MISCOMMUNICATING PLAGIARISM IN SWEDISH SCHOOLS

PLAGIO MAL COMUNICADO EN LAS ESCUELAS SUECAS

Lydia Kokkola
The Department of English, Oulu University, Finland
English & Education, Luleå University of Technology, Sweden

Abstract

Although plagiarism has a much longer history, many teachers of English have noticed that the amount of copying has increased alongside the use of the Internet. The paper begins with a review of the literature demonstrates that although much attention has been paid to undergraduates in academic environments, little attention has been paid to plagiarism in schools. Other studies indicate that plagiarism is more common when people are writing in their L2, and when working with online sources. Combined, the review suggests that studies of L2 plagiarism in schools are needed, particularly studies where pupils are working with English language online sources.

The paper reports on a study in which pupils aged 14-17 in Swedish secondary schools were interviewed about the use of source texts in an English lesson. Their teachers and High School teachers were also interviewed. A phenomenological analysis of the interviews revealed a mismatch between the teachers' instructions, the pupils' understanding of the instructions and the teachers' interpretation of copying behaviour. The pupils' opinions were mostly based on the pedagogical reasons given by their teachers to explain why they should not copy other people's work, rather than on ideas related to the ownership of ideas. The teachers primarily understood the activities in terms of cheating and laziness.

Key Words: plagiarism, adolescent learners, EFL, on-line reading, patch-writing

Resumen

Aunque el plagio tiene una historia mucho más larga, muchos profesores de inglés han observado que la cantidad de plagio ha aumentado ligado al uso de Internet. El artículo comienza con una revisión de la literatura que demuestra que, aunque se ha prestado mucha atención a los estudiantes universitarios en entornos académicos, se ha prestado poca atención al plagio en las escuelas. Otros estudios indican que el plagio es más frecuente cuando las personas escriben en su L2 y cuando trabajan con fuentes en línea. En conjunto, la revisión sugiere que es necesario realizar estudios sobre el plagio en L2 en los centros escolares, en particular estudios en los que los alumnos trabajen con fuentes en línea en lengua inglesa.

El artículo presenta un estudio en el que se entrevistó a alumnos de 14 a 17 años de centros de secundaria suecos sobre el uso de textos fuente en una clase de inglés. También se entrevistó a sus profesores y a profesores de secundaria. Un análisis fenomenológico de las entrevistas reveló un desajuste entre las instrucciones de los profesores, la comprensión de las instrucciones por parte de los alumnos y la interpretación de la conducta de copia por parte de los profesores. Las opiniones de los alumnos se basaban principalmente en las razones pedagógicas dadas por sus profesores para explicar por qué no debían copiar el trabajo de otras personas, más que en ideas relacionadas con la propiedad de las ideas. Los profesores entendían las actividades principalmente en términos de copieteo y pereza.

Palabras clave: plagio, alumnos adolescentes, ILE, lectura en línea, escritura de parche

1. INTRODUCTION

Barack and I were raised with so many of the same values: that you work hard for *what you want in life; that your word is your bond and you do what you say* you're going to do; that *you treat people with* dignity and *respect*, even if you don't know that, and even if you don't agree with them. And Barack and I set out to build lives guided by these values, and to pass them on to the next generation. *Because we want our children* – and all children *in this nation – to know that the only limit to the height of your achievements is* the reach of *your dreams and your willingness to work for them.*

–Michelle Obama, *Address to the Democratic National Convention*, 2008 [emphasis added]

From a young age, my parents impressed on me the values that *you work hard for what you want in life, that your word is your bond and you do what you say* and keep your promise, that *you treat people with respect*. They taught and showed me values and morals in their daily lives. That is a lesson that I continue to pass along to our son.
And we need to *pass them on to the next generations* to follow. *Because we want our children in this nation to know that the only limit to the height of your achievements is the* strength *of your dreams and your willingness to work for them.*

–Melania Trump, *Address to the Republican National Convention*, 2016 [emphasis added]

During the build-up to the election of President Donald Trump in 2016, Melania Trump was accused of plagiarism for her use of Michelle Obama's words in a similar context eight years earlier. As can be seen above, Trump is making the same argument that Obama made in 2008, using similar words and sentence structures. These have been italicised for ease of recognition. The main difference between the two is that Obama focuses on the values she shares with her husband, whereas Trump focuses on values shared between parents and their children. Obama is a talented speaker, whereas Trump a non-native speaker who is heavily reliant on her speechwriters. The outcry vilified Trump for stealing another woman's work, revealing attitudes towards plagiarism that are deeply engrained in the public understanding of the fair use of other people's words but, despite such commonplace disapproval from the peanut gallery, plagiarism remains a widespread problem.

Plagiarism is more commonly thought of in the context of writing rather than speaking. In speech, repetitions of others' words tend to be shorter units, most commonly formulaic chunks such as greetings. Formulaic chunks and plagiarism are far more common when people speak or write in a language that is not their own (Pecorari, 2003; 2014; 2015). But whereas the former is often encouraged (e.g., through class responses to their teacher's greetings) and regarded as a valuable learning strategy, the latter is regarded as being immoral. Language teachers, especially teachers of English, express concern that easy access to texts on the internet and the copy-paste functions have increased the frequency with which pupils present other people's writing as though it were their own (Chen & Chou, 2014). Awareness that L2 writers are more likely to plagiarise reinforces negative cultural stereotypes and

4

promotes deficit thinking (e.g., Liu, 2005) which, as Casey Keck (2014) has noted, contribute to a belittling of L2 learners in a manner that is unlikely to counter unethical source use.

The term 'patchwriting' emerged on the late 1990s to refer to "copying from a source text and then deleting some words, altering grammatical structures, or plugging in one-for-one synonym-substitutes" (Howard, 2003, p. 233). The term deflects the negative associations of 'plagiarism' with its implicit, assumptions of laziness, cheating or, at best, lack of familiarity with referencing systems. The discourse of 'patchwriting' is educationally focussed: 'patchwriters' are assumed to be learning the language of academia through imitation (e.g., Angélil-Carter, 2000). By learning to adopt the discursive style of academics, students gain access to privileged positions. Analogously, by recycling language used by more proficient users and receiving feedback, novice L2 writers can communicate effectively and gain insights into how language is used. In terms of developing original language use, there is little difference between repeating phrases teachers use daily and copy-pasting, although the proportion of reused words to original words may differ. However, the attitudes teachers express and the language they use to describe such activities have consequences on pupils' behaviours. It matters whether these activities are described as 'a creative reuse of chunks of language' or 'cheating'.

