"*Everything* is Plagiarism": An Exploration of Novice Writers' Perceptions of Plagiarism in the University Context

by Stephanie Katherine Diane Crook

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of

The University of Manitoba

In partial fulfillment of the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

Department of Educational Administration, Foundations and Psychology

Faculty of Education

University of Manitoba

Winnipeg

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the following research question: how do novice writers understand and experience the phenomenon of plagiarism? Novice writers were defined as those who are new to writing within the university context. The study employed a parallel mixed-methods design, enabling an analysis of quantitative questionnaires as well as of semi-structured interviews. A total of 350 novice writers participated in the questionnaire, and three novice writers were interviewed. The results indicated that there is a dissonance between: (1) novice writers' certainty in recognizing plagiarism in the abstract; and, (2) the persistent hesitation present in their explorations of the concept. In short, the findings indicate that novice writers believe that they can define plagiarism in spite of the fact that they are unsure of how to proceduralize it. Implications of this study for policy and pedagogy are explored, as well as are suggestions for future research.

Keywords: Plagiarism; Academic integrity; Writing instruction; Novice writers; First-year pedagogy; Discipline policy

Acknowledgements

I could not have completed this thesis without the members of my committee. They are brilliant scholars and wise mentors. If not for Dr. Renaud's continual reminders to balance writing with other personally fulfilling activities, my writing process might have devolved into an endless cycle of perfectionistic editing. He taught me to be patient with ideas and to let them evolve over time. Dr. Cranston challenged me to enter scholarly conversations with measured confidence and not to fear admitting the limits of my knowledge. If not for Dr. O'Brien Moran's reminders to find value in each small accomplishment, I might not have tapped into the endurance required to carry out this work. Also, his call to challenge every written word for meaning will stick with me for as long as I am a writer. I will carry the influence of all three of these scholars with me into my academic career, and for that, I am very grateful.

I want to thank my mother, Kathy, my father, Ron, and my sister, Amy, for enduring the effects of my impostor syndrome and for ceaselessly listening to me explain esoteric concepts in attempts to understand them myself. I would not have been able to complete this work without their encouragement and love.

I am also grateful for the many hours that I spent working alongside friends and colleagues on completely unrelated projects. We were a rag-tag team. Enduring memories of my time in the Master's program will centre upon chats over tea, which were sometimes interrupted by trouble-making cats pawing at the pages of our drafts.

Finally, I wish to thank the instructors who allowed their students to participate in this study, and I wish to thank the novice writer participants. From you, I have learned so much.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my wonderful mother, Kathy, who passed away during the final stage of my program. I feel her absence every day. She was my cheerleader through everything. I told her, in one of our final conversations, that I would dedicate this work to her. That promise brought me through the very tough days, when nothing in the world seemed important to do in light of losing her. I know she'd be proud of my work, but I still wish I could see her beaming face. Since I can't, I'll do my best to imagine.

Table of Contents

Abstract ..... **ii**

Acknowledgments ..... **iii**

Dedication ..... **iv**

List of Tables ..... **ix**

Chapter One: Introduction **1**

Defining Plagiarism 1

Problematic Representations of Plagiarism 3

Plagiarism as crime 3

Plagiarism as transgression 4

The Nature of Intertextuality and the Development of Authorial Voice 6

A Summary of the Problem 7

The Existing Response to the Problem 8

The Proposed Response to the Problem 9

The Theoretical Framework for the Study 10

The Purpose of and Context for the Study 10

The Scope of and Generalizability of the Study 11

Chapter Two: Literature Review **12**

Introduction 12

The Problematic Treatment of Plagiarism as Transgression 12

Intellectual Property, Copyright, Moral Rights, and Plagiarism 13

Plagiarism as a Continuum 17

Learning to Write in Various Disciplines 19
Learning to Cite in Various Disciplines 22
Summary of the Demands of Discipline-Specific Writing and Citation 24
Cognitive Process Theory of Writing 25
Working Memory, Written Composition, and Secondary Source Use 26
Patchwriting and Imitation of the Knowledgeable Other 30
Linguistic legitimacy 33
Discursive proficiency 35
Authorial voice 36
Time limitations 37
Design Problems in Previous Studies of Students' Perceptions 38
Summary 39

Chapter Three: Methods 42

The Purpose of Study and the Guiding Research Question 42
Context of the Study 42
Participants in the Study 44
Instruments and Procedures 44
Quantitative data collection 44
Qualitative data collection 46
Data Analysis 47
Quantitative analysis 47
Qualitative analysis 48

Chapter Four: Results 49

Sample Description 49
Demographic Factors 50
Summary of Demographic Factors 54
Ethical Positioning 54
Frequency Distributions for Plagiarism Ratings 56
"Usually" or "Always" Plagiarism 58
"Usually Not" or "Never" Plagiarism 63
Inconsistent Response Patterns 69
Summary of Plagiarism Ratings 74
Frequency Distributions Related to Plagiarism Instruction 74
Understanding of the academic integrity policy 75
Instruction about academic integrity and plagiarism 76
Procedural knowledge of incorporating source materials 81
Thematic Analysis 82
Integrity and hard work 83
Intellectual property 84
Correct attribution 85
Ambiguous boundaries 86
Summary of Qualitative Findings 88
Chapter Five: Conclusions, Implications, and Limitations 89
Conclusions of the Study 89
An ethic of academic integrity 90
Learning to locate boundaries 92

Novice-ness and participation in academic discourse 94
Implications of the Study 95
Policy implications 96
Pedagogical implications 97
Limitations of the Study 100
Limitations of the quantitative analysis 101
Limitations of the qualitative analysis 103
Suggestions for Future Research 104
Investigations of novice writers' understandings 105
Investigations of novice writers' decision-making processes 105
Evaluations of the effectiveness of pedagogical techniques and responses 106
Summary of Conclusions, Implications, and Limitations 107

References 109

Appendix A: Questionnaire 122

Appendix B: Qualitative Interview Protocol 127

Appendix C: Sample Questionnaire Consent Form 129

Appendix D: Informed Consent Form for Qualitative Interviews 133

List of Tables

Table 1. Admission Category for Citizenship……138

Table 2. Primary Language of Communication……138

Table 3. Age Category……...138

Table 4. Student Status……..139

Table 5. Credit Hours Completed……..139

Table 6. Home Faculty……..139

Table 7. Ethical Positions……..140

Table 8. Copying Information Word-For-Word……140

Table 9. Dual Submission……..140

Table 10. Modified Quotations……..141

Table 11. Copying Another Student's Essay Structure……141

Table 12. Asking the Professor for Help……...141

Table 13. Asking a Friend to Proofread……142

Table 14. Including a Friend's Discussed Ideas……142

Table 15. Including a Friend's Generated Ideas……142

Table 16. Asking a Classmate for Help with Using a Search Engine……....143

Table 17. Asking a Friend to Help with Research……143

Table 18. Including a Classmate's Ideas ……..143

Table 19. Citing a Book That One Has Not Read……144

Table 20. Copying the Structure of An Article……144

Table 21. Read the University of Manitoba's Policy……144

Table 22. Understanding of the University of Manitoba's Policy……145

Table 23. Instruction About Academic Integrity……145

Table 24. Instruction About Academic Integrity Strategies……145

Table 25. Instruction About Plagiarism……..146

Table 26. Instruction About Strategies to Avoid Plagiarism……..146

Table 27. Understanding of Source Incorporation……..146

Chapter One: Introduction

Defining Plagiarism

Plagiarism appears, at first blush, to be a fairly cut-and-dried issue. Academic integrity is a guiding ethic of academic culture, and it is, therefore, reasonable for university administrations to hold students accountable for violations of that ethic. Given that plagiarism is considered to be far more prevalent than it used to be (Park, 2003), particularly due to the ways in which developing technologies can facilitate acts of plagiarism (F. Hyland, 2001), an increased focus on policing plagiarism logically follows. Plagiarism-detection software is becoming a popular method amongst academic institutions (Dahl, 2007; Evans, 2006; Mozgovoy, Kakkonen, & Cosma, 2010), as well as are efforts to design so-called plagiarism-proof assignments (Bloom, 2008). The time invested and money spent both to prevent and to monitor plagiarism initially appear to be reasonable. However, the current approach has an Achilles heel: it treats the symptoms rather than the root causes. Furthermore, the ways in which many institutions define plagiarism are ineffective for excluding behaviours that do not represent the intention to deceive.

One broadly representative definition of plagiarism is "using another's work without appropriate acknowledgement" (Devlin & Gray, 2007, p. 182). The ubiquity of this conceptual definition suggests that plagiarism is easily identifiable and avoidable. However, in a semiotic analysis of academic integrity policies at twenty prominent institutions, Sutherland-Smith (2011) found great variance in operational definitions of plagiarism. According to Sutherland-Smith (2011):

> What counts as an object to be plagiarized — whether text, image, program, graphics, ideas, oral material — depends upon the plagiarism policy of each institution. Consequently, what counts as being able to be plagiarized will vary enormously across institutions. Some institutions provide very detailed lists of objects that are considered to fall under plagiarism's ambit. Other institutions

> word their policies in very general ways, which offers wide powers of interpretation to those determining plagiarism allegations, as to what constitutes the object of plagiarism (p. 131-132)

McGrail and McGrail (2015) found a similar degree of variance in their analysis of the policies of 20 Carnegie-classified universities, as did Eaton (2017) in her analysis of the policies of twenty Canadian universities. This degree of variance makes it difficult to believe that any kind of consistency exists across institutions. Essentially, this variance means that students may be guilty of plagiarism at one institution and not at another. Furthermore, studies of instructors' definitions of plagiarism have demonstrated that consensus is difficult to reach (Bennett, Behrendt, & Boothby, 2011; Borg, 2009; Marzluf, 2013; Roig, 2001; Pecorari & Shaw, 2012; Schwabl, Rossiter, & Abbott, 2013; Sutherland-Smith, 2005).

Complicating matters is, as Chandrasoma, Thompson, and Pennycook (2004) have argued, that many instances of plagiarism, as defined by universities, result from issues of writer development rather than from the intention to misrepresent authorship. Many researchers have made similar arguments about writer development and so-called acts of plagiarism (Abasi & Akbari, 2008; Angélil-Carter, 2000; Currie, 1998; Flowerdew & Li, 2007; Gu & Brooks, 2008; Howard, 1999; Hirvela & Du, 2013; T. Hyland, 2009; Keck, 2014; Li & Casanave, 2012; Price, 2002; Pecorari, 2008; Shi, 2006; Sun, 2009).

Patchwriting is one of the forms of plagiarism that appears to derive from the process of learning to write. The term patchwriting was coined by Howard (1992) to refer to "copying from a source text and then deleting some words, altering grammatical structures, or plugging in one-for-one synonym-substitutes" (p. 233). Abasi and Akbari (2008) have also noted that patchwriting can occur on a macro-level in a piece of writing. For example, a student may closely imitate the structural features of another author's piece. Research that has investigated

the phenomenon of patchwriting has demonstrated that students often have compelling learning-related reasons for selecting patchwriting as a writing strategy (Currie, 1998; Flowerdew & Li, 2007; Gu & Brooks, 2008; Hirvela & Du, 2013; Howard, 1999; T. Hyland, 2009; Keck, 2006; Keck, 2014; Pecorari, 2003; Sun, 2009). Patchwriting appears to reflect, as Howard (1992) has argued, a developmental stage through which novice writers pass on the journey to acquiring discursive knowledge and vocabulary. As Pecorari (2008) has noted, patchwriting represents a departure from prototypical plagiarism (i.e., wholesale copying and pasting with the intention of misrepresentation), and derives from issues of language use, comprehension, and the process of developing authorial voice.

Problematic Representations of Plagiarism

At present, there are two common representations of plagiarism: plagiarism as crime, and plagiarism as transgression. The former is the predominant metaphor used in institutional policies, while the latter has emerged fairly recently from research literature that recognizes the complex nature of writing. Both are problematic for their own reasons. While the first characterizes some students as criminals, the second acknowledges students as learners, but still does not allow for a recognition that the boundaries surrounding plagiarism are opaque rather than transparent. In addition, there is a certain religious sensibility about the word transgression; that is, transgression has historically been associated, at least in Western cultures, with sin. One either has committed a crime or has not, and one has either transgressed or one has not. The trouble with both representations of plagiarism is that they attach binary labels to a phenomenon that is quite simply, fluid.

Plagiarism as crime. Academic honour codes generally operate as if plagiarism were an uncomplicated notion and always easily avoided, despite evidence to the contrary. In fact,

academic integrity policies often employ the language of criminal law (Price, 2002; Senders, 2008; Sutherland-Smith, 2011), adopting terms such as *theft* and *academic offense.* Through a linguistic analysis of twenty academic integrity policies at leading universities, Sutherland-Smith (2011) found that judicial processes often place students in the position of being considered guilty until proven innocent, which, ironically enough, contradicts the sensibilities of criminal law. As Senders (2008) has noted, based on his own experience with plagiarism hearings: *"*while there is quasi-legal language [in the treatment of plagiarism], there *is no law.* There is no set code that governs the rules of evidence, the limits of plagiarism, the limits of accusation, or the reasonable extent of punishment" (p. 198). If the limits of plagiarism are not clearly defined, nor the limits of punishment, then there is a serious problem with using a legal model to deal with plagiarism. Law requires precise definitions and clear boundaries. Perhaps the only cases in which a legal model may reasonably apply, are those in which text has been copied and pasted wholesale, and even then, there must be an established limit to punishment in order to maintain the principle of natural justice.

Plagiarism as transgression. Though preferable to the trope of criminality, the metaphor of transgression is equally problematic. Plagiarism as transgression has become a common analogy in the research literature. While the metaphor of transgression identifies the deeply contextual nature of plagiarism, it still suggests that the boundaries of plagiarism are clearly defined within various contexts.

The use of transgression in reference to plagiarism appears to have originated from Borg's (2009) paper. Borg (2009) argued that the conversation about plagiarism needed to be reframed, moving away from decontextualized institution-wide definitions and moving towards contextual contingency. Borg (2009) proposed that the term *transgressive intertextuality* could

be used to describe cases of intertextuality that flout convention(s) within a particular context. He argued that acts of both plagiarism and collusion should be covered by this term. Chandrasoma et al. (2004) and Thompson (2006) both cited Borg's (2002) conference presentation as the impetus for the use of the terms transgressive and non-transgressive intertextuality in their work. If plagiarism is to be treated as a transgression, clearly established boundaries must delineate plagiarism and original work. However, aside from wholesale copying and pasting, the boundaries of plagiarism are fuzzy (Sutherland-Smith, 2011).

According to the Oxford English Dictionary ("Transgression," 2016), the term transgression has its roots in the Latin word *transgredĭ*, which translates as "to step across." To transgress is to set foot over a boundary. As constructed by Thompson's (2006) findings, in particular, determining whether an intertextual act is transgressive would be so highly contextual that it could really only be negotiated between one student and one instructor. If this is the level at which transgression is being defined, then it seems that transgression has lost its meaning in the context of wider disciplinary apprenticeship.

In addition, it is significant that Chandrasoma et al. (2004) and Thompson (2006) make use of the term *non*-transgressive. Much like the way in which institutions tend to categorize students as either plagiarists or non-plagiarists, these researchers categorize intertextuality as either transgressive or non-transgressive, and, in essence, posit that good writing is defined by the *absence* of transgressions rather than the *presence* of anything in particular. The problem with the use of transgression as a metaphor is, then, two-fold: (1) The boundaries between plagiarism and original work are not clean enough to make meaningful use of the word transgression; and, (2) The metaphor of transgression tells us what good writing is not, but does

not tell us what it is. Intertextuality is a complicated matter and members of discursive communities, particularly novices, benefit from open discussions about it.

The Nature of Intertextuality and the Development of Authorial Voice

Unfortunately, the quasi-legal approach to monitoring plagiarism creates an environment in which students, as novice writers, are excluded from the conversation about *intertextuality*, a term first used by Kristeva (1966/1980; 1985/1996). As Martínez Alfaro (1996) explained, "the theory of intertextuality insists that a text cannot exist as a self-sufficient whole, and so, that is does not function as a closed system" (p. 268). That is to say: texts participate in dialogue with other texts. Academic texts are no different. As Borg (2009) explained:

> While all language has ways of indicating, 'she said … I heard …', academic writing is characterized by explicit intertextuality, which is something that lecturers have learned and that students need to be taught. Ideas and specific language must be referred to others in conventionalised ways (e.g. Harvard or numeric citation systems) that are different from writing in other contexts. Learning explicit intertextuality is a part of disciplinary acculturation. (p. 417)

If explicit intertextuality must be learned, then expressing one's own voice in a multi-voiced environment must also be learned.

A strong authorial voice derives from a thorough understanding of the existing scholarly conversation. This understanding can only be developed over time, through consistent engagement in the conversation. Authorial voice encompasses the unique ways in which writers express their ideas (Humphrey, Walton, & Davidson, 2014) and, in the case of academic writing, the unique ways in which they contribute to scholarly conversation. University students inevitably find themselves engaging with new discourses. As Vygotsky (1978) theorized, learners rely on knowledgeable others. Novices initially imitate resident experts while working within the zone of proximal development. Furthermore, learners make mistakes while working within this zone. Mistake making is the very essence of learning (Vygotsky, 1978). Patchwriting

appears to be a form of imitation that arises naturally from learning. That is, patchwriting represents a students' progress in acquiring disciplinary knowledge and adopting discursive language. While patchwriting may be considered a mistake when compared with a fully developed authorial voice, it is only a natural part of the process of learning to write. As such, patchwriting, as many researchers have argued, needs to be responded to pedagogically rather than punitively.

A Summary of the Problem

Despite research demonstrating that patchwriting represents a stage in a writer's development, evaluations tend to focus on the written product. This means that students are only permitted to patchwrite without penalty so long as patchwritten passages are edited out prior to formal evaluation. When patchwriting is discovered in students' submitted work, it is recognized as problematic and even as a form of plagiarism. However, students cannot realistically be expected to seamlessly transition into writing in novel discourses. Therefore, acts such as patchwriting do not represent moral deviance.

According to Foucault (1977/1995), the systemic and pervasive monitoring of deviance is the basis for power in society. Deviance, of course, can only exist if an acceptable standard has been defined. In the case of academic integrity, and, by extension, deviant intertextuality, the power to define it, monitor it, and to select the consequences of it rests with the institution, but only as a result of the complex societal system that affords the institution this power. This recognition requires, at the very least, a questioning of both the socially constructed definitions and their resulting consequences.

Foucault (1977/1995) also contended that the modern treatment of behaviours deemed deviant has resulted in the birth of the deviant identity. In other words, those who do deviant

things are considered to be deviant people. In the case of plagiarism, those who commit it are considered to be *plagiarists*, a group which must be uniform in some way or another. In this way, students are categorized as either plagiarists or non-plagiarists, making plagiarism central to the shaping of student identity from the institutional perspective. Student perspectives on intertextuality are not regarded as integral to the scholarly conversation, except in the case of identifying ways to bring students' perspectives into line with the institutional perspective. However, appropriateness is not inherent; those who have been afforded power define it. Appropriateness is also not a measure of morality. Still, the nature of apprenticeship requires instructors to bring students' practices in line with those that are accepted within particular contexts. To that end, it is necessary to remove moralistic judgment from the conversation about plagiarism, and, at the same time, to help students learn to write within various disciplinary areas.

The Existing Response to the Problem

In response to the legalistic approach of university administrations, Chandrasoma et al. (2004), and subsequently, Thompson (2006), have argued that the concept of plagiarism is too morally charged to be useful, and that instances of intertextuality should simply be regarded as transgressive or non-transgressive: the assessment of which is meant to derive from considerations of students' intent as well as more complex phenomena such as students' selves and epistemologies. As a result, these authors propose that transgressive intertextuality must be handled developmentally rather than punitively.

Furthermore, Thompson (2006) proposed a dialogic pedagogical approach to handling issues of intertextuality, which she based on the Bakhtinian (1981) notion of *dialogism* and the Kristevian (1985/1996) notion of the-subject-in-process (and) -on-trial. Through the introduction

of this approach, Thompson (2006) advocated for the definitions of both transgressive and non-transgressive intertextuality to be negotiated between instructors and students. While this approach recognizes that the general assumptions underpinning plagiarism are not only falsely binary but also hegemonic, this approach does little to address pragmatic concerns with respect to disciplinary apprenticeship. There are real conventions guiding the use of intertextuality within various disciplines and discourses. The fact that thorough knowledge of these conventions tends to derive from experience, and also the fact that these conventions have proven to be somewhat idiosyncratic, does not make them entirely negotiable. A dialogic approach to intertextuality assumes that faculty members and students can operate equally within the conversation. This assumption contradicts the reality that faculty members possess expertise in their disciplines and are also experienced writers, while students do not and are not. As such, even the most progressive literature appears not to provide ways of moving forward pragmatically.

The Proposed Response to the Problem

At present, universities generally take a binary, quasi-legal approach to assessing intertextuality in student writing, which glosses over its complexities. On the other hand, the research investigating these complexities does not to lend itself to pragmatic ways forward for faculty members or for students. Therefore, I propose the following guiding assumptions from which to develop more pragmatic research (the present study has also been designed based on these assumptions):

1. Universities generally consider all forms of plagiarism to be issues of moral deviance. However, the fact is that novice writers must learn to incorporate research into their writing and they must learn to construct original lines of reasoning. Some forms of

plagiarism appear to derive from the learning process itself. In short, university policies tend to respond to symptoms rather than to root causes.

2. Institutional policies generally assume that novice writers (i.e., students) can easily avoid plagiarism. As such, most existing academic integrity codes do not capture the complex nature of negotiating issues of intertextuality.
3. Giving a voice to novice writers' experiences with and understandings of plagiarism and intertextuality is crucial to moving forward with the development of pedagogically sound and pragmatic responses to problematic textual borrowings.

The Theoretical Framework for the Study

This theoretical framework for this study is phenomenology. Phenomenology is a constructivist approach that seeks to capture "lived experiences" with a particular phenomenon (Creswell, 2007, p. 57). This study is focused on the phenomenon of plagiarism as experienced by novice writers (i.e., students new to writing in the university learning environment). As Patton (2002) put it, phenomenological studies focus on one "foundational question": "[w]hat is the meaning, structure, and essence of the lived experience of this phenomenon for this person or group of people?" (p. 104). Though the literature suggests that plagiarism is a complex phenomenon and is not easily defined, a phenomenological researcher does not seek to understand an objective phenomenon, but rather, a group's experiences with a particular phenomenon. It was assumed that novice writers' experiences of plagiarism would have some elements in common. In fact, they did. This study provides a thematic analysis of experiences.

The Purpose of and Context for the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the complex environment within which novice writers operate when it comes to navigating issues of intertextuality. This study gives

voice to novice writers' experiences with and understandings of plagiarism. Through both quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews with novice writers, this study investigated the following research question: how do novice writers understand the and experience the phenomenon of plagiarism?

This study was focused on the experiences of writers who were new to the university environment. It has been well documented that students often find the transition to writing at university to be difficult (Carroll, 2002; Krause, 2001; Lea & Street, 1998; McCarthy, 1987; McCune, 2004; Wingate, 2012). Students must undergo acculturation in order to participate fully in academic discourse communities. This combination of factors makes this population of particular interest and places a reasonable limit on the volume of data to be collected. If this study were to focus on students at all academic levels, a much higher volume of data would be required. Though academic writing takes various forms, the most common form that students are asked to engage with is the argumentative essay (Wingate, 2012). This study will be carried out in the context of a course that provides explicit instruction in writing argumentative essays, with the available topics grounded in social sciences.

The Scope of and Generalizability of the Study

This study was carried out within six sections the ARTS 1110: Introduction to University course at the University of Manitoba. Surveys were distributed to approximately 604 students (with 350 respondents), and interviews were conducted with three students. The results of the quantitative survey may be generalizable to other contexts involving novice undergraduate writers in North American universities. The qualitative results enrich the quantitative data, and provide insight into the common experiences of novice writers with the phenomenon of plagiarism.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Introduction

Plagiarism is a phenomenon perceived to be growing within universities (Park, 2003), and research attention has been directed towards it as a result. While much research has focused on finding ways to reduce plagiarism, an emerging portion of the literature has focused on deconstructing the notion of plagiarism (Angélil-Carter, 2000; Thompson, 2006). Such deconstruction may allow for a more contextually contingent understanding of plagiarism, which may lend itself to more nuanced ways forward in helping students to follow institutional writing norms. To that end, it is necessary to review the following: (a) the notion of intellectual property and its relation to the construct of plagiarism; (b) the nature of plagiarism as a continuum; and, (c) the ways in which novice writers acquire discursive knowledge and practices. Of course, it is also necessary to provide an overview of the existing research findings relating to students' experiences with complex plagiarism (i.e., forms of plagiarism other than simple copying and pasting). In particular, research findings suggest that novice writers often make use of some forms of plagiarism strategically. They use it as a tool for learning to write in new areas.

The Problematic Treatment of Plagiarism as Transgression

Apprenticeship is the mainstay of the university learning environment. At least, it is in theory. Ideally, students are given learning activities that challenge them and bring them to the next level of mastery without overwhelming them. Unfortunately, this is not always the case in practice. In the case of plagiarism, novice writers (i.e., those who are new to writing within a particular discourse) are expected to know what it is and they are expected to be able to avoid it right out of the starting gate. Plagiarism, and the broader category of academic integrity, is not generally regarded as an area of apprenticeship. Rather, it is regarded as something intuitive, and

often as an issue of intentional dishonesty. At the very least, it is regarded as a transgression of important community boundaries. However, this treatment is problematic. The boundaries of plagiarism are not only contextually dependent, but they are also not as clear as many institutional policies suggest.

