

LEGITIMATE STRATEGIES IN WRITING: EXPLORING
ESOL LEARNER PERSPECTIVES ON
ATTRIBUTION

by

DANIELLE ELAINE PLAUCHÉ

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN TESOL

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

May 2007

Copyright © by Danielle Elaine Plauché 2006

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My special thanks to the following innovational and inspirational colleagues, students, family members and friends: Dr. Mark Ouellette, my thesis chair member, who met with me nearly every week, even when his work load was heavy to provide his thoughtful guidance; Dr. Laurel Stvan, who was the first person to welcome me into the Linguistics and TESOL Masters' program at the University of Texas at Arlington, and who reminded me of the joy of writing and to stay relaxed even during the revision process; Dr. Orr, for her motivating insights, innovative suggestions, and help through technical crisis!; Harry Holden, such an encouraging colleague and friend, who listened to my ideas, gave intuitive feedback, and tolerated much of my absentmindedness throughout the thesis process; and Diana Bustillos, for her clever, helpful, and considerate collegueship and friendship. I would also like to thank the learners who gave their time and effort to participate in this study in the interest of helping teachers and fellow students understand each other.

Furthermore, I would like to thank Barbara Dogger, who mentored this work in its finishing stages as well as Laura Humphreys and Elissa Polley, three minds that helped make this work become polished and presentable. In addition to all of my friends and colleagues in academia, a very special thanks to Irma and Richard Pacheco, and the Liu family who helped me get into an excellent Masters' program at UTA by writing letters of recommendation and being such caring friends. With this in mind, I would

like to thank all of my friends who have helped me remember the easily forgotten ways of living: don't worry, stay young at heart, and have fun! Also, I would like to thank my family for providing endless support, reading my drafts, and patiently listening to me talk about my research without falling asleep or gasping for release. Once, when I expressed how proud I was of Grandpa for accomplishing so much in his life, he said that behind every great man there is a woman, and Grandma modestly blushed. I would like to add to this statement that behind every great thesis is a body of exceptionally caring, understanding, and supportive individuals. Without these wonderful people to support me through the process of birthing this thesis, I don't know if I would have ever finished!

December 7, 2006

ABSTRACT

LEGITIMATE STRATEGIES IN WRITING: EXPLORING
ESOL LEARNER PERSPECTIVES ON
ATTRIBUTION

Publication No. _____

Danielle Elaine Plauché, MA

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2006

Supervising Professor: Dr. Mark A. Ouellette

In many academic institutions today, ESOL (English as a Second or Other Language) writers may incorporate background sources into their writing in ways unrecognized by their academic institutions, which could lead to these learners' academic success or failure. In recent years, researchers and teachers alike have sought to understand the ways ESOL writers understand and avoid plagiarism in many academic institutions. Yet there is little research which explores the perspectives of ESOL writers regarding strategies that are used to attribute authorship. The following study explores the strategies that eight ESOL writers in four different pre-academic proficiency levels use to attribute authorship and their perspectives regarding when they

believe such strategies should be used. In this light, I address the following research questions: (1) In what ways do ESOL writers use strategies to attribute authorship to source texts in three writing tasks? (2) What are these learners' perspectives regarding the use of such strategies for? (3) To what extent do these learners' use of and perspectives on these strategies compare to these learners' academic institution? Three writing tasks are explored: an initial interview-report writing task, a reading-to-write writing task, and a follow-up interview-report writing task. Results suggest that these learners have common perspectives regarding attribution which are similar in some ways and dissimilar in others to their academic institutions. Results also suggest that regardless of task type, instruction, proficiency level, culture, language, and a multitude of individual differences that could shape the strategies ESOL writers use to attribute authorship, explicit instruction and facilitated learner practice may be the most effective methods of helping ESOL writers transition towards using recognized strategies for attribution to avoid plagiarism.

PREFACE

As a native speaker of English, I attended academic institutions nearly all of my life. Throughout the years, I have been exposed, and perhaps, desensitized to the issue of plagiarism, and I have taken for granted the complex process of attribution that is necessary to incorporate background sources in academic writing in the west to avoid plagiarism. After taking several courses with Dr. Ouellette and discussing how plagiarism relates to English language learners, I became interested in the ways ESOL writers attributed represented discourse in their compositions. Ouellette's (2004) study, *Voices on the Landscape: Reconceptualizing Plagiarism, Voice Appropriation, and Academic Competence in ESL Freshman Composition*, became the springboard for this thesis study. As my interest continued, I began reading scholarly literature by researchers and teachers alike. All of the attention to the issue of ESOL writers and plagiarism inspired me to conduct research on my own. The process of synthesizing information, collecting data, connecting ideas, and selecting the most important concepts was challenging at times, but absolutely worthwhile. I hope the findings of this study can allow those of us who may have forgotten what it was like to learn a complex process without the luxury of having already acquired it. By having sympathy for learners and by having patience to understand the multitude of additional variables that hinder the academic competence of ESOL writers and native English writers alike,

we may be able to understand each other in ways that can enrich our perceptions about attribution in academia today.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT	v
PREFACE.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Understanding the Problem of Plagiarism.....	1
1.2 Overview of Chapters.....	4
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1 Perspectives on Attribution.....	7
2.2 Strategies for Attribution.....	9
2.3 Addressing the Gap.....	11
2.4 Research Questions.....	12
3. METHODOLOGY.....	13
3.1 Research Site.....	15
3.1.1 Defining Proficiency Levels.....	15
3.2 The Pilot Study	16
3.3 The Current Study.....	17
3.3.1 Research Sample.....	17

3.4 Defining Key Terms	20
3.4.1 Quotation.....	21
3.4.2 Paraphrase.....	22
3.4.3 Summary.....	23
3.5 Alternative Strategies for Attribution.....	24
3.5.1 Patchwriting.....	24
3.6 Data Collection.....	25
3.6.1 Example of Writing Sample Coding.....	26
4. RESULTS.....	28
4.1 Survey Results	28
4.2 Applying Strategies for Attribution.....	29
4.2.1 Citation.....	30
4.2.2 Direct and Indirect Quotation.....	31
4.2.3 Patchwriting.....	32
4.2.4 One Learner’s Process of Discourse Synthesis.....	33
4.3 ESOL Writer Perspectives on Plagiarism and Attribution.....	35
4.3.1 Comments on Citation.....	38
4.3.2 Comments on Quotation.....	38
4.3.3 Comments on Summary	39
4.3.4 Comments on Discourse Representation.....	40
4.3.5 Using Your Own Words.....	41

4.4 Institutional Perspectives on Attribution and Plagiarism	41
4.5 Summary of Results	43
5. DISCUSSION.....	44
5.1 Restatement of Research Questions.....	45
5.2 ESOL Writers’ Strategies for Attribution.....	45
5.2.1 Non-Attribution Frequency	46
5.2.2 Reliance on Citation.....	46
5.2.3. Discourse Representation	47
5.3 ESOL Writers’ Perspectives on Attribution	47
5.3.1 Avoiding Plagiarism is Necessary	47
5.3.2 Don’t Take Risks Using Unfamiliar Strategies	48
5.3.3 Summaries are Shorter Rewordings of Original Discourse.....	49
5.3.4 When Citation is Used at Least One Time Represented Discourse is Attributed	49
5.4 Comparing ESOL Writer Strategies to Institutional Site Documents.....	52
5.4.1 Defining Attribution	52
5.4.2 Quality of Attribution	53
5.4.3 Quantity of Attribution	53
5.5 Summary of Discussion.....	54
6. CONCLUSION.....	55
6.1 Limitations and Assumptions.....	56

6.2 Delimitations.....	56
6.3 Attrition.....	58
6.4 Implications.....	59
6.5 Contributions and Significance of This Study.....	60
6.6 Future Research.....	61
6.7 Conclusion.....	63
 Appendix	
A. TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS.....	66
B. SITE DOCUMENT REFERENCES.....	68
C. DESCRIPTION OF WRITING TASKS.....	70
D. SURVEYS.....	72
REFERENCES	76
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION.....	80

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Demographic and Cultural Backgrounds of the Learners.....	18
2	Data Collection and Analysis.....	26
3	Number of Strategy Types across Tasks.....	30

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Understanding the Problem of Plagiarism

When in doubt, cite; over-citation is an error, but under-citation is plagiarism.

(Howard, 1995, p. 800)

Many of the academic endeavors in which learner-writers participate require synthesizing spoken or written ideas from background sources. These background sources include newspaper articles, books, and interviews. Spivey (1983) refers to this type of writing as "discourse synthesis" (p. 5), and describes it as "an active process of text construction in which a writer reads textual sources on a particular topic, selects some of the available information from the sources, and combines elements in a new way" in which personal understanding and opinions provide "an overall organization as well as connectivity among related ideas" (Spivey, 1983, p. 5). According to Spivey (1983), it is the writer's synthesis of different background sources that makes the finished work "unique" (Spivey, 1983, p. 5). Hyland claims that this skill is "one of the most important realizations of the academic writer's concern for interactions with an audience: that of reporting, or attributing propositional content to another source" (Hyland, 2004, p. 20).

However, in many academic discourse communities, only synthesizing discourse may not be "unique" enough to avoid plagiarism; because in many academic institutions, attribution is necessary and must be implemented in specific ways. Thus, the ability to synthesize discourse skillfully (i.e., attributing in appropriate ways) could play a major role in the academic success of learner-writers (Campbell, 1990, p. 211).

In many academic institutions, there are specific rules that define how attribution should be implemented in order to constitute "fair use" of background sources (Raimes, 2002, p. 108).

The problem is that many learner-writers struggle to attribute in ways that are recognized by their academic institutions. One reason may be that learning to attribute "appropriately" is, in itself, like learning a second or other language. This can be a problem for many learners, but is especially challenging for ESOL (English as a Second or Other Language) writers, who are already in a process of learning a new language. Thus, these particular learner-writers may not only be in a process of acculturation (Scollon, 1994; Allen, 2004) into an English-speaking speech community (Bloomfield, 1933, p. 42), but may also be expected to attribute authorship in appropriate ways, often without the full native-like proficiency that academic tasks require. Due to the fact that ESOL writers come from a variety of language and cultural backgrounds, these particular learners may not recognize the need to attribute, or use appropriate strategies for attribution (i.e., citation, quotation, and paraphrase). In this sense, ESOL writers not only grapple with learning the English language, but also with learning the rules regarding when and how to use strategies for attribution. This is a problem that could be

easily overlooked by one assumes that plagiarism is the result of a learner trying to "evade doing his or her own work" (Summers 2005, p. 1).

It may be "arrogant" to view ESOL writers' challenges in avoiding plagiarism as a "symptom" (Lahur, 2004, p. 1) of acculturation into a speech community that uses sources appropriately (Scollon, 1994, p. 45), therefore, it is important that ESOL writers are not categorized according to their language and/or cultural backgrounds. In fact, Yamada (2003) suggests that educators should view ESOL writers' use of non-standard strategies as a transitional stage that when recognized, could facilitate these learners' understanding of academic writing conventions; being too sensitive to such issues could impede pedagogy that aims to show these writers how to avoid plagiarism (Yamada, 2003, p. 255; Howard, 1995, p. 799). In much the same way that one learns how to solve a math problem, there may be signs in a learner's writing that he or she is trying to use strategies in appropriate ways, even though the end result differs from the "correct" solution (Barbara Dogger, personal communication, October 6, 2006). The more the learner understands about the rules involved in discourse synthesis (i.e., solving the problem), the closer that learner may come to attributing in appropriate ways (i.e., arriving at the correct solution).

For these reasons, identifying and understanding the strategies and the perspectives that ESOL writers have regarding attribution is indispensable to educators and their learners. This study not only explores the ways a small group of ESOL writers synthesize discourse, but also provides insight into these learners' perspectives about attribution and plagiarism.