In this paper, qualitatively different conceptions concerning the use of material found on the internet in EFL school assignments among three groups: 1) 14-16-year-old Swedish pupils in English classes in a secondary school 2) their teachers at their secondary school and 3) the English teachers in the High School the pupils currently attend. The aim was to explore the different discourses about the recycling of texts, to identify whether these might be contributing to pupils' confusion as to how sources should be used when creating a text in L2 English. The use of texts found on the Internet was chosen because, although patchwriting and plagiarism have existed since writing was developed, the ease with which copy-pasting can take place in digital contexts has led to suggestions that there has been a generation shift in attitudes (e.g., Lau & Yuen, 2014). That is, ideas such as intellectual property may be losing traction as the ideas of sharing and 'prosuming' (producing/consuming) have questioned such individualistic ways of thinking. Moreover, because over 60% of the internet is English, and less than 1% is in Swedish, pupils have a much larger range of sources available to them (w3techs, 2022). Moreover, the topics for written assignments in EFL classrooms are likely to be less familiar than those in L1 educational contexts.

Four sets of data are used to form the discussion:

- Texts submitted as an English assignment by 14-16 year old Swedish pupils. The assignment was based on an Internet search conducted by the pupils, and the sites they visited have been recorded.

- Interviews with the pupils about i) their general understanding of the ownership of ideas and language, and ii) a specific example of recycling in their own work

- Field notes of interviews with the teachers of these pupils (individually and as a pair)

- A recorded group interview with teachers at the High School the pupils would attend after completing secondary school.

5

The study began by comparing the pupils' work with the Internet sources, placing them on a continuum from "almost entirely taken from internet sources" to "no copying". Papers at the extreme ends were selected as case studies, along with two papers in the middle which represent 'patchwriting'. These were used to define three sets of behaviours that could then be compared with the pupils' comments on these behaviours (both in the abstract and in relation to a specific example), their teachers' comments on the pupils' abilities in general and the views of the High School teachers towards such activities.

2. L2 PLAGIARISM IN THE DIGITAL ERA

In 2015, Diane Pecorari provocatively asked whether, after twenty years of research into the plagiarism practices of L2 learners, it was "time to close the case?". She argued that too many studies were simply reiterative, and that future research should be directed in the following four directions:

1. The role of culture.

2. How academic gatekeepers (teachers, editors etc.) respond to plagiarism.

3. Finding ways to teach L2 writers how to use source materials effectively and ethically

4. Determining how the L2 writers' intentions interact with their development as academic writers who can make appropriate use of source text.

Debora Weber-Wulff responded to Pecorari by reasserting that plagiarism is a form of academic dishonesty, not a pedagogical problem: "it is quite irrelevant why they have plagiarized. They have simply submitted the work of others as their own and that is not acceptable" (2015, p.103). Weber-Wulff's argument is concerned with honesty in academia, but her point is also relevant for other contexts. In the age of social media, everyone – not only those who have the opportunity to enter tertiary education – should know how to express their ideas in writing and to engage fairly with the ideas of others. Pecorari's list presupposes that plagiarism is primarily an issue among academics. The learners she – and indeed all the studies she cites – are interested in are students in academic establishments. The vast majority of work on plagiarism, especially L2 plagiarism, has been conducted on undergraduates (e.g. Eret and Ok 2014; Park 2003, Hu & Lei 2015). Moreover, the focus on plagiarism as a problem within academic discourse has meant that attempts to address the problem often focus on matters such as correct citation (e.g. Glassman et al, 2011), and largely ignore the appropriation of ideas and words in other contexts. As Pecorari (2015, pp. 97-8) also points out, plagiarism needs to be addressed in many areas of professional writing including journalism, sales pitches and board meeting reports. The availability of research subjects and the urgency of addressing this topic within tertiary education make these foci unsurprising, but there is a dearth of evidence on the copying practices of secondary school pupils. The few studies that do exist demonstrate that the problem is widespread (e.g. Ma et al 2007; 2008), but do not address the needs of L2 learners. This study is a small step towards redressing that balance. The issue needs to be addressed early: once copy-pasting habits have been formed, they are difficult to unlearn (Doró, 2017). Pamela Jackson (2006) found that even with very focussed training on paraphrase, correct citation and detection practices, college students' plagiarism only decreased by 6%. If college students writing in their L1 struggle with plagiarism, then teenagers writing their assignments in L2 English can be expected to need considerable guidance from their teachers.

Digitalization has increased the ease with which pupils can copy text directly into their own documents and submit it for assessment as though it were their own work which, as Chen and Chou (2014) report, may have changed attitudes toward plagiarism (see also Belcher 2001). Undergraduates and learners in schools have never known a time when information was not freely shared, and this sharing casts the notion of intellectual property in a different light. Support for this suggestion is proffered by Zangenehmadar and Hoon (2017) who found that students were more likely to copy internet-based sources than paper-based sources. The cultural differences that should be examined in relation to plagiarism are not only those between collective and individualist cultures, but also those between generations and between educational settings. Generational differences may well exacerbate miscommunication between scholars, teachers and pupils on the topic of plagiarism. To address all these issues, the fair use of sources needs to be addressed within compulsory education when pupils are first learning to use the internet for locating information. When the pupils are writing in a non-dominant language, the risk of inappropriate reuse of materials is higher, especially if they do not understand what constitutes appropriate use.

Given the widespread use of the Internet as an information source, combined with the prevalence of information in English and the ease with which one can copy and paste from websites, teaching pupils how to use source texts effectively is an area for which teachers of L2 English need to take a great share of the responsibility (see also Belcher 2012). This is especially true in the so-called 'small' language areas where there is less information available in the pupils' L1. Children growing up in Sweden will have heard English on radio and TV all their lives. The pupils interviewed for this study began studying English aged 9-10 and received their first school laptop aged 11-12. They have been using web-based information in English in many of their school subjects from the age of 13 onwards. They have enough experience to make conscious choices, but not necessarily enough skill to be able to recycle the texts they find on the internet without plagiarizing.

The writing task performed by the pupils in this study was to create a synthesis from sources they found themselves. This is such a common task that its ubiquity masks its complexity. Common practices, such as copy-pasting as a way of taking notes, increase the risk of plagiarism, even when "cheating" is not the writer's intention. How teachers to talk to students about source use affects learners' behaviours: the terms "copy-pasting", "plagiarising", and "cheating" can all be used to describe the same actions, but indicate very different attitudes. Ali Abasi and Nabal Akbari (2008) have shown that some instructors inadvertently encourage copying behaviours. This might explain why, when caught by text-matching software or a beady-eyed teacher, pupils often claim that they did not know their actions were unacceptable. This paper takes such claims at face value as the pupils –14-15 year old Swedish learners of English – are only just beginning to learn about the ethical use of others' ideas. Instead of focussing on the mechanics of citation and detailed gradations of similarities between pupils' texts and the source texts, this study investigates the possibility that the language surrounding plagiarism is causing genuine misunderstandings.

