthesize a coherent text to restate the experts' ideas. With such educational background, it is not surprising for Iranian graduate students to encounter serious conflicts with the western ideas of plagiarism.

This research focuses especially on Iranian graduate students in Masters' programs in science and engineering in Malaysian universities. These students are the product of a text book-centered educational system that emphasizes rote learning and tests rather than research and academic writing. Iranian students receive no training in academic writing in general and more specifically in academic writing in English before they enter graduate programs. These students, in addition, suffer from low English proficiency. They try to get help from other sources to compensate for their weakness in English, but they are neither skillful enough to write from other sources, nor familiar with strategies to avoid plagiarism (Jalalian, Bazargani, Latiff, Tajuddin, & Mohamed, 2009); hence, influenced by their past learning environments (Mirshekary & Lawrence, 2009; Nejati, Jamali, & Nejati, 2009), they identify what is considered in Malaysia plagiarism, a positive technique that helps them improve many writing problems. One very common example of this claim among students is what Pecorari (2002), following Howard (1995), labels *patchwriting*. That is to say, these students have either a mistaken or a different perception of plagiarism.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

Lack of adequate published empirical literature makes it difficult to deal with problems arising from source use in academic writing among ESL students. This thesis is based on a premise that plagiarism among ESL graduate students is not intentional to obtain illegal benefit or to cheat supervisors; rather, it stems from a

number of factors chief among them students' cultural and educational background. This is more evident among ESL graduate students in science and engineering programs who usually focus on the content in their scholarly research, and use language only as a medium for presenting their findings to the international discourse community of their discipline (Flowerdew & Li, 2007; Li, 2012; Yilmaz, 2007). Iranian ESL students, especially in the areas of science and engineering receive no instruction in research skills and academic writing neither in their L1 nor L2; therefore, in writing from sources, they follow their own rules instead of following standards of international academic writing. This has raised problems for these students. There are some scattered studies on plagiarism among Iranian students within Iran and outside; however, those studies focus on students in applied linguistics and students in medical programs who have to write in English even inside the country.

The present research seeks two major goals. First, it is an attempt to design a questionnaire that can elicit how Iranian ESL graduate students in science and engineering programs in Malaysian universities think of and decide on textual borrowing and citation practices. Then, it tries to find out whether there is any relationship between students' views and the originality of language in their actual academic writing practices. Therefore, question 1 bellow will help a qualitative investigation of students' views in order to come up with an understanding of the participants' academic writing behavior.

1. How do students' view textual borrowing and source citation?

As the second goal, this research will investigate the relationship between students' views and their actual performance in their academic writings. To this end, it will address questions 2 to 3 quantitatively:

2. Is there any relationship between originality of language and students' views of textual borrowing and source citation?
3. Is there any interaction effect of source citation on the relationship between textual borrowing and originality of language?

1.4 Significance of the study

Success in writing for academic purposes depends more heavily on discipline-specific terminology and awareness of cross-disciplinary diversity in thinking and communication processes than on the general rules of paragraph development and organization (Zhu, 2004). Simply put, each academic community or discipline has unique ways of expressing ideas, particularly in written communication (Hirvela, 1997; Maroko, 2013; Ramanathan & Kaplan, 1996). One of the conventions refers to the ability to integrate information sourced from earlier researchers with the shared area of specialization and inquiry (Campbell, 1990). In fact, academic texts are built upon borrowing pieces of texts from other sources and joining them together to make

new meaning. Such a process is governed by complex conventions mainly manifested through explicit citation, and violation to these conventions perpetrated by novice writers can threaten the originality of their academic texts (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993; Crocker & Shaw, 2002; Fairclough, 1994; Pecorari & Shaw, 2012; Shi, 2010). To add on, textual borrowing and citation practices as two major factors in achieving originality of language in academic writing also simultaneously have potential to function as two possible sources of unintentional plagiarism (Shi, 2010). As Pecorari (2012) puts it:

Inexperienced writers and those with English as a second language have the most to gain from a copying strategy. Therefore, they are perhaps most disadvantaged by disagreement about whether that strategy is legitimate, but nobody is well served by the disagreement. It is imperative that this question be debated in the wider research community as a first step toward achieving a stable consensus (p. 10).

Investigating ESL students' textual borrowing practices and citation practices while writing in English as a second language is important, therefore, in that it sheds light on the blank spots of the task, and thereby helps them avoid unintentional plagiarism and its consequences.

Outcomes of this research may be of value to EAP teachers to be aware of the academic needs of ESL graduate students of sciences and engineering, and raise their consciousness of their disciplinary conventions of academic writing.