1.2 Overview of Chapters

So far, this chapters has reviewed how attribution is problematic for ESOL writers in academic institutions. In the following chapters, I will illustrate the ways scholarly literature has addressed this issue further and introduce the three principal research questions of this study. Then, in Chapters 3, I will describe the methodological measures I use to explore the strategies and perspectives on attribution of a small group of ESOL writers. In Chapters 4, I will report the results of this study; then, in Chapters 5, I follow-up with a discussion of the results from each research question. To conclude, I will explain the limitations and implications of this study as well as suggest courses of future research.

At this time, I invite teachers and researchers alike to not only reconsider the impact of the way plagiarism is viewed today, but to also walk into the classroom and listen to the perspectives of a sample of ESOL writers grappling with one obstacle towards academic success.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In recent years, scholarly literature has explored the relationship between ESOL writers and plagiarism. This literature also explores the ways these learners view and attribute authorship in many academic institutions.

More specifically, Pennycook (1996) found that this learner submitted a composition memorized from a textbook, after noticing "rather simple but perfectly 'correct' prose" of an assignment handed in by one learner from a Chinese cultural background (Pennycook 1996, p. 265). Intrigued, Pennycook examined eastern perspectives of memorization and authorship and suggests that different understandings of "boundaries and ownership" exist cross-culturally (Pennycook 1996, p. 274). Shi (2004) compared the ways Chinese and English writers synthesized discourse and found that the Chinese writers demonstrated a higher tendency to "copy" more text (i.e. duplicate "exact or near verbatim retention of strings of words from sources with or without acknowledgement") than native English-speaking writers (Shi, 2004, Abstract). Based on these findings, it would appear that Chinese ESOL writers tend to copy as a strategy of discourse synthesis. Pecorari (2002) compared the relationship between the uses of background sources and original texts in writing samples from several ESOL writer's theses and dissertations, and observed that most of these ESOL writing samples contained a miniscule (5%) amount of original discourse from non-background sources.

Pecorari (2002) then suggested that, even though these learners appeared to depend on background sources, there wasn't enough evidence to say that these particular learners were plagiarizing (Pecorari, 2002 p. 2). What was happening in the discourse synthesis of these learners' writing?

Shi (2004) claims that one explanation of this phenomenon could be a difference in the way background texts are viewed as information or products of individuality (Shi 2004, p. 174). The impact of perspectives on attribution based on cultural background alone is interesting, but, unfortunately, little scholarly literature reflects the ways other cultures (i.e., other than Chinese-speaking and English-speaking) view attribution and plagiarism (Barks, 2001, p. 265). While culture seems an obvious explanation of how ESOL writers synthesize discourse, scholarly literature suggests that this is not the only issue (Pennycook, 1996, pp. 267; 290; Pecorari 2002, p. 319). Pennycook (1996) claims plagiarism should also be understood through the context of the academic institution, learning situation of the learners, and the relationship between these contexts to the text itself (Pennycook, 1996, pp. 267; 290). Results from Shi (2004) suggest that the writing task shaped the ways native English (L1) writers and ESOL writers synthesized discourse. Shi (2004) claims that both ESOL and L1 writers integrated more source information in a writing task, in which learners were asked to use background sources to write a summary, than in a writing task where learners were asked to use background sources to write about an opinion.

Comparing the ways used by ESOL and L1 writers to synthesize discourse, Campbell (1987; 1990) suggests that reading ability and language proficiency shape

how background information is integrated as well as the particular choices of strategies that these learners use to attribute authorship (Campbell, 1987; Spivey, 1983, p. 39). In other words, these learners' skillfulness with writing conventions shaped the ways they synthesized and attributed discourse. In fact, several variables (e.g., culture, language, task, instructor, educational institution, academic discipline, individual writing style) may shape the ways ESOL writers synthesize discourse (Pennycook, 1996, pp. 267, 290; Spivey, 1983, p. 39; Campbell, 1990, p. 223; Pecorari, 2002).

2.1 Perspectives on Attribution

Several studies have gone to great lengths to explore the ways ESOL writers incorporate background sources in their writing. Shi (2004) suggests that soliciting opinions from ESOL writers, as well as their instructors, could provide an insight that would enable the identification of inappropriately synthesized discourse and plagiarism as two separate instances that exist in ESOL writing, as well as an essential variable to consider in resolving the problem of plagiarism (Shi, 2004, p. 192). In this study, I define perspectives as the opinions and understandings of learners regarding when and how to attribute authorship to background sources.

To begin with, I will first address a few common perspectives and plagiarism found in the research of different academic institutions. Pecorari (2001) and Yamada (2003) assert that plagiarism is defined similarly in academic institutions, as these institutions tend to provide detailed definitions and examples of plagiarism, but also expect learners to be able to read and understand the meanings and application of the definitions in the same way. For example, Pecorari (2001) reviewed several plagiarism

policies of 140 academic institutions and found that most of these institutions defined plagiarism as "Material that has been taken from some source by someone without acknowledgement and with intention to deceive" (p. 235). Yamada (2003) found similar results from ten university websites, noting that definitions of plagiarism are defined in much the same manner. Yamada (2003) identified four similarities in the definitions of plagiarism, including categories of appropriate attribution practices, paraphrase use, and a "lack of emphasis on inferential process in writing" (Yamada, 2003, p. 255). While many academic institutions share a common perspective on plagiarism, the definitions they use to express this perspective may not be understood by learners attending these academic institutions.

Allen (2004) explored the ways that one Japanese ESOL writer managed a writing task, and throughout completion of the writing task, the learner asked for clarification of guidelines and expectations, and more interestingly, stated that she felt that she had to reference every idea: "I have to reference ANYTHING" (capitals in original) (Allen, 2004, p. 83). Allen (2004) further claimed that this learner's attempts at paraphrases tended to result in "Near Copies", or closely copied strings of discourse (Campbell, 1987, p. 17). Thus, this learner's struggle illustrates a need for additional explanation and practice regarding the use of strategies to synthesize discourse. Further explanation and instruction on definitions and policies regarding plagiarism could facilitate learner-writers in synthesizing discourse and meeting the expectations of their academic institutions (Allen, 2004, p. 83; Barks, 2001, p. 264; Yamada, 2003, p. 255).

Perhaps, ESOL writers are learning how and when to use appropriate attribution

strategies as they are learning their new languages and cultures, a phenomenon problematic for some educators that may be an instructional opportunity for others:

When students accustomed to discourses such as these [rote memorization] enter Western academic institutions, quoting the sages from memory is seen as plagiarism. The point here is not to situate students in different cultural boxes in which they are held captive, or to “excuse” them from plagiarism practices. It is rather to heighten awareness of the prior, conflicting discourses, from which students can move.

(Angélil-Carter, 2000, p. 39)

Angélil-Carter (2000) suggests that instructors utilize the knowledge about their learners' cultural backgrounds to build a solid base from which these learners can learn and skillfully use strategies which are appropriate in the writing contexts to which they are adjusting. Clark (1980) identifies a trait in ESOL writers to “short-circuit” to language features that are more familiar to them when they cannot access the target language. This phenomenon could apply to ESOL writers as they are learning to use strategies for attribution. This particular group of learners may use a variety of strategies to attribute authorship to represented discourse including citation, direct quotation, indirect quotation, paraphrase, and summary, all of which are appropriate strategies in most academic institutions. Yet, ESOL writers may also use alternative strategies, short-circuit to familiar strategies, or use no strategies at all, which may not be as supported in their academic institutions.

2.2 Strategies for Attribution

Discourse synthesis may be implemented through strategies for attribution such as quotation marks and reporting clauses (e.g. 'she said' or 'many claimed') (Fairclough,

1994, pp. 105-107). Scollon (1994) explains, “[ESOL] Writers use an abundance of rhetorical devices, from terracing and repetition to metaphors, proverbs, and common sayings, which seem largely out of phase with canons of contemporary English academic style” (Scollon, 1994, p. 44; 1991b). Scollon (1994) identifies strategies that are commonly implemented by ESOL writers, strategies that could also be considered inappropriate. Scollon (1994) states that the problem of plagiarism may not be intentional on the learner’s part and asks language teachers to reconsider current notions of plagiarism to accommodate the current historical and cultural state of perspectives about authorship and attribution (p. 45). Some teachers may not trust that ESOL writers are making efforts to represent discourse by “fair” means, and/or may suspect ESOL writers as thoughtlessly "cutting and pasting" discourses and turning them in as original compositions. These are few reasons why some educators may feel that "policing" plagiarism dwindles the facilitator out of teachers by hindering them from giving the benefit of the doubt to their learners (Freedman 2004; Pennycook, 1996).

Contrary to some assumptions that ESOL writers are thoughtlessly "cutting and pasting" from background sources, Ouellette (2004) claims that many ESOL writers process the discourses they use and synthesize them in unique ways. Thus, Ouellette (2004) makes an important distinction between appropriation (i.e., the stealing of words and ideas), and invocation (i.e., the "construction of emerging discourse") (Ouellette, 2004, p. 239). Ouellette (2004) suggests that “voice invocation”, which may also be thought of as intentionally choosing specific voices from others to communicate and support their ideas, is a positive view of what is happening in the discourse synthesis of

ESOL writers. These studies are important because they illustrate a problem that ESOL writers have meeting the attribution standards of writing in the west. Angélil-Carter (2000) illustrates this ESOL writer experience using a clever metaphor of dance: "The author is alive, wriggling around in the complex contexts of the voices of others, and in the intersecting orchestras of power, but nevertheless making meaning from and in these voices (p. 48). Angélil-Carter (2000) explains how learning how to avoid plagiarism can be like a dance where ESOL writers not only discover the steps to incorporating already existing discourses into their own written compositions, but are also originators of new discourses.

2.3 Addressing the Gap

While scholarly literature focuses on these angles, it still has yet to look specifically in a comprehensive manner, not only at what the learners are doing, but, how they perceive what they are doing. To better understand how ESOL writers synthesize discourse, scholarly literature calls for further research to explore the impact of different variables (i.e., proficiency level, task, perspectives, emerging discourse(s), language and cultural backgrounds, and the categorizing of attribution academic institutions) (Ouellette 2004; Pennycook 1996; Barks, 2001). In this study, participants are from four different ESOL proficiencies, participate in three different writing tasks, express several opinions about attribution and plagiarism, and are from three different language and cultural backgrounds. As with any language learning environment, these, and perhaps, several other variables could independently and/or simultaneously shape the ways ESOL writers synthesize discourse. In this study, however, I focus primarily on the impact of

task on ESOL writer discourse synthesis, as I believe it is the most influential variable on these learners' use of strategies. The following research questions emerge from gaps in scholarly literature and my own curiosity:

2.4 Research Questions

- (1) In what ways do ESOL writers use strategies to attribute authorship to source texts in three writing tasks?
- (2) What are these learners' perspectives regarding the use of such strategies for?
- (3) To what extent do these learners' use of and perspectives on these strategies compare to these learners' academic institution?

This study explores these research questions to further understand the strategies ESOL writers use on specific writing tasks and the perspectives they have regarding attribution. After the strategies and perspectives of these learners are explored, they are compared to their academic institution (based on site documents). By exploring these research questions, a new model may emerge that enhances the contributions of former scholarly literature by further illustrating of the relationship between ESOL writer perspectives as a basis for comparison to those of the academic community.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

To explore ESOL writer strategies and perspectives regarding attribution, I implemented a combination of ethnographic methods and methods of discourse analysis. First, I employed methods of discourse analysis to account for the data collection in this study in a quantitative way that also describes what linguistic markers these learners use to attribute authorship to background sources and avoid plagiarism. Then, I employed ethnographic methods by interviewing and recording field notes to provide a descriptive picture of the academic worlds of these participant-learners in their particular academic institutions during the course of this study.

Fairclough (1994) describes discourse analysis as:

Close textual and linguistic analysis within linguistics, the macro sociological tradition of analyzing social practice in relation to social structures, and the interpretivist or micro sociological tradition of seeing social practice as something which people actively produce and make sense of on the basis of shared commonsense procedures.

(Fairclough, 1994, p. 72)

However, in this study, I maintain the definitions of "text" and "discourse" (Fairclough, 1994, p. 4), but I am only looking at text as a product of the discourses these learners use to produce and interpret the writing samples within the writing context of this study. Future research, however, may explore the ways ESOL writers synthesize discourse in greater depth by exploring perspective through the deeper levels of discursive and social practice.