3. DISCOURSES OF PLAGIARISM

The term 'discourse' is used to indicate the formation of a shared understanding that individuals indicate through their linguistic choices. As noted in the Introduction, the term 'plagiarism' evokes a very

different set of beliefs from the term 'patch writing'. The former is heavily premised on the notions of intellectual property and the ownership of ideas (Bloch, 2012). Ideas and the words in which they are written are owned by the author, and using them without full and accurate reference is akin to the stealing of material possessions. Even the originator cannot reuse words without accusations of 'self-plagiarism'. Teaching premised on the discourse of plagiarism encourages gatekeeping activities, sanctions and the use of text-matching software to support such activities. The software giant in this field is Turnitin, which recently amalgamated with Urkund. Turnitin runs educational sites to support students as they learn the rules of fair use within the academic community. Here they identify ten forms of language recycling from word for word copying – 'Clone' – to 'Retweet', where the original source is correctly cited but the author is overly dependent on the source's original structure. Direct translation is missing as Turnitin focuses exclusively on English language material. Nuanced taxonomies of copying behaviours, identifying typical linguistic patterns abound in the research literature. For instance, Alzahrani et al (2012) provide an excellent analysis of the various means of matching texts, but treat the swapping of words for synonyms as "intelligent plagiarism" which is hard to detect. In short, the focus remains on detection and punishment rather than on trying to understand developmental trends or the root causes of problems (since laziness or dishonesty are considered the only possible explanations).

In contrast, the term 'patchwriting' acknowledges that the writer's motivations are not to steal ideas or to cheat, but simply a pragmatic solution adopted by novice language users when they are faced with a writing task beyond their skills. This way of describing borrowings from sources situates the activity as a pedagogical opportunity, not a juridical problem, and thus appropriate for describing the actions of young teens learning to use sources. The metaphor underlying 'patchwriting' is patch-working. Patchwriters sew patches of writing taken from the source texts together in order to produce a quilt of writing. This image of quilt captures the balance between the copied text (the patches) and the students' own work (the ordering of the patches and the language that holds them together). It situates the learner as a creative being who lacks the linguistic skills needed to produce an entire text alone, but who nonetheless can produce a text that has value and may even be beautiful. Proponents of 'patch-writing' regard imitation and copying as important transitional strategies that will enable learners to become proficient language users. They suggest that teaching should focus on raising a meta-awareness of the acceptable limits of reuse, as well as encouraging novice writers to notice phrasing and structure they might like to adopt in their own writing. On the surface, this would seem to be an appropriate response to the work of 14-year olds, but currently evidence on how effective this might be is lacking.

The goal of this study was to expose the discourses surrounding the use of source texts in the writing of a summary used by young teenagers who could not be expected to be fully cognizant of citation conventions. Using phenomenographic principles to analyse the interview material from teachers, the pupils and their assignments, the discourses used to describe various kinds of copying behaviour have been examined. Mismatches between discourses and their associated actions reveals how teachers might communicate ideas of fair use more effectively and pedagogically.

4. PARTICIPANTS AND METHODOLOGY

4.1 Informants

Three groups of informants were interviewed: Group 1 comprised of eleven 14-15-year-old Swedish pupils who had been studying English for five years at the time of the study. Their two teachers (Group 2) were not formally interviewed with pre-determined questions, but field notes were kept on their comments directly before and after each data collection session with the pupils. This material is augmented with a group interview with teachers at the High School pupils currently attend using questions known to the teachers in advance (Group 3). The material is not longitudinal, but speaks to the expectations teachers have about their pupils at different stages in their education. The names of all informants have been changed.

4.2 Procedure

Two classes of pupils aged 14-16 in a Swedish comprehensive school were asked to use the Internet to gather information about the indigenous population of a country that is today English speaking. They were asked to provide some background on the group's history and culture, and to comment on the group's status today. The latter required forming an opinion, quite possibly responding to conflicting information. When pupils asked whether they were supposed to write "in our own words"; they were told to "do what you normally do". This task was part of their compulsory EFL education.

Volunteer pupils in each class installed a browser extension which captured all their online behaviours, making it possible to verify their original source texts, which was particularly important for identifying translations. Several essays were too short to produce meaningful analyses of their relationship to the source texts. Consequently, 22 essays were examined for plagiarism initially using the tools a teacher might use: feeding suspiciously well-written phrases into google. All but one of the 22 essays examined contained at least one sentence that could be traced back to a source text using this simple method which was then verified by looking at the pupils' search logs. Thereafter, a more detailed comparison of the pupils' assignments and the source texts followed. Following the work of van Weijen et al (2019), chunks of four or more words and the number of unique sources were considered relevant criteria. None of the pupils used quotation marks to indicate that they had taken the sentence from the web.

Eleven of the 22 pupils agreed to be interviewed alongside their texts 4-8 weeks after they had completed the task. The interviews were semi-structured with each of the main questions available written in both English and Swedish. The pupils could choose which language they wanted to be interviewed in, and they could change or mix during the interview. The interviews were recorded using Quicktime player and the interviews were transcribed for content (mispronunciations and pauses were not transcribed). The pupils' English has not been corrected. Translations from Swedish are presented in English.

The interview began by asking the pupil to reread their essay and answer some general questions about their information search and composition strategies. They were specifically asked "Can you own words?" and whether using someone else's text was "like stealing". To gauge their sense of ownership, they were also asked how they would feel if their essay had been put on the Internet and a pupil in

another class had found it, copied it and handed it in to their teacher. Then they were shown a printed version of one of their source texts which had been identified using google search with the copied section highlighted and asked to compare it with their own essay. The interviews lasted 26-52 minutes each. In between the recording sessions, the pupils' teachers volunteered information about the pupils without being prompted. (They were not told about the specific level of copying used by individual pupils.) They were asked about their attitudes towards patchwriting practices and the kinds of instructions they give their pupils concerning writing based on sources, especially web-based sources. Thereafter, nine teachers at the High school the pupils currently attend were interviewed as a group about their attitudes towards plagiarism and their teaching related to the recycling of words using a series of questions that they had seen prior to the interview. Thus the interviews with the pupils and High School teachers were highly structured with written questions made available to them, whereas the field notes on the pupils' teachers' are mostly based on conversations held whilst walking to and from the classrooms.