This research can help experts involved in EAP materials preparation and syllabus design to gain a deeper understanding of the nature of the tasks to be able to rethink their methodology and revise the contents of academic writing courses through shifting focus from text mechanics to discourse. One way to achieve this goal is to raise students' awareness of discipline specific norms of textual borrowing and citation practices, and as Maroko (2013) exemplifies, this can be achieved through selecting authentic corpus-based materials from students' own discipline. That is to say, to improve the quality of academic writing and avoid involuntary threats to the originality of academic works, new EAP materials should include discipline specific terminology, as well as conventions and rules required for the related discipline.

The findings of the study reported in this research can also be of value to the development of English for research purposes (ERP) course for students of sciences and engineering at graduate level. This ERP course can help students achieve their discipline-specific thinking, communication processes, and terminology.

Academic writing is a bridge that links together the various pieces of the puzzle of knowledge (current and prospective) in any field of science. Therefore, accuracy of information, reliability of findings, and professional integrity of the researcher are of high importance in academic writing.

Another significance of this study is the questionnaire designed for this research. The questionnaire is different from similar ones in that it refrains from directly pointing at students' behavior, and thus, by putting them in a judgement position, elicit more real and reliable responses from the respondents. This questionnaire can determine how likely a student has the potential to plagiarize, and which factor is more influencing in leading that student towards plagiarism. This way, faculties and supervisors can have a profile for students and provide them with necessary skills to help them avoid plagiarism.

1.5 Definition of key terms

Academic dishonesty: academic dishonesty includes “cheating,” “fraud,” and “plagiarism,” the theft of ideas and other forms of intellectual property— whether they are published or not (Jones, 2001).

Academic integrity a social contract in which individuals have a duty to follow the rules and norms of academia as well as a duty to ensure their peers also follow such rules and norms (Jones, 2001).

Academic writing a source-based writing in which the text is centered on a topic that is supported by academic materials such as books, journal articles, charts or graphs. Academic writing is based on a set of disciplinary conventions called the academic style that forms a framework within which scholars stake their claims to the original source they have used.

Copyright the exclusive right to reproduce or authorize others to reproduce artistic, dramatic, literary, or musical works; It is conferred by the Copyright, designs and patents acts 1988...Copyright lasts for the author's lifetime plus seven years from the end of the year in which he died (Law & Martin, 2009).

Discourse community a group of people with common interests who may never meet each other, and only newsletter with a particular form of text which they use to pursue their goals, unites them (Borg, 2003).

EAP English for Academic Purposes; English appropriate for higher education setting; In this research, EAP refers to the academic English language and research skills used by graduate students for successful participation in their academic tasks such as writing research articles, writing a graduate thesis, scientific lectures, etc.

Intellectual property intangible property that includes patents, trademarks, copyright, and registered and unregistered design rights (Law & Martin, 2009)

Intertextuality according to Kristeva (1986), each academic text is populated with other texts organized to generate new knowledge claims. In this study, following Kristeva (1986) as well as Fairclough (1992) and Shi (2010) intertextuality means that text has much in common in terms of language and discourse, and follow similar processes of making meaning.

ESL (English as second Language): in this study, refers to all conditions of learning English whether EFL, ESL or ESOL

Originality Pecorari (2003) defines originality in terms of transparency of meaning. She claims that an original text indicates the relationship between the source and the cited text accurately. In this research, originality is defined in the same way as a feature of a text with a clear distinction between the words of the author, and the words that the author has borrowed from others' sources.

Similarity index Turnitin returns results in terms of similarity index. This index is the percentage of matched words or chunk of language that that Turnitin is able to find for the tested document. In the present research, similarity index was taken as a representation of the originality of the text.

Plagiarism According to *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* 2010), any attempt to pass someone's work in any form—paraphrase, direct quotation, or idea description—as of your own or to write from other sources without giving them proper credits is regarded as plagiarism.

Citation Referencing to or acknowledging the sources of ideas, data and other evidence in written assignments (Neville, 2007). In this study, citation behavior refers to the writers' efforts and decisions to use and locate the sources of information.

Textual borrowing “copying from a source text and then deleting some words, altering grammatical structures, or plugging in one-for-one synonym substitutes” (Howard, 1993, p. 233). It is a widely used technique in second language writing in which writers recycle sentences or fragments from other documents to express their own ideas (Cameron, 2007).

Textual capital the knowledge about texts, and about the relationships between texts, which students from vastly different backgrounds possess (Starfield, 2002)

Basic Academic Practitioners (BAP) based on cluster analysis of the scores of the respondents' to the questionnaire, those who had little or inadequate knowledge of writing from sources hence scored low in the questionnaire were labeled Basic Academic Practitioners (BAP).

Informant Academic Practitioners (IAP) based on cluster analysis of the scores of the respondents' to the questionnaire, those who had acceptable knowledge of writing from sources hence received intermediate scores in the questionnaire were labeled Informant Academic Practitioners (IAP).