By combining methods of ethnography and discourse analysis in this way, I can explore a more descriptive, learner-account how the ESOL writers in this study use strategies for attribution and the reasons behind why these learners used certain strategies.

The ethnographic methods used in this study are adapted from *The Ethnography of Communication*, which was developed by Dell Hymes during the 1960's and 1970's to objectively and qualitatively observe "people and their worlds" (Hymes, 1996, p. 10). A full *Ethnography of Communication* would usually entail the researcher wholly involving him or herself in the participant's social life by the ethnographer engaging in at least a year of qualitative research within a particular speech community. In addition, a full *Ethnography of Communication* study would also entail the recording of intensive field notes and procedures following the S.P.E.A.K.I.N.G. model (Hymes, 1974, pp. 55-60), which primarily analyzes speech events, situations, and participants. In this study, however, I employ ethnographic methods, which do not compromise a full *Ethnography of Communication*, but which are methods of data collection and analysis that involve observation and open-ended research objectives that yield qualitative results. These methods include being part of the participant-learners' academic environment, recording less intense field notes, and conducting interviews without addressing all aspects of the Hymesian S.P.E.A.K.I.N.G. model. Instead, I prefer to focus in depth on the Acts, Ends, and Norms (i.e., the processes, reasons, and perceptions of social rules) regarding the production and interpretation of attribution from the perspective of these learners.

In this way, I am able to gain a more qualitative account for what is happening in the discourse representation of these learners than if I were to look at writing samples alone.

3.1 Research Site

This study takes place at Inner City College (ICC). I prefer this research site, as it may be similar to educational institutions in metropolitan areas across the United States and due to its rich cultural diversity. Participants are enrolled in two combined pre-academic 15-week writing courses, in which they must complete four levels before advancing to freshman composition classes. Each class is one hour and 20 minutes long; the first class combines beginning levels one and two, while the second combines advanced levels three and four. The difference between each level is in work load (i.e., homework and assessment) as well as sophistication of material.

From this point on, I will refer to participants in this study as learners in order to consider them less as subjects of study and more as unique individuals with a variety of individual, language, and cultural backgrounds, as well as personalities and learning experiences.

3.1.1 Defining Proficiency Levels

At the beginning of academic enrollment at ICC, each learner is required to speak with an academic advisor. The advisor asks each learner if English is his/her “native” or first language (L1). If the learner responds with “yes”, that learner is then advised to take one of two standard placement tests recognized by most academic institutions. However, if English is not the learner’s first language, that learner is

advised to take an alternative placement test designed to evaluate the learner's English listening, reading, and grammar skills. A learner may be placed in ESOL classes depending on his/her score, which can range from zero to 98. The learner's scores on the grammar portion of this test determine the ESOL class level into which that the learner is placed. Learners scoring between 98 and 77 may be placed into the level four ESOL writing class; 76 and 61 into level three; 60 and 46 into level two; 45 and 30 into level one; and all learners scoring under 30 would be assessed further at discretion of the academic advisor. It may also be noted here that those learners with English as their first language who score considerably low on the standard tests are usually placed in ESOL classes as has been the case in the past.

3.2 The Pilot Study

To troubleshoot survey questions and become familiar with the learning environment, I conducted a pilot study at ICC during the semester prior to this current study. In this pilot study, I administered three surveys to troubleshoot the different types of information I could obtain from each survey. The first survey asked the learners to rate statements about different writing styles on a scale from one to six (1 they strongly agree – 6 strongly disagree). Eight survey questions were on classroom work styles, 24 questions were on strengths, styles, and preferences, and a final chapter was about self-assessment and goals. The second survey asked questions primarily about plagiarism and how it is viewed in academic settings. Learners answered questions in a similar way to survey 2, responding to statements according to the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the statements (SA strongly agree, A agree, SD

strongly disagree). Of these questions, eight were on student background and plagiarism concepts. I decided not to use this survey in the current study because I thought I could ask these questions and get more feedback through the interviews. The third survey contained a list of different terms associated with discourse synthesis from which the learners were asked to circle terms that they understood, and then pick three to define. The pilot surveys provided many quantitative results, so I decided to combine different elements of each to form one survey to be used in the current study. The general results of the pilot study indicated a need for quantitative questions that prompt the learners to identify strategies, as well as qualitative questions that probe the depth of these learners' definitions and experiences with such strategies (See Appendix D).

3.3 The Current Study

3.3.1 Research Sample

At the beginning of the study, I explained to the learners that I would be conducting a study during the semester and asked if any of the learners would be interested in participating. I gave each learner a packet of information containing a flyer explaining that the purpose of the study would be to help teachers know how students view plagiarism. The packet also included an announcement of free writing tutorials I would hold during the semester (by appointment) to any learner in the classes, regardless of their participation or not, and a sample of the consent form to take home and read. I explained that participation in this study would be on a voluntary basis and that any volunteer who wishes to withdraw from the study could do so without penalty. On the following class day, I asked if anyone had any questions about

the study, and I placed a stack of blank consent forms in the center of the table next to a large envelope. I then told the class that I would step out of the room while learners interested in volunteering for the study filled out the consent forms. One learner volunteered to take the packet to my supervisor’s office after volunteers had completed the forms.

From the two classes, twelve learners agreed to volunteer for the current study. However, attrition accounted for three of the learners due to volunteer withdrawal from the class or failure to attend class. One participant was not considered in this study due to a disability atypical of the remaining participants. The following table illustrates the demographic and cultural backgrounds of eight learners who participated in this study.

Table 1: Demographic and Cultural Backgrounds of the Learners

	<u>Level</u>	<u>Native country</u>	<u>mother tongue</u>	<u>Age group</u>	<u>Sex</u>
<u>Mike</u>	1	Sudan	NA	25-34	M
<u>BKY</u>	1	Eritrea	NA	25-34	M
<u>Lee</u>	2	Thailand	Thai	35-44	M
<u>Angela</u>	2	Dominican Republic	Spanish	35-44	F
<u>Jeni</u>	2	Eritrea	Tigrinya	35-44	F
<u>Chito</u>	2	Mexico	Spanish	18-24	M
<u>JC</u>	3	Mexico	Spanish	25-34	M
<u>Wendy</u>	4	Mexico	Spanish	25-34	F

These learners ranged in age from 18 - 44 years old. Five were male and three were female. They were primarily from a Hispanic background (4), while a few were from African (3) backgrounds, and one learner was from an Asian language and cultural background. Two learners were enrolled in the beginning level classes; four learners

were enrolled as level two writers, one as level three, and two as level four. I would also like to mention that most of the names in this study used to refer to these individuals are preferences made by the learners themselves. I asked each learner to write the name that they would like to be referred to as in this study and many volunteered pseudonyms for themselves. For learners who did not volunteer a name, I supplied pseudonyms.

On the second day of class, I administered a survey (See Appendix D), which prompted these learners to circle items that they understood from a list of terms associated with attribution. This list contained terms such as "quotation", "summary", "paraphrase", "plagiarism", etc. Then, learners were asked to identify and define three terms from the survey and answer questions designed to probe for opinions regarding attribution strategy use. Overall, the survey took fifteen minutes and provided useful insight into their understanding of attribution and their experiences with attribution and plagiarism.

In ICC's pre-academic writing program, the curriculum does not include the explicit instruction and practice of strategies. Most of the time, learners come in contact with example strategies in the course textbooks, but usually without instruction on what they mean and how to implement them in writing. In other words, explicit instruction on attribution was not an objective in the syllabus, but a point addressed periodically in the textbooks of these writing classes.

The research site that I observed seems to give the benefit of the doubt to learners who show intention to avoid plagiarism, as it is first up to the instructors to

identify plagiarism, and then negotiate how it will be handled with authorities within the program. In fact, I consider myself lucky for having witnessed this process first-hand as a colleague identified plagiarism of an entire text copied from the internet. The student was first given a zero on the assignment and a warning, and on the second occurrence the learner was disciplined according to academic policy (i.e. usually a conference with a higher authority within the college). The details concerning ICC's perspectives will be illustrated further in the results chapter as I explore the second research question of this study.

3.4 Defining Key Terms

There are four key terms used in this study as follows. First, strategies for attribution, or strategies, are defined in this study as the linguistic strategies these learners use to write about background sources. Second, perspectives on attribution, or perspectives, are the opinions these learners have about when and how to use strategies for attribution. Third, discourse representation (Fairclough, 1994, p. 234) is the way background sources are used by a borrowing author. Lastly, discourse synthesis (Spivey, 1983, p. 5) is defined as the way different background sources, or background texts, are integrated into one cohesive text.

Strategies for attribution usually considered "appropriate" in many academic institutions include citation, quotation, paraphrase, and summary. Scholarly literature defines these strategies in many ways. To begin with, citation, or "naming an author or title in your text tells readers that you are citing ideas from a source, and citing a page number at the end of a summary or paraphrase lets them know when your citation ends"

(Raimes, 2002, p. 119). Most quotations, as well as paraphrases and summaries require this type of parenthetical citation to explicitly attribute authorship to background sources. Langan (2005) defines paraphrase as “an equal number of your own words in place of someone else's words” (p. 388), and the Longman dictionary states that paraphrases should be shorter than the original source. These two definitions of paraphrase differ slightly, because one definition claims that a paraphrase should be of equal length, while the other claims that it should be of shorter length to the original background source. Even though the definitions of strategies are similar throughout scholarly literature, definitions may differ slightly. On the other hand, summary tends to be defined consistently as a short report of the main idea and important supporting details that is shorter than the original discourse(s). Therefore, defining strategies may be up to the academic institution’s discretion on how particular strategies may be implemented.

3.4.1 Quotation

In this study, I identify two types of quotation: indirect and direct quotation. These two categories differ in the ways they are grammatically and syntactically constructed. Fairclough (1994) explains indirect and direct quotation in the ways I have categorized them in this study:

There is an explicit boundary between the 'voice' of the person being reported and the "voice" of the reporter and direct discourse is often said to use the exact words of the person being reported. In indirect discourse, the quotation marks disappear and the represented discourse takes the form of a clause grammatically subordinated to the reporting clause, a relationship marked by the conjunction "that". Tense and deictics are shifted to incorporate the perspective of the reporter, for example "now" becomes "then". The voices of the reporter and the

reported are less clearly demarcated, and the words used to represent the latter's discourse may be those of the reporter rather than those of the reported.

(Fairclough, 1994, p. 107).

Through quotation, attribution to the original author of the text is employed primarily through the reporting clause, which either followed by the exact words of the original author (direct quotation) or a reworded representation of what the original author had said or written (indirect quotation).

Example of Direct Quotation:

With resignation, Newcomb concedes that “such debacles happen [...]”
(13)

(Raimes, 2002, pp. 115-116)

Example of Indirect Quotation:

Newcomb said acceptingly that misfortunes can be expected.

The represented discourse in the example of direct quotation is introduced by the reporting clause; “Newcomb concedes”, in the present tense, followed by the original discourse copied exactly and placed within quotation marks. In this study parenthetical citation (i.e., page numbers or other bibliographic information within parentheses) is not necessary for the classification of "quotation" in this study. On the other hand, the example of direct quotation introduces the quotation through the reporting clause "Newcomb said", in the past tense, followed by a reworded representation of what Newcomb actually said.

In this study, I am exploring the extent these learners' choose to either duplicate represented discourse within quotation marks (direct quotation), or reword the

represented discourse while using a reporting clauses to attribute authorship (indirect quotation).

3.4.2 Paraphrase

Another strategy of attribution is paraphrase, a rewording of a background source, or sources, that is followed by parenthetical citation. The following is a sample of original discourse followed by an example of a paraphrase:

Original Discourse

If any language group, Spanish or other, chooses to maintain its language, there is precious little that we can do about it, legally or otherwise, and still maintain that we are a free country. We cannot legislate the language of the home, the street, the bar, the club, unless we are willing to set up a cadre of language police who will ticket and arrest us if we speak something other than English.