Although the questions asked of the pupils and High School teachers were predetermined, the analyses of their responses were not. The transcripts were analysed phenomenographically. Phenomenography, as Malcolm Tight (2016) has observed, is "arguably the only research design (so far) to have been developed substantially within higher education research by higher education researchers" (2016, p. 319). It rejects the idea that knowledge can exist independently of the knower, and acknowledges that individuals may have contradictory beliefs (such as their belief about the fair use of internet sources and their own behaviour when creating a synthesis). Instead, knowledge is regarded as being a result of the knower's perception of the phenomenon, in this case, their understanding of how source texts should be used when writing a synthesis. Moreover, phenomenology allows for the existence of contradictory beliefs without judgment. The data for such research typically takes the form of interviews with a small number of informants, but can also include reflective writing or a combination of both. The data is coded, and in educational contexts the coding tends to focus on "what" (the phenomenon itself, in this case the reuse of the source text) and the "how" (the process of learning, in this case the thinking behind the reuse) (Bowden, 2000).

By reading and rereading the transcripts, a coding system was primarily developed *in situ* allowing the data to define the categories rather than imposing pre-existing categories on the pupils' and teachers' discussion. In the phenomenographical tradition, it is customary to claim that the categories are not pre-determined, but this claim is disingenuous. Researchers come to their material with a knowledge of previous research in the area and this has undoubtedly affected perceptions. In this study, the questions forced the participants to engage with pre-determined ideas of plagiarism (e.g., as a form of theft) and to express an opinion about it. The analysis presented below is informed by concerns as to whether pupils and teachers have a shared sense of what language knowledge is, and how patchwriting and other forms of language recycling fit into this. Other concerns included a desire to understand how teachers and pupils verbalised the activities of good source use, and how teachers responded to such behaviours. Concerns that arose *in situ* are included evaluation. This was not a concern at the outset of the enquiry, but teachers expressed concern in a way that gave rise to further questions concerning the way in which teachers detect and respond to recycling behaviours. Other issues that arose *in situ* resulting in supplementary questions included the construction of pupil identity (how teachers and pupils labelled

10

people who engaged with particular behaviours) and whether oral language performance indicates anything about pupils' capacity to use language in other ways. By adopting a phenomenographically oriented approach, this study endeavours to reveal how Swedish teenagers and their teachers understand the recycling of ideas and words from the Internet and presupposes that their actions are a result of this understanding.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study focussed on understandings that teachers and pupils hold about copying practices, assuming that this will have a greater impact on their teaching. Nevertheless, both pupils' and teachers' beliefs can be connected to writing practices. Exhaustive taxonomies of connections between source texts and novice writers' texts exist (e.g., Alzahrani, Salim, & Abraham, 2012), but have little relevance in the daily lives of school teachers focussed on the task of teaching teenagers to write in English. Moreover, as Pecorari & Shaw (2012) have shown, teachers' understandings of the nature of intertextual references vary considerably, and Shi (2012) detects that these differences may be genre and content specific. The texts the pupils produced ranged between 195 and 574 words. Quite simply, the material is simply not sufficiently developed for such analyses. Using the simple criteria developed by van Weijen et al (2019) (chunks of 4+ words and the number of unique sources), clusters of copying behaviour that could be roughly placed along a continuum: 1) plagiarism 2) patchwriting and 3) writing "in my own words" were identified. Writing assignments submitted by four pupils are used to illustrate each cluster below alongside the pupils' comments on their own work, and the views of other pupils about those practices, the views of their teachers at the time and the teachers in the High School they currently attend.

5.1 Plagiarism

The most extreme form of copying came in Maria's text, as the excerpts in Table 1: Extreme Plagiarism below show. Her text comprised of 24 sentences, 20 of which were taken from a single source text. Three are copied verbatim and the remaining 17 include very minor changes (e.g., "The Maori were the first people <u>to live</u> on the islands of New Zealand" becomes "The Maori <u>where</u> the first people <u>who live</u> on the islands of New Zealand" in Maria's text).

Table 1: Extreme Plagiarism

Original Text	Pupil Text
The Maori were the first people to live on the islands of New Zealand. They arrived on the islands about 1,200 years ago. Their name means "ordinary people". The earliest Maori are sometimes called the Moa Hunters. Their main source of food was the moa, a huge flightless bird that is now extinct. After the moas were gone, the Maori ate smaller birds. They also caught fish and grew crops for food. The Maori were skilled artists. They carved wooden war canoes big enough to hold 100 people. They also excelled in weaving. According to Maori history, the Maori sailed to New Zealand from a tropical island called Hawaiki. This history says that a "great fleet" of canoes arrived in New	The Maori where the first people who live on the islands of New Zealand. They arrived about 1200 years ago. Their name means "ordinary people" but the word Maori can be used in many sentences. For example "wai maori" which means water. The earliest Maori people can sometimes be called Moa hunters. That is because the main food they ate was the moa, a huge flightless bird that is now extinct. When the moa disappeared, the Maori started to eat smaller birds and started to catch fish instead. The Maori were excellent artists. They carved wooden war canoes big enough to hold 100 people.

Zealand in the 1300s. But experts believe the Maori reached the islands earlier, by 800. (https://kids.britannica.com/kids/article/Maori/353424)	According to the history, the Maori sailed to New Zealand from a tropical island called Hawaiki. The history says that a "great fleet" of boats arrived in New Zealand in the 1300s. But certain experts believe they arrived much earlier, to be exact, by 800.

In the discussion of the process of writing, Maria explained that she worked with a friend and that "I just searched "Maori" and loads of facts came up and so we took that and printed out some" [my translation]. Her decision to work from print-outs meant that she could not literally copy-paste text into her own document, an activity she dismissed as "taking 3 minutes max" and thus not "work" [my translation]. When asked how she worked with the sources, she described the process of looking up synonyms and changing words and confirmed that this was sufficient to make the text her own. This may explain why, after seeing the original and comparing it with her own text, she acknowledged "In fact the texts are very similar" [my translation]. Despite her acknowledgment that the texts were very similar, Maria insisted that she had written the text herself, and in the literal sense, this is true as she worked from a printed version. The interviewer explained that the browser extension revealed that she had printed the text and that she must have copied as the texts could not be so similar by accident. She insisted she had not copied because "I know it took a long time to write everything" [my translation] which, given that she could not copy-paste from paper was probably true. Before being asked about the specifics of her own text, Maria explained that "you can't just write up the text … It's a lot about what you can do yourself so that the text comes out personally" [my translation]. She returned to this idea when looking at the two texts, explaining that she had put in her own ideas. When asked to show where she had included an idea, she used the change from "skilled artists" to "excellent artists" as her example. Maria's teacher considered Maria to be one of the best pupils in the class, and she expressed surprise that Maria had chosen to be interviewed in Swedish rather than English as she was "very fluent".