Advanced Academic Practitioners (AAP) based on cluster analysis of the scores of the respondents' to the questionnaire, those who had adequate and good knowledge of writing from sources, and hence received high scores in the questionnaire were labeled Advanced Academic Practitioners (AAP).

Unintentional plagiarism the unconscious incorporation of language or idea into a written academic task, despite the prevalence of explicit knowledge against doing so.

Citation competence an intertextual skill of referencing which clarifies and expresses writer stance and attains rhetorical functions in academic writing (Ma & Qin, 2017, p. 213).

REFERENCES

- Abasi, A. R., Akbari, N., & 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(2), 102-117. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2006.05.001
- Adam, L. (2015a). Student perspectives on plagiarism. *Handbook of academic integrity*, 1-13.
- Afifi, M. (2007). Plagiarism is not fair play. *Lancet*, 369(9571), 1428.
- Ahmadi, A. (2014). Plagiarism in the academic context: A study of Iranian EFL learners. *Research Ethics*, 10(3), 151-168.
- Alzahrani, S. M., Salim, N., & Abraham, A. (2012). Understanding plagiarism linguistic patterns, textual features, and detection methods. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part C (Applications and Reviews)*, 42(2), 133-149.
- Amiri, F., & Razmjoo, S. A. (2016). On Iranian EFL undergraduate students' perceptions of plagiarism. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 14(2), 115-131.
- Amsberry, D. (2009). Deconstructing Plagiarism: International Students and Textual Borrowing Practices. *The Reference Librarian*, 51(1), 31-44. doi: 10.1080/02763870903362183
- Anderson, J. R. (2009). *Cognitive psychology and its implications*. London, UK: Macmillan.
- Andrews, S. (2004). Washback and curriculum innovation. In L. Cheng & Y. Watanabe (Eds.), *Washback in language testing: Research contexts and methods* (pp. 37-50): Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Appiah, M. K. (2016). The Evil That Men Do In Academics: Understanding Plagiarism And Its Extenuating Circumstances. *British Journal of Education*, 4(6), 56-67.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Aşık-Dizdar, Ö., & Bygrave, C. (2014). When You Really Don't Mean it: A Model of Plagiarism Behaviour and its Correlates. *Global Review: A Biannual Special Topics Journal*, 85.
- Babaii, E., & Nejadghanbar, H. (2017). Plagiarism Among Iranian Graduate Students of Language Studies: Perspectives and Causes. *Ethics & Behavior*, 27(3), 240-258.
- Bahadori, M., Izadi, M., & Hoseinpourfard, M. (2012). Plagiarism: concepts, factors and solutions. *Journal Mil Med*, 14(3), 168-177.

- Bakhtin, M. (1981). Discourse in the Novel. In M. Holquist, C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Eds.), *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by MM Bakhtin*.
- Bazerman, C. (2004). Intertextuality: How texts rely on other texts. In C. Bazerman & P. Prior (Eds.), *What writing does and how it does it: An introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices* (pp. 83-96).
- Berkenkotter, C., Huckin, T. N., & Ackerman, J. (1994). Social context and socially constructed texts. In C. Bazerman & D. R. Russel (Eds.), *Landmark essays on writing across the curriculum* (Vol. 6, pp. 211-232): Routledge.
- Bizzell, P. (1982). College composition: Initiation into the academic discourse community. *Curriculum inquiry*, 12(2), 191-207.
- Bloch, J. (2008). Plagiarism in an intercultural rhetoric context. In U. Connor, E. Nagelhout & W. V. Rozycki (Eds.), *Contrastive rhetoric : reaching to intercultural rhetoric* (pp. 258-274). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub.
- Bloome, D., & Egan-Robertson, A. (1993). The Social Construction of Intertextuality in Classroom Reading and Writing Lessons. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 28(4), 305-333.
- Bohlin, M., & Widén, S. E. (2016). University teacher and student judgments on misleading behavior in study situations.
- Borg, E. (2003). Discourse community. *ELT journal*, 57(4), 398-400.
- Bouville, M. (2008). Plagiarism: words and ideas. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 14(3), 311-322.
- Bryman, A. (2006). Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: how is it done? *Qualitative research*, 6(1), 97-113.
- Burkill, S., & Abbey, C. (2004). Avoiding plagiarism. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 28(3), 439-446.
- Cameron, C. (2007). Bridging the gap: working productively with ESL authors. *Sci Ed*, 30, 43-44.
- 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).
- Chandrasoma, R., Thompson, C., & Pennycook, A. (2004). Beyond Plagiarism: Transgressive and Nontransgressive Intertextuality. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 3(3), 171-193. doi: 10.1207/s15327701jlie0303_1
- 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(3), 310-331.
- Cheng, L. (2004). The Washback Effect of a Public Examination Change on Teachers' Perceptions Toward Their Classroom Teaching. In L. Cheng & Y. Watanabe