(Raimes, 2002, p. 110)

Example of Paraphrase

Stalker points out that in a democracy like the United States, people of all ethnic and language backgrounds are always free to speak their own language without interference. It is not feasible to have laws against the uses of a language because it certainly would not be possible to make police enforce such laws in homes, on the streets, and in public places (21).

(Raimes, 2002, p. 110)

This example of a paraphrase attributes authorship by using the reporting clause “Stalker points out”, rewording the discourse of the original source, and then citing the page number in parentheses.

3.4.3 Summary

The final strategy for attribution identified in this study is summary. Like paraphrase, summaries attribute authorship to the original source primarily through

parenthetical citation. For this reason, coding paraphrases and summaries usually depends on the presence of parenthetical citation. The following example is of summary cited by Raimes (2002).

Example of Summary

An ACLU press release reports that the Massachusetts ACLU has opposed the suspension of a student for writing an assigned essay that was creative enough to frighten the teacher. For the ACLU, it is an issue of civil rights and free speech. The executive director has criticized the teacher and has demanded the student be reinstated; he also calls upon the superintendent of schools to affirm all students' rights to free speech so that punishments of this kind will no longer be meted out.

(In Raimes, 2002, p. 108; original text p. 107)

The original text, appearing in whole in Raimes (2002), was over a page long. However, when represented and attributed through summary, the representation is a paragraph long. In this study, I define summary as a strategy for attribution is carried out through reporting clauses and parenthetical citation, similar to paraphrase, but shorter than the original discourse.

3.5 Alternative Strategies for Attribution

While these strategies may be considered appropriate attribution strategies in many academic contexts, ESOL writers may implement alternative strategies to represent discourse, not all of which directly attribute the original source(s). Campbell (1987) and Howard (1995) have identified a few such alternative strategies and call them "ExactCopy", "NearCopy"/ "patchwriting", and "Marooned Terms" (Campbell, 1897; Howard, 1999).

3.5.1 Patchwriting

Campbell (1987) describes "NearCopy" as "Blending their [ESOL writers'] words and phrases with those of the source-with or without acknowledgement" (p. 23). This is a strategy that Howard (1999) explains is similar to what she identifies as "patchwriting" (p. 118). The following is an example of "patchwriting":

Original text

The world of the Ancient Near East, however, was familiar with myth of a rather different kind, myth as the spoken word which accompanied the performance of certain all-important religious rituals
(Howard, 1993, p. 237; my italics for emphasis)

Example of Patchwriting

Davidson explains ritual myths as concepts that are illustrated through spoken words but are also accompanied by the performance of religious ceremonies.

(Howard, 1995, p. 800; my italics for emphasis)

Notice the hybrid nature of this example of patchwriting as an attribution strategy. The borrowing attributes authorship by citing the original author with a reporting clause followed by "patches" of quoted verbatim, without quotation marks, and intertwined with fragments of the reporting author's rewording of the original discourse.

3.6 Data Collection

The key terms mentioned above were applied in three writing tasks that I the teacher administered (See Appendix C). As learners participated in these writing tasks, I collected writing samples, which I later coded in terms of the strategies for attribution used.

3.6.1 Example of Writing Sample Coding

The following is an example of how I coded writing samples using the above-described coding method; footnotes indicate the type of strategy that this learner implemented, while italicized areas depict represented discourse.

Why Money is Important

For most people money is product of people effort. These people who work hard every day think on the money importance on their lives, because with out money they just can't have a comfortable live. In my personal experience I have been worked since I turned 18 to pay my personal needs and school tuition. But I hope a reward in the future. "When you accep money in payment for your effort, you do so only on the conviction that you will exchange it for the product of the effort of others". Said Francisco d'Aconia From Atlas SHRUGGED pag. 387 [direct quotation]. State goverment are spendind thousands of dollars per student and it has tripled in the last 30 years and the average class size has shrunk from 27 to 17. (Money and Good Intentions are not enough John E. Branl.) [patchwriting]. In conclusion I think that is so important ask ourselves how is mony important for us. I buy a piece of bread, pay for school, buy clothes or just everything that we need. If it make you feel happy and comfortable money will always be important in our live.

In the above writing sample, I coded two strategies in this learner's writing sample: patchwriting and direct quotation. The writing samples in this study are coded in the same way by identifying strategies and counting the times each strategy occurs. After I collected and coded the writing samples, in order to explore the relationship between learner perspectives and the ways learners synthesize discourse, I interviewed four of the eight learners to confirm or reject the conclusions I reached from survey and writing sample results. The following table illustrates the data collection methods further.

Table 2: Data Collection and Analysis

Question	Data Type	Data Analysis
1	Surveys	Identify learner familiarity to strategies
	Writing samples	Code use of strategies
2	Surveys	Identify perspectives
	Interviews	Probe perspectives on attribution
3	Writing samples	Compare learner strategies with “appropriate” strategies
	Site documents	Identify “appropriate” strategies for attribution.

As Table 2 illustrates, to explore research question one, I use surveys to identify these learners' familiarity with strategies for attribution (i.e., citation, quotation, paraphrase, and summary) and writing samples. I analyze these by using discourse analysis to identify, code, and count the strategies each learner used. To explore research question two, writing samples and site documents are used to compare the ways these learners use strategies to the ways they are prescribed at this academic institution. Finally, to explore research question three, surveys and writing samples are used along with interviews to determine these learners' perspectives regarding the ways they use strategies in their writing.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents findings regarding trends and patterns identified in the responses on the surveys, strategies these ESOL writers' use to attribute authorship in the writing samples, as well as perspectives from the interviews.

4.1 Survey Results

Results from the survey indicate that the learners in this study understand several terms associated with attribution (i.e. reference, resources, source, footnote, plagiarism, paraphrase, summary, quotation, and citation). Learners defined some of these items in many ways. To illustrate, the following are four learner definitions of "reference": (1) "to have basic knowledge about something, (2) "when you explain about something else", (3) "a choice of anything, and (4) when you ask someone to give you a reference for example like when you looking for a job. In response to a survey question where I wanted to explore what these learners would do if they read from a source and reading the source inspired them to think about an idea, there were several responses:

Mike: Yes

Chito: I think that it is right is not plagiarism

Angela: Yes, using citation

Jeni: Yes it is their own idea.

J.C.: No

Wendy: I think that it is very common that after we hear or read a good idea, we can influence ourselves to write about it. I think that instead of saying that the idea was not ours, we should provide more details "using

our own, own words" to signature our paper.

Four of the eight learners in this study circled "plagiarism" as a term they understood; four chose to define the term. The four learner definitions are as follows; (1) "[to] bolowe [borrow] or still [steal] from another culture", (2) "utilizing information without quoting/citing the source, (3) "when a person copy[ies] [a] book or internet [text] without [the] author[']s permission", and (4) "to use somebody else words or ideas". As can be seen in the above examples, these learners have a varied understanding of the meanings of the terms plagiarism and reference. For the most part, a variety of responses was typical of the results from the whole of this survey, but most of the learners seem to indicate an understanding that plagiarism deals with the borrowing or taking of words and ideas.

4.2 Applying Strategies for Attribution

Analysis of writing samples indicates that the majority of ESOL writers in this study represented discourse without attribution. In fact, out of the 21 writing samples, only 9 contained at least one strategy for attribution, which means that 57 % of the writing samples were without attribution. Table 2 further illustrates this finding by categorizing the number of times each learner uses a particular strategy across each writing task.

The learners in this study average 0.81 strategies per task; however, the individual strategy use by these learners differed so much that the average strategy use by these learners on each task does not explain when and how these learners attribute.

On the other hand, Lee and Wendy tended to use similar strategies on all three tasks, and Angela only used strategies on the reading-to-write writing task. However, it is worth mentioning that most of the learners did not use these strategies; therefore, the mode of attribution strategy use across all tasks is zero ($M_o = 0$), or non-attribution.

Table 3: Number of Strategy Types across Tasks¹

<u>Learner</u>	<u>Task 3</u>	<u>Task 4</u>	<u>Task 6</u>	<u>Total</u>
B.K.Y.	X	0	0	0
Jeni	0	0	0	0
Mike	X	0	0	0
Angela	1c	1c, 1pw	1c	5
Lee	2c	1dq	1c, 2idq	6
Chito	0	1dq, 1pw	0	2
Wendy	1c, 2idq	0	1c, 1idq	5
<u>J.C.</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	6	5	6	17

The gap between the mode and mean of the strategies used could be a result of several factors including the proficiency levels of these learners and familiarity with each strategy type, but in the current study, I will describe these learners' strategy use through the different writing tasks in which they participated.

4.2.1 Citation

Among these strategies, citation was the most commonly occurring strategy of attribution found in these learners' writing samples. At a total of eight out of the 17 strategies used in all 21 writing samples, citation was used an average of .33 times per

¹ X = non-participation c = citation dq = direct quotation idq = indirect quotation pw = patchwriting

writing sample, and was used by three of these learners four times during writing task 1, once during writing task 2, and three times during the last writing task. Citation also was used eight times out of the 17 strategies used in all 21 writing samples, which equals to 47% of the total strategies used across all three tasks. Therefore, learners in this study employed citation as a strategy of attribution almost half of the time.

4.2.2 Direct and Indirect Quotation

Out of the eight learners, only two implemented indirect quotation; Wendy in the first writing task, and both Wendy and Lee in second writing task. The average indirect quotation use by these eight learners is 0.24. No learners implemented indirect quotation in task two. Direct quotation, on the other hand, was employed by two learners during writing task 2, and averaged .01 strategies per writing sample. The following example from a writing sample is how Chito used quotation in the reading-to-write task:

When you accep money in payment for your effort, you do so only on the conviction that you will exchange it for the product of the effort of others". Said Francisco d'Aconia From Atlas SHRUGGED pag 387.

After comparing Chito's representation to the original source, I noticed that this learner's representation was from a source which had already represented Ayn Rand's fiction book Atlas Shrugged (1957):

When you accept money in payment for your effort, you do so only on the conviction that you will exchange it for the product of the effort of others...

(<http://jim.com/money.htm>, 2006, p. 1)

In other words, there are many layers to Chito's representation. Chito does, however, attribute authorship to the original source through the use of quotation marks and

citation, even though the citations are not in parentheses. Angela, represented discourse in similar ways:

“Vince Young is a hometown hero," said Ed Smith, vice president of public relations for Foley's, which gave Mr. Young \$ 10,000 for his favorite charity to sign 300 autographs at the store

(Brown, C. 2006, The Dallas Morning News, Young is calling his own plays February 19th, 2006)

No instances of paraphrase or summary were identified in the writing samples of learners participating in this study, primarily due to a lack of parenthetical citation.

4.2.3 Patchwriting

The only instances of patchwriting identified in this study were in the writing samples of two learners, Angela and Chito. Both Angela and Chito implement patchwriting one time in their writing samples during writing task 2. Thus, the average patchwriting use is 0.10 per writing sample, which is coincidentally the same average as direct quotation that was also implemented in writing task 2. The following example illustrates how Angela uses patchwriting as a strategy of attribution:

Similarly they can develop in sports to help others with necessities like, "Vince Young that received 10,000 dollars for his favorite charity to sign 300 autograph in front of Foley's department store at the Houston Gallery."

Angela uses quotation marks, and places a comma after the reporting clause; however, she synthesizes the original discourse with her own by altering the grammar of and adding words. In addition, no parenthetical citation is present in Angela's writing sample. Thus, Angela's representation appears to be pieces of the original discourse "patched" into pieces of her own discourse. The patchwriting implemented by Chito was also implemented in a similar way, although Chito appeared to use a

combination of words copied directly from a webpage with text promoting a book, along with his own words to "patch" the represented discourse with his own discourse. However, Chito cites the background source using parenthetical citation.

4.2.4 One Learner's Process of Discourse Synthesis

During writing task 3, I had the opportunity to record these learners interviewing each other about their spring break plans, which allowed me the opportunity to illustrate one learner's process of discourse synthesis. First, I will begin with the initial discourse exchange between Lee and Angela during their learner-learner interview. To provide a brief context, these learners were to have researched a place of interest, visit the place, and then report to their partners during learner-learner interviews.