As noted in the introduction to this study, the term transgression has its roots in the Latin word *transgredï*, meaning, "to step across" ("Transgression," 2016). If plagiarism is to be considered a transgression, there must be a clear dividing line between acceptable and unacceptable borrowing. The treatment of plagiarism as transgression suggests that it is easily identifiable as a function of clear boundaries. The problem is that the boundaries of plagiarism are not clear. Research studies have shown that even instructors disagree on the boundaries of plagiarism (Bennett, Behrendt, & Boothby, 2011; Marzluf, 2013; Roig, 2001). Part of this confusion results from the fact that plagiarism is, in practice, more complicated than it is in the abstract, and it is highly contextual. The other problem is that plagiarism is often confused with issues of copyright law when, in fact, these are separate problems.

Intellectual Property, Copyright, Moral Rights, and Plagiarism

The construct of plagiarism could not exist without the notion of intellectual property. This critical relationship is often overlooked in discussions of plagiarism. While plagiarism is frequently regarded as a moral imperative, it is, in fact, contextually dependent. In particular, it is important to recognize its ontological dependence on the capitalist system from which the idea of intellectual property derives. Spence's (2007) definition of intellectual property is as follows:

> An intellectual property right is a right: (i) that can be treated as property; (ii) to control particular uses; (iii) of a specified type of intangible asset. In addition, intellectual property rights normally share the characteristics that they are: (i) only granted when the particular intangible asset can be attributed to an individual creator or identifiable group of creators, the creator(s) being presumptively entitled to the right; and (ii) enforced by both the civil and

> criminal law. Each of these aspects of the concept of intellectual property merits separate consideration. (pp. 12-13)

What Spence (2007) argues, in part, is that the notion of intellectual property does not attach directly to an intangible asset, but rather to the *right* to control uses of an intangible asset.

Many academic integrity codes conflate theft of the intangible asset (i.e., the idea or expression) with theft of the right to control use. The common treatment of plagiarism as theft, and as metaphorically related to copyright, both rest on the assumption that those who plagiarize are stealing an idea or an expression of an idea. Furthermore, though ideas are not subject to copyright (Lipton, 2013-2014), academic integrity codes generally provide protection for ideas as well. For example, the University of Manitoba (2016a) defines plagiarism as:

> [T]he presentation or use of information, ideas, sentences, findings, etc. as one's own without appropriate citation in a written assignment, test or final examination. (p. 61)

According to civil and criminal laws, an author may be afforded the right to control the use of their creative expressions (Spence, 2007; Lipton, 2013-2014). As part of the student's introduction to academia, the student is expected to learn to credit authors for the use of their work. Certainly, in a capitalist system, publishing another author's work as if it was one's own denies the original author intellectual property rights.

Intellectual property, with respect to written works, emerged as a direct result of the advent of the printing press in 1450 (Febvre & Martin, 1976/1990). The printing press ushered in a new era of mass textual production. This mass production led to increased literacy and enabled the commodification of original works. Mass distribution increased the importance of preventing others from profiting off of the use of one's works. As Febvre and Martin (1976/1990) note, modern laws regarding authors' copyrights are based on the laws developed in the late 18th and early 19th centuries in England. Laws at this time were developed to protect authors after they

found themselves denied that which they viewed to be due compensation for their works. As many researchers have noted, the avoidance of plagiarism, a concept that has emerged from copyright and moral rights, is not an absolute moral imperative (Howard, 1999; Pecorari, 2008; Pennycook, 1996; Price, 2002). It is a result of a distinctly capitalist framework, which includes original works as a profitable commodity. Even within this framework, though, an author's rights may be protected from infringement regardless of whether profit results from a particular infringement (Lipton, 2013-2014).

Separate, but related to intellectual property rights, is an author's moral rights. According to Lipton (2013-2014), moral rights include, but are not necessarily limited to, the "right of attribution (or paternity) and the right of integrity" (p. 964). Lipton (2013-2014) focuses on these particular moral rights because they are the "only two rights […] required to be enacted into domestic laws by signatories to the Berne Convention" (p. 964). Lipton (2013-2014) noted that American law is not particularly clear with respect to moral rights. However, she also noted that many laws in the European Union do include moral rights. Similarly, the Copyright Act of Canada, Revised Statutes of Canada (1985, c. C-42), section 14.1(1), defines moral rights as follows:

> The author of a work has, subject to section 28.2, the right to the integrity of the work and, in connection with an act mentioned in section 3, the right, where reasonable by circumstances, to be associated with the work as its author by name or under a pseudonym, and the right to remain anonymous.

According to Lipton (2013-2014), plagiarism is a concept related to, but separate from, both copyright and moral rights. It is "a concept that also protects a creator's right to be identified as the author of a work, and to prevent unattributed misappropriation of the work by others" (p. 952). However, plagiarism does not operate within the legal realm (Lipton, 2013-2014). Rather, it operates within "market norms and institutional honor codes" (Lipton, 2013-2014, p. 954).

Lipton (2013-2014) explained that "plagiarism […] is a matter of honor and reputation and does not in and of itself give rise to legal cause of action or an award of damages by way of compensation to the wronged party" (p. 995). Therefore, though plagiarism is often treated in a legalistic manner, it does not, in fact, operate under the law.

Chandrasoma et al. (2004) and Thompson (2006) reject the quasi-legal model put forward by most academic honour codes. These researchers have instead put forward two categories of intertextuality: transgressive and non-transgressive. They credit Borg's (2002) conference presentation as being the source of the term *transgressive intertextuality*. In their view, the term plagiarism should only be used to describe extensive, uncited, and unauthorized misappropriation of another's text. They argued that in these cases, the intention to cheat can be assumed. Thompson (2006) and her colleagues (Chandrasoma et al., 2004) have reframed the conversation about plagiarism from one that focuses on prevention and policing, to one that is concerned with interrogating students' intentions, identities, and developmental journeys as writers.

Chandrasoma et al. (2004), followed by Thompson (2006), suggested that with regard to intertextuality, transgression is always contextually contingent. It follows, then, that there cannot be decontextualized institutional criteria for determining whether a student has engaged in transgressive intertextuality. In their view, transgression is a complex phenomenon, the determination of which may require taking the following factors into account: "intentionality, development, identity, resistance, student epistemologies, common knowledge, mediated discourse, interdisciplinarity, variability, and task type" (p. 189). This focus on contextual contingency is a positive development in the discourse surrounding plagiarism. Due to the

difficulties in identifying the precise boundaries of plagiarism, the role of the instructor is to guide students through such discussions.

The university environment relies on apprenticeship. As such, students operate as apprentices, relying upon instructors to guide them to some degree of mastery of the use of secondary source material. While Chandrasoma et al. (2004) and Thompson (2006) acknowledge many factors that may influence the ways in which students construct intertextual works, they do not provide pragmatic solutions for instructors who are struggling to introduce their students to the complexities of intertextual discourse. In fairness, this does not appear to have been their aim. However, the nature of apprenticeship demands that the master provide clear guidance to the apprentice. It seems disingenuous to suggest, as Chandrasoma et al. (2004) and Thompson (2006) do, that the university classroom could operate with the instructor and the students on an equal plane, co-constructing knowledge dialogically. The instructor and the students do not have equal stakes in the conversation about plagiarism. As instructors are expected to be masters in their respective disciplines, they must be the ones who identify problematic elements in student intertextuality, and who guide the students closer to accepted discursive practices. To use Vygostky's (1978) terms, instructors are the *knowledgeable others*, who can *scaffold* students' mastery of writing within a particular discipline.

Plagiarism as a Continuum

It is important to consider the socio-historical construction of plagiarism because it needs to inform institutional responses to plagiarism. If academic integrity is a construction rather than an absolute moral imperative, perhaps the discourse surrounding it should not be informed with moral judgments. Instead, it is necessary to consider the complexities of plagiarism in universities, and to examine whether plagiarism is easily avoided, as is often assumed.

Unfortunately, it appears that universities tend to treat plagiarism as a monolithic entity although it is a complex phenomenon. Rather than lending itself to binary categorization, plagiarism appears to operate on a continuum.

According to most institutional definitions, plagiarism encompasses all intertextual practices that involve "using another's work without appropriate acknowledgement" (Devlin & Gray, 2007, p. 182). Plagiarism might manifest itself in the misappropriation of a few words, an idea, or a complete work in its entirety. Regardless of the degree to which a work has been plagiarized, the student can be considered to be guilty of the same offense. Studies of plagiarism often report statistics that conflate various forms of plagiarism. For example, McCabe's (2005) large-scale study conducted in Canada and the United States reported that 8% of graduate students and 16% of undergraduate students had committed fairly serious acts of plagiarism. McCabe (2005) then includes a breakdown of the percentages of students committing particular plagiaristic acts, but, as many do, suggests that the statistic including all of these acts is meaningful, leading the reader to believe that the acts are of equal importance. The problem with collapsing forms of plagiarism together is that there are important distinctions between various forms of plagiarism with respect to both intention and extent.

In order to address the problem of conflation, various researchers have sought to distinguish between forms of plagiarism that are more akin to cheating (i.e., intentional gain of an unfair advantage) and other forms of plagiarism. Pecorari (2008) distinguishes between *prototypical plagiarism* and *patchwriting*. Prototypical plagiarism refers to unaltered copying and pasting, and patchwriting describes, in the words of Howard (1999), "copying from a source text and then deleting some words, altering grammatical structures, or plugging in one synonym for another" (p. xviii). According to Pecorari (2008), prototypical plagiarism by definition carries

intent, whereas patchwriting does not. Due to the absence of evidence of the intent to deceive, Pecorari (2008) argues that a different response is required to patchwriting than to prototypical plagiarism. Namely, Pecorari (2008) argues that a developmental response rather than a punitive response is required. This call, and similar calls for a developmental approach (Abasi & Akbari, 2008; Angélil-Carter, 2000; Howard, 1992; Howard, 1999; Keck, 2014; Schwabl et al., 2013) have arisen as a result of mainly qualitative research, which has focused on students' development as writers in various academic contexts.

Learning to Write in Various Disciplines

In the 1970s, Writing Across Curriculum (WAC) courses were developed in the United States as a response to widespread problems with university students' writing (Russell, 1990). According to Russell (1990), WAC courses were intended to teach students generalized writing skills that could be applied throughout their courses of study. One of the major problems with this approach, according to McCarthy (1987), is that:

> […] the contexts for writing may be so different from one classroom to another, the ways of speaking in them so diverse, the social meanings of writing and the interaction patterns so different, that the courses may be for the student writer like so many foreign countries. (p. 260)

If that is the case, it is unrealistic to expect a WAC course to adequately prepare students to write within a variety of disciplines. As K. Hyland (1999) explains, "what constitutes valid claims and admissible reasoning differs between disciplines, and these values and epistemologies are instantiated in aspects of a community's genre conventions" (p. 355). Therefore, as Wardle (2004) states, it is problematic to teach students to write academically in a generalized way, and it is also problematic to have instructors teach composition within a discipline other than their own.

In her focus groups with first-year composition instructors at a mid-western American university, Wardle (2004) found that some instructors approached their assigned disciplines with a certain degree of criticism, which they then chose to pass along to their students. One instructor, who did not have a business background, was tasked with teaching a composition course for students entering a business major. Wardle (2004) reported that this instructor felt that it was more important to teach students to question business values than to impart successful strategies for writing in business. It may be difficult for instructors to help students learn to write in disciplines other than their own. It would seem that as these instructors are coming from outside the discipline, they are themselves novices with respect to that discipline, and are not conversant in the epistemological assumptions and rhetorical practices.

Similar to the problematic treatment of writing as a generalized skill, there are also problems with treating critical thinking as a generalized skill. Critical thinking, like writing, is a domain-specific skill. That is, while critical thinking is a meaningful concept generally, it is not easily transferable, or even measurable, across contexts (Renaud & Murray, 2008). A person can be skilled at critical thinking in one domain, and unskilled in another domain. Some researchers still take issue with this position. A particular example of this is Davies' (2013) response to Moore's (2011) contention that critical thinking is a domain-specific skill. Davies (2013) complained that Moore (2011) conflated domain-specific content with domain-specific skill. Davies (2013) concluded that critical thinking is, in fact, a generalized skill.

Davies (2013) compared domain-specific forms of critical thinking with different styles of type fonts. In essence, he argued that differences in critical thinking across domains are akin to stylistic differences. As a result, he accused Moore (2011) of overemphasizing the degree of difference across domains. However, Moore's (2011) argument that critical thinking is domain-

specific was not based on differences in style or flavour. His argument was that the differences in critical thinking across domains are fundamental, and based on epistemological assumptions (i.e., the nature of knowledge in that particular discipline). In other words, one cannot be a Critical Thinker, in a general sense. One can only critically think about the particular things one has learned to critically think about. Moore (2011) cites a large body of research, including his own, to substantiate this claim.

Similarly, differences in rhetorical practices across disciplines do not come down to stylistic differences. Rather, the differences are rooted in epistemological assumptions and discursive frameworks. According to Carroll (2002), students tend to acquire discursive knowledge and domain-specific rhetorical practices idiosyncratically, through years of experience writing and receiving feedback on their writing from experts in a particular domain. In her qualitative interviews with upper years undergraduate students, it was found that students described induction into their academic disciplines as a process. Carroll (2002) explained that, eventually, students in her study realized that the writing protocols that they perceived as idiosyncratic preferences were, in fact, standard expectations of the discourse community. Carroll (2002) argued that written feedback is particularly useful when it provides students with insight into the strengths of their writing and also identifies ways forward for improvement. She states that such feedback allows students to recognize patterns of expectation within the discipline. The importance of providing students with ways forward for improvement has been confirmed by the results of other research studies concerned with written feedback (Bevan, Badge, Cann, & Willmott, 2008; Higgins, Hartley, & Skelton, 2001; Price, Handley, Millar, & O'donovan, 2010).

Learning to Cite in Various Disciplines

As learning to write in a discipline is a process, it follows that learning discipline-specific rules regarding use and attribution of secondary sources would also be a process. Incorporating secondary sources into one's writing requires more than mastery of a particular documentation style. Incorporating secondary sources also requires organizational skills and, more importantly, decision-making skills, which can only be developed within a particular context. As Day (2008) noted, "students who learn the conventions of source acknowledgement in one field might be accused of plagiarism if they apply those same standards to writing in another field" (p. 51). Documentation styles were developed in order to govern the ways in which secondary sources are typically used within various disciplines. The process of becoming acquainted with the rules of documentation may not always be straightforward for novice writers.

For example, in the APA (American Psychological Association) documentation style, one should only include sources on the 'References' page that have been referenced directly in the paper (American Psychological Association, 2010, p. 180). On the other hand, MLA (Modern Language Association) format allows for several types of bibliographic lists, including 'Works Consulted' and 'Works Cited' (Modern Language Association, 2009, p. 130). 'Works Consulted' refers to the list of sources one has read for background on their topic, while 'Works Cited' refers to the list of sources one had referenced directly within the paper (Modern Language Association, 2009, p. 130). While these may seem like easily distinguishable features between documentation styles, they may not be obvious to students who are learning a new documentation style, or to those who had previously learned a different documentation style and assume that the features are similar, or that the documentation style they learned applies in a new environment.

In addition to the confusion that students may experience surrounding documentation styles, common knowledge can be a source of struggle for students. According to Shi (2011), common knowledge "carries the sense of knowledge mutually known and shared among a group of people" and "it carries no burden of property" (p. 308). In addition, the concept of common knowledge differs between disciplines. According to Rampolla's (2012) *A Pocket Guide to Writing in History*, there are historical facts that may be mentioned without attribution, as the facts surrounding them are widely verifiable. In contrast, in the social sciences, it is generally important to document the origins of even widely known theories, which, according to K. Hyland (1999), is a practice that serves to situate the writer's argument in the development of the field as a whole. These discipline-specific guidelines may not be immediately obvious to novices.

The difficulty for students with the idea of common knowledge is that it is only common from the perspective of those whom are well versed in their respective fields. Students, who are novices in their fields, can face difficulty with determining whether the ideas they are writing about are considered to be common knowledge. Furthermore, Shi's (2011) study found that faculty members within the same field might not agree on what constitutes common knowledge. As England (2008) argues, the difficulty for students likely stems from unfamiliarity with the field as well as problems with estimating the audience's knowledge. The failure to recognize the difference between common knowledge and knowledge which should be cited may also lead to the charge of plagiarism. On the other hand, citation of common knowledge may both clutter student papers unnecessarily, and may also, according to Starfield (2002), draw criticism from instructors.

England (2008) also suggested that "[t]he strategy of providing examples as substitutes for detailed explanations [about common knowledge] is fairly common in [writing] handbooks" (p. 108). As Hillocks (1986) has noted, however, providing exemplars is not necessarily an overly useful method of teaching writing practices, particularly in the absence of more procedural instruction. In addition, because the concept of common knowledge differs between disciplines, and, at least occasionally, even within disciplines (Shi, 2011), decontextualized instruction about the nature of common knowledge may not allow students to make context-specific distinctions.

Summary of the Demands of Discipline-Specific Writing and Citation

Given all of the factors that affect the ways in which one should attribute secondary sources in written work, it appears that institutional responses to plagiarism need to be altered to address the complexity of the phenomena. Procedural instruction in formatting citations may provide students with the building blocks for documenting sources, but this instruction alone does not teach them to distinguish common knowledge from knowledge that needs attribution. Furthermore, instruction in one documentation style does not guarantee transferability of skills to another style, and it also does not guarantee the awareness that different disciplines employ different styles. Finally, incorporating sources successfully also relies on an understanding of appropriate linguistic practices. For example, if a student provides a citation for a work, but then paraphrases too closely to the original work, the student can still be found guilty of plagiarism (Roig, 2001; Schwabl et al., 2013). Learning to incorporate sources into one's writing may present students with several strains on working memory capacity, and it may be difficult for a student to manage these concerns along with all of the other decisions they need to make about their writing.

Cognitive Process Theory of Writing

Writing is a complex series of hierarchical decision-making processes. The cognitive process theory of writing emerged from this proposition. This view of writing can be distinguished from earlier views, which typically conceptualized the writing process as a linear set of discrete stages (see Rohman, 1965). The cognitive process theory of writing recognizes writing as a recursive process, which Flower and Hayes (1981) highlighted in their seminal article. In Flower and Hayes' (1981) model, writing involves a set of hierarchical decisions, goals, and processes, which writers navigate recursively. Rather than being guided by a linear progression of stages (i.e., planning, writing, revising), writers are guided by the comparison between their developing texts and the texts they hope to produce. Furthermore, writers revisit various processes such as planning, translating, and reviewing based on the immediate needs of the developing text. In short, according to cognitive process theory, the process of writing is a series of problem-solving activities.

Context shapes the audience and purpose of what one writes. Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) and Sitko (1998) found that novice writers do not always recognize the intended audience of a writing assignment, nor that the intended audience shapes the purpose of a writing assignment. Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) argued that this lack of recognition leads to *knowledge-telling*: describing information without an overarching purpose for the information in mind. Sitko (1998) argues that novice writers benefit from being taught to identify audience and purpose. Instruction surrounding audience and purpose must necessarily be contextual. As Beaufort (2007) states, each context (i.e., academic discipline), possesses different "subject matter, […] different ways of thinking, different social purposes, and values in the discourse communities, different genres, different kinds of rhetorical issues, and even, different writing

processes" (p. 140). As a result of these differences, generalized instruction is not particularly useful.

Sitko (1998) also argues that novice writers benefit from being taught to manage the demands of writing on working memory. According to McCutchen (1996), novice writers face demands on working memory during all of Flower and Hayes' (1981) writing processes: planning, translating, and reviewing. It may be that secondary source use places its own demands on working memory, which are separate from, but related to the demands of writing on working memory. In an academic context, writers are expected to not only include information from secondary sources, but to do so in a novel way. It is key for an academic writer to maintain boundaries between his or her own work and the work of others, highlighting his or her own unique contributions to the discourse.

Working Memory, Written Composition, and Secondary Source Use

McCutchen (1996; 2000) developed a capacity theory of working memory in written composition that derives from capacity theories of working memory in reading. McCutchen (1996) summarized the defining feature of capacity theories as follows: "the limited resources of working memory necessitate trade-offs between processing and storage" (p. 302). When one of these demands too much of working memory resources, the other functions less efficiently (McCutchen, 1996). McCutchen (1996; 2000) argued that automatizing various processes frees up working memory resources. McCutchen (1996) reviewed the literature on working memory in written composition. She identified a number of tasks that writers must balance in the generation of text, including: correctly spelling words; managing sentence structure; making decisions based on discourse schemas; working within rhetorical constraints; and detecting errors in one's work. Based on her review of the literature, McCutchen (1996) concluded that managing all of these

procedures reduces working memory capacity. McCutchen (2000) also stressed the critical importance of disciplinary expertise to the writer. She found that novice writers face increased demands on working memory because they have not yet automatized disciplinary expertise. Similarly, Kellogg et al. (2013) found that, for writers working within an unfamiliar domain, working memory might be taxed precisely because they have not yet automatized their use of domain-specific knowledge.

It appears that incorporating secondary sources into one's writing also places demands on working memory. The use of information from sources as well as correct attribution of sources appear to place demands on working memory. In academic writing, it is not enough for a student to be well versed in a discourse. The student must also be conversant with domain-specific citation conventions. Therefore, students must find some way to keep track of sources as they read. Otherwise, they risk conflating sources or not being able to identify the origins of ideas at a later date.

Additionally, correct attribution of sources relies on an understanding of the nature of evidence within a particular discourse. For example, a student studying literature may be able to recognize that textual evidence is of utmost importance, and, therefore, recognize the importance of citing key passages to support their analysis. On the other hand, a student studying sociology may recognize the importance of situating a social issue in terms of both prevalence and incidence, and citing the findings of studies with respect to these.

Almargot, Caporossi, Chesnet, and Ros (2011) argued that a writer's working memory capacity could, in fact, affect the quality of his or her written output. In their study of twenty-five graduate student writers, Almargot et al. (2011) found that writers who operated with a high working memory capacity were those whose writing appeared to be most keenly aware of its

audience. Almargot et al. (2011) posited that the writers with high working memory capacity were "guided not by the core procedure, but by the representation of the audience" (p. 513). Almargot et al. (2011) likened the strategy of these writers to Bereiter and Scardamalia's (1987) concept of *knowledge-transforming.* Their study concludes with a recommendation for audience-awareness training as a way of increasing working memory capacity and, in turn, quality of writing (Almargot et al., 2011).

The aforementioned strains on working memory capacity may create particular challenges for writers in unfamiliar writing situations, who need to attend more consciously to the protocols for incorporating secondary sources. The management of secondary sources creates an additional challenge for these writers. While it does not appear that researchers have specifically investigated the impact of secondary source use on the working memory capacity of novice writers, it is plausible that source use places its own demands on working memory. Incorporating secondary sources demands that students not only locate and comprehend source materials, but also that they understand the way in which source materials fit within broader discourse. Furthermore, incorporating sources involves an awareness of citation conventions. Two studies involving first-year university students (O'Brien Moran, 2013; Soiferman, 2012) demonstrate that novice writers may experience difficulties juggling the demands of learning to search for sources, learning to appropriately integrate sources to one's own text, and learning to format citations and bibliographies correctly.

In her interviews with first-year university students, Soiferman (2012) found that some students experienced difficulties with issues related to secondary source use, including: the time investment needed to locate sources; the types of sources required in university essays; and the perception that one's own opinion was not valuable to the essay. Students in Soiferman's (2012)

study also expressed their difficulties with citation protocols, with one student stating that learning the protocols was "so hard" (p. 201). Soiferman (2012) stated that students in her study viewed formatting as a critical skill of academic writing. It is clear that these students perceived the particulars of formatting to be a taxing aspect of writing an academic paper. It seems that the effort required to correctly cite sources may have displaced time from the other tasks necessary to writing a successful academic essay.

Similarly, the first-year university students in O'Brien Moran's (2013) study also faced difficulties when learning to incorporate sources into their essays. In general, the students were unsure of exactly what to do with the research once they found it. Some also found learning the particulars of formatting to be somewhat difficult. Others were unsure of where appropriate sources could be found. One student expressed a more particular problem with secondary source use, saying, "I still couldn't get that full idea down of being able to take a reference and kind of fitting it into the paper […] and how to tell what you actually need and don't need" (p. 177). It seems that, for this student, procedural knowledge surrounding secondary source use was elusive. He reported a lack of understanding of the relationship between the evidence and his own argument. He may have also been unaware of the intended audience and purpose of his essay. Without possessing a good understanding of the context surrounding one's writing, a writer is likely to have difficulty making key decisions about which information should be included, and which should be left out.

Taken together, the research on working memory capacity in written composition and the first-year students' experiences with incorporating sources suggest that writing an academic paper is not a simple task. As Carroll (2002) put it, "[w]hat are often called 'writing assignments' in college are, in fact, complex 'literacy tasks' calling for high-level reading, research and

critical analysis" (p. xiv). Incorporating secondary sources is only a part of this matrix. While wholesale copying and pasting is simple to avoid, more complicated forms of plagiarism appear not to be. In fact, research suggests that often that which is categorized as plagiarism can result from legitimate attempts to participate in academic discourse. In addition, it appears that students may end up engaging in unsanctioned intertexual strategies as a result of the imperfect imitation of a knowledgeable other (Vygotsky, 1978). Since it appears that there may be educational merit to these imitation strategies, it is necessary to examine the results of the studies that led various researchers to this conclusion.