- (Eds.), *Washback in language testing : research contents and methods*: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Cowie, A. P. (1988). Stable and creative aspects of vocabulary use. *Vocabulary and language teaching*, 126-139.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano, C. V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Crocker, J., & Shaw, P. (2002). Research student and supervisor evaluation of intertextuality practices. *Hermes*, 28, 39-58.
- Currie, P. (1998). Staying out of trouble: Apparent plagiarism and academic survival. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(1), 1-18. doi: 10.1016/s1060-3743(98)90003-0
- Curtis, G. J., & Popal, R. (2011). An examination of factors related to plagiarism and a five-year follow-up of plagiarism at an Australian university. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 7(1), 30-42.
- Deckert, G. D. (1993). Perspectives on plagiarism from ESL students in Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2(2), 131-148.
- Divan, A., Bowman, M., & Seabourne, A. (2015). Reducing unintentional plagiarism amongst international students in the biological sciences: An embedded academic writing development programme. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 39(3), 358-378. doi: 10.1080/0309877X.2013.858674
- Dong, Y. R. (1996). Learning How to Use Citations for Knowledge Transformation: Non-Native Doctoral Students' Dissertation Writing in Science. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 30(4), 428-457. doi: 10.2307/40171551
- Doro, K. (2017). From Phrase to Discourse Level Patchwriting: Is it Possible to Unlearn? *Alkalmazott Nyelvtudomány XVII*, XVII(1), 1-19. doi: dx.doi.org/10.18460/ANY.2017.1.004
- Eckel, E. J. (2011). Textual appropriation in engineering Master's theses: A preliminary study. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 17(3), 469-483.
- Eira, C. (2005). Obligatory intertextuality and proscribed plagiarism: Intersections and contradictions for research writing. Retrieved March, 21, 2007.
- Elhambakhsh, S. E. (2010). *The Effects of Teaching Paraphrasing and Citation Strategies to Avoid Plagiarism in Students' Second Language Academic Writings*. (Masters' Thesis), Yazd University, Yazd Iran.
- Eret, E., & Ok, A. (2014). Internet plagiarism in higher education: tendencies, triggering factors and reasons among teacher candidates. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(8), 1002-1016.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and text: Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 3(2), 193-217.
- Fairclough, N. (1994). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2007). Language re-use among Chinese apprentice scientists writing for publication. *Applied linguistics*, 28(3), 440-465.
- Gasparyan, A. Y., Nurmashev, B., Seksenbayev, B., Trukhachev, V. I., Kostyukova, E. I., & Kitas, G. D. (2017). Plagiarism in the Context of Education and Evolving Detection Strategies. *Journal of Korean Medical Science*, 32(8), 1220-1227.
- George, D. J. (2016). *Finding Their Ground: Nigerian Nursing Students' Perceptions of Plagiarism*.
- Ghajarzadeh, M., Mohammadifar, M., & Safari, S. (2013). Introducing Plagiarism and Its Aspects to Medical Researchers is Essential. *Anesthesiology and pain medicine*, 2(4), 186-187.
- Ghajarzadeh, M., Norouzi-Javidan, A., Hassanpour, K., Aramesh, K., & Emami-Razavi, S. H. (2012). Attitude toward plagiarism among Iranian medical faculty members. *Acta Medica Iranica*, 50(11), 778.
- Gilmore, A. (2010). Catching words: Exploiting film discourse in the foreign language classroom. *Perspectives on Language Learning Materials Development*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 111-148.
- Gosden, H. (1995). Success in research article writing and revision: A social-constructionist perspective. *English for Specific Purposes*, 14(1), 37-57. doi: dx.doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906(94)00022-6
- Gu, Q., & Brooks, J. (2008). Beyond the accusation of plagiarism. *System*, 36(3), 337-352. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2008.01.004
- Gullifer, J., & Tyson, G. A. (2010). Exploring university students' perceptions of plagiarism: a focus group study. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(4), 463-481.
- Habibzadeh, F., & Shashok, K. (2011). Plagiarism in scientific writing: words or ideas? *Croatian medical journal*, 52(4), 576.
- Harwood, N., & Petrić, B. (2012). Performance in the Citing Behavior of Two Student Writers. *Written Communication*, 29(1), 55-103. doi: 10.1177/0741088311424133
- Hatton, N., & Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in teacher education: Towards definition and implementation. *Teaching and teacher education*, 11(1), 33-49.
- Heitman, E., & Litewka, S. (2011). *International perspectives on plagiarism and considerations for teaching international trainees*. Paper presented at the Urologic Oncology: Seminars and Original Investigations.
- Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hirvela, A. (1997). "Disciplinary portfolios" and EAP writing instruction. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16(2), 83-100.