Angela: Do you go anywhere?

Lee: The museum.

Angela: The museum.

Lee: Kimbell museum.

Angela: Kimbell.

Lee: K-I-M-B-E-L-L. Kimbell. Kimbell museum.

F: [B-E..? Kimbell.]

Lee: Yea.

From this interaction, Angela writes "Kimbell Museum" at the top of her paper, thereby condensing about 17 words of negotiated discourse into two topic words: "Kimbell Museum"; the title of her writing sample (10 of which were the words "Kimbell Museum"). Angela then begins her paragraph with the topic sentence "Lee is planning to go to Kimbell Museum during the Spring break." The next exchange between Angela and Lee begins to form the support Angela uses in her paragraph:

Angela: B-E..? Kimbell.

Lee: Yea.

Angela: eh.

Lee: the art exhibition.
Angela: Like what?
Lee: Different xx.
Angela: oh
Lee: xxx
Angela: what else?
Lee: xxx

Underneath Kimbell museum, Angela lists words from their exchange (e.g. exhibition, Japanese Art, Egyptian Sculptures). While their exchange was not entirely clear in the recording, Angela appears to begin synthesizing her own words with Lee's spoken discourse in her first supporting sentence "The most important spect to see there is the Japanesse exhibition. Another exhibition is the Egyptian Sculptures after that he wants to spend some money at the museum shop". It appears that Angela expresses how the Japanese exhibition is the most important aspect of the Kimbell Museum; an idea that was not stated by Lee anywhere in their negotiation. Lee and Angela continue:

Lee: They have a restaurant over there.
Angela: You, you planning to go to the restaurant?
Lee: Yea. I'm on Wednesday; I don't know the menu yet.
Angela: We, can-can, a little bit expensive right?
Lee: XX
Angela: Ok, um- what else?
Lee: An, they have a shop you can go to.
Angela: Shopping?! In the museum?! You have money like that to buy-
Lee: No, No, maybe like a boa-xx or a post card.
Angela: Ueh-uh (laughs) Japanese art. Mmm. What day are you planning to go?

From this negotiation, Angela wrote, "Before leave he spect to eat at the restaurant located there." Yet again, Angela concentrates the quantity of words in Lee's original discourse into only a fraction of words containing copied, original, and reworded discourse. Angela concludes her paragraph with, "He's are planning to has a intersting

Spring break."

Overall, Angela seems to record keywords in her notes from Lee's original discourse and represents the discourse by rewording and reshaping Lee's original vocabulary and organization. Angela seems to have filtered the language of Lee's discourse through her understanding, possibly attributing authorship to her partner by including Lee's name in the title of her writing sample "Lee's Spring Break".

4.3 ESOL Writer Perspectives on Plagiarism and Attribution

After interviewing four of the eight participant-learners, I found that the learners in this study seem to have several interesting opinions and understandings about when and how attribution is carried out, as well as reflections about the manners in which they use different strategies.

During the interview with Lee, I wanted to revisit his definition of plagiarism (from the survey) to find out more about what he meant by "below" from another culture. After I asked Lee what he meant, he provided a lengthy analogy of how elderly people are respected more in his native country than in the United States. Surprisingly, Lee expressed that people in the United States are somehow plagiarizing Thailand's culture. I wanted to learn more about this analogy, so I inquired about his definition using the analogy of "stealing":

Danielle: So you think the American culture is stealing from-

Lee: Maybe steel a little bit, I'm not sure because-

Danielle: Or borrow-

Lee: Borrow, yeah, get that an use it, let the kids, younger people respect older people.

It seemed that prior to this interview, Lee understood the terms "stealing" and

“borrowing” to be synonymous. However, not all learners shared this understanding. Wendy explained her understanding of plagiarism through the feelings she had when a colleague claimed credit for a project that Wendy prepared: “That’s not fair, I mean, I would never do that to someone else because you’re taking someone else’s thoughts and your making them yours” (Interview April 1, 2006). To probe how Wendy would relate this experience to an academic writing situation, I asked her if she believed her story was similar to the way people use background sources without citing them. Wendy responded:

I don’t know, the way that I think writing is that you sharing your more personal thoughts with someone else and you should get credit for that...is your personality, the way you write your vocabulary that makes the writing you...but if you someone else did the work, so why you should get credit if you didn’t even force yourself?

Wendy expresses how she didn't mind another colleague borrowing and sharing her ideas, as long as credit was given to her. Another learner, Angela, views the consequences of plagiarism as more an issue of legality. Angela claimed that in her home country, the concept of plagiarism was treated strictly:

Danielle: [...] what would happen to someone who plagiarized?

Angela: I really, really, I don’t know but if somebody plage for my personal, if somebody plagiarize something, they go to jail.

While these learners’ understandings vary according to ambiguity, the rights of the author, and legality, J.C. seemed to express an ethical understanding of plagiarism.

J.C.: I don’t think is, I think is all better an you feel better if you do it on

your own words.

Danielle: Feel "better"? Hmm...now, this is gonna be a little strange, but can you tell me about what you mean by "better"? Like feeling "better" about...about not doing that?

J.C.: Well...let's say for example, if you writing about, let's say you doing a research paper-mmm- an you read a book and then you ...what if the teacher go back and look in the book and she find that you copy straight out from the book, so she gonna come back to you an say, "J.C., you did this but I found out that you copied everything straight out from the book" or you copying from somebody else's paper, and at that point you might say, ah yeah, eh...I was uh...you know xx or something, you know if you don't do that you know your heart your mind and then I work doing that an um so I'm thinking if you gonna get a grade it is gonna be um, lets see exactly how...you feel in your heart an your mind what I did for that I spend my time, I did a effort for this paper and I know I didn't copy from no body else...own words.

J.C. expresses how he will feel better about writing a paper on his own rather than turning in a paper that someone else had written and claiming the paper as his own. J.C. acquired most of his education in the United States; however, Wendy only recently began attending college in the United States. While J.C. expresses an ethical perspective of plagiarism, Wendy's comment below is similar in that she expresses a negative connotation regarding plagiarism, but her comment seems to involve more fear than J.C.'s comment. The following statement made by J.C. expresses this point further:

I was thinking in Mexico, we always know what is plagiarism, but also know that the chances of getting caught, that's only like one in one million...but I was thinking, but they're serious here, they gonna take your right, they're not gonna allow you to come back to school.

J.C.'s comment here indicates that this particular learner's understanding of plagiarism may involve the similar negative connotations that plagiarism has in many academic institutions (i.e., a notion of theft and unethical behavior). As these results suggest, plagiarism is defined and understood in different ways by these particular ESOL

writers. I will now address the perspectives that these learners have on strategies.

4.3.1 Comments on Citation

I asked Angela to explain how she showed the reader that she was writing about what her partner, and she said, “Because I put in the title "Lee's Spring Break" and that way I let you know, the reader, know if that is not my spring break, is his spring break (Interview April 1, 2006). Another learner, Wendy, explained how she understood that attributed could be carried out solely through the works cited page:

Danielle: How, based on looking at this, how do you communicate to me that some ideas are from another source?

Wendy: No, no, yeah- I see what you tell me. No, honestly, the reason I did it like that was because when we talk about works cited, I thought that if you include the works cited in there that that would cover it, but it's also true because I'm also giving other examples that did not come from the source- and then you wasn't sure because I included the source- no, yeah, I should have done it the other way.

Wendy explained how she assumed a works cited page would cover attribution requirements. Only by comparing her writing sample to the original source could I know that specific information from Wendy's writing sample was summarized.

4.3.2 Comments on Quotation

Quotation was the only strategy of attribution that was explicitly instructed (to the beginning level). Post-explicit instruction on quotation, during the interviews, learners shared a variety of opinions and understandings about quotation. While coding Wendy's writing on the research task, I noticed that segments of her writing sample were very similar to the source text, but she did not seem to give explicit credit to a source through strategies. When I called Wendy's attention to my having a difficult time identifying the source that she used in her writing and her own words, she

immediately sympathized:

Danielle: How can I tell the difference between-? (I pointed to the place in Wendy's writing sample)

Wendy: between that and the other-

Danielle: Yeah, yeah.

Wendy: Okay, I got it.

Sometimes, as this particular case illustrates, it is difficult to tell when a learner is representing discourse or is writing in his or her own words. While Wendy, in my opinion, was not intending to plagiarize, she did, however, fail to attribute this discourse in a way that was readily observable.

4.3.3 Comments on Summary

At the onset of this study, during the survey, summary was defined by seven of the eight learners in this study as follows:

- (1) To revise what you did before or go back and redo again
- (2) When [one] review[s] something you know or search
- (3) Short résumé in your own words
- (4) A short brife [brief] defination [definition]
- (5) Is like when you read a letter or a book and then you give a summary in your own words about the letter or book
- (6) It is when we condense information
- 7) What did you read this paper then write a short paragraph about what happens.

To expand on these written definitions supplied by the learners, during the interviews, I asked each learner to explain how they understood summary. J.C. expressed, "A summary is like to me like when I write something like read a book and then summarize [xx] lets say the book is like about 150 pages, but like put it in your own words, like the whole book. For J.C, summary is a way to condense information from a large text into his own words. Angela explained summary in a similar way:

[Summary] is like when you, for me, when you read or hear something but is too long so you say in your own words [...] but, but pretty sure not too long, is like when you read one book after that you read, then explain in short exam what you think about.

Even though neither J.C. nor Angela comment about how the original sources of summaries should be attributed in order to preserve and/or protect original authorship, these learners seem to express that a summary is a shorter representation of an original discourse or discourses.

4.3.4 Comments on Discourse Representation

After having probed these learners' understandings about common terms associated with attribution and plagiarism, I wanted additional understanding about how these learners viewed discourse representation. I asked more questions during the interviews to probe these learners' perspectives further. In response to such probing, J.C. explained how his knowledge regarding the way to use different strategies shaped the choices he made when representing discourse. J.C. stated, "Sometimes, I don't know how to use them", and further explained:

Well, cause you know, I have found with writing, I spend like, when I graduated from high school, I took a [writing] test, also an essay. I had problems with writing on the way you use quotations, like XX [referring to earlier place in our interview] like you were telling me, sometimes I had problems with those [paraphrase and summary].

J.C. seems to express that even though he represents discourse in his writings, he is unsure about when and how to use certain strategies. Angela also expresses how a lack of skills, particularly knowledge of vocabulary, affects her choice not to use strategies. Angela stated, "I don't have enough vocabulary to paraphrase". Lee too expressed that he had trouble using quotation. During our interview, after I provided

Lee with definitions of quotation from the Longman Dictionary and site documents, I asked Lee if he would have represented his partner's discourse differently. Lee then nodded affirmatively. For Lee, the issue was not a lack of confidence in language skills, such as vocabulary or grammar; his difficulty may have had to do with a lack of confidence in the application of strategies.

4.3.5 Using Your Own Words

Survey results indicated that these learners, for the most part, share a common understanding that summary is a shorter version of a larger discourse or discourses. During the interviews, I probed these learners' perspectives about when they would implement summary and why. After I asked Lee to explain when he would use a summary, and he responded, "When I try to make only thing important, not get too much story but make it short but understand". Lee explains that a summary should be used when one wishes to save time and cut a long story down into a shorter version of the story that still carries the same meaning.

These learners seem to believe that one must be able to use his/her own words in order to use summary as a strategy for discourse representation; however, attribution may still be missing. Consequently, most of the learners interviewed in this study appear to view summary as a strategy of discourse representation rather than a strategy of attribution, placing more importance on conveying an idea rather than the source of original discourse.

In the writing, these learners may very well have been summarizing; however, I could not tell when a summary occurred due to the lack of parenthetical citation. To

understand this more, I questioned Angela about a writing sample that I believed could have been a summary of her partner's discourse:

Danielle: When you were writing it, did you think that maybe I knew who your partner was?

Angela: No (laughs)

Danielle: You just wrote it?