Patchwriting and Imitation of the Knowledgeable Other

There is evidence to suggest that students engage in various unsanctioned intertextual behaviours (i.e., forms of plagiarism) in order to learn to write in their disciplines and to manage their workloads in university study. In particular, researchers have taken notice of patchwriting as a strategy for L2 (i.e., second language) learners. Some research has been carried out with L1 (i.e., first language) learners, but this is still an emerging part of the literature (Keck, 2014). Research on patchwriting is generally qualitative in nature and tends to investigate students' reported experiences with incorporating secondary sources. This body of research illuminates the ways in which students make decisions about incorporating sources into their writing. More importantly, perhaps, it also demonstrates the complexity of the decision-making surrounding secondary source use. The research suggests that students may use patchwriting as a way to learn to participate effectively within new areas of study through imitation (Vygotsky, 1978).

Some of the earlier researchers to discuss patchwriting include Howard (1992), Currie (1998), and Angélil-Carter (2000). Their works provide context for the origins of research on patchwriting and the latter two also contain rich accounts of student experiences. Howard coined

the term *patchwriting* in a 1992 article, and she was the first to argue that patchwriting is a developmental stage for writers. Howard (1992) made this argument on the basis of her experience with first-year students who had turned in essays with passages that were too similar to the assigned reading. After realizing that one-third of the class had done this, she thought it necessary to consider possible motivations and causes. In the end, she concluded, based on extrapolations from studies of summary writing, that her students had not plagiarized, but had made legitimate attempts to participate in an academic conversation. She explained that these students were new to the language of academic discourse and were engaging with this language and the signified concepts as well as they could.

Currie's (1998) case study of a Cantonese-speaking third-year student who was writing in an English-language context appears to lend additional support to Howard's (1992) position. Currie (1998) followed the development of a student's writing over the course of an academic term. Currie (1998) found that the student was aware of her struggles to clearly express ideas. She was also acutely aware of the difficulties she was having with the course readings. Over the course of the term, the clarity of the student's writing improved, but, as Currie (1998) noted, the improvement did not appear to be a result of her improved articulation, but rather, of her increasing tendency to patchwrite from source texts. Currie (1998) called this strategy "apparent plagiarism." The more the student engaged in patchwriting, the higher the grades she received. As Currie (1998) noted, "[w]hat she had done, in fact, was to accommodate the TA for more accessible, less awkward text that contained the appropriate disciplinary terminology" (p. 9). As a result, the student received praise from her TA, even though her work was now less 'original' than it had been at the beginning of the course.

Currie (1998) argued that there is a key reason to believe that the student was not engaging in prototypical plagiarism: "the extraordinary time, effort, and patience it must have taken for Diana to struggle through the reading, find precisely those phrases or sentences that met her needs in terms of content and generality, and then weave them together. . ." (p. 9). It is difficult to see how such a strategy could be compared to prototypical plagiarism (i.e., plagiarism akin to cheating). In this student's case, it appears that patchwriting operated as a way to imitate academic writing. Using Bourdieu's (1991) concept of *legitimate language* (i.e., language that is legitimized by an authority in a given context), it may be the case that the student recognized that she was not able to produce such language of her own accord. She told Currie (1998), "Usually I stick to the book because they give you a better expression of what you're supposed to say. Usually you would say the 'department' but in the book they say 'unit' and that will give you another terminology…" (p.10). The student appears to be expressing, as Currie (1998) noted, a sense that some linguistic practices were considered legitimate, while others were not.

Angélil-Carter (2000) noted that novice writers she interviewed (i.e., first-year and third-year undergraduate students) used similar strategies in their writing. In the interviews, several writers mentioned strategically modifying the words of original sources in order to maintain important structural or linguistic features of the text. Some writers expressed a fear of misrepresenting the authors' meanings by using their own words. This fear appears to derive from struggling with the meanings of source texts. Angélil-Carter (2000) argued that the students she interviewed used these textual borrowing strategies as a way of learning the discourse as well as learning to develop authorial voice. She ultimately argued that "many instances of 'plagiarism' in student academic writing are […] problems of academic literacy" (Angélil-

Carter, 2000, p. 61). Angélil-Carter's (2000) findings appear to provide support for Howard's (1992) contentions regarding patchwriting.

All three of these works (Angélil-Carter, 2000; Currie, 1998; Howard, 1992) point towards writer development as the driving force behind complex forms of plagiarism (i.e., those other than simple copying and pasting). There are a few main themes that arise from studies of textual borrowing and patchwriting: linguistic legitimacy, discursive proficiency, authorial voice, and time limitations.

Linguistic legitimacy. Abasi and Akbari (2008) identified patchwriting as a strategy that L2 graduate students could use to address difficulties with language acquisition, as well as issues of linguistic legitimacy. Abasi and Akbari (2008) describe linguistic legitimacy as derived from Bourdieu's (1991) concept of *legitimate language*, that is, language that has been authorized. Each discourse possesses its own legitimate language (in effect, the *right* terms to use in the discourse). In Abasi and Akbari's (2008) naturalistic study, students expressed concerns about their fluency in English, and they also described a requirement of academic writing that was at odds with their level of fluency: the demonstration of discursive mastery as evidenced by linguistic legitimacy. Several students commented in interviews on the need to borrow language from sources in order to reach the linguistic demands of their assignments. Several professors in the study also commented on the difficulty of the discourse within which their students were being asked to work. Abasi and Akbari (2008) found that some of the students' writing practices, including repeated use of unexplained terms, pointed to the tension between the students' fluency with language and the linguistic demands of the assignments, including the demand to use particular terms, regardless of student understanding.

Pennycook (1996) also found that L2 writers could use patchwriting as a strategy towards linguistic legitimacy. Pennycook (1996) investigated competing conceptions of authorship, property, and plagiarism. He wrote about the historical development of these ideas in the West, and then used them to help explain the cultural tensions between him and his students in China. Pennycook (1996) explained that Western educators have often oversimplified Chinese learning culture: many have argued that the Chinese learning culture privileges rote memory over deeper learning, and this characterization creates something of a false dichotomy.

Pennycook (1996) noted that deeper learning might, in fact, include memorization, particularly when learning a new language. In his informal interviews with students who had been accused of plagiarism, Pennycook (1996) found that one student likened copying text to the practice of memorization, suggesting that he was able to learn the subject through copying. Other interviewed students explained that using the original language from a text could help preserve its essential meaning in a way that their own language could not (Pennycook, 1996). The graduate students in Sun's (2009) study expressed similar concerns. What these students seem to have unwittingly expressed is that their comprehension of the material was not sophisticated enough to allow them to explain it in their own words. It appears that they may have been experiencing difficulties in acquiring disciplinary knowledge. However, one of these students argued: "I don't think if one plagiarises, that means he doesn't learn anything. . . Perhaps plagiarism is a way of learning" (Pennycook, 1996, p. 225). Pennycook (1996) does not address comprehension as an issue for these students and does not question their arguments about learning through plagiarism. However, he does note the students' seeming ambivalence towards English as a language. While many students viewed learning English as a pathway to important goals, others viewed English as a "colonial imposition" (Pennycook, 1996, p. 225). It seems that

for Pennycook's (1996) students, fluency in English either provided them with "cultural capital" (Bourdieu, 1986), or, it represented bowing to an oppressive power (or, in some cases, it did both). The commonality between these differing viewpoints appears to be the understanding of the English language as affording legitimacy to their communications.

Discursive proficiency. Starfield (2002) and Sun (2009) also noted the ways in which low linguistic proficiency and low discursive proficiency affected students' source incorporation strategies. Sun's (2009) study included 141 Taiwanese L2 graduate students attending a Taiwanese university. Sun (2009) examined these students' paraphrasing strategies and their perspectives on these strategies. Sun (2009) found that the majority of students appeared to view patchwriting as an acceptable practice. Those who viewed patchwriting as acceptable were more likely to describe paraphrasing as being difficult. Sun's (2009) analysis also showed that viewing patchwriting as acceptable was correlated with being concerned that one's own paraphrasing would alter the original meaning of the text. The students in this study appear to have been experiencing both difficulties with language as well as with discursive proficiency. The students did not feel confident to express key ideas in their own words.

Similarly, Starfield (2002) found that one of the L2 undergraduate students in her study wrote an essay in which discursive terms were borrowed, but presumably not understood. The student meant to write an essay about capitalism, but only referred to capitalism a few times in his essay. The student's main strategy for source incorporation was cited patchwriting. That is, he borrowed a lot of language from other sources but also made sure to cite these borrowings. The student, when interviewed, talked openly about his strategy, seemingly unaware that it might be problematic. This behaviour is in line with Howard's (1992) and Pecorari's (2008) assertions that patchwriting is generally accompanied by citation, and, therefore, not likely to be intentional

plagiarism. It may be that novice writers are unable to self-assess the degree to which they have mastered a discourse.

T. Hyland's (2009) study comparing both the processes and products of L1 writers and L2 writers found that possessing background knowledge on a topic allowed both groups of writers to integrate a secondary source to their own text more easily and accurately. In this study, prior knowledge seemed to allow writers to interact more fluently with the discourse. This may seem to be an obvious point, but it is worth noting, particularly because novice writers are expected to engage with topics that are relatively new to them. Students cannot engage effectively with a discourse in which they are not proficient, and this likely leads them to rely more heavily on the words of others than the students who are proficient in the discourse.

Authorial voice. Several studies point to the role of authorial voice in effective incorporation of source. T. Hyland (2009) compared the citation and referencing behaviours of L1 and L2 writers within writing proficiency assessments at a liberal arts college. When these assessments were administered along with a reading prompt for both groups of writers, appropriate citation and referencing was correlated with reading comprehension and strong discursive background knowledge.

According to T. Hyland (2009), two key features of appropriate citation and referencing include the *bounding* and *documenting.* 'Bounding' refers to distinguishing between one's own voice and the voice of other works, whereas 'documenting' refers to recording the sources of various ideas. While L1 writers' submissions included more appropriate references to the required reading than those of L2 writers, they also included more inappropriately referenced allusions to the required reading than those of L2 writers. T. Hyland (2009) concluded that there might be at least four stages of referencing practice for writers: "no bounding and documenting;

partial and inconsistent documenting or bounding; partial and consistent documenting and/or bounding; and consistent documenting and bounding" (p 70).

She also concluded that patchwriting was an issue for both L1 and L2 writers. It appears then, that patchwriting in a written work may also be linked to the stages of referencing practice. It could be argued that globalized patchwriting, in particular, may be related to issues of bounding and documenting. Difficulty distinguishing one's own voice from may manifest as unbounded and/or undocumented ideas. Indeed, T. Hyland (2009) alludes to this relationship in her results.

Abasi and Akbari (2008) found that the graduate students in their study struggled with both localized and globalized patchwriting, and they argued that globalized patchwriting (i.e., writing with a weak authorial voice) appeared to result from the positioning of students in an evaluative context. While the students were being asked to engage with material at an expert level, the very nature of submitting assignments for evaluation may, according to Abasi and Akbari (2008), encourage L2 students to engage in globalized patchwriting. It may be that the students find themselves predisposed, as part of the 'student' role, to display their knowledge to their professors (Abasi & Akbari 2008). It seems that, from Abasi and Akbari's (2008) study, L2 students may find it difficult to manage the expectations of both 'professional' writing and 'student' writing at the same time. This is likely due to placing greater importance on the student role, as, ultimately, it passing evaluation that will allow them to continue in their studies. Therefore, students may interpret their role as one in which they display their vast knowledge of their field of study.

Time limitations. Some researchers mentioned time limitations on assignments as a factor in patchwriting (Currie, 1998; Pennycook, 1996). Time limitations on assignments place

limits on the degree to which students can grow in the mastery of their field. As a result, students may patchwrite in order to reach the requirements of their coursework despite their lack of mastery. The demands of evaluation may, at times, place students in the difficult position of turning in work that is either complete, or completely theirs, whatever that may mean in practice. This is not to say that time constraints force students into plagiarizing. Rather, it seems that, as these studies suggest, students may select patchwriting as a strategy to manage time without recognizing patchwriting as plagiarism.

Design Problems in Previous Studies of Students' Perceptions

Given that plagiarism appears to be a complex phenomenon, it is critical to explore novice writers' perceptions of plagiarism in order to improve writer apprenticeship. It is important to acknowledge the process of mastery involved in writing with academic integrity. Historically, the legalistic treatment of plagiarism has informed the design of research studies of students' perceptions of plagiarism. This is particularly problematic when it influences definitions of plagiarism. Childers and Bruton (2016) have noted that many studies have focused narrowly on verbatim copying (i.e., the form of plagiarism which students are most easily able to recognize). On the other hand, they also observed that many studies take for granted that students recognize and understand the various facets of plagiarism, and that they take these into consideration when providing self-reports of their behaviours and attitudes. In contrast, Newton (2016) found that "students starting university have […] a seriously misplaced confidence in their understanding of referencing and plagiarism" (p. 494). Childers and Bruton (2016) also argued that studies also tend to assume that students all have similar understandings of plagiarism. Both of these approaches (i.e., relying on overly narrow or overly broad definitions)

do not allow for researchers to gain a clear understanding of students' perceptions of the phenomenon of plagiarism.

In response to these measurement concerns, Childers and Bruton (2016) designed their study in such a way that students' perceptions of various textual passages could be correlated with their general attitudes about plagiarism. This present study will take a similar approach, but will focus on students' perceptions of descriptions of compositional behaviours rather than of textual passages. The reason for this difference is that this study is more concerned with uncovering students' proceduralization of plagiarism (in effect, identifying the ways in which students understand plagiarism to occur). Uncovering proceduralization will allow educators to devise ways to help students learn to monitor their strategies for writing with integrity.

Summary

A review of the literature suggests that plagiarism often results from issues of writer development rather than from the intention to cheat. It also suggests that, despite this evidence, institutional responses to plagiarism do not generally reflect a commitment to helping students learn to write with integrity. Instead, institutional policies generally treat students who have unintentionally plagiarized as if they have crossed a moral boundary. Students are assigned penalties, and, in the best-case scenario, educated on information management procedures and citation practices. The problem with the information management approach, though preferable to simple penalization, is that writing is a skill. The nature of a skill is that it can only be developed through practice. Even if one is newly equipped with declarative, and even procedural, knowledge, practice is still needed in order to actualize that knowledge. It is, therefore, not reasonable to expect the impartation of abstract procedural knowledge to be enough to ensure

that plagiarism will not reoccur. Practicing the incorporation of source materials is part of developing the skill-set of writings.

Writing involves, according to cognitive process theory, a series of hierarchical decisions. Research has demonstrated that novice writers find these decisions to be taxing on their working memories. It appears that secondary source use may present additional challenges to working memory for novice writers. Secondary source use requires a novice writer to comprehend readings in a new area, to tease out the main ideas from those readings, and to locate his or her own position within the matrix of ideas. Balancing these tasks along with the other demands of writing is not easy. Novice writers can have difficulty with effectively paraphrasing ideas when they are adjusting to a new linguistic or discursive environment. In effect, writing is not a generalized skill. While there are writing skills that apply, to a certain degree, across writing environments, there are many that shift from one environment to another. Due to the challenges of secondary source use to working memory, it appears that novice writers are not positioned to incorporate sources as seamlessly as they are often expected to do. In short, institutions expect novice writers to meet standards that are unrealistic for many of them. The only thing that appears to operate in the favour of novice writers is the inconsistent application of standards. In that way, writers are not always penalized for developmental behaviours like patchwriting. However, if most penalties were applied to letter, they would be penalized for patchwriting.

Given these findings in the literature, it is important for institutions to be aware of the challenges involved learning to use secondary sources. Writing assignments demand a lot of novice writers, and it is important to recognize that they may require a lot of practice in order to effectively integrate secondary source material. It may be that students require more one-to-one guidance with learning to do this than was previously supposed. More research is needed to

determine how novice writers conceptualize the purpose for secondary source use and the ways in which they learn to navigate disciplinary conventions with respect to intertextuality. Research is also needed to illuminate how novice writers, in particular, understand the phenomenon of plagiarism in the context of the domains in which they write. While some research has already been undertaken of students' understandings, there has not generally been a focus on novice writers in particular. It is crucial to consider the perspective of novice writers, as they are the ones who experience the greatest challenges in writing. Furthermore, it appears that phenomenological research is needed in order to explore novice writers' subjective experiences with the phenomenon of plagiarism. That is the approach that this study has taken.

Chapter Three: Methods

The Purpose of Study and The Guiding Research Question

The purpose of this study was to investigate the following research question: how do novice writers understand and experience the phenomenon of plagiarism? This study was focused on novice writers within the university context (i.e., first- and second-year undergraduate students). Focusing on this population allowed for an investigation into the experiences of the least acculturated members of the academic community – the writers who encounter the greatest difficulties with respect to navigating disciplinary and discursive expectations surrounding intertextuality.

To answer the research question, a parallel mixed methods design (Creswell, 2008) was employed. According to Creswell (2008), this design type allows quantitative and qualitative data to be analyzed separately, but then comparisons between them can be drawn and synthesized into conclusions. The quantitative survey provided descriptive statistics with respect to students' ethical positioning (Forsyth, 1980) and understandings of plagiarism. A measure of ethical positioning was included in order to situate participants' definitions of plagiarism within a broader ethical decision-making framework. Subsequent qualitative interviews provided some indication of the ways in which novice writers determine the boundaries of the concept of plagiarism. Quantitative data was analyzed separately from qualitative data, and then the interpretation of results compared the findings of each.

Context of the Study

The study was carried out within a semester-long introductory course at the University of Manitoba in Winnipeg, Manitoba. The course, Introduction to University (ARTS 1110), focuses on preparing students for the demands of university study with respect to learning, writing,

research and critical thinking. ARTS 1110 is offered by University 1, the home faculty of undeclared students, and is taken by students enrolled in a wide variety of academic programs. For most degree programs, this course satisfies the Senate's written English requirement, which is described as follows by the University of Manitoba (n.d.):

> Minimum requirements for a course to qualify for approval as meeting the written English requirement as approved by Senate include:
> 1. There must be a minimum of either three pieces of written work, each 3 to 5 pages in length, or two pieces of written work, each of 6 to 8 pages in length.
> 2. There must be a minimum of 3,000 words in total.
> 3. There must be feedback on style as well as content.
> 4. The written work must include a description or argument that is clear, concise, and logically constructed and that reflects an appropriate awareness of the audience or readership being addressed.

The design of the course is such that students attend a lecture for 75 minutes per week and a writing lab for 75 minutes per week. The lecture topics relate to educational psychology, logical argumentation, and critical reasoning. The writing labs focus on teaching students the process of writing argumentative, academic essays. Lab session topics include argumentation, audience, purpose, organization, structure, research, plagiarism, citation practices, and strategies for revision. Taken together, the lectures and labs are designed to increase students' understanding of learning and writing processes. A major focus of the course is on equipping students with strategies for metacognitive regulation, including planning, monitoring, and evaluating one's own progress with respect to learning goals.

Students attend lectures in large groups (i.e., groups of approximately 50-175 students) and attend writing labs in small groups (i.e., groups of approximately 30 students). In the writing labs, students write argumentative academic essays in stages so that they can benefit from guided engagement with the process of writing. Because the lab sections are small, instructors are able to facilitate group discussions and activities, which are intended to assist students with

developing a metacognitive approach to writing. For each of two topics, students write both a 500- and 1500-word essay. Students are given the opportunity to apply feedback from the 500 word essays to their 1500-word essays. Students are also permitted to rewrite one of their 1500-word essays at the end of the term. The assignments are designed to enable students to view writing as a communicative act rather than as a one-way presentation of ideas.

As this course focuses on the transition to university study, the course content necessarily includes strategies for appropriately navigating intertextual relationships within its writing instruction component. This feature of the course is relevant to this study because it means that all students who participated in the study will have received explicit instruction regarding plagiarism, which serves to minimize differences in exposure to the concept.

Participants in the Study

Students from six sections of ARTS 1110 offered in the Fall 2017 term were surveyed. A questionnaire was completed by 350 participants who were in either their first or second year of study and at least 18 years of age. Three participants agreed to be interviewed. As this study was focused on novice writers' experiences, only students who had completed fewer than 60 credit hours of study were eligible for participation in the study. The ARTS 1110 course typically restricts registration to those who have completed fewer than 60 credit hours, though two participants' questionnaires were excluded on the basis that they reported having completed more than 60 credit hours. Some questionnaires were also excluded on the basis that the respondents reported their age as 17 years.

Instruments and Procedures

Quantitative data collection. The quantitative questionnaire (see 'Appendix A') consisted of selected-response questions in four parts. The first part asked about relevant

demographic factors, including: age, student status, citizenship status, primary language of communication, admission category, faculty of registration, and completed credit hours. The second part of the survey asked participants to rate the degree to which they agreed with various ethically-based statements. The statements were drawn directly from Forsyth's (1980) Ethical Positioning Questionnaire. The third part of the survey asked participants rate the degree to which various academic behaviours represent an act of plagiarism, on a scale offering the following options: "Never Plagiarism," "Usually Not Plagiarism," "Usually Plagiarism," "Always Plagiarism," and "Unsure." Finally, participants were asked questions regarding their instruction about academic integrity and plagiarism at the University of Manitoba.

The quantitative survey was distributed to students enrolled in six sections of ARTS 1110. The survey required 20-25 minutes to complete, and was completed after the point in the course during which the students received feedback on one 500-word essay. The lectures were selected as distribution sites over writing labs because it was assumed that students would feel a greater sense of anonymity in the lectures. This was important because the subject matter of the questionnaire could be considered to be sensitive. In addition, if students had responded to the questionnaires in the writing labs, they may have been predisposed to try to determine which answers their writing lab instructor would think to be correct. Finally, distributing the questionnaire during the lectures enabled a more efficient collection of data, compared with distributing the surveys in a larger number of writing labs.

A volunteer distributed the questionnaires at the beginning of the lecture with the instructor out of the room during the entire process of introduction, distribution, and collection. The volunteer informed the students that the results of the questionnaire would be used as part of a thesis in the Master of Education program at the University of Manitoba. The volunteer gave

the students the opportunity to provide informed consent for the use of their data in the study, and the volunteer explained to the students that the data would remain anonymous. Because of our involvement in the ARTS 1110 program, all participants were informed that myself and Dr. O'Brien-Moran were involved in the study. My involvement in the study would have been acknowledged regardless of my employment with ARTS 1110, but my role in ARTS 1110 was made clear to all students. It was not assumed that they would know who I am. Dr. Cranston's students were informed of his involvement in the study.

Qualitative data collection. Participants who indicated a willingness to participate in an individual interview were contacted at their institutional e-mail addresses. My students and the students of Drs. Cranston and O'Brien Moran were not eligible for participation in interviews because of the inherent power dynamic between student and teacher. The semi-structured interviews were originally expected to last between 45-60 minutes, but in practice, they lasted between 15-20 minutes. They were guided by two main questions for each academic behaviour that appeared on the survey (see 'Appendix B' for the full interview protocol):

1. In the context of writing an essay for a university course, please comment on the degree to which the following behaviour represents an act of plagiarism: [insert behaviour from the quantitative survey here].
2. Why is this behaviour [always, usually, usually not, or never plagiarism, or why are you unsure]?

There were also questions regarding students' definitions of academic integrity and plagiarism, as well as questions regarding the ways in which students have received instruction about academic integrity and plagiarism at the University of Manitoba.

I conducted the interviews, giving each student the opportunity to provide informed consent, both before and throughout the interview process. I informed the participants that their responses were confidential, and that their completion or non-completion of the interview would have no effect on their grade in the course. I also let the students know that the Program Coordinator for ARTS 1110 (Dr. O'Brien-Moran), as a member of my thesis committee, would only have access to their pseudonymized interview transcripts and would not know their identities.

Data Analysis

Quantitative analysis. Quantitative data was analyzed through the production of frequency distribution tables through SPSS (Statistical Package for Analysis of the Social Sciences). Demographic factors of the sample were summarized and compared with the general population of undergraduate students enrolled at University of Manitoba. This comparison was made in order to determine the normality of the sample group – it was important to establish whether the sample differed substantially from the broader population. Next, participants were assigned to ethical positions based on normed Ethical Positioning Questionnaire scores (Forsyth, 1980; Forsyth, O'Boyle Jr., & McDaniel, 2008). The sample group's results were compared to the general population. Finally, frequency distributions were produced for the participants' ratings with respect to plagiarism. Items were put into groups based on the degree of skewedness in the responses (i.e., for many items, respondents largely agreed or disagreed on whether the behaviour constituted plagiarism). The quantitative results were integrated with qualitative findings with respect to the behavioural items. Interviewees' responses to the items were quoted and interpreted based on contextual information and non-verbal cues. A brief summary of

responses to questions regarding instruction at the University of Manitoba was also provided and integrated with qualitative findings.

Individual survey responses were not linked to interview transcripts due to privacy concerns in maintaining records of the quantitative data. Given the importance of the survey data remaining anonymous, it was critical that no identifying information is included on the surveys themselves. However, to account for this, interviewees were asked to rate the behaviours once again and also to explain their ratings.

Qualitative analysis. Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed. I employed a recursive method of concept coding (Saldaña, 2016). According to Saldaña (2016), concept coding focuses on "a 'bigger picture' beyond the tangible and apparent" (p. 119). It was my aim to identify themes that "suggested meaning broader than a single item or action" (Saldaña, 2016). I analyzed each transcript to establish the initial list of codes. Once all three transcripts were analyzed, I reviewed each transcript again based on the established codes. This second review of the transcripts ensured that the interview responses were coded consistently and provided an opportunity for additional codes to arise.