- Hirvela, A., & Du, Q. (2013). "Why am I paraphrasing?": Undergraduate ESL writers' engagement with source-based academic writing and reading. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12(1), 87-98.
- Hosseini, M. J., Bazargani, R., Latiff, L., Hanachi, P., Hassan, T. S., & Othman, M. (2009). Medical researchers in non-English countries and concerns about unintentional plagiarism. *Journal of Medical Ethics and History of Medicine*, 2, 14.
- Howard, R. M. (1993). A Plagiarism Pentimento. *Journal of Teaching Writing*, 11(2), 233-245.
- Howard, R. M. (1995). Plagiarisms, authorships, and the academic death penalty. *College English*, 57(7), 788-806.
- Howard, R. M. (2001). Forget about policing plagiarism: Just teach. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 11(16), 1-4.
- Howard, R. M. (2007). Understanding "internet plagiarism". *Computers and Composition*, 24(1), 3-15.
- Howard, R. M., Serviss, T., & Rodrigue, T. K. (2010). Writing from sources, writing from sentences. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 2(2), 177-192.
- Hu, J. (2001). An alternative perspective of language re-use: Insights from textual and learning theories and L2 academic writing. *English Quarterly*, 33(1), 52-62.
- 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. doi: 10.1093/applin/20.3.341
- Isbell, J. K., Chaudhuri, J., & Schaeffer, D. L. (2018). "It Just Messes Your Mind": US International Students' Perspectives of and Experiences with Academic Text Sourcing. *Journal of International Students*, 8(1), 308-331.
- Jalalian, H. M., Bazargani, R., Latiff, L., Tajuddin, S. H., & Mohamed, O. (2009). Medical researchers in non-English countries and concerns about unintentional plagiarism. *Journal of Medical Ethics and History of Medicine*, 2(14), 1-2.
- Jalilifar, A. (2012). Academic attribution: citation analysis in master's theses and research articles in applied linguistics. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), 23-41. doi: 10.1111/j.1473-4192.2011.00291.x
- Jamieson, S. (2016). Is it plagiarism or patchwriting? Toward a nuanced definition. *Handbook of academic integrity*, 503-518.
- Jobe, J. B., & Mingay, D. J. (1991). Cognition and survey measurement: History and overview. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 5(3), 175-192.
- Johns, A. M. (1990). L1 composition theories: Implications for developing theories of L2 composition *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 24-36).

- Johnson-Eilola, J., & Selber, S. A. (2007). Plagiarism, originality, assemblage. *Computers and Composition*, 24(4), 375-403.
- Jones, L. R. (2001). Academic Integrity & Academic Dishonesty: A Handbook About Cheating & Plagiarism.
- Kaufman, L., & Rousseeuw, P. J. (2005). *Finding groups in data: an introduction to cluster analysis*: John Wiley & Sons.
- Keck, C. (2006). The use of paraphrase in summary writing: A comparison of L1 and L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(4), 261-278.
- Keenan, C., & Jemmeson, P. (2006). International students and plagiarism: A review of the literature. UK: Bournemouth University Centre for Academic Practice.
- Kristeva, J. (1986). The Kristeva Reader. In T. Moi (Ed.), (Vol. 111): New York: Columbia University Press.
- Law, J., & Martin, E. A. (Eds.). (2009) A dictionary of law. Oxford [etc.]: Oxford University Press.
- Leary, C. (2010). Composing the Anthology: An Exercise in Patchwriting. *Writing Spaces: Readings on Writing*, 225.
- Leki, I., & Carson, J. (1997). "Completely different worlds": EAP and the writing experiences of ESL students in university courses. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(1), 39-69.
- Lemke, J. L. (1995). *Textual Politics: Discourse and Social Dynamics*: Taylor & Francis, .
- Li, Y. (2012). "I have no time to find out where the sentences came from; I just rebuild them": A biochemistry professor eliminating novices' textual borrowing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(1), 59-70. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.01.001>
- Li, Y. (2013 a). Text-Based Plagiarism in Scientific Writing: What Chinese Supervisors Think About Copying and How to Reduce it in Students' Writing. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 19, 569-583. doi: DOI 10.1007/s11948-011-9342-7
- Li, Y. (2013 b). Text-Based Plagiarism in Scientific Publishing: Issues, Developments and Education. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 1-14. doi: 10.1007/s11948-012-9367-6
- Li, Y., & Casanave, C. P. (2012). Two first-year students' strategies for writing from sources: Patchwriting or plagiarism? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(2), 165-180. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.002
- Liu, Z. (1993). Difficulties and characteristics of students from developing countries in using American libraries. *College and Research Libraries*, 25.
- LoCastro, V., & Masuko, M. (2002). Plagiarism and academic writing of learners of English. *Hermes Journal of Linguistics*, 28, 11--38.