Other pupils who had not copied nearly as extensively expressed similar views to Maria, often framed their explanations as a way of helping the reader. For instance, Katy explained that texts on the internet are "so complicated it is just (makes a noise to indicate that it is just 'noise' not words that she sees) so that one doesn't know what the text is about because it is so complicated" [my translation]. As a result, she tries to produce "a simpler text, one perhaps, simplifies the words, so it will be easier for others to read" [my translation]. By way of example, she states that "there might be a really difficult word, for example a word that comes from Greek, and one can change it for a word that people actually understand" [my translation]. When examining examples from her own text, she commented that "You see I've changed these words so that it's easier for myself, for me to understand what I have written" [my translation]. This activity was regarded as hard work by many of the pupils, and sufficient for them to regard the text as being in their "own words". Alternatively, the pupils worked hard to understand the words in the source text, and considered this sufficient grounds. Johanna, for instance, recalled the difficulty she had finding out what the word 'engulf' meant. She had asked her teacher and looked up the word, and then she felt that she had done the hard work of learning the word, so it was now her own word and she could use it. From an EFL education perspective, this seems reasonable. Note, however, that teachers cannot distinguish this language learning activity from copying when they are marking a

school assignment. As a result, teacher feedback may not match with pupils' understandings, thereby causing miscommunication about plagiarism.

This idea that the process of learning what the source text means is the main goal of the exercise is a reasonable response to being taught via reading comprehension tasks. Katy and Johanna undertook the task of rewriting the source texts far more extensively than Maria, but their texts also contained sentences with the kinds of minor alterations that characterised the bulk of Maria's text. The pupils genuinely interpreted the instruction to "write in your own words" to mean "write a text you can understand", although neither the pupils' own teachers, nor the High School teachers intended pupils to respond in this way. On the contrary, they understood activities like replacing words with synonyms as ways to avoid having their deception discovered by the software programme, Urkund. They used expressions such as "fool[ing] the system" (Eva) and collectively named a variety of ways in which their pupils sought to "hide" the kinds of rewriting Maria, Katy and Johanna characterised as "hard work". Nevertheless, the High School teachers only asked pupils to revise the text or submit a completely new text if more than half the total text came from sources with such minor changes. How they detected copying is discussed in relation to the patchwriting.

5.2 Patch-writing

Most pupils produced texts that incorporated several sentences taken directly from the source text or with minor alterations. Typically, the ideas in each paragraph in the pupils' assignments were drawn from a single source and were a mixture of revised sentences from the source text and sentences that were original. As such, they were more dependent on the source texts than is usually meant in research on patchwriting. In Table 2: Patchwriting Examples, Anna's text is used to illustrate this way of creating assignments. Anna's assignment was 299 words long and included four illustrations. Every sentence could be traced to one of three pages with only the minimal kinds of changes seen in the examples below. In terms of copying, her text is very similar to Maria's, but differs in that she has used more than one original source. Please note in the example below that both the Cloudflare text and the Wikipedia page contain the identical phrase "complex geometric tattooing, covering the whole bodies of both men and women". The ubiquity of copying in the internet sources the pupils read may well have encouraged them to think that this is acceptable.

The other example selected to illustrate patchwriting in Table 2 is somewhat more sophisticated. Aya took sentences both with and without alterations and inserted them into her assignment, but shifted between the source texts so that the idea of sewing together pre-existing 'patches' of language to form a new, original pattern is an appropriate metaphor for describing the final product. Aya's assignment was 279 words long and contained two images. Like Anna, she shifted between source texts, but there appears to be slightly more attention to making the units cohere. For instance, the use of the continuous present in the introductory clauses "Moving throughout their country" and "Living primarily along the foreshores of the harbour" appear to confuse her, as she endeavours to place a subject ("They") prior to the verb. The units of borrowed text were also shorter than Anna's. As the example shows, she takes about a sentence at a time from her sources.

Table 2: Patchwriting Examples

Original Text	Pupil Text
Anna	
Text 1: Native Marquesan culture was devastated in the period following the arrival of European explorers. While the decline in Marquesan culture can in large part be attributed to the activities of the Christian missionaries, the primary cause of its collapse can be directly linked to the catastrophic effects of alien diseases, especially smallpox, which reduced the population by an estimated 98%. The Marquesas have a long history of complex geometric tattooing, covering the whole bodies of both men and women. Cloudflare: Culture of the Marquesas Islands Text 2: In the Marquesan culture there is a complex geometric tattooing, covering the whole bodies of both men and women. Today, Marquesan culture is a mélange created by the layering of the ancient Marquesan culture, with strong influences from the important Tahitian culture and the politically important French culture. Wikipedia.org: Culture of the Marquesas Islands	Native Marquesan culture was devastated of the following the arrival of European explorers. While the decline in Marquesan culture can in large part be assigned to the activities of the Christian missionaries, the primary cause of its collapse can be directly linked to the catastrophic effects of diseases, especially smallpox, which reduced the population by an estimated 98%. In the Marquesan culture there is a complex geometric tattooing, covering the whole bodies of both men and women. Today, Marquesan culture is a mélange created by the layering of the ancient Marquesan culture, with strong influences from the important Tahitian culture and the politically important French culture.
Aya	
Text 1: Living primarily along the foreshores of the harbour, they fished and hunted in the waters and hinterlands of the area, and harvested food from the surrounding bush. … Moving throughout their country in accordance with the seasons, people only needed to spend about 4-5 hours per day working to ensure their survival. With such a large amount of leisure time available, they developed a rich and complex ritual life – language, customs, spirituality and the law – the heart of which was connection to the land. https://www.aboriginalheritage.org/history/history/ Text 2: Australian Aboriginal culture can claim to be the oldest continuous living culture on the planet. … Traditional Australian Aborigines lived a nomadic life, following the seasons and the food. … When at rest, Aborigines lived in open camps, caves or simple structures made from bark, leaves or other vegetation. Their technology was both simple and sophisticated. https://www.didjshop.com/shop1/AbCulturecart.html	Aboriginal culture can claim to be the oldest continuous living culture on the planet. … They living primarily along the foreshores of the harbor in the southern and eastern, they lived in open camps, caves or simple structures made from bark. Their technology was both simple and sophisticated, they fished and hunted in the waters and hinterlands of the area, and harvested food from the surrounding bush. They want about 4-5 hour working time per day. They was connection to the land. Traditional Australian Aborigines lived a nomadic life, following the seasons and the food

Neither Anna nor Aya spoke Swedish at home. Anna moved to Sweden as a young child, and learned Swedish in day-care. Aya was still officially registered as a "newly arrived" child – an official designation in Sweden which means that the pupil has lived in the country less than 4 years and has the right to language support. Anna wanted to be interviewed in English, and she managed the entire 48-minute interview without any obvious signs of difficulty. She managed to convey fairly sophisticated ideas, and had numerous strategies for dealing with problems such as not knowing specialist vocabulary