I recognize that my interpretation of the data is but one such possible interpretation, and that it is not possible to establish true reliability across coders, owing to the fact that even similar nomenclature would not signify identical meanings. To establish credibility (McMillan, 2012) with respect to my coding, one member of my committee, who has extensive experience with qualitative coding, thoroughly reviewed all of my coding work. We met to discuss the codes I came up with and adjusted the labeling of the codes so that they reflected a common understanding between us.

Chapter Four: Results

This chapter describes the results of this phenomenological mixed-methods study focused on novice writers' perceptions of plagiarism in the university context. First- and second-year university students enrolled in the course Introduction to University (referred to as ARTS 1110) responded to a questionnaire that was designed to investigate their perceptions of academic integrity and of plagiarism as well as of the instruction they received related to these. The questionnaire also included all 20 items from Forsyth's (1980) Ethical Positioning Questionnaire in order to determine whether these students tend towards idealism or relativism when it comes to ethical decision-making. Finally, demographic questions asked participants about age, student status, citizenship status, first language, admission category, faculty of registration, and completed credit hours. These demographic factors were collected in order to provide background context for the sample. Participants who completed the questionnaire were also asked to indicate if they would be interested in participating in a follow-up interview.

Frequency tables referred to in this chapter are included after the appendices. Frequency tables were produced using SPSS (Statistical Package for Analysis of the Social Sciences).

Sample Description

Participants were drawn from six sections of ARTS 1110, the total number of sections offered during the term. A volunteer distributed questionnaires in each section during either the fifth or sixth week of the course. Fifty-eight percent of the 604 students enrolled in ARTS 1110 participated in the study for a total of 350 participants. This is a relatively high rate of return, particularly given that not all students were likely to have been present in class on those dates.

Participants were provided with the opportunity to leave their e-mail addresses in order to be contacted about a follow-up interview. As a result, eighteen participants provided their

contact information and were sent an e-mail asking them if they would still like to participate. The e-mail provided them with a copy of the informed consent form for the interview. Of the eighteen, three responded with interest in arranging an interview. It is not reasonable, in a qualitative analysis, to assume that the results provide any kind of representation of the sample group as a whole, but each interview does represent the impressions of one novice writer.

Three respondents from the sample group participated in semi-structured interviews, each of which ran for approximately 15-20 minutes. For the purpose of reporting the qualitative data, the feminine pronoun has been used for each of the interviewees. The interviewees were assigned the pseudonyms Morgan, Riley, and Taylor. Interviewees responded to the same questions as they had done for the questionnaire, excluding the questions drawn from Forsyth's (1980) EPQ. The full interview protocol can be found in Appendix B. In order to maintain the anonymity of the questionnaire responses, responses shared in the interviews could not be linked to and/or checked against the interviewees' questionnaire responses.

Demographic Factors

Collecting information on demographics is important for providing context for the sample. In particular, it allows for a comparison with the general undergraduate student population of the University of Manitoba. Data on admission category (i.e., domestic or international) and student status (full-time or part-time) were collected in order to determine whether the sample group shared similar characteristics with the general undergraduate population. Data on age were collected because, in a first-year course, it might be expected that most students would be between eighteen to nineteen years old, but it seemed best not to make this assumption without verification. In addition, data for those younger than eighteen had to be excluded from the study as there would not have been a way to gain parental permission for

inclusion. Data on completed credit hours were collected to ensure that only questionnaires completed by novice writers were included in the analysis. Questionnaires that indicated completion of sixty or more credits were excluded from the study. Sixty credits completed at the time of the questionnaire would indicate that the respondent was in his or her third year of undergraduate study. Finally, data on primary language of communication and home faculty were collected. These two factors were deemed to be important because language acquisition can pose challenges for writers and because different areas of study may influence students' understanding of academic integrity and plagiarism due to differing discursive conventions.

Tables 1 through 6 provide a demographic overview. The demographic factors seemed to reflect what one would expect to find in a sample drawn from the undergraduate student population of the University of Manitoba, at least as far as the limited comparison data would indicate.

Admission category for citizenship. As demonstrated in Table 1, 90% (n = 314) of respondents indicated that they belonged to the domestic citizenship category (Canadian citizen or permanent resident) while 10% (n = 35) of respondents indicated that they belonged to the international citizenship category. According to the Fall 2017(b) report from Office of Institutional Analysis at the University of Manitoba, 16.1% of students enrolled in undergraduate study were international students. This means that the sample group had a difference of 6.1% in favour of domestic students.

Primary language of communication. Table 2 shows that 89.9% of the respondents indicated that their primary language of communication was English, 0.9% indicated that it was French, and 9.2% indicated that it was neither English nor French. As the majority of the respondents were domestic students, this is an expected finding.

Age category. As might be expected for a first-year undergraduate course, Table 3 indicates that the majority of the respondents were between 18-21 years old (86.2%, n = 300), but there was still a minority of older students. Of note is that 7.5% (n = 26) of the respondents indicated that they were older than twenty-three years. The University of Manitoba does not provide publically available data on age and as such, a comparison to the general population of first-year students could not be made. However, given that most high school students graduate at the age of 18, and given that ARTS 1110 is a first-year course, the age distribution does appear to be in line with what might be expected.

Student status. Table 4 shows that the majority of the respondents (88.9%, n = 311) were enrolled full-time during the Fall 2017 term (which, in the University of Manitoba community, is defined as taking at least three courses for a total of fifteen credit hours), whereas the remainder (11.1%, n = 39) were part-time students. This finding is similar to the statistics provided by the Office of Institutional Analysis (2017a) at the University of Manitoba, which indicate that 84.9% (n = 4196) of University 1 students studied full-time in the Fall 2017 term whereas 15.1% (n = 744) of them studied part-time. A breakdown of student status was not available specifically for first- and second-year students enrolled in other faculties. Available figures included upper-years students and, therefore, those figures were not included here for comparison to the sample.

Credit hours completed. According to Table 5, 79.4% (*n* = 274) of the respondents reported that they had received final grades for up to 9 credit hours, which is one course short of one full term of study. This group was guaranteed to be in their first year of study at the time of the questionnaire distribution because students can register for a maximum of fifteen credit hours per term. Of these 274 respondents, 240 of them (69.6% of the sample) indicated that they had not yet received final grades for any courses. Fifty-three additional respondents (15.4%) had completed between 21-30 credit hours at the time of questionnaire distribution, comprising the group of students who were just beginning their second year of study. 5.2% (*n* = 18) respondents indicated that they had finished between 33-60 credit hours. Six of these respondents may have been beginning their third year of study at the time of the questionnaire, given that they had already completed between 45-60 credit hours. However, it is equally possible that they were in their last term of their second year of study. Two respondents indicated that they had completed more than 60 credit hours of study, but their responses were excluded from the study on that basis.

Home faculty. As demonstrated in Table 6, the respondents belonged to a variety of home faculties, though the majority of respondents indicated their home faculty as being University 1 (75.1%, *n* = 263). While many students enter University 1 before moving on to a specific area of study, some students enter other faculties directly after high school completion. Enrolling in University 1 is an option rather than a requirement for attending faculties that permit direct entry from high school. In addition to the faculties listed in Table 6, respondents wrote in the following faculties on their questionnaires: Agriculture, Extended Education, Kinesiology and Recreation Management, and Music. Unfortunately, the distribution of home faculties could not be compared with the general population of first-year students at the University of Manitoba.

The University of Manitoba has not produced publicly available data on first-year students' home faculties.

Summary of Demographic Factors

Overall, the demographic composition of the sample was similar to the general undergraduate student population data at the University of Manitoba, though this assertion is based on limited publicly available data. Results of this study may be useful for not only the University of Manitoba, but also for similarly populated research-intensive institutions. The most likely candidates for comparison would be the institutions belonging to the U15 group of Canadian research universities.

Ethical Positioning

Forsyth's (1980) Ethical Positioning Questionnaire (EPQ) was designed to measure the ways in which human beings make ethical decisions. The first ten questions measure idealism and the second ten questions measure relativism. Scores for idealism and relativism can range from 10-90 (each item in the questionnaire is answered with a rating from 1-9). Schlenker and Forsyth (1977) defined idealism as a belief that correct action will lead to desirable outcomes, and relativism as the rejection of universal moral absolutes (as cited in Forsyth, 1980). Forsyth (1980) used these definitions in developing the EPQ. The EPQ allows for four separate ethical positions to emerge: absolutist, situationist, exceptionist, and subjectivist. These quadrants are defined as follows (quoted directly from Forsyth, 1980, p. 176, Table 1):

- **Absolutist (High Idealism/Low Relativism):** Assumes that the best possible outcome can always be achieved by following universal moral rules.
- **Situationist (High Idealism/High Relativism):** Rejects moral rules; advocates individualistic analysis of each act in each situation; relativistic.

- **Exceptionist (Low Idealism/Low Relativism):** Moral absolutes guide judgments but pragmatically open to exceptions to these standards; utilitarian.
- **Subjectivist (Low Idealism/High Relativism):** Appraisals based on personal values and perspective rather than universal moral principles; relativistic.

In the context of this present study, the EPQ was used to determine the composition of the sample's ethical positioning. Forsyth, O'Boyle, and McDaniel (2008) conducted a meta-analysis of 139 studies using the EPQ in 29 countries for a total of 30, 230 respondents, and the median value of Idealism was 66.06 out of a range of 10-90, whereas the median value of Relativism was 54.54 out of a range of 10-90. For the purposes of this study, these normed medians were used for determining to which quadrant each respondent belonged. Using medians in this sort of circumstance leads, of course, to numbers close to the median being arbitrarily assigned to either the *low score* category or the *high score* category. For the purposes of this present study, scores of 10-66 for Idealism were counted as low scores, while scores of 67-90 were considered to be high. As for Relativism, scores of 10-54 were considered to be low, while scores of 55-90 were counted as high. The medians of this sample's Idealism scores and Relativism scores were higher than the normed medians, with medians of 74 and 61, respectively. Therefore, this sample scored higher on both Idealism and Relativism than the norm.

In some cases, participants provided 0s or 10s as responses. Scores of 0s were rounded to 1s and scores of 10s were rounded down to 9s. This allowed responses to fit into the scales and would not have a significant effect on measures of Idealism or Relativism. Respondents who skipped any of the questions, or exhibited extreme response styles (Batchelor & Miao, 2016) on the EPQ had their scores excluded from the analysis. As a result, a total of 46 respondents'

scores were excluded, which left 304 respondents' scores being counted. Table 7 shows the breakdown of ethical positioning within the sample group.

Due to the fact that many studies do not make use of the four ethical positions when interpreting the EPQ results, there are no normed proportions of the ethical positions with respect to the general population. What is clear, though, is that the majority of the sample (52.6%, n = 160) were situationists (individuals scoring high in both Idealism and Relativism), that is, individuals who believe that the measure of an ethical solution derives from maintaining the well-being of all involved in the situation as best as possible. These individuals recognize that, sometimes, this means violating established societal rules, whereas the next largest category, absolutists (19.7%, n = 60), are set on following established rules in all situations, believing that this conformity will lead to favourable outcomes for all involved. With these categories including the majority of respondents, the sample is made up mostly of individuals scoring high in Idealism as compared to the normed median. Only 27.6% of the sample (n = 84) scored low in Idealism. Compared to the normed medians, the sample scored higher in both Idealism and Relativism, with Idealism even further from the median than Relativism, making the respondents more likely to be absolutists and situationists than the general population.

Frequency Distributions for Plagiarism Ratings

In the third section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to consider thirteen composition-related behaviours and to determine to what degree each behaviour reflected an act of plagiarism. Respondents were provided with the following options on a Likert-type scale, each of which are taken directly from the questionnaire:

- **Always Plagiarism:** This behaviour definitely and clearly constitutes plagiarism in any situation in which it would occur.

- **Usually Plagiarism:** This behaviour likely represents plagiarism, but there may be some situations in which this behaviour would not count as plagiarism.
- **Usually Not Plagiarism:** It is unlikely that this behaviour is a form of plagiarism. However, there could be some possible situations in which this behaviour would count as plagiarism.
- **Never Plagiarism:** This behaviour would never constitute plagiarism in any situation.

Respondents were also provided with the option to indicate that they were 'unsure' about the whether the behaviour reflected plagiarism.

It would not have been possible, due to time and resource limitations, to ask each respondent to write their own definitions of academic integrity and plagiarism. It would have been possible to present multiple choice questions regarding these definitions, but this solution would not have been sound because this study was designed to discover the ways in which novice writers define them, not the degree to which novice writers can recognize institutional definitions. This is the precise reason that follow-up interviews were carried out: in order to provide greater context for the quantitative responses found below.

The results are presented in the same way that the study was conducted, with the results of the questionnaire followed by the findings of the qualitative interviews. It was found that, for some questionnaire items, responses were skewed towards "Usually" or "Always" plagiarism, for some, they skewed towards "Not Usually" or "Never" plagiarism, and some items elicited a more equally distributed response pattern. Frequency distributions for each of the behavioural items have been grouped together by the responses given by the majority of respondents. After the behavioural items, a discussion will be presented regarding instruction about academic integrity and plagiarism at the University of Manitoba. Following this discussion, the thematic

analysis of the qualitative interviews will be presented. This analysis provides rich examples of the patterns of reasoning through which some novice writers determine the boundaries of plagiarism. The chapter will end with a summary of the results as a whole.

"Usually" or "Always" plagiarism. Four tables (Tables 8-11) have recorded responses to the items that the majority of respondents felt reflected plagiarism in most, or all, cases. The four behaviours, as taken directly from the questionnaire, were:

- Copying information word-for-word from an article, book, or website and including that word-for-word information in your essay.
- Submitting an essay for credit in two separate courses.
- Copying the structure of another student's essay.
- Changing a quote by modifying a few words and including the modified quote in your essay.

These items appear to have some features in common. Most notably, the act of direct copying is a key feature. Even a modified quote includes at least some identical wording to an external source. The research literature indicates that generally, students are able to recognize direct copying as problematic (Childers & Bruton, 2016). The present study seems to confirm earlier findings.

Copying information word-for-word. Table 8 indicates that, as a group, respondents strongly agreed that copying information word-for-word falls under the category of plagiarism. 92.0% of respondents (n = 320) believed that copying word-for-word information into one's essay was usually or always plagiarism (79.6%, 277 respondents, indicated that it was always plagiarism). 5.2% of respondents (n = 12) indicated that it was usually not or never plagiarism. 8.0% (n = 10) were unsure of the nature of this behaviour.

The interviewees expressed similarly strong feelings to the larger sample group. Morgan suggested that the behaviour was always plagiarism, explaining that it's "directly copying something from another work and not giving credit for it." Similarly, Taylor explained that the behaviour was "*usually* plagiarism, if not cited. Like, if it's word-for-word in means of a quote, and you cite it properly, then, no, it wouldn't be plagiarism, but if you [inaudible], chunks of text that were not cited from someone else's work then that is usually plagiarism." Riley seemed to agree, saying that the behaviour was usually plagiarism unless the word-for-word information was "cited properly." Riley explained that "if the writer just get the word-for-word information in the essay, then, without anything, then that is plagiarism."

If the broader sample group possesses a similar awareness of citation protocol to the interviewees, this would explain the frequency of the "usually plagiarism" and "always plagiarism" ratings. It is not clear what might have led a minority of the respondents to be unsure about the behaviour, or to regard copying word-for-word information into one's essay as a permissible action in most or all circumstances.

Dual submission. Table 9 demonstrates that 71.3% of the respondents (n = 247) identified submitting an essay for credit in two separate courses as an act of plagiarism in most, or all cases. This is a behaviour that they seemed to feel particularly strongly about, as 46.8% of the respondents (n = 162) indicated that it was an act of plagiarism in all cases. Only 13.3% of the respondents (n = 46) were unsure about the nature of this behaviour. In spite of the sample group's tendency towards identifying the behaviour as plagiarism, 15.3% (n = 53) indicated that it was usually not or never plagiarism (6.6% of the sample, 23 respondents selected "never"). Based on the review of literature, many institutions consider this behaviour to be an act of what is often referred to as self-plagiarism (Halupa & Bolliger, 2015), and, at the University of

Manitoba, the rationale given for this concept is that students are expected to produce original work in each course (University of Manitoba, 2016a)

Notably, each interviewee mentioned the concept of self-plagiarism when speaking about this particular behaviour, and all of them indicated that it was, in all cases, an act of plagiarism. However, they each used circular reasoning to explain why it was a problem. That is, they did not seem to provide any kind of ethical reasoning for its status as plagiarism. Morgan explained that once the essay was submitted in the second course "that would be plagiarizing yourself, I think. I know you can do that so that's what I would assume it would be." Taylor provided a similar explanation, saying that it's always plagiarism "because you're plagiarizing yourself by submitting something for two different courses." Riley appeared to have a little more difficulty with identifying the exact problem with the behaviour, but offered the following: "[I]t's obviously that you copying some, an essay from other course. Even that's the essay that you wrote it, and, like, just basically submit it for oth – for this course, which is not the meaning of – the purpose – not the purpose of the essay." Riley seemed to indicate that the problem was with copying one's own work.

Taylor was the only interviewee to describe where she learned about self-plagiarism. She reported that it was "heavily talked about at – and I remember, like, the meeting at Orientation – talked about how you can't submit an essay for two different courses that you've written." Incoming first-year students were invited to attend an Orientation day before the start of classes. Later in the interview, in relation to another question, she described Orientation as "[meeting] and [being] divided into different groups, and we all went to, um, [the University's gymnasium], and they were talking about like, academic integrity and plagiarism […]" Taylor took note that

dual submission was emphasized in the process of induction to the university learning environment.

Modified quotations. Respondents were less sure of the nature of including modified quotes in one's work than of directly copying information. This is demonstrated in Table 10. While 92% of respondents thought that directly copying information into one's essay was usually or always plagiarism (see Table 8), 70.2% (n = 245) felt the same about modified quotes. Furthermore, 79.6% of respondents felt that direct copying was always plagiarism, as compared to 30.4% of respondents (n = 106) who believed modified quotes to hold the same status. It seems that the concept of modifying quotations introduced ambiguity to the respondents, particularly as indicated by the fact that 20.1% (n = 70) reported that the behaviour was usually not or never plagiarism and 9.7% (n = 34) were unsure of the nature of the behaviour.

Riley seemed to take a strong stance on modified quotations. For Riley, the behaviour is "always plagiarism because it's like, you use someone else based on their work, but like, adjust or change is, is the same thing, and is, like, disrespect to the writer." Morgan gave a similar response, saying that "[it's] also known as paraphrasing and it needs to be cited." It may be that Riley shared Morgan's assumption that the behaviour did not include citation, but it is not possible to know that fact. Taylor seemed to assume the opposite – that the behaviour did include citation, saying that it was "usually not plagiarism as long as you cite it as paraphrasing 'cause there's ways to cite quotes as using paraphrasing […] and you still have to cite them 'cause if you don't you are still plagiarizing their work, but if you cite it, then, no." It seems that the interviewees more or less agreed on this issue, in spite of the ambiguity indicated by the wider sample group. One possibility is that those who selected "Usually Plagiarism" or "Usually Not Plagiarism" may have actually been expressing similar sentiments – a possibility that is based on

Taylor's answer. If respondents selecting 'Usually Not Plagiarism' assumed, like Taylor, that the behaviour did include citation, they may actually be saying the same thing as respondents assuming that it did not include citation and selecting 'Usually Plagiarism.' Further research would be needed to investigate this possibility.

Copying another student's essay structure. Table 11 demonstrates that 67.9% of the respondents (n = 237) believed that copying the structure of another student's essay met the criteria for plagiarism in most, or in all cases. Still, 22.9% (n = 80) of the students felt that it was usually not or never plagiarism. 9.2% (n = 32) were not sure which it was. Given that the ethic of academic integrity is to be honest about authorship, it may be that some students do not consider an organizing framework as something that can belong to a particular author – perhaps they view it as standardized. Another possibility is that copying structure may appear to be a reasonable to strategy through which to create a framework for an essay on a particular topic. Because the respondents were not asked to define the term "structure," nor provided with a definition of it, the way in which the term was interpreted is not entirely clear. However, the interviewees did provide some indication of their own interpretations.

For Riley, settling the issue of copying structure was simple – to her, it is always plagiarism to copy another student's essay structure: "copying structures still means copying something. Even it's the structure or, like, words-for-word, but it's still copying action." The idea of copying, regardless of content, was important to Riley's definition of plagiarism. Taylor had a more involved process for determining whether it was permissible to copy another student's essay structure. According to Taylor, it is permissible to copy the "flow and organization and the referencing style" and "[use] the framework on *how* [participant's emphasis] you're going to organize your essay." However, Taylor did specify that the

"information is your own and not plagiarism." Taylor rated the behaviour, as listed on the interview protocol, as usually not plagiarism. Morgan seemed to disagree with Taylor, explaining that it is usually plagiarism because "when you're writing an essay your structure should be your own. Like, I think." Morgan did not seem certain that this was the case, but at least indicated a strong suspicion by the rating she chose. The interviewees did not come to a clear consensus, but neither did the wider sample group, though the majority of respondents did label the behaviour as plagiarism.

"Usually Not" or "Never" plagiarism. Six tables (Tables 12-17) have recorded responses to the items that the majority of respondents felt did not reflect plagiarism in most, or all, cases. The six behaviours, as listed on the questionnaire were:

- Asking the professor for help with generating ideas and including some of the professor's ideas in your essay.
- Asking a friend to proofread your essay.
- Discussing your ideas for your essay with a friend, who is not taking the same course, and including some of your friend's ideas in your essay.
- Asking a friend, who is not taking the same course, for help with generating ideas and including some of your friend's ideas in your essay.
- Asking a classmate to help you find relevant websites to your essay topic on an Internet search engine.
- Asking a friend to help you find relevant research articles and/or books for your essay topic.

All of these behaviours involve the beginning stage of the writing process – gathering information. It seems that respondents may believe that the information-gathering stage of

writing, by definition, does not involve plagiarism. Nearly all of the behaviours related to information-gathering appear in this section of the results. The only behaviour of this type that does not appear in this section is: "Discussing your ideas for your essay with a classmate and including some of your classmate's ideas in your essay." It is interesting that responses were more evenly distributed with respect to this particular behaviour, particularly because all of the similar behaviours elicited more skewed response patterns. This difference in rating suggests a certain amount of ambiguity surrounding the use of a classmate's ideas that does not attach to using others' ideas. Possible reasons for this ambiguity are explored in the next section of this chapter.

It may be that novice writers consider proofreading, searching for sources, and discussing ideas as processes inherent to the beginning stage of writing – processes to which the concept of ownership does not attach. It seems that the only time they are concerned with including others' ideas is when the ideas are coming from classmates. The frequency distributions for each of the rating behaviours are outlined below, and each distribution is followed by a brief analysis.

Asking the professor for help and including the professor's ideas. Table 12 demonstrates that 72% of the sample (n = 250) considered the inclusion of the professor's ideas in one's essay not to be plagiarism in most or all instances. Even despite this relatively strong agreement, 2.9% (*n* = 10) of the respondents rated this behaviour as plagiarism in all cases. This certainly constitutes a minority of the respondents, but, nonetheless, demonstrates that some understand the issue in an entirely different way than most of their peers.

Consistent with the response pattern from the questionnaire, all three interviewees indicated that this behaviour was usually not plagiarism. Taylor said that "helping you brainstorm […] should be part of a good relationship with professors – that they can help you

create ideas when you're stuck." It is noteworthy that Taylor recognized generating ideas as a creative process while simultaneously lending the ownership of such ideas to the student. It would appear that something about the mentorship relationship that professors have with students led her to decide that students could not really appropriate ideas from professors. She also offered the reason that "you're not taking a piece that [the professor has] written." Perhaps the fact that the hypothetical professor's ideas had not been recorded in print made them fair game.

Riley and Morgan both indicated that brainstorming was an important feature of a professor-student relationship. Still, Riley seemed to struggle a bit with the tension between her perceived purpose of a writing task – generating original ideas – and getting help from a professor with generating ideas. She said, "I know like, it's our work to write an essay and to come up with something new, but like, a lot of student have difficulty, uh, on it – with it – and like, professors are like, available to give us some, like, suggestion, or like, maybe just – for example, like, a suggestion for a book, then you can come up with some idea from that book." It seems that Riley may not have been certain of whether students could use professor's ideas or just their knowledge of source materials.

Morgan appeared to be more hesitant to rate this behaviour at first, pausing for a long time before deciding that it was not usually plagiarism. She explained that "it's definitely useful to brainstorm" but "it's hard to cite your professor's ideas." She also said that "[whether or not it is plagiarism] depends on how much the person changed, like, *incorporated* [participant's emphasis] the professor's ideas into creating their own ideas, I guess." Morgan seemed, like Riley, to be unsure of where the boundaries lie around the use of a professor's ideas. Morgan treaded carefully in her answer.

Asking a friend to proofread one's essay. As can be seen in Table 13 below, nearly all of the sample (89.7%, *n* = 313) rated proofreading by a friend as not usually or never plagiarism. 249 of the respondents (71.3%) stated that the behaviour was not plagiarism in any circumstance. While the definition of proofreading most likely varies somewhat amongst respondents, it is striking that so many respondents were certain that this behaviour never constitutes plagiarism. Proofreading may be considered to be inappropriate collaboration in some contexts, but not in others. The variance in acceptable proofreading in various domains suggests more ambiguity than is indicated by the results. It would seem that novice writers believe that proofreading by a friend is permissible.