- Löfström, E., & Kupila, P. (2013). The instructional challenges of student plagiarism. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 11(3), 231-242.
- Lyon, A. (2009). " You Fail": Plagiarism, the Ownership of Writing, and Transnational Conflicts. *College Composition and Communication*, 61(2), W222.
- Ma, R., & Qin, X. (2017). Individual Factors Influencing Citation Competence in L2 Academic Writing. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 24(2-3), 213-240.
- Maroko, G. M. (2013). Citation Practices in Selected Science and Humanities Dissertations: Implications for Teaching. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 1(4), 126-136.
- Marshall, S., & Garry, M. (2005). *How well do students really understand plagiarism*. Paper presented at the The 22nd annual conference of the Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education (ASCILITE).
- Marshall, S., & Garry, M. (2006). NESB and ESB students' attitudes and perceptions of plagiarism. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 2(1), 26-37.
- Maurer, H. A., Kappe, F., & Zaka, B. (2006). Plagiarism-A Survey. *J. UCS*, 12(8), 1050-1084.
- McGowan, U. (2005). Academic integrity: An awareness and development issue for students and staff. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 2(3), 6.
- Messick, S. (1996). Validity and washback in language testing. *Language Testing*, 13(3), 241-256.
- Mirshekary, S., & Lawrence, A. D. K. (2009). Academic and business ethical misconduct and cultural values: a cross national comparison. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 7(3), 141-157.
- Moody, J. (2007). Plagiarism or intertextuality?: Approaches to Teaching EFL Academic Writing. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 9(2), 195-210.
- Nejati, M., Jamali, R., & Nejati, M. (2009). Students' Ethical Behavior in Iran. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 7(4), 277-285.
- Neville, C. (2007). *The complete guide to referencing and avoiding plagiarism*. Berkshire, England: Open University Press.
- Okoro, E. A. (2011). Academic integrity and student plagiarism: Guided instructional strategies for business communication assignments. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 1080569911404064.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Collins, K. M. (2007). A Typology of Mixed Methods Sampling Designs in Social Science Research. *Qualitative Report*, 12(2), 281-316.
- . OriginalityCheck. (2011)Turnitin Instructor User Manual: iParadigms, LLC. Retrieved from

https://turnitin.com/static/resources/documentation/turnitin/training/Instructor_Originality_Report_Chapter_2.pdf.

- Pan, Y. (2009). A review of washback and its pedagogical implications. *VNU Journal of Science, Foreign Languages*, 25, 257-263.
- 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.
- Pecorari, D. (2001). Plagiarism and international students: How the English-speaking university responds. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies : Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 229--245): University of Michigan Press.
- Pecorari, D. (2002). *Original reproductions: An investigation of the source use of postgraduate second language writers*. (Doctoral thesis), University of Birmingham.
- Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second-language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(4), 317-345. doi: doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2003.08.004
- Pecorari, D. (2006). Visible and occluded citation features in postgraduate second-language writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25(1), 4-29. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2005.04.004
- Pecorari, D. (2008). Repeated language in academic discourse: The case of biology background statements. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 7(3), 9-33.
- Pecorari, D. (2010). *Academic writing and plagiarism : a linguistic analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Pecorari, D. (2012). Textual Plagiarism: How Should It Be Regarded? *Office of Research Integrity Newsletter*, 20(3), 3 & 10.
- Pecorari, D. (2013). *Teaching to avoid plagiarism : how to promote good source use*.
- Pecorari, D. (2016). Writing from sources, plagiarism and textual borrowing. In R. Manchón & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Handbook of Second and Foreign Language Writing* (Vol. 11, pp. 329-347): Walter de Gruyter.
- Pecorari, D., & Petrić, B. (2014). Plagiarism in second-language writing. *Language Teaching*, 47(03), 269-302.
- Pecorari, D., & Shaw, P. (2012). Types of student intertextuality and faculty attitudes. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(2), 149-164. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.006
- Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing Others' Words: Text, Ownership, Memory, and Plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(2), 201-230. doi: 10.2307/3588141