14

(e.g. miming, asking for a translation, paraphrasing), and simply using the Swedish word. When the interviewer praised her communication skills to her teacher, the teacher's response was that "Yes, she always has a lot to say for herself. Very chatty". She then paused and commented that she believed that much of the text was plagiarized. (The agreement with both pupils and teachers was that individual pupils' copying behaviour would not be revealed.) Anna did not use her home languages in her searches and stated that she cannot read one of them (which uses a Cyrillic script). She preferred to search in English and then use Google translate to turn them into Swedish if she needed to check what the text meant. She freely acknowledged that she copy-pasted sections into her text, and justified this on pedagogical grounds: "If I feel most of it confident that I can explain it I keep it in the text. Sometimes I don't, I can't really explain it at the moment or not as good as other words would. If I think I can explain it a little bit then I can keep it because, if I understand it, I hope like someone else can understand it like, like if my teacher comes ask me what you mean about this then I say". She gave no indication her behaviour might be problematic: her explanation indicated that she believed she was completing the task as intended.

Aya chose to be interviewed in Swedish, and she struggled to express herself. She used her hands to convey ideas, and used eye-contact and intonation as techniques to ask the interviewer to fill in the gaps. When asked about her searching and writing strategies, she said that she began her search in Arabic, and that the results produced texts with many similar ideas. Then she searched in English and used Google translate to check that she had understood. She summed up her writing process by saying "There are many texts that say the same, say the same things. So I just" (flares her fingers followed by pinching movements) [my translation]. Her gestures were interpreted as meaning that she selects the small pieces from the texts she wishes to use, which accurately describes how her assignment was formed. When she was asked to compare her text with the source texts with the identical sections highlighted, like Maria she continued to claim that the material was her own because she had worked hard, looking at many sources and had checked the meanings of the words she did not know.

Aya had indeed put in a great deal of effort. Both her texts required K4 to reach the 95% vocabulary level. She described the process of working with the texts in terms of making it easier for the reader. When the interviewer pointed out that both she and Aya's teacher can read very difficult texts, Aya laughed and then retracted her statement and explained that the changes were intended to show her teacher that she had understood what she had read. When talking about copying practices in the abstract, however, she stated that "the whole text has to be written in your own words", but acknowledged that "There are some words that you cannot change to another word" [my translation]. When asked what she thought about taking an entire text from the internet, she shook her head vigorously and stated that "I don't like that, it's not good" [my translation]. When asked to expand, she returned to pedagogical principles: "So that one can understand, you know when you copy something you don't understand anything. So the first thing is to understand, and change some words so you can understand" [my translation].

The data is limited, but it does not seem to be a coincidence that the two pupils whose work showed the most evidence of patchworking strategies were also children who have had to manage in a second language from an early age. Patchwriting of the type that Anna produced (i.e. longer stretches of one text after another) were also submitted by pupils from monolingual Swedish homes (e.g. Katy, Johanna

and Vanessa), but these texts included more obvious attempts to alter the texts, and there were whole sentences that were completely original. Aya was struggling with both the language of instruction and the task of learning English, and yet her text showed the most sophisticated switching between different texts in the entire 22 assignment corpus. She had genuinely created her own pattern from the existing blocks of language, demonstrating good reception skills and also an understanding of what the task of creating a text entails. Nevertheless, the teacher considered Aya to be one of the weakest pupils in the class. Anna was considered more advanced but still not a strong pupil and Maria, who had used the least sophisticated writing strategies, was considered to be one of the best pupils.

Teachers' opinions of their pupils matter greatly in the context of detecting and responding to copying. When the pupils' teachers were asked what they do to address plagiarism, their replies expressed concerns about their own ability to teach source criticism (rather than source use), one stating that "we need to get better at teaching this". When the question was rephrased "When you tell the pupils to write in their own words, what is the reason you give?", both replied with pedagogical explanations to the effect that the pupils will not learn anything if they just copy. One added that she explains that when she is assessing the text, she will not really be assessing the pupils, but rather someone else who has posted their material on the net. Neither had used plagiarism detection software. Neither the pupils nor the teachers referred to any incident when a pupil had been caught plagiarizing and how it had been dealt with in class.

The high school teachers acknowledged that detecting plagiarism was hard work, even with additional tools such as Urkund, and that discrepancies between the pupils' language skills and the language of the assignment alerted them to check. As Elin explained

> I think that you have some kind of a feeling for where your students are at when it comes to like proficiency and for me it's quite clearer if a lower proficiency user writes a text that I know that he or she couldn't produce on her own. And, if they're, it depends on how much it is of course but if if a higher level student like uses a phrase, I'm fine with that but not a full paragraph of course or sentences.

When pushed as to whether this meant it was easier for high ability pupils to get away with plagiarism, Elin disagreed, stating that teachers know which pupils they can "trust", a point on which Eva agreed and several other teachers nodded.

When copying was discovered, the High School teachers all dealt with the issue 1:1 with the pupil concerned. Tactics ranged from asking pupils to rewrite a few sentences identified by text-matching software to "punishing" the pupils by setting a new assignment for those who had copied 50% or more. Prior to their involvement in the research project, the teachers had not systematically instructed pupils on *how* pupils should write in their own words. And since feedback on inappropriate use of source texts was considered a form of discipline, it was happening in situations when the teacher and pupil were alone. As a result, the majority of pupils receive neither specific instructions on ethical source use nor specific sanctions.

Problems may arise if multilingual children like Anna and Aya are not be "trusted" as much as pupils from monolingual environments. Maria was considered to be a good pupil. Her teacher wrote

"Well done. Good work!" on the assignment, which implies that the extent of the copying behaviour was not checked. Whereas the teacher of Anna and Aya, who reworked the sources texts more extensively was somewhat dismissive of Anna's "chatty" skills. (This teacher did not write comments on the assignments.) Teachers' attitudes towards their pupils may result in decidedly different kinds of feedback. As Pecorari explains, when teachers fail to notice problematic source-use, they will not provide the specific feedback needed to address the issue: "lack of criticism … can be interpreted by students as an endorsement of their source use strategies (2008, p. 95). A further problem with this approach, as Keck points out, is "what is most noticeable is often not what is most typical" (2014, p. 19). Unintentionally, teachers may well be giving pupils from privileged backgrounds more encouragement for unethical source use, whilst lower ability children and children from multilingual homes meet sanctions. At present, no studies have clarified which is more likely to result in more ethical source use in the long term.