Similarly, two of the interviewees indicated that the behaviour was usually not plagiarism, and the third believed that it was never plagiarism. For example, Morgan said that it was usually not plagiarism, explaining that "just proofreading it and giving feedback isn't a bad thing," but she also said that proofreading meant "just reading it and giving you feedback on it" as opposed to "edit[ing] for grammar, spelling mistakes and stuff," which she identified as being within the realm of plagiaristic behaviours. She also specified revising – "reorganiz[ing] and […] possibly put[ing] new ideas into your paper" – as something that should not be done on behalf of the student. In fact, she said that "if someone else was [revising] it, it's not really your paper anymore." Morgan was able to articulate her boundaries around what was permissible for a reader to do with her own paper. It is worth noting that, in some institutional contexts, proofreading could be considered as a form of inappropriate collaboration (Academic Integrity Working Group, 2016).

Even though Taylor was also concerned with maintaining boundaries around revision and/or original writing, she did not appear to worry about "looking for grammatical mistakes and

spelling errors and issues with syntax." That was her definition of proofreading, and, according to Taylor, it did not fall under the definition of plagiarism. She explained that proofreading was not usually plagiarism unless it veered off into "writing in sentences that [the proofreader has] thought of originally." In some contexts, direct editing on a paper could be considered as inappropriate collaboration. For example, the University of Manitoba's Office of Student Advocacy identifies direct editing as potentially inappropriate collaboration (Academic Integrity Working Group, 2016).

Riley did not appear to distinguish between various subtypes of proofreading and/or commenting on a paper. She said that her understanding of the word *proofreading* [participant's emphasis] related simply to providing comments on another's draft. She explained that this would never be plagiarism because "it doesn't relate to anything with copying or cheating at all." Riley did not see how providing comments could be considered as cheating because it did not involve direct alteration to the paper. Her exploration of this behaviour seems to be more concrete than the other interviewees'. However, the common thread in their responses is that it is permissible to comment on a paper, but not to alter it.

Including a friend's discussed ideas in one's essay. Table 14 shows that 70.7% of the sample (n = 246) identified including a friend's ideas in one's essay as not plagiarism in most or all circumstances. This is a similar response to the other item on the questionnaire that refers to including a friend's ideas (Table 14, 69.5% of the sample, n = 241). Some respondents still felt that it represented plagiarism, but only 4.9% (n = 17) stated that it was so in all cases. Members of the sample largely agreed on this item, which was also reflected in the interviewees' responses.

Taylor said that "if [the friend] is not writing a piece on that material, then I don't believe that it's plagiarism because they haven't created something and they're just helping – you're just bouncing ideas off of them." This answer shares strong similarities to the one she provided in response to making use of a professor's ideas. For Taylor, the context of a friendship allows for such assistance, particularly because the friend is not also working on similar coursework.

Riley also explained that "discussing to find an idea is not a wrong action, I think." This comment appears to be referring to brainstorming, like Taylor's comment. Riley said that including a friend's ideas would usually not be plagiarism because, in most cases, the "friend [would not have] really come up with something" that the writer would simply take. She expressed that such a behaviour would represent plagiarism.

Morgan shared a similar view, but she appeared to have difficulty articulating her reasons why. She said:

> [It's] usually not plagiarism for the same reason [as including a professor's ideas is not plagiarism]. It's like, you should be using your own ideas, but brainstorming – it's hard to kind of define, where those, like, which, where your ideas start and someone else's doesn't.

Despite her statement that the behaviour was not usually plagiarism, her answer seems to betray uncertainty about the action. She seems to have an awareness that ideas belong to people, but she does not seem confident about how to delineate boundaries of ownership.

Including a friend's generated ideas in one's essay. Because both the interviewees' responses and the respondent data were similar to the next question, a further analysis will not be provided of the results of Table 15. The description would have been almost identical to that of Table 14.

Asking a classmate for help with using a search engine. Table 16 demonstrates that 83.6% of the respondents (n = 290) agreed that getting help from a friend with finding relevant websites is not an issue of plagiarism. This is a similar result to the 87.6% of the sample (n = 304) that indicated the same about getting a friend to help with finding research articles and/or books (see Table 16). The distributions of responses to these two items are nearly identical.

Riley views finding sources as "basically like a skill rather than copying." She explained that, regardless of the type of source the friend was helping to search for, the behaviour never constituted plagiarism. Similarly, Morgan said that "that's just helping with research. I think that's okay. You're allowed to have help with that."

Taylor said that this behaviour would usually not constitute plagiarism because a friend is "just extra eyes looking out for articles and there's a lot of information to go through sometimes when you want to find a good peer-reviewed source." She said that having a friend help was also valuable when looking for online sources because search engines will "come up with like, twelve thousand sources and there's a lot to look through when you're looking for certain information." Taylor did not indicate a reason why getting help with searching for sources might be an issue of plagiarism in some contexts.

Because both the interviewees' responses and the questionnaire respondent data were similar to the next question, a further analysis will not be provided of the results of Table 17. The description would have been almost identical to that of Table 16. The next section of behavioural items are the ones that elicited inconsistent response patterns.

Inconsistent response patterns. Three tables (Tables 18-20) have recorded responses to the items that elicited inconsistent response patterns as compared to those patterns that tended

towards agreement within the sample. The three behaviours were (taken directly from the questionnaire):

- Discussing your ideas for your essay with a classmate and including some of your classmate's ideas in your essay.
- Citing a book in your essay that you have not directly read yourself.
- Copying the structure of an article that you read.

The first and third item are both notable because similar items were rated with greater agreement by the sample. When "classmate" was replaced with "a friend who is not taking the same course," a vast majority of respondents rated the behaviour as not being plagiarism in most, or all, cases. Similarly, when "an article that you read" was replaced with "another student's essay," the vast majority of respondents identified the behaviour as plagiarism in most, or all, circumstances. Changing the relationships involved in the items clearly had an impact on the respondents' appraisal of the behaviours. This suggests that context, particularly the context of relationships, is important for decision-making about plagiarism. The frequency distributions for each of the rating behaviours are outlined below, and each distribution is followed by a brief analysis.

Including a classmate's idea in one's essay. Table 18 shows that respondents were relatively split on this behavioural item, with 38.1% of the sample group (n = 133) believing such assistance not to be plagiarism most or all of the time, and 56.2% (n = 196) indicating the opposite understanding. 241 respondents (69.1%) provided a qualified answer as opposed to 88 respondents (25.2%) who made absolute claims. This is a much lower percentage of absolute responses than for the items discussed prior to this section, suggesting that this item presented greater ambiguity for participants than did the items discussed earlier in this chapter.

The interviewees were also split on their positions. Taylor explained that using a classmate's ideas in one's essay could lead to "crossover between your essays which could be an accidental case of plagiarism because then it might look like you guys wrote the same essay together and just did two copies." She stated that this was a risk especially when writing on the same topic. According to Taylor, this behaviour usually represents plagiarism, and Riley agreed. She indicated that "if [a] person want to get the idea from other mate – classmate – he or she should really get approval from them first." She went on to explain that using the idea without authorization "can be considered like copy. Cheat." What Riley does not seem to realize is that regulations around inappropriate collaboration may not allow for students to authorize the use of their ideas. Inappropriate collaboration guidelines are often left to interpretation by individual faculty members in their particular contexts. As such, different instructors may have different senses of the processes that Riley described for ethical collaboration.

After a brief pause to consider the behaviour, Morgan concluded that the behaviour was usually not plagiarism "because it's hard to define where like, your ideas end and their ideas start when you include it in there, I guess." While this is not actually a fully developed rationale for the claim that the behaviour does not usually represent plagiarism, it does demonstrate that boundaries around ideas are important to Morgan's definition of plagiarism, and that defining boundaries appears to be a fairly ambiguous undertaking for her.

Citing a book that one has not read. Table 19 provides a widely-distributed set of responses, with a higher percentage of respondents answering "Unsure" (24.1%, $n = 84$) than for all other behavioural items on the questionnaire. 52.1% of respondents ($n = 182$) indicated that the behaviour was usually not or never plagiarism, whereas 23.7% of respondents ($n = 83$) rated the behaviour as usually or always plagiarism. A high proportion of respondents indicated that

they were unsure about the nature of this behaviour, and some potential reasons for this confusion can be found in the interviewees' responses.

Riley paused for a while before explaining that she actually remembered this item from when she filled out the questionnaire, and was just as confused about it at the time of the interview. She said that she was "confused between – 'cause the action of citing is, like, the one that – the thing that we do to appreciate other works, but the thing is, that we don't actually read it, so, it's kind of make me confused between those two ideas." She expressed that perhaps not reading the source could make citing it a form of plagiarism. Morgan seemed to take a similar point of view, saying that she was unsure of the nature of the behaviour because "you haven't *read* [participant's emphasis] the thing so you don't know the ideas, but you've cited it because you assumed ideas so I'm not sure where that lies." Morgan, like Riley, appeared to be caught between two competing values. Both interviewees seemed to indicate that honesty about one's reading was important, but, at the same time, it was difficult to classify a behaviour as plagiarism when it included citation.

Taylor may have held a different point of view. She stated that the behaviour was usually not plagiarism "because you don't need to read the entire book to get all the information you need." In providing her rating, she seemed to assume that the student had read at least some of the book, and explained that even if the whole book had not been read, it could still be cited and that inclusion in one's own work would not constitute an act of plagiarism.

Copying the structure of an article. Table 20 shows that 31.2% of respondents (n = 108) classified this behaviour as usually not or never plagiarism, whereas 58.7% of respondents (n = 203) took an opposite point of view. Still, 10.1% of respondents (n = 35) were unsure of the nature of this behaviour. While the majority of respondents indicated that this behaviour

represented an act of plagiarism in most or all circumstances, more respondents indicated the same about copying the structure of another student's essay (67.9%, *n* = 237) The fact that this behaviour mentions a more abstract source than that of a classmate seems to figure in to decision-making based on this difference in response patterns.

The interviewees also seemed to make greater reference to the author's creation than they did in the discussion on using classmate's ideas. Taylor explained that directly copying the structure would usually be plagiarism "because that's information that's already been published." When asked whether it would make a difference if the article was unpublished, Taylor said that "it would still count because it's something that they've created." She did not describe the circumstances under which this behaviour would not constitute plagiarism.

Riley appeared to be more certain than Taylor that the behaviour reflected an act of plagiarism, saying that it was always so "because, um, uh, it's, like, copying the structure, like, the grammar structure from someone else who wrote it out. So, it's just copying action." Like in many of her other responses, Riley mentioned copying as a key reason why the behaviour could be defined as plagiarism. However, it seems that she may not have understood the question in the way that was intended on the questionnaire – she mentions grammatical structure rather than organizational structure.

Morgan also believed that the behaviour would usually be plagiarism because "your essay or whatever should have your own organization to it." She explained that she was unaware of how citation protocols would apply to this situation, but that if the structure was going to be used, it would need to be cited. She did say that copying the structure was "probably a wrong thing to do," explaining that it is important to make the organization "as much your own as possible." Like Taylor and Riley, Morgan described the importance of submitting original work

for credit and she explained how using another person's structure might have an impact upon that originality.

Summary of Plagiarism Ratings

The behavioural items were collapsed into three categories: usually/always plagiarism; usually not/never plagiarism; and, an inconsistent response pattern. The behaviours that the majority of respondents identified as usually or always plagiarism seemed to focus on direct copying. This result aligns with the existing literature's suggestion that students are generally able to recognize actions involving copying as plagiarism (Childers & Bruton, 2016). The behaviours that the majority of respondents felt did not reflect plagiarism were each related to the beginning stages of writing and did not seem to have the concept of ownership attached to them. Finally, some of the behavioural items that yielded inconsistent response patterns were, notably, highly similar to behaviours in other categories. The only difference was a shift in relationships involved in the question (e.g., a classmate instead of a friend). The shifts in the relationships involved in the behaviours created a different question for the respondents, suggesting that context is important to novice writers when determining whether a particular behaviour constitutes plagiarism. In short, the judgment is not only based on the behaviour itself, but also on the context in which it occurs. The question that elicited the most polarized answers was the question of whether or not citing a book one had not read constituted an act of plagiarism. Roughly one quarter of the sample was unsure of the nature of this behaviour (see Table 19).

Frequency Distributions Related to Plagiarism Instruction

Five items on the questionnaire asked respondents to indicate whether or not they: understood the University of Manitoba's policy with respect to academic integrity (for the policy

– *Student Discipline By-law*, see University of Manitoba, 2016c); had been instructed about academic integrity and plagiarism at the University of Manitoba; had been provided with strategies for maintaining academic integrity and avoiding plagiarism. Participant responses were analyzed to determine whether students felt that they had received explicit instruction about academic integrity and plagiarism, and whether they felt that they understood the institution's expectations for their behaviour. It should be noted that the Introduction to University course (referred to as ARTS 1110) includes instruction about academic integrity and plagiarism in its curriculum. The frequency distribution tables for the participants' responses can be found in the list of tables.

Understanding of the academic integrity policy. It is worth noting that fewer respondents (67%, $n = 234$) reported that they had read the University of Manitoba's policy than the number of respondents who indicated that they understood the policy (73%, $n = 254$). This suggests that some respondents felt that they understood the policy even though they had not read it (see Tables 21 and 22). It is possible that they were exposed to the policy indirectly, perhaps through instruction, and felt that was sufficient for developing a clear understanding. It is also possible that they may not have remembered reading the policy.

When asked whether she understood the policy, Morgan paused. After replying with a stammered "yes," she said, "it's just in the way that, like, I don't understand what, like, I don't really know, like, what the consequences are, like, depending on the severity of the academic integrity, like, I'm not, I don't remember, or, like, I'm not fully aware of what it is, but I do know that *it's bad* [participant's emphasis]. So just don't do it. [laughs] [inaudible] I know what not to do to avoid, like, you know, doing that." Morgan appeared not to be sure what the policy is actually outlining, particularly in terms of consequences. She may have felt responsible to

understand the policy based on the fact that she explained that "they talked about [the policy] a little bit at Orientation." Based on her response, she did seem to be certain that she knew how to avoid academic dishonesty, however.

Riley also indicated that she understood the policy. She said that the concept of academic integrity is "not, like, a really difficult thing, like, a difficult term to understand, but I basically understand it enough to make it as my common sense, so I don't feel any, like, unfamiliar with it." Riley did not indicate how she learned of the policy, but did mention, later in the interview, that she learned about the concept of academic integrity from something that "all the course's instructors just handed […] out." She may have been referring to the course syllabi, which are required to include information about academic integrity (University of Manitoba, 2016b, Section 2.5(n)).

Similarly, Taylor explained that she understood the policy based on "watching someone I know go through what happens when you get caught in plagiarism and just seeing how terrifying that is, and how you have to, like, go and get an advocate […] it almost sounded like a court thing. And, it almost, like, scared me into not wanting to go through that, so." This response certainly stood out among the others as her understanding of the policy came from a much more personal source. Taylor referenced this incident several times throughout the interview and explained the ways in which it shaped her conceptualization of plagiarism and her sense of vigilance against it. She seemed to feel that she learned a lot about academic integrity from her friend's experience.

Instruction about academic integrity and plagiarism. It is worth noting that the majority of respondents indicated that they had received instruction at the University of Manitoba about academic integrity (78.4%, $n = 272$) and plagiarism (80.1%, $n = 277$). However,

fewer of them reported that they had been taught strategies to maintain academic integrity (66.9%, *n* = 232) and strategies to avoid plagiarism (71.8%, *n* = 250). Though the majority of respondents believed that they had been taught such strategies, it seems clear that some respondents, though apparently aware of the concepts in general, did not feel that they had been taught any strategies (see Tables 23-26).

Taylor indicated that she learned about academic integrity from "the mini-course on [the university's learning management system] and on Orientation Day. Also, through the ARTS 1110 lab course – we spent a whole day on academic integrity and how not to plagiarize." When asked about what was done in class on that day, she explained that "we learned how to cite through the formatting for this course, um, just learned about plagiarism through that, learned what a direct quote was, what a paraphrased quote was, and just told 'don't take something that's not yours and use it.'" The instruction that Taylor described amounted to a series of formal learning opportunities.

Morgan's response was more focused on the content included in course syllabi. She explained that instruction about academic integrity "[is] in every syllabus." She reported that she "had one or two professors that have actually gone into it and kinda talked, like, a brief blurb about it on the first day of classes, but *mostly* [participant's emphasis] it's just, like, in the syllabus." She described reading the information provided in the syllabus during her first term, but also said that she had not looked over it since. She referred to it as "a voluntary read." In addition to learning about academic integrity from course syllabi and brief explanations in class, Morgan said that professors tended to bring the concept up again around test and exam time. She said they "reiterate, like, *this* [participant's emphasis] would be considered cheating, don't do *this* [participant's emphasis]." Riley also said that she read through some material in class,

saying that "all the course's instructors just handed it out." She explained that she "kind of read a little bit of them from this course and the rest of them from the other course." Riley did not point to any other sources for her knowledge about academic integrity.

Each of the interviewees expressed that they had been taught strategies for maintaining academic integrity. Morgan stated that most of her courses provided instruction about strategies with respect to midterm exams. She said that the instruction centred around "how not to, you know, cheat on your exam." She explained that a student could get into trouble based on both his or her own actions and the actions of others. Morgan appeared to express concern about "be[ing] at the mercy of someone else trying to cheat off of you and you can get in trouble for that, too." When asked if any specific strategies were suggested to her, she responded:

> Um, if you need to look up from – like, my Psychology TA said that if you need to look up from your exam it's definitely good to, like, try and make contact with the mediators that are walking around the room or just look at the ceiling so that they definitely know you're not looking at anything else […] I mean, there's lots of strategies detailed in the course, like this ARTS 1110 course, 'cause like we talk about it a lot, I'd say. Um, just 'cause of, like, learning how to cite things and stuff like that, so strategies, like, if you're not sure, try and, like, cite it or, like, you know, ask. So, things like that.

Morgan's response seems to focus on strategies to avoid accidentally getting into trouble, whether in a test situation or when writing a paper.

Taylor also described instruction about strategies in a similar way. She explained that, on Orientation Day, there was a discussion of "kind of the consequences of what happens when you go through – if you get into a plagiarism case." She also mentioned that "someone I know has gotten through into that, which is – and the process is very scary and very awful and you don't wanna go through that. And so, it's like, 'this is what's gonna happen…' It's easier if you just put in the little extra work to not to do it." When Taylor was asked to identify general guidelines and specific strategies she was provided with to avoid plagiarism, she said that she was told to

"use the sources available to you like academic advisors, use, like, the people who work in the library to help you [trails off]." She did not seem to be sure of exactly how these resources could help. The most specific suggestion she provided was to:

> [get] the Writing Centre to review your citing so that you know by someone who knows what they're doing that this is proper and – 'cause they'll [pause] To you it may look like you haven't taken that information – it looks like you've put it off as your own – but if you have someone else reading usually it's pretty clear. So just using the sources around you to check and make sure you don't hand something in that's plagiarized.

Taylor's main concern, like Morgan's, seemed to be with avoiding committing an offense accidentally. She appeared to believe that plagiarism could be committed without one's own knowledge.

Riley explained that in ARTS 1110, she learned "how to note-taking – how to take note – and how to, like, write a paper – an academic paper – and cite – citation stuff." Riley did not elaborate on how these strategies would be useful for maintaining academic integrity. The only additional comment she made was that these strategies were intended for "good demonstration in university."

When Riley was asked whether she had received instruction about plagiarism, she provided a more specific answer. She said, "I had a – a few session about – from the library in – in my faculty. They kind of come and then instruct – instructed us in the first year when, uh, to write an essay. Not, like, specifically how to write an essay, but they instructed us how to cite properly." Riley said that the instruction was "really helpful."

Taylor explained that, at the University of Manitoba, "the main thing with cases […] about plagiarism is not that they've *stolen* [participant's emphasis] information, but it just wasn't cited properly, so it looks like it was." Her distinction between behaviours appears to be similar to the distinction between shoplifting and accidentally walking out of the store with an item that

was not paid for. According to Taylor, it might look like a student has plagiarized when he or she has not, and that similarity might lead to a formal case being pursued. She went on to explain that "if you just learn how to cite your information properly you won't get caught up in a plagiarism case." For Taylor, "accidentally not citing or citing improperly" do not reflect instances of plagiarism. Plagiarism is when "you're just [pause] stealing it 'cause you don't wanna write it on your own." Intention was key to her definition of plagiarism, but she seemed to believe that the institution did not take intention into account.

Morgan explained that ARTS 1110 was "*really* [participant's emphasis] the only time we've talked about [plagiarism]." She said that, in the course, students were "instructed how to like, cite, like, other ideas in a paper. We learned about like, what, like, plagiarism was. Just briefly. Like, you know, things like that, so." She said that she:

> learn[ed] how to cite [….] but I haven't taken another written course so I feel like, it's hard to, um – there's also been instructions in my lab manual for chemistry on how to write a lab report – that, you know, things need to be cited, so there's another one [inaudible] plagiarism. So, there's more than just this course, so that's good. [laughs].

Morgan seemed to believe that teaching about plagiarism was mainly under the purview of courses that were heavy in written assignments. When she recalled that her chemistry lab manual also discussed the issue of plagiarism, she appeared to be expressing a sense of relief that she had, in fact, heard about plagiarism from multiple sources. Perhaps she felt that she should have, given the topic's importance in the university learning environment.

One of the most striking comments made during the interviews also came from Morgan. She described an upper years classmate telling her the following: "In university, *everything* [participant's emphasis] is plagiarism, so just be safe about it." Morgan laughed as she recounted this statement. She continued on quoting her classmate, saying "Like, just assume it's plagiarism.

If it's not your idea, it's plagiarism." This appeared to have become a guiding principle for Morgan as she continued on through her studies. She said that the classmate told her to "keep that in the back of [her] mind." This story encapsulates both a sense of ambiguity around the boundaries of plagiarism and a sense that students are primarily responsible for navigating this hazy learning environment.

Procedural knowledge of incorporating source materials. The final question in this section of the questionnaire asked respondents to indicate whether they felt that they understood how to bring information from source materials into an essay (see Table 27). Almost three-quarters of respondents felt that they understood this process (73.3%, $n = 253$). Each of the interviewees indicated the same.

Taylor explained that she had learned how to incorporate information from source materials through "submit[ting] my first essay in ARTS 1110. Um, my TA wrote – she put corrections on my citing." Taylor said that this process allowed her to "know directly that I was doing it right" because the TA commented on her correctness as well as any errors that she had made.

Riley also said that she learned from her experience writing in ARTS 1110. She explained that, after she received her first essay back, she met with her professor "in private and then [the professor] was, like, instructing and showing what kind of mistake this is. And like, it can be something if – if, um, if I write an essay in this way. So [the professor] just basically judge and give comment on it to make me, like, just – just to guide me." She said that learning how to incorporate sources has been a process, but that she learned how to "cite everything properly" and not to "take, like, word-by-word [inaudible] from other information into my

essay." Riley's response seemed to suggest that this sort of learning had to occur through a feedback mechanism rather than on one's own.

Morgan also referenced instruction in ARTS 1110. In somewhat convoluted language, she explained that she learned a little bit about incorporating source materials in her chemistry course as well. She explained that the ARTS 1110 TA "kinda [went] through [incorporating source materials] in *painstakingly* [participant's emphasis] detail [pause] amount." She explained that the TA reminded them "all the time" of how to do it. She also mentioned that one of the required textbooks contained a particular chapter that was "very helpful" for learning this particular aspect of writing, but also that the book as a whole "has a lot of really good information and techniques about how to cite materials properly." She also described her TA's instruction in a little bit more detail when asked, saying that "one whole class was dedicated to, like, how to cite material […] uh, with a real focus on APA format." APA is the required citation style for course work in ARTS 1110. Morgan also said that the TA gave students resource materials to consult that would help them "find out how to properly cite things." She mentioned one particular resource in her response, which is a website that provides instruction in citation protocols.

Thematic Analysis

Two techniques were used to analyze the qualitative data. First, the interview responses were compared with the wider sample group's responses to the questionnaire. These comparisons have been described in the preceding section. The purpose of this section is to provide an analysis of the themes that emerged from the interview data which coalesced conceptually. Four principal themes emerged: (1) integrity and hard work; (2) intellectual property; (3) correct attribution; and, (4) ambiguous boundaries. These themes were identified

across interviews, which indicates that the interviewees had some shared sense of the concepts of both academic integrity and plagiarism, at least in the abstract. There is, however, an inherent conflict between their expressed certainty about the concepts and the ways in which they attempted to explain the boundaries of plagiarism. This finding is similar to Newton's (2016): that "[n]ew undergraduates were confident in their understanding of plagiarism, yet performed poorly on simple tests of referencing" ("Abstract," p. 482). Their understandings of academic integrity and plagiarism appear to be conceptual rather than practical. In essence, the participants spoke as if they knew what these concepts were, but their inability to articulate procedural boundaries betrayed their uncertainty.

Perhaps ironically, for members of a generation that is, at times, condemned for moral relativism (McBrayer, 2015), the interviewees uniformly expressed that if a student simply followed the rules for academic integrity, he or she could avoid being charged with plagiarism. One representative comment to this effect was: "I think, like, the rules of plagiarism here are pretty [pause] clear and […] I understand, like, some students who don't wanna put in the time or the work to write an essay on their own would [plagiarize]." This sensibility is more in line with an absolutist position, which Forsyth (1980) defined as "[a]ssum[ing] that the best possible outcome can always be achieved by following universal moral rules" (p. 176, Table 1). This is not necessarily surprising as the wider sample group scored higher on idealism than the general population, as discussed earlier in this chapter. This absolutist position is, however, notable in light of the fact that the boundaries of plagiarism were difficult for the participants to articulate. Each of the themes that emerged from the interviews are discussed below.