- Petric, B. (2004). A pedagogical perspective on plagiarism. *NovELTy*, 11(1), 4-18.
- Petrić, B. (2012). Legitimate textual borrowing: Direct quotation in L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(2), 102-117. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.005
- Plakans, L., & Gebril, A. (2012). A close investigation into source use in integrated second language writing tasks. *Assessing writing*, 17(1), 18-34.
- Polio, C., & Shi, L. (2012). Perceptions and beliefs about textual appropriation and source use in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*.
- Poorolajal, J., Cheraghi, P., Irani, A. D., Cheraghi, Z., & Mirfakhraei, M. (2012). Construction of knowledge, attitude and practice questionnaire for assessing plagiarism. *Iranian journal of public health*, 41(11), 54.
- Porter, J. E. (1986). Intertextuality and the discourse community. *Rhetoric Review*, 5(1), 34-47.
- Power, L. G. (2009). University students' perceptions of plagiarism. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80(6), 643-662.
- Presser, S., Couper, M. P., Lessler, J. T., Martin, E., Martin, J., Rothgeb, J. M., & Singer, E. (2004). Methods for testing and evaluating survey questions. *Public opinion quarterly*, 68(1), 109-130.
- Publication manual of the American Psychological Association*. (2010). (6th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Ramanathan, V., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). Audience and voice in current L1 composition texts: Some implications for ESL student writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5(1), 21-34. doi: doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(96)90013-2
- Rashidi, N., Rahimi, M., & Dehghan, F. (2016). □ Perspectives of L2 graduate students and their professors about students' academic writing practices: Patchwriting or plagiarism? *English Language Teaching*, 3(2), 110-195.
- Ravelli, L., & Ellis, R. A. (2005). *Analysing academic writing : contextualized frameworks*. London; New York: Continuum.
- Rezanejad, A., & Rezaei, S. (2013). Academic dishonesty at universities: The case of plagiarism among Iranian language students. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 11(4), 275-295.
- Rhee, E. H. (2010). *Complexities and Dynamics of Korean Graduate Students' Textual Borrowing in Academic Writing*: ProQuest LLC.
- Riasati, M., & Rahimi, F. (2013). Why do Iranian postgraduate students plagiarize? A qualitative investigation. *Middle East Journal of Scientific Research*, 14(3), 309-317.
- Riazi, A. M., & Candlin, C. N. (2014). Mixed-methods research in language teaching and learning: Opportunities, issues and challenges. *Language Teaching*, 47(02), 135-173.

- Rinnert, C., & Kobayashi, H. (2005). Borrowing words and ideas: Insights from Japanese L1 writers. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 15(1), 15-29.
- Roig, M. (1997). Can undergraduate students determine whether text has been plagiarized? *Psychological Record*, 47, 113-122.
- Roig, M. (2001). Plagiarism and paraphrasing criteria of college and university professors. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11(3), 307-323.
- Saadabadi, M. H., Arshad Abdul Samad, & Roselan Baki. (2012). *Iranian perspective on source using and source citing in academic writing*. Paper presented at the MICELT 2012: Aligning ELT Classroom Practice with Real World Needs, Ipoh, Perak, Malaysia.
- Savage, S. (2004). Staff and student responses to a trial of Turnitin plagiarism detection software. In R. Carmichael (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Australian Universities Quality Forum 2004*. Adelaide, Australia: Citeseer.
- Scollon, R. (1995). Plagiarism and ideology: Identity in intercultural discourse. *Language in Society*, 24(01), 1-28.
- Seadle, M. (2009). Copyright in the networked world: plagiarism and its ambiguities. *Library Hi Tech*, 26(4), 691-695.
- Sharkey, P. B. (1992). What to Tell Your Students about Copyright. *The Clearing House*, 65(4), 213-214.
- Shi, L. (2004). Textual Borrowing in Second-Language Writing. *Written Communication*, 21(2), 171-200. doi: 10.1177/0741088303262846
- Shi, L. (2006). Cultural Backgrounds and Textual Appropriation. *Language Awareness*, 15(4), 264-282. doi: 10.2167/la406.0
- Shi, L. (2010). Textual Appropriation and Citing Behaviors of University Undergraduates. *Applied linguistics*, 31(1), 1-24. doi: 10.1093/applin/amn045
- Shi, L. (2011). Common Knowledge, Learning, and Citation Practices in University Writing. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 45(3), 308-334.
- Shi, L. (2012). Originality of Expression and Formal Citation Practices: Perceptions of Students and Professors. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 4(1), 43-67.
- Shi, L. (2012a). Rewriting and paraphrasing source texts in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(2), 134-148. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.003
- Smailes, J., & Gannon-Leary, P. (2008). Have we got it right? A case study on international student views of inclusive teaching and learning at Northumbria. *International Journal of Management Education*, 7(1), 51-60.
- Sohrabi, B., Gholipour, A., & Mohammadesmaeili, N. (2011). Effects of personality and information technology on plagiarism: An Iranian perspective. *Ethics & Behavior*, 21(5), 367-379.