5.3 Writing entirely in one's own words

Only one pupil – Jenny – submitted a text which was impossible to connect to the source texts without using the data gleaned from the extension browser. Somewhat curiously, Jenny was also the only interviewed pupil who could not explain why she should not copy: "I don't really know why. I've mostly heard it here in school, but only that it's not allowed" [my translation]. Jenny was a very methodical writer with clear planning strategies including printing out her text and cutting the paper to separate the ideas so that she could reorganize them into meaningful units. She used coloured pencils and mind maps to help structure her thinking. However, Jenny was not particularly strong at English: she scored 6300 words on the vocabulary size test, which was below the class average of 7380 words. Every sentence in her 19 sentence text contains a significant grammatical error in addition to numerous spelling errors. Jenny was keen to learn and willing to work hard, which may explain why she did not copy the source texts, even though it might have served her better to do so (for instance, her spelling would have been better if she had copied directly). However, she did engage in a form of copying that has not been examined in relation to plagiarism: translation. This can be seen in Table 3: Translation as patchwriting below.

Table 3: Translation as patchwriting

Original Text	Pupil Text
Jenny	
"Indianer" är en term som uppstod ur Christofer Columbus missuppfattning då han nådde de karibiska öarna 1492 och trodde att han hade nått Ostindien. Han kallade därför invånarna *indios*, spanska för "indier". (Wikipedia.se 'Indianer') Translation: "Indians" is a term that stems from Christopher Columbus's miscomprehension when he arrived in the Caribbean islands in 1492 and believed he reached the East Indies. For this reason, he called the native inhabitants *indios*, Spanish for 'Indians'.	Bering land bridge was a bridge made out of ice between Asia and North America ca 1000 years ago. The people ho lived there walk ower the bridge to get food and to hunt, and some of the people stayd there. Groups were formed and became indigenus. One of the groups were the Indians. Way we cal them Indians are because of Columbus. 1491 Columbus should go with a bout to Indian frome Spain but came rong and got to America. Columbus thort he was in indian and cald the people there for indians.

Jenny sought information in both Swedish and English, using google translate frequently to check her understanding of the English texts. All her source texts have a vocabulary load of 95% at the K3 frequency band, so should have been comprehensible for someone with her vocabulary size. She did not copy anything directly from the English sites she visited, and her use of direct translation is the only time it is possible to identify a specific sentence from the source texts. Plurilingualism has received scant attention in studies on Internet use, despite its ubiquity. Unlike the term 'multilingualism' (which indicates the coexistence of different languages, plurilingualism is based on the assumption that the languages are *not* kept separate). As a term, it acknowledges the reality of code-switching and language play as speakers of multiple languages allow their languages to intertwine (Coste, More and Zarate, 2009). People like Jenny may not be particularly proficient in their later learned languages, but they can use them when navigating the web.

Another pupil in the same class, Katy, explained that she specifically chose to conduct her searches in Swedish so that it would be easier to write in her own words: "I searched a lot in Swedish, because I think it's hard work, I think it is easier to look things up in Swedish and then translate it into English". When asked whether direct translation was okay, she responded "No, it's still in principle the same thing" [my translation]. Her classmate, Helen, also worked very methodically, writing down the facts that she found by hand and checking whether she found the same information on another website to check for accuracy. Although it was possible to identify phrases of 4+ words taken from her sources, they were rather generic phrases such as "the proportion of the Australian population who identify as Aboriginal". She also commented on translation as an unacceptable form of copying:

> Helen: "I think that has been copyright. So, so but uh it's easy to do the mistakes."
> Lydia: So is this a mistake?
> Helen: "I haven't just do this from Swedish to English (uses hands to indicate copying) I have write from my own head and it hasn't been a mistake but it's I didn't think it was the same"
> Lydia: Would translating a paragraph be OK?
> Helen: "I don't think it's OK then. You have trained on English and so, but you haven't trained, training on this, things that you are taking into your assignment".

Translation is, in a literal sense, one's own words. Jenny's, Katy's and Helen's writing based on Swedish sources seems to be sufficiently well reworked that they should not be labelled 'plagiarism'. Nevertheless, the ubiquitous use of Google translate was an issue that both the pupils' teachers and the High school teachers commented on. Ingalill summed up the main point: "They can use Google translate also to take a source. Because Google translate works also works really well nowadays. The they will take the source and just run it through Google translate". However, the pupils in this study neither used this option nor did they directly translate longer sections.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS: MISMATCHED DISCOURSES

The main reason for not copying texts from the Internet expressed by both the teachers and the pupils is captured by Edward White: "Plagiarism is outrageous, because it undermines the whole purpose of education itself: Instead of becoming more of an individual thinker, the plagiarist denies … the possibility of learning" (1993, p. 44). White's idea of learning as an individualistic activity is at odds with the socio-constructive view of education associated with Vygotsky and enshrined in the legally

binding steering documents governing Swedish schools. From the outset, research on plagiarism has suggested that culture may play a role in determining acceptable limits for recycling previously published material (e.g. Kayaoğlu et al, 2015), and this topic remains on Pecorari's list of directions for future research. However, as Betty Leask (2006) points out, this line of approach simply reinforces stereotyping and deficit thinking. Keck's more nuanced approach is to reject the L1-L2 dichotomy for describing differences in the reuse of sources, and instead examine the precise strategies of recycling to identify developmental growth for all writers. This study does not allow for large scale generalization, but does seem to indicate that EFL teachers need more research-based advice on how to address this matter when teaching pupils to write from Internet sources. Both Leask and Keck acknowledge the importance of the way teachers and learners talk about plagiarism in addressing the issue. The way in which teachers talk to pupils about the use of source texts and the way in which pupils understand these explanations need to align for progress to take place. Unfortunately, the teachers' pedagogical explanations were interpreted by the pupils in ways that were not intended. However, the teachers felt that pupils were more likely to misuse source texts when searching online.

The pupils' essays contained a great deal material which was taken directly from the sources, however their explanations as to why this was acceptable were closely aligned with the pedagogical explanations offered by their teachers as to why they should not copy. Many of the pupils genuinely believed that if they worked hard to understand the source text, they could use it verbatim in their own work. Altering the text – such as finding a synonym – was not an attempt to deceive, but rather a way to demonstrate their own understanding of the source text and to make it comprehensible to others. In contrast, the High School teachers understood such practices as deceitful, intended to enable the pupil to avoid detection, yet they designed tasks (such as rewriting a poem in prose) that were supposed to reveal how well their pupils understood the content of the texts they read. In short, the way in which teachers talk about copying behaviours with pupils causes confusion (see also Bellipanni, 2012).