Integrity and hard work. The first theme that emerged was a sense of an ethic of academic integrity. That is, they had a sense that academic integrity and, by extension, avoiding

plagiarism, were about being honest with one's work and about putting forth effort into one's work. This theme was coded as *integrity and hard work.* Interviewees used phrases to describe academic integrity such as "be[ing] honest" (Morgan), "try[ing] your best" and "pursu[ing] a good life in the university" (Riley), and "being truthful to the work that you yourself have done and that other students have done" (Taylor). Plagiarism was described as something that arose from a lack of interest in putting forth effort. It was said that plagiarizing was essentially "stealing [others' work] 'cause you don't wanna write it on your own" (Taylor). It was explained that it was "easier [to] put in the little extra work to not [plagiarize]," and that it was important to "just do [the work of writing an essay] yourself" (Taylor).

The interviewees seemed to believe that the ethic of academic integrity was important. They described plagiarism as something that resulted from a lack of effort, dishonesty, and as something that "disrespect[s]" (Riley) those writers whose materials are being "stolen" (Taylor). One of Taylor's remarks appeared to put distance between herself and those who would plagiarize: "If you're intentionally plagiarizing, I don't know what everyone's thoughts are as they're going through that." This comment seems to signify intentional plagiarism as something with which Taylor would never be able to identify. The ethic that the interviewees described seemed to be an internalized one, not something to which they attended merely out of obligation.

Intellectual property. The theme of intellectual property arose as a collective attempt at explaining the boundary between original work and plagiarism. The interviewees appeared to recognize that ideas constitute property and that property has value. Plagiarism was uniformly described as something like "using someone else's ideas or works without giving them credit […] or using them as your own" (Morgan). Ownership of ideas was discussed within the responses to many different questions. Interviewees discussed the importance of recognizing the

difference between one's own ideas and someone else's ideas. There was a sense throughout the interviews that an idea belonged to somebody, and that person deserved credit for coming up with the idea.

Interviewees appeared to determine ownership of an idea on the basis of who generated it. If an idea or work was original to a particular individual, it belonged to that individual. It was explained that writing an essay was about "com[ing] up with something new" and that "copying other people ideas" was wrong (Riley). It was said that information was stolen if it was used in an essay without attribution and "it wasn't something that you thought up of originally" (Taylor). One response, though, indicated that it was okay to use a friend's "general ideas" as long as the writer was "creating the information and the writing on [their] own" (Taylor). Though the interviewees shared a sense of intellectual property, they did seem to be some idiosyncratic differences in their interpretations of that concept. Regardless, their main shared solution to the problem of plagiarism, as theft of intellectual property, was formally correct attribution.

Correct attribution. Correct attribution seemed to be imagined as the antidote to plagiarism. Interviewees discussed learning how to cite in the ARTS 1110 course and they described learning this from other sources as well. The term "proper" was used often to describe the sort of citation that one ought to employ. "APA format" was mentioned as a focus of the ARTS 1110 course (Morgan). It was explained that "you should have, like, a quote mark, and uh, probably cite the writers and when it was publish, for information of the source" (Riley). "A quick lapse in citing" could lead to "get[ting] wrapped up" in a plagiarism case, so it was important to "be very diligent" (Taylor).

Despite their seemingly ardent focus on correct attribution – citation was mentioned more times than any other concept in the interviews – the interviewees seemed to be uncertain of their

ability to recognize correct citation. Even Riley, who was the only one to explicitly describe the form of a citation in APA style, explained that she learned how to correctly incorporate source materials through her professor's correction of her mistakes. Taylor mentioned that having the "Writing Centre […] review your citing" would allow a student to "know by someone who knows what they're doing that this is proper." When Morgan was asked if it was an act of plagiarism to copy the structure of an article that one has read, she responded: "I don't know how you cite that and stuff, but I'd say that's probably a wrong thing to do." Morgan's response highlights the importance of citation, but also the ambiguity surrounding it.

Ambiguous boundaries. Despite their insistence that plagiarism could easily be avoided with effort, particularly with attending to formally correct attribution practices, the interviewees expressed a great deal of ambiguity when discussing the boundaries between one's own ideas and the ideas of others. As Morgan explained: "when you're generating ideas, it's really hard to, like, define, like, where your ideas stop and their ideas start." Morgan reiterated this fuzziness of boundaries many times during the course of the interview, most often when making reference to brainstorming with others.

Similarly, Taylor explained that "if [a classmate] is writing an essay […] on the same topic then you could have crossover between your essays which could be an accidental case of plagiarism because then, it might look like you guys wrote the same essay together and just did two copies." Taylor said it was not a good strategy to discuss ideas for one's essay with a classmate. Both Morgan and Taylor seemed to be concerned with accidentally stepping over a boundary line that they could not clearly see, which seemed to be summed up in Taylor's statement that "to you, it may look like you haven't taken the information […] but if you have

someone else reading usually it's pretty clear." This was a statement she made when describing the importance of having a writing tutor check over one's work for plagiarism issues.

Riley appeared to be particularly troubled by the conundrum posed by citing a book that one had not read. She said that "citing is […] the thing that we do to appreciate other works, but the thing is that we don't actually read it, so it's kind of make me confused between those two ideas." At first, Riley seemed not to know whether something that was cited could be plagiarized. She ultimately decided that it could be. What she seemed not to recognize was that her decision was not consistent with her own definition of plagiarism: "copying other people ideas or, um, like, don't really cite when you use other people thinkings, sort of." Her procedural thinking about plagiarism was not entirely consistent with her conceptual definition of it. Morgan, in a similar way, said that "you haven't *read* [participant's emphasis] the thing so you don't know the ideas, but you've cited it because you assumed ideas so I'm not sure where that lies." She did not come to a decision on the nature of the behaviour, simply noting the blurred line between appreciating others' works and misappropriating them.

The quote that sums up the theme of ambiguous boundaries to the greatest extent is this: "In university, *everything* [participant's emphasis] is plagiarism, so just be safe about it." This is the most memorable advice that Morgan said she received from a more senior student about avoiding plagiarism. "Everything" would seem to be a fairly difficult thing to avoid, but, nonetheless, Morgan adopted the advice as a sort of mantra. She operates with this guiding principle in mind, even though she "[doesn't] really know, like, what the consequences are, like, depending on the severity of the academic integrity. Like, I'm not, I don't remember, or, like, I'm not fully aware of what it is, but I do know that *it's bad* [participant's emphasis]. So just don't do it." She laughed as she made this comment, but the laugh seemed to be a result of

nervousness. This would not be surprising given that it was her mission to avoid seemingly "everything" in an environment in which the consequences of one's actions were not clear, just known to be "bad." Similarly, Taylor explained, "what happens when you get caught in plagiarism" is "terrifying."

Summary of Qualitative Findings

The themes that emerged from the qualitative analysis reflect an inherent conflict in the interviewees' thinking. On the one hand, the interviewees seemed relatively certain that the ethic of academic integrity could be maintained through the effort of correct attribution. On the other hand, they did not seem to be able to articulate where the boundary exists between one's own work and the work of others. Their collective assertion is best summed up by Taylor, who said that "the rules of plagiarism […] are pretty [pause] clear" betrays their uncertainty even in its construction. Taylor's pause before settling on "clear" as her choice of word seems to highlight a degree of hesitation. The interviewees seemed to be experiencing an epistemological crisis with respect to defining plagiarism, which was evidenced by their frequent deferrals of explanation through the use of examples. Derrida's (1967/2001) concept of "*différance*" was certainly an identifiable dynamic within their responses; that is, the interviewees continued to defer meaning by reference to other concepts that were not the one which they were attempting to explain.

Much of their language use reflected hesitation – this can be found in the pauses, the ums, the uhs, and the phrases "stuff like that" and "kind of." Explaining what something is like or similar to is not the same as explaining what it is. Nonetheless, the interviewees spoke as if they had a clear understanding of the concepts, perhaps confusing what they felt they ought to know with what they did know. They may have felt that, given the serious consequences for plagiarism that they described, it is a concept that they are responsible to understand.

Chapter Five: Conclusions, Implications, and Limitations

The purpose of this study was to investigate the following research question: how do novice writers understand and experience the phenomenon of plagiarism? In order to answer this question, I distributed a questionnaire to first- and second-year students enrolled in the Introduction to University (referred to as ARTS 1110) course during the Fall 2017 academic term (see 'Appendix A' for the questionnaire). I also interviewed three of the respondents (see 'Appendix B' for the interview protocol). This chapter outlines the conclusions that have emerged from the results of this study, implications for institutional policies and pedagogical practice, the limitations of the study, and, finally, some suggestions for future research.

Conclusions of the Study

Three interlinked conclusions emerged from the data analysis. The first is that novice writers identify academic integrity as an ethical act of being honest and working hard. The second is that students find it difficult to locate the boundaries between one's own ideas and the ideas of others. Finally, novice writers find it difficult to identify concrete ways in which to integrate the principles of academic integrity. To synthesize these findings: novice writers appear to recognize the importance of maintaining academic integrity, but they concomitantly find it difficult to apply principles related to avoiding plagiarism in actual writing situations. This appears to be due to the ambiguity surrounding ownership of ideas as well as expressions of ideas. The conclusions outlined herein may appear to be drawn entirely form the qualitative analysis, but every effort was taken to draw inferences from both the quantitative and qualitative analyses. That is to say that the parallel mixed-methods design of this study enabled me to compare the qualitative findings to the quantitative results, and then to draw conclusions from this comparison. In other words, the conclusions of this study emerged from the mixing of the

results and findings. The comparison of results and findings has been outlined in detail in the previous chapter.

An ethic of academic integrity. When asked to explain the concept of academic integrity, the participants described it as both working hard at one's assignments as well as being honest about authorship. The quantitative analysis indicated that the majority of respondents felt that they understood the university's policy with respect to academic integrity. They also believed that they had received instruction with respect to academic integrity and plagiarism. Avoiding plagiarism seemed to be a moral duty for the interviewees, even though they apparently struggled with the application of related processes in many situations. There are two important implications of this finding.

There appears to be a degree of public mania concerning moral relativism and the ways in which it has denigrated moral decision-making in the current generation (McBrayer, 2015), such a conclusion does not seem to reflect the findings of this study. In fact, the majority of the sample group scored high on idealism (results related to the scale drawn from Forsyth's (1980) EPQ). Institutions can work with students' ethical positioning in order help them to acquire a more robust understanding of academic integrity. Interviewees mentioned that they struggled to correctly cite sources, despite their dedication to honesty. It seems that incorrect citation practices may not reflect an intention to deceive.

This leads to the second implication, which is that the definition of plagiarism has perhaps moved too far from the purpose of identifying intentional misrepresentation of authorship (Pecorari, 2008). As universities have embraced the concept of unintentional plagiarism (even a quick search on an online engine will verify this concept is a focus of many

university policies) it is worth considering why the simple failure to follow citation protocols is enough to charge a student with misconduct – a concept which typically relies on intentionality.

Institutional policies seem to consider intentionality as a feature of severe cases of plagiarism, but not as a necessary condition for all charges of plagiarism. By way of example, The University of Manitoba Office of Student Advocacy (2017a) states that intention is taken into account when determining penalties, but it also notes that plagiarism can be unintentional. Similarly, a guide related to academic misconduct written by the Faculty of Arts & Science at the University of Toronto (2018), states that plagiarism can be committed "by accident" (in the chart of academic offenses).

The Harvard Extension School (2018) at Harvard University goes further by stating that "[i]ntention is not considered when adjudicating cases. The penalty can be the same if you intentionally or unintentionally plagiarize, if it is your first offense, or if it was a final paper, small assignment, or draft" (paragraph under the heading "Consequences of Plagiarism and Cheating"). This is a rather bold set of statements. Taken together, the Harvard Extension School (2018) guidelines suggest not only that intention is irrelevant to the charge of plagiarism, but also that the extent of the misattribution may not be considered as a relevant factor in the formulation of institutional disposition. In essence, it seems that plagiarism is considered to be so egregious that any infraction is absolutely unacceptable.

Policies like the one of Harvard Extension School (2018) are problematic in light of the challenge of locating boundaries between one's own ideas and the ideas of others, which is a complex undertaking. In fact, this challenge renders any policies that include unintentional or accidental plagiarism problematic. Not only are the boundaries of originality complex, but cognitive research suggests that some forms of "inadvertent plagiarism represent[..] a type of

memory illusion in which individuals mistakenly trust that they have generated a new idea when, in reality, they have merely accessed a previously experienced idea and inadvertently claimed it as their own" (Gingerich & Sullivan, 2013, p. 903). Gingerich and Sullivan (2013) explain that this phenomenon is called "cryptomnesia." It is certainly not reasonable to expect students to be accountable for such misremembering, at least insofar as harsh penalties may potentially be applied.

The participants in this study recognized the ambiguity of these boundaries as a challenge to maintaining academic integrity, even in spite of their good intentions. They expressed concern on several occasions about accidentally committing plagiarism for fear of "terrifying" consequences (as Taylor had said). This sort of learning environment does not promote learning so much as it does fear-based avoidance. Furthermore, it promotes the avoidance of something that is difficult to accurately identify.

Learning to locate boundaries. Another conclusion that can be drawn from the qualitative analysis has to do with ambiguous boundaries. The participants seemed to have difficulty with determining ownership of ideas. Much of the existing literature has pointed to the same problem (Angélil-Carter, 2000; Childers & Bruton, 2016; Thompson, 2006). Participants seemed concerned with the complexity of determining the ownership of ideas. The concept of intellectual property was key to the participants' definitions of plagiarism. Each interviewee described plagiarism as taking ideas that belonged to someone else without providing attribution. They seemed to be aware of the duty to provide attribution and they possessed a commitment to it.

Their commitment persisted in spite of the perceived difficulty of determining ownership of ideas. In referencing brainstorming with others, they explained that it was not easy to

determine the lines among individual's ideas. They also seemed confused about correct attribution, despite their insistence on its importance. They suggested that attribution could seem correct to a writer, but appear incorrect to a reader. There was a sense that this was one way that plagiarism could be committed by accident.

The interviewees' responses included many non-lexical utterances. This may reflect a level of uncertainty with respect to their responses. While they generally did not formally indicate ambivalence, which they could have done by selecting the "Unsure" rating, the explanations of their chosen ratings appeared to indicate that complexity was involved in their decision-making. Furthermore, it seemed that they did not necessarily recognize a dissonance between the certainty of chosen ratings and the hesitation present in their explanations. The persistent use of non-lexical utterances, combined with the deferral of explanation through the use of examples, suggests that the interviewees had not reached a comprehensive understanding of the concept of plagiarism.

The interviewees described learning to attribute sources as a process. The process seemed to involve both repeated practice and guidance by a more-learned other. Librarians, writing tutors, and instructors were mentioned as resources for such guidance. The interviewees seemed to be aware of the responsibility to know how to cite while recognizing that they could not learn to do so entirely on their own. If learning to attribute sources requires a guided process, then it does not appear to be reasonable for universities to expect students to enter with this skill.

Given that scholarship is an ever-evolving conversation (Martinez Alfaro, 1996), the participants' experience of fuzzy boundaries is not surprising. Intertextuality is inevitable (Porter, 1986), which is to say that texts are necessarily in conversation with other texts. Even studies involving faculty members' perceptions of plagiarism have pointed to disagreement with

respect to boundary lines between original work and misappropriated work (Bennett, Behrendt, & Boothby, 2011; Borg, 2009; Marzluf, 2013; Pecorari & Shaw, 2012; Roig, 1997; Roig, 2001; Schwabl, Rossiter, & Abbott, 2013; Sutherland-Smith, 2005). Studies also indicate that institutional definitions vary widely (Eaton, 2017; McGrail & McGrail, 2015; Sutherland-Smith, 2011). Perhaps for the sake of procedural simplicity, many universities present the avoidance of plagiarism as relatively straightforward, in spite of the persistent claim that it can be committed by mistake. Such a position is a disservice to novice writers as it sets very challenging standards for them to meet while also labeling them as lazy if they fail to meet them.

Novice-ness and participation in academic discourse. Novices appear to face some unique challenges with respect to participating in academic discourse. The existing literature has demonstrated that novice writers must learn to establish authorial voice, and that this learning results from explicit instruction of the principles employed in a particular discourse and practice with writing (Borg, 2009; Humphrey et al., 2014). The participants appeared to have difficulty with applying principles of academic integrity in specific, pragmatic ways because of the perceived challenge of determining to whom ideas belonged. This determination may be particularly difficult for novice writers because they lack familiarity with academic context in which they are asked to write. They may not be able to easily situate their own points of view within the complex matrix of established viewpoints.

Furthermore, the novice writers in this study appeared to be operating in a learning environment in which it is difficult to develop a clear understanding of what constitutes original, written work. That is, they appeared to recognize that they needed to complete their own work, but the boundaries of originality were not clear to them. The interviewees made reference to having librarians, writing tutors, and instructors check over their work to ensure originality. They

discussed the difficulty of determining whether any of the ideas they presented in their work might have been stolen. This is a confusing use of the concept of stealing, as stealing necessarily involves the intentional acquisition of another's property. In other words, stealing cannot be accidental.

However, their use of the concept of stealing is consistent with the institutional framing of plagiarism as potentially unintentional (University of Manitoba, 2017a). Given that many other institutional policies describe plagiarism as potentially unintentional (e.g., Harvard Extension School, 2018; University of Toronto Faculty of Arts & Science, 2018), it would seem that novice writers in other university contexts may also construct the concept of plagiarism in similar ways. Attempting to create original work without a clear definition of originality does not allow for a robust process of self-regulation. Therefore, it seems reasonable for the participants to believe that another person needs to check over their work to ensure that they have met that goal. Despite its paradoxical implications, this strategy does appear to serve its purpose of clearing novice writers' consciences.

Implications of the Study

The conclusions of this study present implications for institutional policies as well as for pedagogical practice. The guiding principle is that academic integrity needs to be taught through mentorship, especially with respect to plagiarism. Writing involves engaging with other voices in a scholarly conversation and balancing that engagement with an assertion of one's own voice. Correct attribution is learned through process. Both policy and pedagogy need to take mentorship into account, and they need to provide students with opportunities for ways forward within an apprenticeship approach to learning.

Policy implications. There are several policy implications suggested by the conclusions of this study. These implications are: the need for explicit instruction regarding academic integrity; the need for adaptability in policy; and, the need for pedagogical responses to breaches of policy. The conclusions of this study suggest that policies must be crafted in such a way that consequences are logically connected to learner actions. It is necessary to provide students with the opportunity to learn from mistakes and to acknowledge intention as a required component of the charge of plagiarism.

The need for explicit instruction regarding academic integrity. In order for a policy to contain reasonable standards, it needs to be based upon a shared understanding of its terms. In the context of academic integrity, it is necessary to provide students with explicit instruction regarding academic integrity. It is not sufficient to simply tell them to maintain it, or to instruct them to avoid plagiarism. Given that the university learning context requires writing that is done differently from other contexts, it seems unreasonable to expect students to enter with a robust understanding of the expectations. The fact that students who have been made aware of the concepts related to academic integrity can still have difficulty applying them means that learning to correctly attribute sources requires more than declarative knowledge. Policy needs to be developed based on the degree to which the institution provides explicit instruction regarding academic integrity. It is not reasonable to penalizing learners based on something that they have not been explicitly taught.

The need for adaptability in policy. In addition to being developed in response to explicit instruction, policies also need to be adaptable, within the bounds of the institutional culture, to a variety of situations. Though some institutional contexts indicate that intentionality does not matter (Harvard Extension School, 2018), and many more consider it simply as a mitigating

factor, it is not sensible to consider the intentional misrepresentation of authorship and unintentional attribution errors as the same problem. One is a dishonest act, while the other is simply a mistake. Treating all situations involving misattribution as equal is not in the students' best interest, and it is not consistent with an apprenticeship approach to learning. Policy needs to acknowledge that different situations should yield different consequences.

The need for pedagogical responses to breaches of policy. The University of Manitoba (2017b) has started to move towards pedagogical responses to breaches of policy. This is a trend that needs to continue because it allows for policy to be adaptable to the needs of various learners. If a policy is adaptable, it can include the flexibility to assign consequences based on the needs of the student as a learner rather than on the perceived severity of the offense. Two students may engage in the same behaviours for different reasons, some of which may involve an intention to deceive, and some of which may not. Consequences should logically follow from the motivations behind an unacceptable behaviour.

Pedagogical implications. There are several pedagogical implications suggested by the conclusions of this study. These implications are: recognizing the impact of prior knowledge; teaching academic integrity through an apprenticeship approach; and, designing feedback that "feeds forward" (Higgins, Hartley, & Skelton, 2001). In brief, feeding forward enables students to use feedback in future learning situations. The conclusions of this study suggest that instructors should provide explicit instruction with respect to academic integrity. Variance in students' prior knowledge needs to be acknowledged, and students need to be brought through the process of learning academic integrity with opportunities for feedback rather than simply the possibility of punishment for mistakes.

Recognizing the impact of prior knowledge. Assessing students' prior knowledge is important for establishing a base from which to develop teaching strategies. In other words, it is essential to incorporate this to the process of scaffolding learning (Vygotsky, 1978). Scaffolding refers to instructional support that enables students to reach a learning goal (Vygotsky, 1978). Scaffolding is intended to move learners towards independence. The quantitative analysis of this study suggests that, even though most respondents agreed on what constitutes plagiarism, there were some that held an opposing view. It also suggests that some writing behaviours are more ambiguous for novice writers as a group. Similarly, the qualitative analysis suggests that even when novice writers agree about which composition behaviours are permissible and unacceptable, they may do so for different reasons. If academic integrity is going to be taught effectively, pedagogical scaffolds should derive from students' existing knowledge. In particular, instructors of courses that involve writing assignments can investigate their students' incoming knowledge and develop learning activities that build upon this knowledge.

Teaching academic integrity through an apprenticeship approach. Learning academic integrity appears to be a process, regardless of one's personal moral code. Maintaining academic integrity involves a complex set of skills, and, for novice writers, these skills are required to be employed in a novel environment. This complexity puts novice writers at a disadvantage when they are not mentored through the process of acquiring procedural skills related to academic integrity. Assessment design needs to move away from "plagiarism proof[ing]" (Bloom, 2008), otherwise known as plagiarism deterrence, and towards providing low-risk learning opportunities in which students can practice writing while engaging with sources without the fear of making mistakes. Plagiarism proofing appears to be a well-intended trend in teaching, but, nonetheless, it frames plagiarism as something that students need to be insulated from. Alternatively, the charge

of plagiarism should only be applied to intentional acts of deception, which leaves room for apprenticeship with respect to learning to engage with secondary source material. It would seem that well-designed summative assessments should evaluate the success of a students' incorporation of sources, which means that poor use of sources would not actually yield success in a writing assignment.

Designing feedback that "feeds forward." According to Higgins et al. (2001), feedback on writing assignments should "feed forward." That is, it should provide students with opportunities to use the feedback on future assignments. This appears to be a necessary feature of feedback with respect to academic integrity. Regardless of whether a particular course contains multiple writing assignments, feedback can provide students with ways forward for citing better as well as writing better.

Feedback, even on summative assessments, should not be exclusively summative in nature. There should be aspects of the feedback that can be formative and transferable to future writing situations. To move students away from prioritizing the technical aspects of citation over the spirit of academic integrity, instruction must similarly focus on the spirit of the law. In an apprenticeship context, which the university environment arguably is, apprentices will pick up on the priorities of their mentors and will work towards those priorities. Feedback on written assignments that involve the use of source materials should, to a large extent, focus on the development of authorial voice and specific strategies to increase students' command of the discourses in which they are engaged. It would seem reasonable to focus such formative feedback on the conventions that are employed within the particular discourse. "Feeding forward" should be considered a requirement for providing feedback rather than as a good option. University students are meant to be engaged in comprehensive degree programs that

introduce them to particular disciplines. If the completion of a degree is regarded by faculty as a piecemeal exercise, then the apprenticeship approach to learning is not being employed.

Limitations of the Study

According to Creswell (2008), a parallel mixed-methods study is one in which a "researcher gathers both quantitative and qualitative data, analyzes both datasets separately, compares the results from the analysis of both datasets, and makes an interpretation as to whether the results support or contradict each other" (p. 557). The rationale for such a design is that it allows for both generalizability of the quantitative results as well as for the emergence of rich, contextual information surrounding a phenomenon (Creswell, 2008). In parallel mixed-methods studies, the limitations of each method are mitigated, but they are not entirely eliminated. In this present study, some inherent limitations of quantitative questionnaires as well as of semi-structured interviews need to be considered in the interpretation of the results.

One general limitation, related to the subject matter of the study rather than the methodology, may have applied to both the quantitative and qualitative results. Given that the subject matter of this study is an offense of misconduct, it is possible that participants were not entirely honest with some of their responses. This would be in the interest of self-protection. Though measures were taken to encourage participants' propensity towards providing truthful responses, such as keeping their instructors out of the room during questionnaire distribution and maintaining anonymity of the questionnaires and the confidentiality of the interviews, it is difficult to entirely eliminate the risk of social desirability bias when researching sensitive issues (Furnham, 1986). Mitigation of the risk of this bias was the main reason for not asking participants about their own participation in plagiarism. It was supposed that asking questions about abstract behaviours might yield more accurate results. This is also the reason that the

questionnaires were distributed by an volunteer who was not involved in any other aspect of the study.

Limitations of the quantitative analysis. The questionnaire was not pilot-tested. In hindsight, this was an oversight in the questionnaire development process. McMillan (2012) describes the purpose of pilot-testing as "obtain[ing] feedback on the clarity of the items and response scale" (p. 161). Without a pilot test, it becomes more difficult to establish the validity of the research instrument as well as the test-retest reliability.