[...]

Angela. Okay, I wrote it, but for sure know that you know (laughs) who my partner was.

Danielle: uh-huh, just from the reading it was difficult to tell because-

Angela: -Yes, because we were in the class, you know who the partner is exactly from the I, for me, I just say like that, but not I understand that if we going to write we need to expect that the reader don't know who the people's idea is.

Angela communicates how she may have assumed that I knew who her partner was, which ultimately led to a realization that one cannot expect the reader to know which ideas represented belong to which authors. The following transcript further illustrates Angela's probable realization.

4.4 Institutional Perspectives on Attribution and Plagiarism

Visiting the on-line Student Code of Conduct for ICC, I found the following definitions for terms associated with plagiarism and attribution. Throughout, ICC seems to view attribution and plagiarism in similar ways, as I expect are similar to many academic institutions. ICC defines plagiarism as, "Intentionally representing the words or ideas of another as one's own in any academic exercise". In this case, it is also important to know what is meant by "intentionally"; ICC defines intentionally as, "Conduct that one desires to engage in or one's conscious objective". To further illustrate ICC's perspective on plagiarism, I have included an excerpt from the student

code of conduct:

When students submit work purporting to be their own, but which in any way borrows ideas, organization, wording or anything else from another source without appropriate acknowledgment of the fact... All matters of academic dishonesty (plagiarism, collusion, fabrication, cheating, etc.) will result in a failing grade for the assignment in question. All violations will be forwarded to the proper college authorities in review. The college may at its discretion, impose additional penalties on the student, including academic probation, suspension, or expulsion. Any form of disruptive behavior in the classroom will not be tolerated.

(Site Documents, 2006, Appendix B)

My understanding of ICC's policy, as illustrated in the site documents, is that when a learner is identified as having plagiarized an assignment, that learner will not receive credit for that particular assignment and the case of plagiarism will be further reviewed by college authorities. These definitions seem to express that ICC values intentions when it comes to turning in work for a grade. If a learner represents discourse without attribution intentionally, (i.e., with the "desire" to "engage" in an action "consciously") that action is considered plagiarism according to ICC academic ethics policy. Similar to research conducted by Pecorari (2001) and Yamada (2003), these learners' academic institution seems to define plagiarism in ways equivalent to most academic institutions.

4.5 Summary of Results

Findings from the surveys, writing samples, and interviews suggest that even though learners claim to understand terms associated with attribution, they may not attribute authorship appropriately when writing in many academic institutions. In fact, findings from writing samples indicate that most learners in this study did not attribute authorship to the discourses they represented. Therefore, the findings of this study

essentially identified the ways these learners' identified, understood and applied strategies and plagiarism.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

So far, I have illustrated the ways these learners identify, understand, and apply attribution in discourse synthesis. This chapter discusses the merging point of ESOL writer perspectives on plagiarism and those of many academic institutions. By addressing the initial research questions of this study, the ways ESOL writers perceive and apply attribution may be more clearly understood as a transitional phase in which these learners are acquiring the skills necessary to represent discourse appropriately in most academic institutions.

5.1 Restatement of Research Questions

Before I discuss these concerns, I would like to recall the principal research questions of this study:

- (1) In what ways do ESOL writers use strategies to attribute authorship to source texts in three writing tasks?
- (2) What are these learners' perspectives regarding the use of such strategies for?
- (3) To what extent do these learners' use of and perspectives on these strategies compare to these learners' academic institution?

5.2 ESOL Writers' Strategies for Attribution

Four important findings in this study surface regarding the types of strategies and the way they are used: (1) a frequency of non-attribution, (2) reliance on citation,

(3) alternative discourse representation strategies, and (4) the impact of task instruction on ESOL writers' attribution.

5.2.1 Non-Attribution Frequency

The first important finding from this study is that of non-attribution, or "passages copied exactly from the work of another (regardless of whether that work is published or unpublished or whether it comes from a printed or electronic source) without providing (a) footnotes, endnotes, or parenthetical notes that cite the source and (b) quotation marks or block indentation to indicate precisely what has been copied from the source" (Howard, 1995, p. 799). I expand on Howard's definition to include all represented discourse which is unaccounted for by means of attribution. Non-attribution was the most commonly chosen strategy of all learners in this study on all tasks. However, were these learners plagiarizing, or trying to "evade" turning in their own work? Howard (1995) clearly separates non-attribution from "cheating". This means that learners may not attribute authorship due to a learner's purposeful attempt to turn in the work of others as their own, even though non-attribution can result from a purposeful attempt to cheat. There may be an overlapping of these categories as non-attribution can have several implications including plagiarism and signs of language acquisition in the area of writing and attribution.

5.2.2 Reliance on Citation

During the survey, none of the learners chose to define citation; yet in practice, citation was the most commonly occurring strategy of attribution found in these learners writing samples. Based on this finding, it is clear that these learners, while they may be

familiar enough with certain terms associated with attribution, may not fully understand their meanings and the appropriate use of strategies to attribute authorship to source texts, further indicating that these learners are in a transitional period.

5.2.3 Discourse Representation

Additional findings indicate that alternative strategies of discourse representation, such as patchwriting and signing the authors name after representing discourse in the first-person also occurred in the writing samples of these learners. These learners are exhibiting an attempt to attribute authorship to represented discourse, even though these attempts are alternative to most academic standards of attribution, such attempts to attribute by these learners further illustrate that these learners are in a transitional period in their academic writing development.

5.3 ESOL Writers' Perspectives on Attribution

Perspectives gathered from the interviews suggest four common trends: (1) avoiding plagiarism is necessary (2) don't take risks using unfamiliar strategies, (3) summaries are rewordings of original discourse(s), and (4) When Citation Is Used at Least One Time, represented discourse is attributed. The following is a more detailed description of these perspectives on the part of the learners.

5.3.1 Avoiding Plagiarism is Necessary

Recall Lee's analogy of plagiarism and borrowing from other cultures (i.e. respect for the elderly); while Lee seemed to view plagiarism through a positive lens, some learners in this study expressed the more negative connotations associated with plagiarism in many academic contexts. Remember how J.C. expressed a feeling of guilt

about being confronted by a teacher who, after turning in a paper, copied directly from a book. For J.C., avoiding plagiarism seems to mean that the work of others cannot be copied in an assignment, and that the work must be done with, perhaps, honest effort. Sometimes, as expressed by Wendy and Angela, a sense of disappointment, or perhaps fear also is present in other learners' perspectives about the way plagiarism is viewed. These perspectives reflect how these learners understand rules regarding plagiarism as stricter than in the countries from which they came, with penalties including the removal of academic privileges. For the most part, the ESOL writers in this study expressed perspectives that plagiarism has negative connotations in many academic institutions and should be avoided. However, do these learners understand how plagiarism is to be avoided in terms of using specific strategies for attribution?

5.3.2 Don't Take Risks Using Unfamiliar Strategies

Even though learners in this study appear to be familiar with the concept of plagiarism, many learners may not use certain strategies to avoid plagiarism. To illustrate, recall J.C.'s expression "sometimes, I don't know how to use them" when explaining the non-attribution in his writing samples. J.C. claimed that his experience on a writing test in a high school caused him to develop a perspective of inability to use strategies skillfully. Lee too expressed a similar view when he described that if he were more familiar using quotation, he would have represented his partner's discourse using quotation as a strategy of attribution.

In general, many learners may choose strategies with which they are more familiar or avoid strategies altogether due to a lack of confidence in implementing such

strategies. What this perspective seems to explain is that these learners may resort to using strategies with which they are more familiar, or none at all, before risk using a different strategy type. This obstacle may be a cornerstone to the reasons behind ESOL writers, and perhaps, native English writers risk plagiarism in academic contexts. As Angélil-Carter (2000) emphasizes, ESOL learners have to learn the 'dance' before they are confident performing attribution in unfamiliar discourse communities.

5.3.3 Summaries are Shorter Rewordings of Original Discourse

Summary is most commonly appropriately defined by the ESOL writers in this study; however, no learner implemented summary using parenthetical citation and/or reporting clauses; thus no summaries are coded in the ESOL writing samples of this study. For the most part, these learners seemed to express how discourse can be represented by condensing the text into reworded discourse, but the reader may not always be able to distinguish original from represented discourse. Without citation or reporting clauses, attribution becomes ambiguous. Therefore, summary, in this study, may be a strategy of discourse representation than a strategy of attribution for these learners.

5.3.4 When Citation Is Used at Least One Time, Represented Discourse Is Attributed

Learners in this study seemed to understand that if the author or source is cited at least once in the beginning, middle, or end of the writing sample, then attribution is successfully carried out. However, the reader may find it difficult to sort out which discourse is represented and which originated from the author.

Some learners may believe that there is an assumption, which is understood, that the represented discourse can be distinguished from the original discourse. As these learners' instructor, I was able to read their original sources and have the advantage of knowing that each task involved discourse synthesis, an advantage that an audience outside of the scope of our classroom would not have.

After I explained this problem to Angela and showed her this ambiguity of authorship in one of her writing samples, she agreed that a reader may not be able to tell which discourse she wrote and which came from another source. Angela was also the only learner to use signature-citation at the end of her writing sample that she had represented the discourse of her partner using the first person.

Many of these ESOL writers' perspectives indicate the assumption that I knew, as their teacher, which discourses were represented and which were original. Pecorari (2005) describes "features of occlusion" in writing, which in this case, are different linguistic markers in a text that signal unrecoverable elements in that particular text. Pecorari (2005) describes how citation can be one of these features: "While citations themselves are quite visible, some aspects of what they signal are less so" (Pecorari, 2005, p. 6). For example, in one writing task, Angela wrote about the discourse of her partner using the first person, as if she were telling a story from her partner's perspective. At the end of her paper, she wrote her partner's name at the bottom of the page, as a sort of signature citing that the ideas she wrote about did not originate from her; they originated from her partner. However, the specific details that originated from her partner's discourse and the details from Angela's discourse seem to be occluded (i.e.,

the reader would not be able to tell based on the citation alone). The assumption “no attribution is necessary” that some learners make when representing discourse, when they assume that the teacher knows the difference between original and represented discourse, could be dangerous to these learners’ academic success due to the controversy surrounding plagiarism. These learners may need to be reminded that “when in doubt, cite; over-citation is an error, but under-citation is plagiarism” (Howard, 1995, p. 800). I have never heard or read about a learner who received a negative grade, or who was expelled from school, for citing too much!

So far, I have addressed the second research question of this study by highlighting four of the most common perspectives they shared. By summarizing these common perspectives I am not limiting, nor expressing that all learners in this study held these perspectives. I am, however, suggesting that these were common perspectives that I delineated from the interviews of four learners in this study. The perspectives that surfaced in the interviews were that avoiding plagiarism is necessary, using unfamiliar strategies is risky, summaries are shortened and reworded versions of original discourse, and that citation can be used at least once to represent discourse appropriately. These perspectives may or may not be typical of the perspectives held by the ESOL writers, but they do provide an insight into the learners’ perspectives, which, I have found, usually seems to be muted by the perspectives of many academic institutions.

5.4 Comparing ESOL Writers' Strategies to Institutional Site Documents

5.4.1 Defining Attribution

In comparison, learner definitions tended to be slightly dissimilar to definitions of strategies for attribution defined in ICC site documents. The learner definitions of plagiarism as "borrowing" or "using" are not synonymous with the Longman Dictionary definitions. However, two learners define plagiarism in a similar way to this dictionary. What surprises me most is how learners who define plagiarism in a non-standard manner or were unfamiliar with the term seem to have overlooked or have not experienced the negative connotation that surrounds plagiarism in academic writing contexts.