- Sorokina, D., Gehrke, J., Warner, S., & Ginsparg, P. (2006). *Plagiarism detection in arXiv*. Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Data Mining.
- Sousa-Silva, R. (2017). Detecting translingual plagiarism and the backlash against translation plagiarists. *Language and Law= Linguagem e Direito*, 1(1).
- Spack, R. (1988). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go? *TESOL Quarterly*, 22(1), 29-51.
- Spigelman, C. (1998). Habits of Mind: Historical Configurations of Textual Ownership in Peer Writing Groups. *College Composition and Communication*, 49(2), 234-255.
- Stapleton, P. (2012). Gauging the effectiveness of anti-plagiarism software: An empirical study of second language graduate writers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11(2), 125-133.
- Starfield, S. (2002). "I'm a Second-Language English Speaker": Negotiating Writer Identity and Authority in Sociology One. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 1(2), 121-140. doi: 10.1207/s15327701jlie0102_02
- Stearns, L. (1992). Copy wrong: Plagiarism, process, property, and the law. *California Law Review*, 513-553.
- Strauss, S., Feiz, P., Xiang, X., & Ivanova, D. (2006). The dialogic construction of meaning in advanced L2 writing: Bakhtinian perspectives. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning : the contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 184-203). London: Continuum.
- Suh, S. J. (2011). *Plagiarism, textual borrowing, or something else?: An L2 student's writing-from-sources tasks.*: ProQuest, UMI Dissertation Publishing.
- Sutherland-Smith, W. (2005). Pandora's box: academic perceptions of student plagiarism in writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4(1), 83-95.
- Sutherland-Smith, W., & Carr, R. (2005). Turnitin.com: teachers' perspectives of anti-plagiarism software in raising issues of educational integrity. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 2(3), 94-101.
- Sutton, A., Taylor, D., & Johnston, C. (2012). A model for exploring student understandings of plagiarism. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 1-18. doi: 10.1080/0309877X.2012.706807
- Swales, J. (1990). The concept of discourse community. *Genre Analysis*, 21-32.
- 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. doi: 10.1177/0741088313515166
- Talents, N. T. (2016). Strategies and Technologies for Preventing Plagiarism in Modern Higher Education.
- Tashakkori, A., & Creswell, J. W. (2007). Editorial: The new era of mixed methods. *Journal of mixed methods research*, 1(1), 3-7.

- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2006). A general typology of research designs featuring mixed methods. *Research in the Schools*, 13(1), 12-28.
- Téllez, K., & Waxman, H. C. (2006). Preparing quality teachers for English language learners: An overview of the critical issues. *Preparing quality teachers for English language learners: Research, policies, and practices*, 1-22.
- Thompson, C. (2009). *Plagiarism, Intertextuality and Emergent Authorship in University Students' Academic Writing* (Vol. 6).
- Thornley, C., Watkinson, A., Nicholas, D., Volentine, R., Jamali, H. R., Herman, E., . . . Tenopir, C. (2015). The role of trust and authority in the citation behaviour of researchers. *Information research*, 20(3).
- Verma, J. P. (2013). *Data analysis in management with SPSS software*. India: Springer.
- Vessal, K., & Habibzadeh, F. (2007). Rules of the game of scientific writing: fair play and plagiarism. *The Lancet*, 369(9562), 641.
- Vieyra, M., Strickland, D., & Timmerman, B. (2013). Patterns in plagiarism and patchwriting in science and engineering graduate students' research proposals. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 9(1).
- Walker, J. (2010). Measuring plagiarism: researching what students do, not what they say they do. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(1), 41-59.
- Wall, D. (2000). The impact of high-stakes testing on teaching and learning: can this be predicted or controlled? *System*, 28(4), 499-509. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(00\)00035-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(00)00035-X)
- Weigle, S. C., & Parker, K. (2012). Source text borrowing in an integrated reading/writing assessment. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(2), 118-133. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.004
- Wolff, B., Knodel, J., & Sittitrai, W. (1993). Focus groups and surveys as complementary research methods. In D. L. Morgan (Ed.), *Successful focus groups: Advancing the state of the art* (pp. 118-136): Sage.
- Yang, W. (2014). *A Quantitative Study Of Esl/Efl Students' understanding Of Plagiarism*. Indiana University of Pennsylvania.
- Yasami, Z., & Yarmohammadi, L. (2014). Iranian Postgraduate Students' Perception of Plagiarism. *Journal of Studies in Learning and Teaching English*, 2(6), 49-63.
- Yilmaz, I. (2007). Plagiarism? No, we're just borrowing better English. *Nature*, 449(7163), 658-658.
- Yixin, W., & Daller, M. (2014). *Predicting Chinese Students' academic achievement in the UK*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 47th Annual Meeting of

the British Association for Applied Linguistics, Learning, Working and Communicating in a Global Context.

Zafarghandi, A. M., Khoshroo, F., & Barkat, B. (2012). An investigation of Iranian EFL Masters students' perceptions of plagiarism. *International Journal of Educational Integrity*, 8(2), 69-85.

Zare-ee, A., & Khalili, T. (2016). Plagiarism In L2 Academic Writing: A Theoretical Perspective. *Journal of Fundamental and Applied Sciences*, 8(2S), 1606-1617.

Zhu, W. (2004). Faculty views on the importance of writing, the nature of academic writing, and teaching and responding to writing in the disciplines. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(1), 29-48.

Zimmerman, M. (2012). Plagiarism and international students in academic libraries. *New Library World*, 113(5/6), 290-299.