Validity refers to the degree to which a research instrument measures what it is intended to measure (McMillan, 2012). In a questionnaire, the construction of language is the main variable involved in the establishment of valid measures. However, the effectiveness of language as a communication tool depends upon the degree to which interlocutors agree on the meaning of various constructions. One of the inherent limitations of research on plagiarism is that plagiarism is a concept that appears not to have a fixed shape. In the absence of a high degree of agreement about what constitutes plagiarism, I decided to focus my research question on novice writers' understandings of and experiences with plagiarism as it has been constructed for them by the institution. This is why I developed the items on the questionnaire as I did – I used language that novice writers at the University of Manitoba had likely encountered before. While I admit that pilot-testing the questionnaire would have been useful for ensuring that respondents understood the questions in the way that I had intended them to, I want to reiterate that the questionnaire was not intended to measure the experience of a monolithic phenomenon; rather, its intended purpose was to measure the ways in which novice writers experienced the institutional construction of the phenomenon. The interviews, on the other hand, provided an opportunity for novice writers to deconstruct their personal understandings of plagiarism.

An additional limitation of the questionnaire is that test-retest reliability was not established. A measure of test-retest reliability could also have been achieved through a pilot test. It may have been possible to give the pilot group the same questionnaire to complete on two separate occasions, allowing me to determine whether the questionnaire was likely to produce similar results if administered at different times (McMillan, 2012). However, it is worth noting that phenomenological studies are undertaken based on the assumption that reports of experience can change over time. While test-retest reliability would have been worth investigating, poor test-retest reliability would not necessarily have been an indication of the quality of the research instrument; rather, it might would have been a reflection of the fluid nature of the concept of plagiarism, leading to changing perceptions over time.

One of the limitations of Likert-type scales is that the psychological distance between ratings may not be as great for some respondents as for others (Sullivan & Artino Jr., 2013). Another concern is that the number of rating options can influence the perceived psychological distance between the options (Wakita, Ueshima, & Noguchi, 2012). Therefore, the interpretation of results derived from Likert-type scales necessarily involves a recognition that ratings do not reflect a precise degree of agreement or disagreement with a statement. Rather, they provide an approximate representation.

Forsyth's (1980) EPQ has established validity and reliability, and therefore, the portion of the questionnaire that was drawn from this instrument can be more easily trusted. However, according to McMillan (2012), scales that measure noncognitive traits can produce "response set[s]" (p. 162). That is, respondents may have "a tendency to respond in the same way, regardless of the content of the items" (p. 162). Some responses to the items from Forsyth's (1980) EPQ appeared to reflect extreme response styles. Batchelor and Miao (2016) defined an

extreme response style as a "tendency to prefer responding using extreme endpoints on rating scales" (p. 51). Four of the questionnaires exhibited an extreme response pattern on the EPQ items and were excluded from the analysis. Extreme responses are especially problematic for a scale such as the EPQ because the scale contains contradictory statements. It is also suspect that one respondent indicated neutrality on all of the items because it seems unlikely that an individual would possess no opinions on ethics. This was also treated as a response set for the purposes of this study. These response sets seem to indicate "deliberately inaccurate responses by subjects," otherwise known as "faking" (McMillan, 2012, p. 163).

In addition, forty-two questionnaires contained incomplete EPQ responses. These responses were also excluded from the analysis. As a result, 304 out of 350 questionnaires met the criteria for inclusion for analysis of the EPQ results. This means that the sample size was much smaller for the measure of ethical positioning than for any other measure in the study.

It is also worth noting that I did not ask for class attendance to be taken on questionnaire distribution days, so I do not know how many students were present on those days. While 58.0% of enrolled students responded, I do not know how many enrolled students were absent from class and I do not know if these individuals share any characteristics in common. For example, it may be that low-achieving students were underrepresented in the questionnaire as non-attendance may be more common amongst this group. It is doubtful, however, that distributing the questionnaire via e-mail rather than in class would have led to a comparable response rate, as e-mailed questionnaires typically elicit fewer responses than questionnaires that are administrated face-to-face (Nulty, 2008).

Limitations of the qualitative analysis. Qualitative research inherently carries the risk of researcher bias (McMillan, 2012). Though I have no vested interest in the outcome of this

study, I have extensive experience teaching students enrolled in the ARTS 1110 course, and I would have entered my analysis with preconceived notions of the ways in which students interact with the constructed phenomenon of plagiarism. Being aware of this potential for bias enabled me to self-reflect as a researcher, which allowed for the findings of this study to have greater credibility (McMillan, 2012).

I also worked to reduce potential bias by sharing my entire coding process with a member of my committee and by asking the member to provide feedback on the reasonableness of my interpretations. This was intended as a "peer debriefing" process, in which "a colleague […] review[s] the study for credibility and determine[s] if the results seem to follow from the data" (McMillan, 2012, p. 304). Though qualitative interpretation is subject to a certain degree of idiosyncrasy, the main aim is to ensure that learned others can agree that the interpretation is, at least, reasonable.

While generalization is not the aim of qualitative research due to the impossibility of replication, it is possible to increase the likelihood that the findings can be applied in some way "to other contexts and settings," a concept otherwise known as "transferability" (McMillan, 2012, p. 305). While consumers of this research must decide for themselves if the findings might be applicable to their contexts (McMillan, 2012), I have worked to ease that decision-making process by providing "thick description" of the procedures used to collect data, as well as describing the demographics of the population under study (McMillan, 2012, p. 305).

Suggestions for Future Research

Several directions for future research emerge from this study. First, similar investigations of novice writers' understandings of plagiarism will either confirm or contradict the results. Replication is central to the practice of scholarly research. Second, while this study touched on

novice writers' processes for determining the boundaries of plagiarism, it is necessary to further investigate the ways in which novice writers make these determinations. Furthermore, it will be important to understand their processes in actual writing situations as opposed to in rating situations. One suggestion might be to revisit talk-aloud protocols (Flower & Hayes, 1981) as method of investigation to probed writers' composition processes and use of secondary source materials. Finally, the effectiveness of pedagogical techniques needs to be examined. This applies to the techniques that might be used to teach academic integrity as well as the techniques that are used to respond to breaches of policy.

Investigations of novice writers' understandings. To add to instructors' understanding of novice writers' prior knowledge, studies should continue to focus on novice writers' understandings of academic integrity and plagiarism, particularly in different institutional contexts. There may be some understandings that are fairly universal, and there may be others that are more idiosyncratic and based upon specific learning contexts. The analysis of such studies does not need to judge what students should know, but they should simply comment on what they do know, and, in some cases, how they came to that knowledge. How knowledge is reached is relevant when it pertains to the ways in which institutional framing may have impacted that knowledge. If institutional framing of the issue is found to lead to misunderstanding, it can then be corrected.

Investigations of novice writers' decision-making processes. An understanding of learner's processes is important for designing effective learning scaffolds. While the present study investigated, to a degree, novice writers' processes for determining the boundaries of originality and plagiarism, it did not investigate novice writers' decision-making processes in actual writing situations. A systematic study of the ways in which novice writers incorporate

sources and work to maintain academic integrity would enable instructors to build upon these processes and to provide corrective instruction with respect to ineffective or inefficient student writing practices.

Talk-aloud protocols are a useful method of investigation because they provide the most accurate record of writer processes (e.g., Flower and Hayes, 1981). Concurrent verbalizations lead to much more accurate results than retrospective verbalizations (Smagorinsky, 1989). This is because writers are prone to draw upon known schematic frameworks in their description of their processes rather than describing what they actually do (Smagorinsky, 1989), which is true of retrospective descriptions of decision-making in general (Holbrook, 2008). This is not the result of the intention to deceive, but rather, it emerges from the confusion between what one ought to do and what one has actually done. Writers, in general, are predisposed to overestimate their participation in the pre-determined steps that they were previously taught.

Evaluations of the effectiveness of pedagogical techniques and responses. There are many ways in which to apply a pedagogical approach towards academic integrity. These applications need to be evaluated for effectiveness. In general, it would seem that pre- and post-test designs would provide the necessary investigative framework for such evaluations. If particular techniques lead to greater competency in source incorporation and in putting forth a unique authorial voice, then those techniques could be judged as effective, and then instructors could be confident in their efficacy.

Pedagogical responses to breaches of policy should be evaluated. It may be that particular interventions lead to greater learner competency, and others may not. Rather than developing best practices based on anecdotal evidence, systematic evaluation can provide institutional administrations with the confidence that they are responding to breaches of academic integrity

policies with the best interest of its students in mind. If ineffective pedagogical responses are employed, this is no better than simply punishing students for their mistakes. Responses must provide students with access to strategies for improvement.

Summary of Conclusions, Implications, and Limitations

While the study under discussion involved subject matter that may have limited participants' truthfulness in the interest of self-protection, measures were taken to increase the veracity of the findings. Primarily, this was done through maintaining the anonymity of the questionnaire results and the confidentiality of the interviews. Furthermore, while the applicability of the study's results may not be entirely generalizable to other contexts, university contexts that are similar to the University of Manitoba may find the results to be at least transferable to a degree.

The main conclusions of this study are that novice writers appear to possess a commitment to maintaining honesty in their work and in putting effort into their writing. They do seem to believe in the ethic of academic integrity, but they apparently have difficulty with applying the principles of academic integrity in particular writing situations. Namely, they seem to have difficulty locating the boundaries between their own work and the work of others. This difficulty does not appear to be a result of a lack of effort. Rather, it appears to be a result of operating within a learning environment with ambiguous targets and potentially severe consequences for mistakes.

The conclusions of this study imply that academic integrity policies should acknowledge that writers may apply principles of academic integrity in different ways, depending on their understanding of the concept. They must also recognize explicit instruction with respect to academic integrity as an institutional responsibility, and policies should be designed with this

instruction in mind. Furthermore, policies reflect adaptability to particular situations and should provide pedagogical responses to breaches of policy, particularly in the absence of the intention to deceive. Pedagogical practice should recognize the impact of prior knowledge on students' understanding, teach academic integrity through an apprenticeship approach that extends even to the summative feedback stage, and should include feedback that students can apply to future writing situations.

Further research is needed to investigate novice writers' understandings of academic integrity and plagiarism in order to establish a base from which to design effective scaffolds. Research should also focus on uncovering novice writers' practices with respect to incorporating sources into one's own writing. Finally, pedagogical techniques for teaching academic integrity as well as for responding to breaches of policy must be evaluated for effectiveness. Anecdotal evidence of effectiveness is not sufficient for establishing that particular interventions are in the best interest of the population of students as a whole. Given the sensitivity of the issue, and the impact of penalties on students' lives, great care must be taken to simultaneously protect the standards and reputation of the institution and to facilitate the intellectual development of the students.

References

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

Academic Integrity Working Group, University of Manitoba (2016, June). *Appropriate collaboration guidelines for written assignments.* Retrieved from http://www.umanitoba.ca/student/resource/student_advocacy/media/appropriate-collaboration-guidelines-for-written-assignments.pdf

Almargot, D., Caporossi, G., Chesnet, D., & Ros, C. (2011). What makes a skilled writer? Working memory and audience awareness during text composition. *Learning and Individual Differences, 21*(5), 505-516. doi: 10.1016/j.lindif.2011.06.001

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

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

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

Batchelor, J., & Miao, C. (2016). Extreme response style: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Psychology, 16*(2), 51-62.

Beaufort, A. (2007). *College writing and beyond: A new framework for university writing instruction.* Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Bennett, K. K., Behrendt, L. S., & Boothby, J. L. (2011). Instructor perceptions of plagiarism: Are we finding common ground? *Teaching of Psychology, 38*(1), 29-35.

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition.* New York, NY: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Bevan, R., Badge, J., Cann, A., Willmott, C., & Scott, J. (2008). Seeing eye-to-eye? Staff and student views on feedback. *Bioscience Education, 12*(1), n.pg.

Bloom, L. Z. (2008). Insider writing: Plagiarism-proof assignments. In C. Eisner & M. Vicinus (Eds)., *Originality, imitation, and plagiarism: Teaching writing in the digital age* (pp. 208-218). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Borg, E. (2009). Local plagiarisms. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 34*(4), 415-426. doi: 10.1080/02602930802075115

Bourdieu, P. (1986). *The forms of capital.* In I. Szeman & T. Kaposy (Eds.). *Cultural theory: An anthology* (pp. 81-93). Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power.* J. B. Thompson (Ed.). G. Raymond & M. Anderson (Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Carroll, L. A. (2002). *Rehearsing new roles: How college students develop as writers.* Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Chandrasoma, R., Thompson, C., & Pennycook, A. (2004). Beyond plagiarism: Transgressive and non-transgressive intertextuality. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 3*(3), 171-193.

Childers, D., & Bruton, S. (2016). "Should it be considered plagiarism?" Student perceptions of complex citation issues. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 14*(1), 1-17. doi: 10.1007/s10805-015-9250-6

Copyright Act of Canada, Revised Statues of Canada. (1985, c. C-42). Retrieved from the Department of Justice Canada website: http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-42/

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J. W. (2008). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (3rd ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.: Upper Saddle River, NJ.

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

Dahl, S. (2007). Turnitin ®: The student perspective on using plagiarism detection software. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 8*(2), 173-191.

Davies, M. (2013). Critical thinking and the disciplines reconsidered. *Higher Education Research and Development, 32*(4), 529-544. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2012.697878

Day, K. (2008). Time is not on our side: Plagiarism and workload in the community college. In R. M. Moore & A.E. Robillard (Eds.)., *Pluralizing plagiarism: Identities, contexts, pedagogies* (pp. 43-61). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.

Derrida, J. (1967/2001). *Writing and difference* (A. Bass, Trans.). Routledge: New York, NY.

Devlin, M., & Gray, K. (2007). In their own words: A qualitative study of the reasons Australian university students plagiarize. *Higher Education Research & Development, 26*(2), 181-198. doi: 10.1080/07294360701310805

Eaton, S. E. (2017). Comparative analysis of institutional policy definitions of plagiarism: A pan-Canadian university study. *Interchange, 48*(3), 271-281.

England, A. (2008). The dynamic nature of common knowledge. In C. Eisner & M. Vicinus (Eds)., *Originality, imitation, and plagiarism: Teaching writing in the digital age* (pp. 104-113). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Evans, R. (2006). Evaluating an electronic plagiarism detection service: The importance of trust and the difficulty of proving students don't cheat. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 7*(1), 87-99.

Febvre, L., & Martin, H. (1976/1990). *The coming of the book: The impact of printing 1450-1880* (D. Gerard, Trans.). G. Nowell-Smith & D. Wootton (Eds.). A Verso Modern Classic. New York, NY: Verso.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communications, 32*, 365-387.

Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2007). Plagiarism and second language writing in an electronic age. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 27,* 161-183.

Forsyth, D.R. (1980). *A taxonomy of ethical ideologies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*(1), 175-184.

Forsyth, D. R., O'Boyle Jr., E. H., & McDaniel, M. A. (2008). East meets West: A meta-analytic investigation of cultural variations in idealism and relativism. *Journal of Business Ethics, 83*(4), 813-833.

Foucault, M. (1977/1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.) (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Furnham, A. (1986). Response bias, social desirability and dissimulation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 7*(3), 385-400.

Gingerich, A. C., & Sullivan, M. C. (2013). Claiming hidden memories as one's own: A review of inadvertent plagiarism. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology, 25*(8), 903-916. doi: 10.1080/20445911.2013.841674

Gu, Q., & Brooks, J. (2008). Beyond the accusation of plagiarism. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics, 36,* 337-352.

Halupa, C., & Bolliger, D. U. (2013). Faculty perceptions of student self-plagiarism: An exploratory multi-university study. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 11*, 297-310.

Harvard Extension School. (2018). *Tips to avoid plagiarism.* Retrieved from https://www.extension.harvard.edu/resources-policies/resources/tips-avoid-plagiarism

Higgins, R., Hartley, P., & Skelton, A. (2001). Getting the message across: the problem of communicating assessment feedback. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *6*(2), 269-274.

Hillocks, Jr., G. (1986). *Research on written composition: New directions for teaching.* Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills.

Hirvela, A., & Du, Q. (2013). "Why am I paraphrasing?": Undergraduate ESL writers' engagement with source-based academic writing and reading. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 12,* 87-98.

Holbrook, A. (2008). Self-reported measure. In P. J. Lavrakas (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of survey research methods volume 1* (pp. 804-805). Sage Publications, Inc.: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Howard, R. M. (1992). A plagiarism pentimento. *Journal of Teaching Writing, 11*(3), 233-246.

Howard, R. M. (1999). *Standing in the shadow of giants.* Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Humphrey, R. C., Walton, M. D., & Davidson, A. J. (2014) "I'm Gonna Tell You All About It": Authorial voice and conventional skills in writing assessment and educational practice. *The Journal of Educational Research, 107*(2), 111-122. doi:10.1080/00220671.2013.788990

Hyland, F. (2001). Dealing with plagiarism when giving feedback. *ELT Journal, 55,* 375-381.

Hyland, K. (1999). Academic attribution: Citation and the construction of disciplinary

knowledge. *Applied Linguistics, 20*(3), 341-367,

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

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

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

Kellogg, R. T., Whiteford, A. P., Turner, C. E., Cahill, M., & Mertens, A. (2013). Working memory in written composition: An evaluation of the 1996 model. *Journal of Writing Research, 5*(2), 159-190. doi: 10.17239/jowr-2013.05.02.1

Krause, K. (2001). The university essay writing experience: A pathway for academic integration during transition. *Higher Education Research & Development, 20*(2), 147-168.

Kristeva, J. (1966/1980). Word, dialogue, and novel. In L. S. Roudiez (Ed.), T. Gora, A. Jardine, & L. S. Roudiez (Trans.), *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (pp. 64-91). New York: Columbia University Press.

Kristeva, J. (1985/1996). Intertextuality and literary interpretation (Interview with M. Waller). In R.M. Guberman (Ed.), *Julia Kristeva Interviews* (pp. 188-203). New York: Columbia University Press.

Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education, 23*(2), 157-172.

Li, Y., & Casanave, C. P. (2012). Two first-year students' strategies for writing from sources: Patchwriting or plagiarism? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*(2), 165-180.

Lipton, J. (2013-2014). A taxonomy of borrowing. *Fordham Intellectual Property, Media Entertainment Law Journal, 24*(4), 951-996.

Marzluf, P. (2013). Examining teachers' and students' attitudes towards plagiarism. In M. Donnelly, R. Ingalls, T.A. Morse, J. Castner Post, & A.M. Stockdell-Giesler (Eds)., *Critical conversations about plagiarism* (pp. 7-21). Anderson, SC: Parlor Press, LLC.

Martínez Alfaro, M. J. (1996). Intertextuality: Origins and development of the concept. Atlantis: Revista de la Asociación Española de Estudios Ingleses y Norteamericanos. 18(1-2). 268-285.

McBrayer, J. P. (2015, Mar 2). Why our children don't think there are moral facts. *The Stone.* The Opinionator in The New York Times. Retrieved from https://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2015/03/02/why-our-children-dont-think-there-are-moral-facts/

McCabe, D. L. (2005). Cheating among college and university students: A North American perspective. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *1*(1). Retrieved from http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/article/view/14

McCarthy, L. (1987). A stranger in strange lands: A college student writing across the curriculum. *Research in the Teaching of English, 21,* 233-265.

McCune, V. (2004). Development of first-year students' conceptions of essay writing. *Higher Education, 47,* 257-282.

McCutchen, D. (1996). A capacity theory of writing: Working memory in composition. *Educational Psychology Review, 8*(3), 299-325.

McCutchen, D. (2000). Knowledge, processing, and working memory: Implications for a theory of writing. *Educational Psychologist, 31*(1), 13-23. doi: 10.1207/S15326985EP3501_3

McGrail, E., & McGrail, J. P. (2015). Exploring web-based university policy statements on plagiarism by research-intensive higher education institutions. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 13*, 167-196. doi: 10.1007/s10805-015-9229-3

McMillan, J. H. (2012). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer (6th ed)*. Pearson Education, Inc.: Boston, MA.

Modern Language Association. (2009). *MLA Handbook for writers of research papers* (7th ed.). New York, NY: Modern Language Association.

Moore, T. (2011). Critical thinking and disciplinary thinking: A continuing debate. Higher Education Research & Development, 30(3), 261–274.

Mozgovoy, M., Kakkonen, T., & Cosma, G. (2010). Automatic student plagiarism detection: Future perspectives. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 43*(4), 511-531.

Newton, P. (2016). Academic integrity: A quantitative study of confidence and understanding in students at the start of their higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 41*(3), 482-497.

Nulty, D. D. (2008). The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: What can be done? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(3), 301-314.

O'Brien Moran, M. (2013). *An investigation into the efficacy of using direct explicit instruction of single-cue writing strategies.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB: MSpace University of Manitoba. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/1993/22168.

Office of Institutional Analysis (2017a). Fall 2017 Student enrolment report: University of Manitoba. Retrieved from http://umanitoba.ca/admin/oia/media/student_enrol_F17.pdf

Office of Institutional Analysis (2017b). Fall 2017 Term enrolment summary report: University

of Manitoba. Retrieved from http://umanitoba.ca/admin/oia/media/summary_report_F17.pdf

Park, C. (2003). In other (people's) words: Plagiarism by university students -- literature and lessons. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 28*(5), 471-488. doi: 10.1080/02602930301677.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). Qualitative research and evaluation methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

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, England: Continuum.

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

Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(2), 201-230.

Porter, J. (1986). Intertextuality and the discourse community. *Rhetoric Review, 5,* 34-47.

Price, M. (2002). Beyond "Gotcha!": Situating plagiarism in policy and pedagogy. *College Composition and Communication, 54*(1), 88-115

Price, M., Handley, K., Millar, J., & O'donovan, B. (2010). Feedback: All that effort, but what is the effect? *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 35*(3), 277-289.

Rampolla, M. L. (2012). *A pocket guide to writing in history* (7th ed.). New York, NY: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Renaud, R. D., & Murray, H. G. (2008). A comparison of a subject-specific and a general

measure of critical thinking. *Thinking Skills and Creativity, 3*, 85-93.

Rohman, D. G. (1965). Pre-writing the stage of discovery in the writing process. *College Composition and Communication, 16*(2), 106-112.

Roig, M. (1997). Can undergraduate students determine whether the text has been plagiarized? *The Psychological Record, 47*, 113-123.

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

Russell, D. R. (1990). Writing across the curriculum in historical perspective: Toward a social interpretation. *College English, 52*(1), 52-73.

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers (3rd ed.)*. Sage Publications, Inc: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Schwabl, K., Rossiter, M., & Abbott, M. (2013). University students' and instructors' paraphrasing and citation knowledge and practices. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 59*(3), 401-419.

Senders, S. (2008). Academic plagiarism and the limits of theft. In C. Eisner & M. Vicinus (Eds)., *Originality, imitation, and plagiarism: Teaching writing in the digital age* (pp. 195-207). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Shi, L. (2006). Cultural backgrounds and textual appropriation. *Language Awareness, 15*(4), 264-282.

Shi, L. (2011). Common knowledge, learning, and citation practices in university writing. *Research in the Teaching of English, 45*(3), 308-344.

Sitko, B. (1998). Knowing how to write: Metacognition and writing instruction. In D. Hacker, J. Dunlosky, & A. Greasser (Eds.). *Metacognition in Educational Theory and Practice.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Smagorinsky, P. (1989). The reliability and validity of protocol analysis. *Written Communication, 6*(4), 463-479.

Soiferman, L. K. (2012). "University and high school are just very different": Student perceptions of their respective writing environments in high school and first-year university. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB: MSpace University of Manitoba. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/1993/13237.

Spence, M. (2007). *Intellectual property* [eBook].Clarendon Law Series. Retrieved from Oxford Scholarship Online: doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198765011.001.0001

Starfield, S. (2002). "I'm a second-language English speaker": Negotiating writer identity and authority in Sociology One. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 1,* 121-140.

Sullivan, G. M., & Artino Jr., A. R. (2013). Analyzing and interpreting data from Likert-type scales. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education, 5*(4), 541-542.

Sun, Y. (2009). Using a two-tier test in examining Taiwan graduate students' perspectives on paraphrasing strategies. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 10*(3), 399-408.

Sutherland-Smith, W. (2005). Pandora's box: Academic perceptions of student plagiarism. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 4*(1), 83-95.

Sutherland-Smith, W. (2011). Crime and punishment: An analysis of university plagiarism policies. *Semiotica, 187* (1/4), 127-139.

Thompson, C. (2006). *Plagiarism or intertextuality? A study of the politics of knowledge, identity, and textual ownership in undergraduate student writing.* (Unpublished doctoral

dissertation). University of Technology, Sydney, Australia: OPUS University of Technology. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10453/20014.

Transgression. (2016, March). In *Oxford English Dictionary (Online)*. Oxford University Press.

University of Manitoba. (n.d.). Criteria for identification of courses satisfying the university written English and mathematics requirement. Retrieved from https://umanitoba.ca/faculties/arts/media/Criteria_for_English-Math.pdf

University of Manitoba. (2016a). *2016-2017 Undergraduate Academic Calendar.* Retrieved from http://umanitoba.ca/student/records/media/2016-2017-Undergraduate-Calendar.pdf

University of Manitoba. (2016b). *Responsibilities of Academic Staff with Regard to Students: Procedure.* Retrieved from http://intranet.umanitoba.ca/academic_support/catl/roass.htm

University of Manitoba. (2016c). *Student Discipline By-law.* Retrieved from http://umanitoba.ca/admin/governance/governing_documents/students/student_discipline.html

University of Manitoba Office of Student Advocacy (2017a). *From A to I: What is academic integrity.* Retrieved from http://www.umanitoba.ca/student/resource/student_advocacy/academicintegrity/students/a-to-i-what-is-academic-integrity.html#plagiarism.