These confusions are further compounded by the way in which copying behaviours are dealt with *post factum*. None of the copying in the pupils' texts was dealt with by their own teachers, and the pupil who copied the most extensively was considered to be an excellent pupil. The High School teachers were more likely to check assignments for unethical source use, but when it was detected it they dealt with it 1:1. Although they described such conversations as a matter of ensuring that the pupils were only assessed on their own work, the consistent decision to hold such conversations in private indicates that they consider the primary function of the conversation to be disciplinary. What is needed, as Tracey Bretag (2013) explains, is to address the issue on multiple fronts from an early stage. Bellipanni's (2012) study indicates that the discourse teachers use when teaching source use have a direct impact on the quantity of material plagiarised, but the study lacks nuance in its definition of plagiarism. What is needed next are intervention studies that examine how subtle difference in the discourses surrounding copying behaviours, especially in instructions given by teachers, so that pupils' and teachers' conceptions of fair source use align.

Acknowledgements

REFERENCES

Abasi, A. R., Akbari, N., & Graves, B. (2006). Discourse appropriation, construction of identities, and the complex issue of plagiarism: ESL students writing in graduate school. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *15*(2), 102-117.

Alzahrani, S. M., Salim, N. & Abraham, A. (2012). Understanding plagiarism linguistic patterns, textual features, and detection methods. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics 42*(2), 133-149.

Angélil-Carter, S. (2000). *Stolen language? Plagiarism in writing.* Harlow: Longman.

Belcher, D. (2001). Cyberdiscourse, evolving notions of authorship, and the teaching of writing. In M. Hewings (Ed.), *Academic writing in context: Implications and applications* (pp. 140–149). Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press.

Belcher, D. (2012). Considering what we know and need to know about second language writing. *Applied Linguistics Review, 3*(1), 131–150.

Bellipanni, M. (2012). *The relationship between teacher classroom practices and 21 st century students' academic dishonesty at the secondary level*. The University of Southern Mississippi. Retrieved from: https://aquila.usm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1436&context=dissertations [Last accessed 7/10/2022].

Bloch, J. (2012). *Plagiarism, intellectual property and the teaching of L2 composition*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Bowden, J. (2000). The nature of phenomenographic research. In J. Bowden & E. Walsh (Eds.), *Phenomenography* (pp. 1–18). Melbourne: RMIT University Press

Bretag, T. (2013). Challenges in addressing plagiarism in education. *PLoS medicine, 10*(12) doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001574

Chen, Y., & Chou, C. (2017) Are we on the same page? College students' and faculty's perception of student plagiarism in Taiwan. *Ethics & Behavior, 27*(1), 53-73.

Coste, D., Moore, D., & Zarate, G. (2009). Plurilingual and pluricultural competence. *Strasbourg: Council of Europe*.

Doró, K. (2017) From Phrase to Discourse Level Patchwriting: Is it Possible to Unlearn?. *Alkalmazott Nyelvtudomany*, *17*. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.18460/ANY.2017.1.004

Eret, E., & Ok, A. (2014). Internet plagiarism in higher education: tendencies, triggering factors and reasons among teacher candidates. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *39*(8), 1002-1016.

Glassman, N. R., Sorensen, K., Habousha, R. G., Minuti, A., & Schwartz, R. (2011). The plagiarism project. *Medical Reference Services Quarterly*, *30*(4), 337-348.

Howard, R. M. (2003). WPAs and/versus administrators: Using multimedia rhetoric to promote shared premises for writing instruction. WPA: Writing Program Administration (Fall/Winter 2003): 9-22. Retrieved from: http://surface.syr.edu/wp/2/ [Last accessed 07/10/2022]

Hu, G., & Lei, J. (2015). Chinese university students' perceptions of plagiarism. *Ethics & Behavior, 25*(3), 233–255.

Jackson, P. A. (2006). Plagiarism instruction online: Assessing undergraduate students' ability to avoid plagiarism. *College & Research Libraries*, *67*(5), 418–428.

Kayaoğlu, M. N., Erbay, Ş., Flitner, C., & Saltaş, D. (2016). Examining students' perceptions of plagiarism: a cross-cultural study at tertiary level. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *40*(5), 682-705.

Keck, C. (2014). Copying, paraphrasing, and academic writing development: A re-examination of L1 and L2 summarization practices. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *25*, 4-22.

Lau, W., & Yuen, A. (2014). Internet ethics of adolescents: Understanding demographic differences. *Computers & Education, 72*, 378-385.

Leask, B. (2006) Plagiarism, cultural diversity and metaphor—implications for academic staff development. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 31*(2), 183-199, doi: 10.1080/02602930500262486

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

Ma, H. J., Wan, G., & Lu, E. Y. (2008). Digital cheating and plagiarism in schools. *Theory Into Practice*, *47*(3), 197-203.

Ma, H., Lu, E. Y., Turner, S., & Wan, G. (2007). An empirical investigation of digital cheating and plagiarism among middle school students. *American Secondary Education*, 69-82.

Park, C. (2003). In other (people's) words: Plagiarism by university students—Literature and lessons. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 28*(5), 471–488.

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

Pecorari, D. (2008). *Academic writing and plagiarism: A linguistic analysis*. London: Continuum.

Pecorari, D., & Shaw, P. (2012). Types of student intertextuality and faculty attitudes. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*, 149–164.

Pecorari, D., (2015). Plagiarism in second language writing: Is it time to close the case?. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *30*, 94-99.

Shi, L. (2012). Rewriting and paraphrasing source texts in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*, 134–148.

Tight, M. (2016) Phenomenography: The development and application of an innovative research design in higher education research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 19(3), 319-338.

Turnitin. (2018) Retrieved from: http://turnitin.com/assets/en_us/media/plagiarism-spectrum/ [Last accessed 07/03/2018].

van Weijen, D., Rijlaarsdam, G., & van den Bergh, H. (2019). Source use and argumentation behavior in L1 and L2 writing: a within-writer comparison. *Reading and writing*, *32*(6), 1635-1655.

W3techs (2022) Usage statistics of content languages for websites. Retrieved from: https://w3techs.com/technologies/overview/content_language [Last accessed 08/09/2022].

Weber-Wulff, D. (2015). Response to Diane Pecorari's "Plagiarism in second language writing: Is it time to close the case?" *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *30*, 103-104.

White, E. M. 1993. Too many campuses ignore student plagiarism. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 39 Rerieved from: https://www.chronicle.com/article/Too-Many-Campuses-Ignore/73921 [Last accessed 08/03/2018].

Zangenehmadar, S., & Hoon T.B. (2017) ESL Undergraduates' Patterns of Plagiarism in Academic Essays Based on Print or Internet Sources. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, *25*(1), 205-220.