Regarding summary, however, there seems to be closer similarity between the learner-definitions and the definition recognized by their academic institution. Not only did these learners attempt to define summary more than any other term, more learners also defined summary appropriately, i.e. in similar ways to the Longman Dictionary., because they emphasized using discourse to illustrate only the "main information" from an event or another discourse while leaving out minor details. However, some definitions were not as "appropriate", as "summary" was defined by some of these learners as synonymous to revision or review. In addition, the appropriate definitions, including Longman's definition, appear to define "summary" as a mode of discourse representation which accounts for important details of a concept (discursive or otherwise) while at the same time withholding minor details that may not be as important to understanding the represented concept. The institutional definition of

"summary" (as illustrated by Longman) does not, however, incorporate how a summary can also consist of information which cites the original sources; an important distinction which may be necessary to avoid plagiarism. In this way, learners appropriately define "summary" as a strategy of discourse representation rather than a strategy of attribution. This understanding of summary may seem trivial at the moment, but it may play a larger role in the way ESOL learners represent and attribute discourse, an issue which will be discussed later in Chapter 5. In general, the quality of ESOL writer definitions tend to differ from ICC recognized definitions. In addition, ESOL writer samples do not contain as many strategies as when compared to the ICC writing samples.

5.4.2 Quality of Attribution

Most of the learners in this study tended to employ strategies in seemingly rough and unskillful manners, in comparison to ICC writing examples. These learners are clearly demonstrating an intention to attribute authorship to the discourse they represent in their writing, but the delivery of such standard strategies may be unreliable until a later point in these learners' English language acquisition.

5.4.3 Quantity of Attribution

Lastly, ESOL writers in this study tended to attribute authorship to represented discourse using fewer strategies, in less skillful manners, and understanding their meanings in dissimilar ways than the writing samples of their academic institution. These results may be due to learner attempts to use direct quotation as modeled in the beginning ICC textbook, however, unskillfully executed. The pre-academic administration at ICC seems to be more forgiving than I would imagine instructors of

regular academic classes to be.

5.5 Summary of Discussion

Overall, the methods used to explore the research questions of this study provide a way for researchers and teachers to observe how ESOL writers perceive, as well as apply strategies when synthesizing discourse. In summary, explorations of the first research question yielded findings that most ESOL writers did not use attribution, used citation a few times to attribute authorship to several represented discourses, and that citation is the most commonly used strategy of attribution among the learners who actually attributed in their writing samples. Exploring the second and third research questions, not only provided a way to qualify the results from the first research question, but allowed a way to better understand more about how and when ESOL writers attribute (or do not attribute) authorship to discourses they represent when synthesizing background sources. These results allow for an insight into how these learners understand attribution and plagiarism that could be typical of other ESOL writers, or perhaps, may only reflect these learners' individual processes of language acquisition.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

Prevention, not detection, is at the heart of the new paradigm for combating plagiarism.

(Freedman, 2004, p. 548)

Overall, this study has explored ESOL writer attribution strategy use across six writing tasks. Opinions from learners with different language and cultural backgrounds regarding attribution and plagiarism have also been explored. In general, learners in this study, while aware of the concept of plagiarism, tend to represent discourse without attribution.

For the most part, learners, as mentioned above, do not use strategies to attribute authorship to the author/s of the represented discourse found in their writing samples. However, examples of strategies and explicit instruction on attribution may encourage a variety of strategies used than when such instruction is implied and examples of strategies are absent. It is difficult to determine how these learners would have attributed represented discourse had circumstances been different, because we have two concepts here: (1) the acquisition of Basic English language skills and (2) the acquisition of skills necessary to attribute represented discourse appropriately in many academic contexts. Two essential issues are important to English language instructors whereby one may not take prevalence over the other when an accusation of plagiarism is at hand. In light of this paradigm, instructors may be more adept at evaluating each

learner's acquisition of writing skills in relation to the way he/she represents discourse. For instance, a less discriminating, more individual approach can be adapted that most benefits ESOL writers.

6.1 Limitations and Assumptions

The limitations of this study are in randomization and generalization. Regarding randomization, the ESOL writers who participated in this study were not specifically selected; they were accidental, as they were enrolled in the classes and all had an opportunity to participate. Also, proficiency levels of these ESOL writers may not compare to other academic institutions. These writers are from primarily Hispanic, with a few from African, and one from Asian language and cultural backgrounds, so this study's findings cannot be generalized in terms of culture.

Regarding generalization, the way this study codes strategies may also be a limitation to the implications of this study, as I was unable to identify any paraphrase or summary strategies in these learner's writing samples due to the fact that parenthetical citation was not present. As a result, the ways these ESOL writers attribute authorship and their perspectives regarding attribution in this study may not be comparable to other ESOL writers in different academic institutions.

6.2 Delimitations

I consider my role as both teacher and researcher as a control in this study, even though this role may also be a limitation to the implication of findings. By being the teacher and the researcher, I am able to screen instruction on attribution and plagiarism to what is specifically addressed in the course syllabus and respective class

assignments, without supplying supplemental instruction on attribution during the course of the study. Similarly, I am able to be a part of these learners' learning environment during the construction of their writing samples. Therefore, it was easier to measure my influence as a teacher in terms of how these learners use strategies. To illustrate, I implemented two types of instruction and described them in the methodology of this study, and anything that came up that related to the topic of this paper.

To illustrate the precaution I took to avoid giving instruction on attribution in addition to the mandatory class assignment, the following transcript is from field notes taken while thinking about the effects of an unexpected request from B.K.Y. to write about his partner's discourse:

I have been careful to avoid using quotation marks any other place than what is described in the book "Do we write these words he say to write?" "Well- if you want to write exactly what he said, remember the chapter on quotation -"do that?" "Yes, but well-" "add some words?" "Well, I'll tell you what-do it how you think and I'll talk to you about it at another time". Expressed explicit instruction on how to use quotation, paraphrase, and summary will be given later in the semester.

I did not want my instruction to surface in the results of this study; therefore, I relied on course textbooks for instruction and the syllabus-recommended Longman Dictionary for definitions of terms. If I had observed another instructor's class, the results would be subject to any supplemental instruction by the instructor.

Some may argue that this type of supplemental instruction would occur in a natural ESOL writing class. However, due to the highly subjective nature of when and what types of supplemental instruction could occur, I wanted to control this variable by

being both the researcher and instructor of this study.

6.3 Attrition

As mentioned before, three of the participant learners in this study withdrew from the writing class, and thus, withdrew from this study. However, one of these learners withdrew after I questioned the ways she represented discourse in a paper. This learner submitted a works-cited page; however, the works cited did not match the discourse represented in this learner's composition. I asked this learner to review the syllabus and the student code of conduct regarding plagiarism and suggested that I would like to have a discussion with her concerning her paper on the following day. She agreed to look up the information and said, "That's okay, I need to know." After I explained that the close copying in her paper could be considered plagiarism, she told me that she worked in the medical field and that she knew about the medicine she wrote about in her paper. She appeared to be frustrated and told me that her paper reflected how she understood the use of source texts. As a researcher, these statements intrigued me; I wanted to probe into this understanding to discover the method and perspective behind direct copying of a source text as a strategy for attribution of the source text. However, as a teacher, I was beside myself, and even disappointed, even though I could easily recall the efforts that the learner had made to turn in quality assignments on time. I gave the learner an option to rewrite the paper, but unfortunately she did not return to class. Since this experience, in the classroom, I have been reluctant to directly state when I suspect that a learner has plagiarized, even when I have the original source, for fear that the learner will become embarrassed and never return to class. Instead, I ask

direct questions about the vocabulary used or the concepts behind the composition. In this way, addressing plagiarism becomes less of an accusation and allows the learner the freedom to admit they have made a mistake and express willingness to make the appropriate revisions.

6.4 Implications

Pre-academic classes might consider incorporating explicit instruction on the strategies that are expected from the learners into their curricula, as well as providing and explaining examples of such strategies before these learners enter academic college classes. Such an endeavor may require a great deal of time and patience on the part of instructors, learners, as well as academic institutions, but I believe that more focus in the language-learning classroom may help to alleviate the troubles ESOL writers have using attribution before they pre-academic classes. A learner in a listening and speaking class would never get expelled for failing to acquire the pronunciation of “/θ/” sound, so how is it fair that a learner is expelled for not acquiring how to use a strategy for attribution, such as quotation, which could be considered plagiarism? Granted, comparing the “/θ/” sound and “plagiarism” is apples compared to oranges, but punishing learners for a skill they have not yet acquired is a paradox that educators and educational administration should strongly consider.

There may be ways of identifying struggles with attribution early on in writing class. Educational administrators and instructors could conduct an initial needs assessment of ESOL writers that probes their perspectives and attribution strategy styles. Becoming more informed about the different perspectives that ESOL learners

have regarding attribution may aid in the construction and implementation of effective and fair curriculum design.

For researchers exploring this topic, a unified system containing definitions of strategies for attribution across academic institutions could be compiled in order to reflect an objective template of academic expectations for discourse representation. Such a system could be designed with fewer limitations in randomization and generalization and more specific parameters and definable features than attempted in this study.

6.5 Contributions and Significance of This Study

There are four primary contributions that may be drawn from this study. First, ESOL writers may not have the attribution skills needed for college classes, so instructors in all academic writing levels must be aware of the possibility of misuse of strategies. Since intentions may not be measured by linguistic markers alone, instructors must be 'self-reflective' (Ouellette, 2004, p. 259) and consider constructive ways to address plagiarism in ways that facilitate language acquisition, as well as socialization (e.g., learning how to avoid plagiarism, which could take a great deal of time, practice, and patience. Next, ESOL writers may need direct and explicit instruction on the different types of strategies that are necessary and when they should be employed. Instructors might also be as direct as possible when delivering task instruction, to make sure to clearly communicate what is expected from learners when incorporating resources and representing discourse. Similarly, examples of each strategy of attribution and rules describing when strategies should be executed may also

prevent plagiarism in the writing of learners whose intention is not to deceive.

When I originally set out to uncover the attribution strategies used by these learners, I found that categorizing them was difficult and "linguistically ambiguous" (Fairclough, 1994), due to overlap within the categories (Campbell, 1995). Summaries and paraphrases, and even indirect quotations were indistinguishable without clearer specifications for each, as even the ways different textbooks and dictionaries defined these strategies. Therefore, in order to unravel the ambiguity surrounding plagiarism and identifying appropriate methods for attributing authorship, scholarly literature must first define such terms consistently. This study coding system which could be used by other researchers to avoid overlap between strategies such as summary, paraphrase, and indirect quotation made original and represented even more indistinguishable.

Overall, this study not only provides evidence that plagiarism is a complicated issue in the ESOL writing context, but also offers a descriptive account of one learner's process of discourse analysis, and a comprehensive description of how some ESOL learners used strategies for attribution and their perspectives about what they were doing.

6.6 Future Research

Researchers interested in this important issue may consider conducting further research that involves more participant learners from a larger variety of language and cultural backgrounds, that not only uses varieties of explicit and implicit task instruction and types, but which also compares learner attribution strategy uses across several academic institutions. Perspectives from more ESOL writers, as well as native speakers

of English learners, instructors, and administrators may also be solicited so a more detailed and complete model of ESOL writers' attribution strategy use may be considered. In addition, future research could identify parameters for the phases of transition ESOL writers undergo in their acquisition of recognized strategies for attribution. Identifying such stages may open a new door in instruction and curriculum development for these learners that can facilitate their acquisition of the writing skills that help them avoid plagiarism. Further research in these areas may provide a way to generalize the findings to account for ESOL writing contexts, as well as, provide more insight into why learners share common perceptions about attribution and plagiarism. As I mentioned earlier in the methodology chapter, this study was neither a full Ethnography of Communication nor a full Discourse Analysis that used all levels of Fairclough's (1994) three-dimensional model (text, discursive practice, and social practice) (p. 73). In the future, I might explore these research questions using the full versions of the methodological frameworks from which I borrowed; however, scholars interested in this issue may want to consider expanding on this study through these frameworks sooner.

Future research might also consider exploring how the perspectives that ESOL writers have relate to the ways they employ strategies in their writing. Writing task, as illustrated in this study, as well as the delivery of writing task instruction may have a great effect on the presence and types of strategies used in ESOL writer compositions. Researchers may even want to explore if source texts are used when given an option and exploring the perspectives on why the sources were used, or why they weren't used.