University of Manitoba Office of Student Advocacy (2017b). *Options for educational supports & disciplinary outcomes.* Retrieved from http://umanitoba.ca/student/resource/student_advocacy/academicintegrity/faculty/options-for-educational-disciplinary-outcomes.html

University of Toronto Faculty of Arts & Science. (2018). *What is academic misconduct?* Retrieved from http://artsci.utoronto.ca/osai/The-rules/what-is-academic-misconduct

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wakita, T., Ueshima, N., & Noguchi, H. (2012). Psychological distance between categories in the Likert sale: Comparing different numbers of options. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 72*(4), 533-546.

Wardle, E. (2004). Can cross-disciplinary links help us teach "academic discourse" in FYC? *WAC Clearinghouse: Across the Disciplines, 2.* Retrieved from http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/articles/wardle2004/Index.cfm

Wingate, U. (2012). 'Argument!' helping students understand what essay writing is about. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 11,* 145-154.

Appendix A: Questionnaire

Survey of Essay Writing Strategies

Instructions

The main purpose of this survey is to obtain your perceptions regarding the degree to which various academic behaviours would be considered to constitute plagiarism. This information is being collected as part of an M.Ed. thesis that is exploring some of the ways in which new university students learn to become more proficient in their writing. This survey consists of four parts: (1) some basic demographic information; (2) questions that are intended to measure your general ethical positions; (3) rating the degree to which various behaviours represent plagiarism; and (4) questions about what you have learned so far about plagiarism from the University of Manitoba. This survey should take about 10-15 minutes to complete. Please try to be both thoughtful and candid in your responses so as to maximize the value of your responses.

By completing this survey, you are consenting participate in the study. Please note that you must be at least 18 years of age to complete this survey.
You do not have to complete this survey.

Part I. Basic Demographic Information

1. What is your student status (circle one)?

   Full-time Part-time

2. Are you a domestic student or an international student (circle one)?

   Domestic International

3. What is your primary language of communication (circle one)?

   English French

   Other (if so, please write the language in the blank):_____

4. Were you admitted under the Limited Admission student category (circle one)?

   Yes No Unsure

5. Were you admitted under the Mature Student category (circle one)?

   Yes No Unsure

6. What is your home faculty (circle one)?

   University 1 Faculty of Arts Faculty of Science

   Asper School of Business School of Art

   Other (if so, please write the name of your faculty in the blank):_____

7. How many credit hours of study have you completed (i.e., received a final grade for) (circle one)?

   0 3-9 12-18 21-24 27-30 33-42 45-60 More than 60

8. What is your age (circle one)?

   18-19 20-21 22-23 Older than 23

Part II. Ethical Positions[1]

[Author note: Forsyth's (1980) scale has been redacted for copyright purposes. The source can be found in the source footnoted below. The footnote was also published on the questionnaires that participants in this current study received.]

[1] Part II of this questionnaire is drawn from Forsyth, D.R. (1980). *A taxonomy of ethical ideologies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*(1), 175-184.

Part III. Rating Behaviours

In the context of writing an essay for a university course, based on the following definitions, please rate the degree to which you think that each behaviour represents an act of plagiarism **(circle your answer to each question)**:

Always Plagiarism: This behaviour definitely and clearly constitutes plagiarism in any situation in which it would occur.

Usually Plagiarism: This behaviour likely represents plagiarism, but there may be some situations in which this behavior would not count as plagiarism.

Usually not Plagiarism: It is unlikely that this behaviour is a form of plagiarism. However, there could be some possible situations in which this behaviour would count as plagiarism.

Never Plagiarism: This behaviour would never constitute plagiarism in any situation.

1. Asking the professor for help with generating ideas and including some of the professor's ideas in your essay.

Always Plagiarism	Usually Plagiarism	Usually Not Plagiarism	Never Plagiarism	Unsure

2. Discussing your ideas for your essay with a friend, who is not taking the same course, and including some of your friend's ideas in your essay.

Always Plagiarism	Usually Plagiarism	Usually Not Plagiarism	Never Plagiarism	Unsure

3. Asking a friend to proofread your essay.

Always Plagiarism	Usually Plagiarism	Usually Not Plagiarism	Never Plagiarism	Unsure

4. Submitting an essay for credit in two separate courses.

Always Plagiarism	Usually Plagiarism	Usually Not Plagiarism	Never Plagiarism	Unsure

5. Discussing your ideas for your essay with a classmate and including some of your classmate's ideas in your essay.

Always Plagiarism	Usually Plagiarism	Usually Not Plagiarism	Never Plagiarism	Unsure

6. Copying information word-for-word from an article, book, or website and including that

word-for-word information in your essay.

Always Plagiarism	Usually Plagiarism	Usually Not Plagiarism	Never Plagiarism	Unsure

7. Copying the structure of another student's essay.

Always Plagiarism	Usually Plagiarism	Unsure	Usually Not Plagiarism	Never Plagiarism

8. Citing a book in your essay that you have not directly read yourself.

Always Plagiarism	Usually Plagiarism	Usually Not Plagiarism	Never Plagiarism	Unsure

9. Asking a friend, who is not taking the same course, for help with generating ideas and including some of your friend's ideas in your essay.

Always Plagiarism	Usually Plagiarism	Usually Not Plagiarism	Never Plagiarism	Unsure

10. Asking a friend to help you find relevant research articles and/or books for your essay topic.

Always Plagiarism	Usually Plagiarism	Usually Not Plagiarism	Never Plagiarism	Unsure

11. Copying the structure of an article that you read.

Always Plagiarism	Usually Plagiarism	Usually Not Plagiarism	Never Plagiarism	Unsure

12. Asking a classmate to help you find relevant websites to your essay topic on an Internet search engine.

Always Plagiarism	Usually Plagiarism	Usually Not Plagiarism	Never Plagiarism	Unsure

13. Changing a quote by modifying a few words and including the modified quote in your essay.

Always Plagiarism	Usually Plagiarism	Usually Not Plagiarism	Never Plagiarism	Unsure

Part IV. Instruction at the University of Manitoba

Please circle 'Yes,' 'No,' or 'Unsure,' in response to each of following questions:

1. Have you read the University of Manitoba's policy with respect to academic integrity?

Yes No Unsure

2. Do you feel that you understand the University of Manitoba's policy with respect to academic integrity?

   Yes No Unsure

3. At the University of Manitoba, have you received instruction about academic integrity?

   Yes No Unsure

4. At the University of Manitoba, have you received instruction about strategies to maintain academic integrity?

   Yes No Unsure

5. At the University of Manitoba, have you received instruction about plagiarism?

   Yes No Unsure

6. At the University of Manitoba, have you received instruction about strategies to avoid plagiarism?

   Yes No Unsure

7. Do you feel that you understand how to bring information from source materials into an essay?

   Yes No Unsure

YOU HAVE REACHED THE END OF THE SURVEY.

Appendix B: Qualitative Interview Protocol

Defining the Phenomena

1. How would you describe the meaning of academic integrity?
2. How would you describe the meaning of plagiarism?
3. I have provided you with five rating options: Always Plagiarism, Usually Plagiarism, Usually Not Plagiarism, Never Plagiarism, and Unsure *(hand interviewee sheet with rating options and list of behaviours)*. In the context of writing an essay for a university course, please comment on the degree to which the following behaviour represents an act of plagiarism: [insert behaviour from the quantitative survey here].

- Why is this behaviour [always, usually, usually not, or never plagiarism, or why are you unsure]? *(repeat these questions for each of the behaviours on the list)*

Instruction

1. At the University of Manitoba, have you received instruction about academic integrity? If yes, how were you instructed about academic integrity?
2. At the University of Manitoba, have you received instruction about strategies to maintain academic integrity? If yes, what were the strategies that were suggested to you in this instruction?
3. At the University of Manitoba, have you received instruction about plagiarism? If yes, how were you instructed about plagiarism?
4. At the University of Manitoba, have you received instruction about strategies to avoid plagiarism? If yes, what were the strategies that were suggested to you in this instruction?

5. Do you feel that you understand the University of Manitoba's policy with respect to academic integrity? Why/why not? If yes, how did you come to understand the policies?
6. Do you feel that you understand how to incorporate information from source materials into an essay? Why/why not? If yes, how did you learn to do so?

Appendix C: Sample Questionnaire Consent Form

(slight modifications were made for the sections taught by Drs. Cranston and O'Brien-Moran)

UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA | Faculty of Education
Department of Educational Administration, Foundations and Psychology

227 Education Building
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada R3T 2N2
Telephone (204) 474-9018
Fax (204) 474-7550

Informed Consent

Study Title: Novice Writers' Perceptions of Plagiarism

Principal Investigator: Ms. Stephanie Crook, M.Ed. Student, Faculty of Education (Adult & Post-Secondary Education)
umcrooks@myumanitoba.ca

Research Supervisor: Dr. Robert Renaud, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education (Adult & Post-Secondary Education)
Robert.Renaud@umanitoba.ca

This consent form, a copy of which will be left with you for your records and reference, is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.

Project Description

This research study is being conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Principal Investigator's Master of Education degree. This study explores the ways in which novice writers (i.e., writers new to writing within the university environment) understand and experience the phenomenon of plagiarism. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose to participate, you will be asked to participate in filling out a survey, expected to last for about ten to fifteen minutes. In the survey, you will be invited to share information about your understanding of plagiarism. You will also be asked about your understanding of the policies regarding academic integrity at the University of Manitoba. You will also be asked about the instruction you have received at the University of Manitoba regarding academic integrity, and more specifically, plagiarism. Finally, you will be asked to rate statements intended to measure your general ethical positions. You may also, separately, elect to participate in a second stage of this study, which will involve a 45-60 minute interview about the same topics as the survey.

Potential Benefits

Participation in this study will not bring you specific benefits outside of an opportunity to share

your views and opinions. Your participation, however, may be beneficial to the research literature on plagiarism in academic writing and to the application of such research to universities and other post-secondary communities.

Potential Risks

There is minimal risk involved in participating in this study. At no time during the survey will you be asked to reveal your own engagement in plagiarism. Your ARTS 1110 instructor and teaching assistant will not know who is or is not participating in this study. If you choose to participate in a voluntary follow-up interview, The Principal Investigator, who is the Assistant to the Coordinator of ARTS 1110, will be conducting the interviews and will therefore know the identities of those who are participating in the study. However, the Principal Investigator will keep this information confidential.

Anonymity

Any data that is obtained in connection with this survey will remain anonymous and will be available to the above-named persons and the thesis committee, and research assistant(s) connected to the study. The data will be kept on password-protected computers, with the paper copies stored in a locked filing cabinet.

Please note that the Thesis Committee includes an individual who has academic responsibilities with respect to the course ARTS 1110 – Introduction to University:

- Dr. Michael O'Brien-Moran, Senior Instructor and Program Coordinator for ARTS 1110

Due to this individual's responsibilities with respect to the course, this individual will not be made aware of the identities of any of the participants in the study. This individual will, however, have access to anonymized survey data.

Dissemination of Research Results

The results of this research will be disseminated through the Principal Investigator's Master's thesis, which will be made publicly available online through the University of Manitoba Libraries. The results of this research may also be disseminated through research conferences, or through academic publishing (e.g., journals, books). You will not be named or identifiable in any reports of this study. If any statement you made during the interview is used in a research report it will be attributed to a pseudonymous source.

Your participation in this survey indicates that you have understood, to your satisfaction, the information regarding participation in the research project and agree to participate as a subject. In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the researchers, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time, and /or refrain from answering any questions you prefer to omit, without prejudice or consequence. Your continued participation should be as informed as your initial consent, so you should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation.

The University of Manitoba may look at your research records to see that the research is being done in a safe and proper way.

This research has been approved by the Education and Nursing Research Ethics Board. If you have any concerns or complaints about this project you may contact any of the above-named persons, or the Human Ethics Coordinator at 204-474-7122 or humanethics@umanitoba.ca. A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.

Handout of Resources for Participants
Academic Integrity Resources

Below, please find some University of Manitoba resources for any questions or concerns you may have about academic integrity and, by extension, plagiarism.

- Link to the **University of Manitoba Academic Integrity website**:

  http://www.umanitoba.ca/academicintegrity

- Link to the **Student Advocacy website**:

  http://umanitoba.ca/student/advocacy/

- Link to the **University of Manitoba's *Student Discipline By-law*:**

  http://umanitoba.ca/admin/governance/governing_documents/students/student_discipline.html

These are the University of Manitoba's go-to resources for staff and students when it comes to issues relating to academic integrity. Student Advocates are available for consultation free of charge. **The Student Advocacy Office is located in 520 University Centre.**

(The portion below was included on a stapled slip to the front of the survey/consent form so that the research assistant could easily tear it off and separate it from the survey data):

If you wish to receive a summary of the results, please leave your email address below. This information will be stored separately from the data collected from your participation. A summary of results will be sent to participants by June 2018.

_____

Would you be willing to participate in a voluntary follow-up interview (please circle)?

Yes No

If you answered yes, please include your University of Manitoba e-mail address on the following line:

The researcher will contact you at the above e-mail address to provide you with more details about the interview process. Your participation in an interview is voluntary. You may withdraw your consent to participate in an interview at any time.

Appendix D: Informed Consent Form for Qualitative Interviews

UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
Faculty of Education
Department of Educational Administration, Foundations and Psychology

227 Education Building
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada R3T 2N2
Telephone (204) 474-9018
Fax (204) 474-7550

Informed Consent

Study Title: Novice Writers' Perceptions of Plagiarism

Principal Investigator: Ms. Stephanie Crook, M.Ed. Student, Faculty of Education (Adult & Post-Secondary Education)
umcrooks@myumanitoba.ca

Research Supervisor: Dr. Robert Renaud, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education (Adult & Post-Secondary Education)
Robert.Renaud@umanitoba.ca

This consent form, a copy of which will be left with you for your records and reference, is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.

Project Description

This research study is being conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Principal Investigator's Master of Education degree. This study explores the ways in which novice writers (i.e., writers new to writing within the university environment) understand and experience the phenomenon of plagiarism. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose to participate, you will be asked to participate in an audio tape-recorded interview anticipated to last between forty-five minutes to one hour. In the interview, you will be invited to share information about your understanding of plagiarism. Specifically, you will be asked to share information about how you define plagiarism and the strategies you use to avoid plagiarism in your writing. You will also be asked to share your perspectives on plagiarism and academic integrity. Finally, you will be asked about the instruction you have received regarding plagiarism at the University of Manitoba.

Potential Benefits

Participation in this study will not bring you specific benefits outside of an opportunity to share your views and opinions. Your participation, however, may be beneficial to the research literature on plagiarism in academic writing and to the application of such research to

universities and other post-secondary communities.

Potential Risks

There is minimal risk involved in participating in this study. At no time during the interview will you be asked to reveal your own engagement in plagiarism. Neither your ARTS 1110 instructor nor your teaching assistant will know who is participating in this study. The Principal Investigator, who is also the Assistant to the Coordinator of ARTS 1110, will be conducting the interviews and will therefore know the identities of those who are participating in the study. However, the Principal Investigator will keep this information confidential.

Confidentiality

Any data that is obtained in connection with this study will remain confidential and will be available to the above-named person, the thesis committee, and research assistant(s) connected to the study. The data will be kept on password-protected computers.

Confidentiality will be maintained by using pseudonyms instead of participant names when audio-recording and transcribing interviews. All research materials will be destroyed by deletion and/or shredding five years after the Principal Investigator graduates (approximately October 2023).

Please note that the Thesis Committee includes an individual who has academic responsibilities with respect to the course ARTS 1110 – Introduction to University:

- Dr. Michael O'Brien-Moran, Senior Instructor and Program Coordinator for ARTS 1110

Due to this individual's responsibilities with respect to the course, this individual will not be made aware of the identities of any of the participants in the study. This individual will, however, have access to pseudonymized interview transcripts.

Dissemination of Research Results

The results of this research will be disseminated through my Master's thesis, which will be made publicly available online through the University of Manitoba Libraries. The results of this research may also be disseminated through research conferences, or through academic publishing (e.g., journals, books). You will not be named or identifiable in any reports of this study. If any statement you made during the interview is used in a research report it will be attributed to a pseudonymous source.

Your signature on this form indicates that you have understood, to your satisfaction, the information regarding participation in the research project and agree to participate as a subject. In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the researchers, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time, and /or refrain from answering any questions you prefer to omit, without prejudice or consequence. Your continued participation should be as informed as your initial consent, so you should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation. If you wish to withdraw from the study, please contact the Principal Investigator or the Research Supervisor.

The University of Manitoba may look at your research records to see that the research is being done in a safe and proper way.

This research has been approved by the Education and Nursing Research Ethics Board. If you have any concerns or complaints about this project you may contact any of the above-named persons, or the Human Ethics Coordinator at 204-474-7122 or humanethics@umanitoba.ca. A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.

Participant's Signature_____Date_____

Researcher and/or Delegate's Signature_____Date_____

If you wish to receive a summary of the results, please leave your email address or other preferred means of contact below. This information will be stored separately from the data collected from your participation. A summary of results will be sent to participants by June 2018.

_____

Table 1

Admission Category for Citizenship

Admission Category	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Domestic	314	89.7	90.0	90.0
International	35	10.0	10.0	100.0
Total Responses	349	99.7	100.0	
Missing	1	.3		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 2

Primary Language of Communication

Language	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
English	313	89.4	89.9	89.9
French	3	.9	.9	90.8
Other	32	9.1	9.2	100.0
Total Responses	348	99.4	100	
Missing	2	.6		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 3

Age Category

Age Category	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
18-19 years	253	72.3	72.7	72.7
20-21 years	47	13.4	13.5	86.2
22-23 years	22	6.3	6.3	92.5
Older than 23 years	26	7.4	7.5	100.0
Total Responses	348	99.4	100.0	
Missing	2	.6		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 4

Student Status

Student Status	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Full-time	311	88.9	88.9	88.9
Part-time	39	11.1	11.1	100.0
Total Responses	350	100.0	100.0	

Table 5

Credit Hours Completed

Credit Hours	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	240	68.6	69.6	69.6
3-9	34	9.7	9.9	79.4
12-18	25	7.1	7.2	86.7
21-24	18	5.1	5.2	91.9
27-30	10	2.9	2.9	94.8
33-42	12	3.4	3.5	98.3
45-60	6	1.7	1.7	100.0
Total Responses	345	98.6	100.0	
Missing	5	1.4		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 6

Home Faculty

Faculty	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
University 1	263	75.1	75.1	75.1
Arts	18	5.1	5.1	80.3
Science	52	14.9	14.9	95.1
Management	4	1.1	1.1	96.3
School of Art	1	.3	.3	96.6
Other	12	3.4	3.4	100.0
Total Responses	350	100.0	100.0	

Table 7

Ethical Positions

Ethical Position	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Absolutist	60	17.1	19.7	19.7
Situationist	160	45.7	52.6	72.4
Exceptionist	32	9.1	10.5	82.9
Subjectivist	52	14.9	17.1	100.0
Total Responses	304	86.9	100.0	
Missing	46	13.1		
Total	350	100.0	100.0	

Table 8

Copying Information Word-For-Word

Plagiarism Rating	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Never	6	1.7	1.7	1.7
Usually Not	12	3.4	3.4	5.2
Unsure	10	2.9	2.9	8.0
Usually	43	12.3	12.4	20.4
Always	277	79.1	79.6	100.0
Total Responses	348	99.4	100.0	
Missing	2	.6		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 9

Dual Submission

Plagiarism Rating	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Never	23	6.6	6.6	6.6
Usually Not	30	8.6	8.7	15.3
Unsure	46	13.1	13.3	28.6
Usually	85	24.3	24.6	53.2
Always	162	46.3	46.8	100.0
Total Responses	346	98.9	100.0	
Missing	4	1.1		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 10

Modified Quotations

Plagiarism Rating	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Never	15	4.3	4.3	4.3
Usually Not	55	15.7	15.8	20.1
Unsure	34	9.7	9.7	29.8
Usually	139	39.7	39.8	69.6
Always	106	30.3	30.4	100.0
Total Responses	349	99.7	100.0	
Missing	1	.3		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 11

Copying Another Student's Essay Structure

Plagiarism Rating	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Never	17	4.9	4.9	4.9
Usually Not	63	18.0	18.1	22.9
Unsure	32	9.1	9.2	32.1
Usually	116	33.1	33.2	65.3
Always	121	34.6	34.7	100.0
Total Responses	349	99.7	100.0	
Missing	1	.3		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 12

Asking the Professor for Help

Plagiarism Rating	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Never	65	18.6	18.7	18.7
Usually Not	185	52.9	53.3	72.0
Unsure	29	8.3	8.4	80.4
Usually	58	16.6	16.7	97.1
Always	10	2.9	2.9	100.0
Total Responses	347	99.1	100.0	
Missing	3	.9		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 13

Asking a Friend to Proofread

Plagiarism Rating	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Never	249	71.1	71.3	71.3
Usually Not	64	18.3	18.3	89.7
Unsure	12	3.4	3.4	93.1
Usually	15	4.3	4.3	97.4
Always	9	2.6	2.6	100.0
Total Responses	349	99.7	100.0	
Missing	1	.3		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 14

Including a Friend's Discussed Ideas

Plagiarism Rating	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Never	78	22.3	22.4	22.4
Usually Not	168	48	48.3	70.7
Unsure	26	7.4	7.5	78.2
Usually	59	16.9	17.0	95.1
Always	17	4.9	4.9	100.0
Total Responses	348	99.4	100.0	
Missing	2	.6		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 15

Including a Friend's Generated Ideas

Plagiarism Rating	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Never	73	20.9	21.0	21.0
Usually Not	168	48	48.4	69.5
Unsure	22	6.3	6.3	75.8
Usually	61	17.4	17.6	93.4
Always	23	6.6	6.6	100.0
Total Responses	347	99.1	100.0	
Missing	3	.9		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 16

Asking a Classmate for Help with Using a Search Engine

Plagiarism Rating	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Never	185	52.9	53.5	53.3
Usually Not	105	30.0	30.3	83.6
Unsure	20	5.7	5.8	89.3
Usually	26	7.4	7.5	96.8
Always	11	3.1	3.2	100.0
Total Responses	347	99.1	100.0	
Missing	3	.9		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 17

Asking a Friend to Help with Research

Plagiarism Rating	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Never	220	62.9	63.4	63.4
Usually Not	84	24.0	24.2	87.6
Unsure	13	3.7	3.7	91.4
Usually	21	6.0	6.1	97.4
Always	9	2.6	2.6	100.0
Total Responses	347	99.1	100.0	
Missing	3	.9		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 18

Including a Classmate's Idea in One's Essay

Plagiarism Rating	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Never	28	8.0	8.0	8.0
Usually Not	105	30.0	30.1	38.1
Unsure	20	5.7	5.7	43.8
Usually	136	38.9	39.0	82.8
Always	60	17.1	17.2	100.0
Total Responses	349	99.7	100.0	
Missing	1	.3		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 19

Citing a Book That One Has Not Read

Plagiarism Rating	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Never	72	20.6	20.6	20.6
Usually Not	110	31.4	31.5	52.1
Unsure	84	24.0	24.1	76.2
Usually	57	16.3	16.3	92.6
Always	26	7.4	7.4	100.0
Total Responses	349	99.7	100.0	
Missing	1	.3		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 20

Copying the Structure of an Article

Plagiarism Rating	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Never	27	7.7	7.8	7.8
Usually Not	81	23.1	23.4	31.2
Unsure	35	10.0	10.1	41.3
Usually	119	34.0	34.4	75.7
Always	84	24.0	24.3	100.0
Total Responses	346	98.9	100.0	
Missing	4	1.1		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 21

Read the University of Manitoba's Policy

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	234	66.9	67.0	67.0
No	93	26.6	26.6	93.7
Unsure	22	6.3	6.3	100.0
Total Responses	349	99.7	100.0	
Missing	1	.3		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 22

Understanding of the University of Manitoba's Policy

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	254	72.6	73.0	73.0
No	31	8.9	8.9	81.9
Unsure	63	18.0	18.1	100.0
Total Responses	348	99.4	100.0	
Missing	2	.6		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 23

Instruction About Academic Integrity

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	272	77.7	78.4	78.4
No	38	10.9	11.0	89.3
Unsure	37	10.6	10.7	100.0
Total Responses	347	99.1	100.0	
Missing	3	.9		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 24

Instruction About Academic Integrity Strategies

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	232	66.3	66.9	66.9
No	71	20.3	20.5	87.3
Unsure	44	12.6	12.7	100.0
Total Responses	347	99.1	100.0	
Missing	3	.9		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 25

Instruction About Plagiarism

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	277	79.1	80.1	80.1
No	35	10.0	10.1	90.2
Unsure	34	9.7	9.8	100.0
Total Responses	346	98.9	100.0	
Missing	4	1.1		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 26

Instruction About Strategies to Avoid Plagiarism

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	250	71.4	71.8	71.8
No	68	19.4	19.5	91.4
Unsure	30	8.6	8.6	100.0
Total Responses	348	99.4	100.0	
Missing	2	.6		
Total	350	100.0		

Table 27

Understanding of Source Incorporation

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	253	72.3	73.3	73.3
No	39	11.1	11.3	84.6
Unsure	53	15.1	15.4	100.0
Total Responses	345	98.6	100.0	
Missing	5	1.4		
Total	350	100.0		