In addition, future research could even explore the extent that learners fabricate facts or discourses as an avoidance strategy to representing discourse due to any of the perspectives reflected in this study, or others that might emerge in future studies.

In summary, this study comes to the same need for future research as the studies prior that have addressed ESOL writers and the issue of plagiarism. Due the number of variables that could influence the ways these writers synthesize discourse, much scholarly literature and empirical research is still needed to understand more about the reasons ESOL writers and attribution, as well as, find ways to alleviate the problem.

6.7 Conclusion

In conclusion, plagiarism may be a more complicated issue than previously thought, because learners may think they are plagiarizing, but may think that they actually think that they are doing something else. As more is understood about the perspectives ESOL writers bring to the classroom regarding attribution, more will be understood about the ways in which these writers represent discourse in their writing. Granted, there are conditional rules to follow when entering and becoming a part of a particular discourse community. However, as educators, do we value our learner's comprehension of written material, presentation of information, synthesis of other's ideas, or their ability to follow rules? While the ways these learners employ strategies could be considered appropriate and accepted in the language learning writing classrooms in their educational institution, once these learners graduate from these pre-academic classes and merge into regular academic-level English classes, the ways in which strategies are carried out may not be accepted by the larger academic discourse

community. By attempting to resolve this issue in this way, I do not imply that punitive efforts be taken towards ESOL learners in pre-academic ESOL classes. Instead, consideration, facilitation, and education can be implemented as preventative measures to assertively face the negative consequences of plagiarism in a less forgiving academic writing context.

Educating writers about the relationship between attribution and plagiarism may be a key to resolving the controversy related to plagiarism in ESOL writing environments. Determining when a learner is telling the truth about a suspicious paper is unrealistic because intentions and ethics are not necessarily linguistically defined in academic writing styles. However, identifying specific strategies or the lack thereof could be cues that the learner is meeting the academic institution's standards effectively, or that he or she needs additional help. Reporting clauses, quotation marks, and parenthetical citation are a few linguistic markers that indicate attempts of attribution, but overall, these may only imply that the learner is struggling. As Pecorari (2002) explains, "A writer who is not particularly skillful at a task...may lack a sufficient perspective on the new text to be able to reflect meaningfully on the relationship between it and its sources" (p. 26). When novice ESOL writers, as well as L1 writers demonstrate an effort to attribute authorship they may not implement strategies in ways that are recognized as appropriate, according to general academic standards. These attributive attempts on the parts of learners should be viewed as areas for improvement and grounds for helping these writers acquire the strategies they need to avoid plagiarism.

Educators may do a disservice to learners by labeling a composition as plagiarism without first considering these learners' attempts to avoid plagiarism and their perspectives about attribution. Now, we must move ahead. Campbell (1987) suggests that "all composition instructors at the university level, and even those at a college-bound secondary level, should provide their students with assignments which develop better awareness and skill in using information from background reading texts and acknowledging the authors" (p. 35). Developing awareness, facilitating instruction, and providing resources will provide more education to our learners than suspension or expulsion from academic endeavors.

APPENDIX A

TRANSCRIPTION and CODING SYMBOLS

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

xx	short unclear utterance
xxx	longer unclear utterance
..	one to two second pause
...	five to seven second pause
[...]	> five to seven second pause
?	rising intonation signaling a question
!	rising intonation signaling an imperative
(laughs)	laughing

APPENDIX B

SITE DOCUMENT REFERENCES

SITE DOCUMENT REFERENCES

Academic Ethics Policy: <http://www.dcccd.edu/cat9898/conduct.htm>

Beginning Writing Textbook: Blanchard, K., Root, C. (2003). Reading to write. Pearson Education Inc., Whiteplains, NY. (pp. 47-57)

Advanced Writing Textbook: Langan, J. (2005). College writing skills. Sixth edition. (pp.) McGraw Hill Companies, Inc. (224-225, 388, 408)

APPENDIX C

DESCRIPTION OF WRITING TASKS

Writing Task 1: Interview-Report

2/27/06 - 3/1/06

During class, learners interviewed a partner about how another person completes a process (how he/she makes a favorite dish, completes a job, makes a craft, etc). After collecting information from the interviews, learners then individually composed a paragraph (beginning levels) or an essay (advanced levels) accounting for their partner's process. The beginning levels were instructed to complete this task just as they were instructed to complete the prior interview tasks without explicit instruction to make clear that the writing should clearly indicate to the reader that the writing is about this learner's partner's processes and not their own.

Task 2: Reading-to-Write Task

3/1/06

The beginning group was instructed to support a statement that money was either 'good' or 'evil' and support it with an example from their personal experience, one factual example, and one quotation. This task was taken directly from the beginning textbook (Blanchard & Root, 2003, pp. 47-57); therefore, it required instruction on quotation. To achieve this, I used the definition and examples supplied in the textbook and did not supplement any additional instruction on attribution. Advanced learners selected a background source (i.e., an article from a newspaper, the library, or the internet) and wrote an essay about the article. Again, this task was administered from the textbook (Langan, 2005, p. 224-225), and did not require that I instruct on how to use quotation, so I explained the instructions from the textbook. In addition, all levels of learners were provided with a sample of a works cited page (Langan, 2005, p. 408) and were asked to turn in the assignments including a completed works cited page.

Writing Task 3: Interview-Report Task

3/8/06

The beginning learners interviewed a partner about the place he or she was planning to visit. The advanced learners completed the same task, only they wrote an essay about their partners' expectations. I made a particular effort in my instruction to be as clear as possible that the writings should clearly indicate that it was the learners' partner's place that was written about.

APPENDIX D

SURVEYS

Pilot Study Survey A

Name: _____

Please circle: ESOL 0051 0052 0053 0054

- 1) What is your native country?
- 2) Please circle the age group that applies to you:

18 -24 25- 34 35 – 44 46 – 54 54+

- 3) Out of the following list, please circle the terms that you understand:

reference quotation citation source footnote
summary paraphrase plagiarism resources.

- 4) Choose three of the words that you circled and define them below:

1. _____ :

2. _____ :

3. _____ :

Pilot Study Survey B

Plagiarism in the University

SA = strongly agree

A = agree

SD = strongly disagree

1. I am a non-native speaker of English, so I think it's difficult to use my own words when I write about something in English. Response: _____

2. In my country, we are not so worried about plagiarism, but here in the US it is a much more serious issue. Response: _____

3. I try not to commit plagiarism so I always use many quotations in my essays. Response: _____

4. One way to learn another language is to copy the sentences of native speaking writers. Response: _____

5. I can't write original ideas in my own words because many authors have already written everything about my topic. Response: _____

6. The definition of plagiarism means different things to different teachers. Response: _____

7. When I read a book and it makes me think about an idea for an essay, I have to write that the idea is not mine. Response: _____

8. If I read information, opinions or facts from the Internet, I don't have to write in my essay that these ideas are not mine. Response: _____

(Anonymous source)

Current Study Survey

Name: _____

Please circle: ESOL 0051 0052 0053 0054

- 5) What is your native country?
- 6) Please circle the age group that applies to you:
18 -24 25- 34 35 – 44 46 – 54 54+
- 7) Out of the following list, please circle the terms that you understand:
reference quotation citation source footnote
summary paraphrase plagiarism resources.

8) Choose three of the words that you circled and define them below:

1. _____ :

2. _____ :

3. _____ :

- 4. What is plagiarism?
- 5. Have you ever experienced any instances of plagiarism either personally, seen on TV, in the classroom, or elsewhere? If so, what were they?
- 6. What does this phrase mean "Use your own words"?
- 7. How can we use "other people's words" when we write?
- 8. If someone reads something and it makes him/her think about an idea for an essay, should that person write that the idea is not their own?
- 9. Do you think original texts (books, magazines, the internet, etc.) are sources of information, points of view, or something else? Explain.

REFERENCES

- Allen, S. (2004). Task Representation of a Japanese L2 writer and its impact on the usage of source text information. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 14 (1), (pp. 77-89).
- Angélil-Carter, S. (2000). *Stolen language? Plagiarism in writing.* (pp 39-48). London: Longman.
- Barks, D. (2001). Textual borrowing strategies for graduate-level ESL writers. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking Literacies: Perspectives on L2 Reading-Writing Connections*, (pp. 246-267). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York: Henry Holt. (p. 42).
- Campbell, C. (1987). *Writing with others' words: native and non-native university students' use of information from a background reading text in academic compositions.* Report published for the Centre for Language Education and Research, University of California: Los Angeles. (pp. 17- 23).
- Campbell, C. (1990). *Writing with others' words: Using background reading text in academic compositions.* In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (pp. 211- 223).
- Fairclough, N. (1994). *Discourse and social change*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers, Inc., (pp. 4-5,72-73,105-107).

- Freedman, M. P. (2004). A tale of plagiarism and a new paradigm. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87 (7), (pp. 545-548).
- Howard, R.M. (1993). "A plagiarism pentimento". *Journal of Teaching and Writing*. 11(2), (pp. 233-245).
- Howard, R. (1995). Plagiarisms, authorships, and the academic death penalty. *College English*, 57: 788-805. (799-800)
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations of sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. (pp. 55-60). University of Pennsylvania: Philadelphia.
- Hymes, D. (1996). *Ethnography, linguistics, narrative inequality: Toward an understanding of voice:and education*. London: Taylor & Francis, (p. 10).
- Langan, J. (2005). *College writing skills*. Sixth edition. New York, NY: McGraw Hill Companies, Inc. (pp. 388).
- Lahur, A. M. (2004). Plagiarism among Asian students at an Australian university offshore campus: Is it a cultural issue? A pilot study. In *Proceedings of the HERDSA Conference 2004*, Miri, Sarawack, Malysia, Non-referred paper. Retrieved July 19 2005 from <http://herdsa2004.curtin.edu.my/contributions/NRPapers/A033-jt.pdf>
- Ouellette, M. A. (2004). *Voices on the landscape: Reconceptualizing plagiarism, voice appropriation, and academic competence in ESL freshman composition*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 2004. UMI Microfilms No. 3125885. (pp. 239; 270).

- 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*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press. (pp. 210-245). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Pecorari, D. (2002). *Original Reproductions: "An investigation of the source use of post graduate second language writers. Summary of doctoral thesis*. UK: University of Birmingham,. (2, 319). Retrieved January 31st, 2006 from <http://www.copycatchgold.com/OR%20summary.htm>
- Pecorari, D. (2005). Visible and occluded citation features in postgraduate second-language writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25. (pp. 4 -29).
- Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing other's words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. In V. Zamel & R. Spack (Eds.), *Negotiating academic literacies: Teaching and learning across academic cultures*. (pp. 265-296). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Raimes, A. (2002). *Keys for writers: A brief handbook*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Scollon, R. (1994). As a matter of fact: The changing ideology of authorship and responsibility in discourse. *World Englishes*. 13 (1), (pp. 33-46).
- Shi, L. (2004). Textual borrowing in second-language writing. *Written Communication*, 21 (2), (pp. 171-200).
- Spivey, N. (1983). *Discourse synthesis: constructing texts in reading and writing*. (Outstanding Dissertation Monograph Series). Newark, DE: International

Reading Association, (pp. 5; 39).

Summers, S.N. (2005). Questions of academic integrity. *Innovation Abstracts*, 27 (16),
(p. 1).

Yamada, K. (2003). What prevents ESL/EFL writers from avoiding plagiarism?:
Analysis of 10 North-American college websites. Osaka, YMCA, Temple
University Japan, (pp. 248-258).

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Danielle Plauché was born in Arlington, Texas, graduated from Arlington High School, and holds a Bachelor's degree from the University of Texas at Arlington. Plauché became interested in teaching while tutoring second through twelfth reading and math. Shortly thereafter, Plauché became interested in teaching ESOL learners and began teaching ESOL listening, speaking, writing, grammar, and reading skills. Through helping these learners Plauché discovered a joy for teaching, through which, she found her place in the world. Plauché is planning to pursue a Ph. D. in Applied Linguistics and one day help ESOL learners and teachers alike through the difficult, yet highly rewarding, path of academia.