When students reference plagiarised material – what can we learn (and what can we do) about their understanding of attribution?

Kate Chanock
La Trobe University

Abstract

Although some students probably intend to plagiarise, others do it unintentionally; yet, as McGowan observes, "unwitting plagiarism" has been "largely neglected in the literature" (2005). In this article, I discuss some practices of attribution that students bring from school to university, and focus on one kind of 'unwitting plagiarism' that puzzles lecturers and student learning advisers alike – that is, when students provide a reference for 'clearly' plagiarised material. Drawing on Bakhtin, I suggest reasons why this practice makes sense to the students who do it. Then, drawing on Rose (1996) and East (2006), I look at the kind of teaching that would be necessary to mediate the gap between students' and lecturers' understandings of the purposes of attribution in scholarly writing.

Introduction

A widespread perception that plagiarism among university students is increasing (Emerson, Rees, & MacKay, 2005) is generating a growing literature on the subject (for example, the recent special issues of the *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, *2*(3a and 3b), 2005 and *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 31*(2), 2006 and the establishment in 2005 of the *International Journal for Educational Integrity*). Most writers attribute this apparent increase to the ease of hunting and gathering on the Internet (e.g., McGowan, 2003, p. 1), which explains the 'how' but not so much the 'why'. Although some students probably intend to plagiarise, Academic Language and Learning (ALL) advisers like myself, who work with students to improve their academic writing, also encounter students who do it unintentionally; however, McGowan (2005) observes that "unwitting plagiarism" has been "largely neglected in the literature". It has, however, recently been the subject of legal deliberations, when the Supreme Court of Queensland considered whether a Law student's referencing practices should be regarded as plagiarism or simply sloppy work (Humzy-Hancock [2007] QSC 034). McMurdo J. ruled that the practices complained of were very poor scholarship but did not constitute plagiarism. The case does raise questions, at least, about what students think they are doing when their work falls so far short of what is expected – and explicitly required – in their subjects.

Working at a large, outer-suburban campus of an Australian university where international students, mostly from countries where English is an additional language, make up a substantial proportion of the student body, I am familiar with ambient impressions that international students are particularly given to plagiarising for reasons ranging from insufficient English to cultural difference. However, international students are not my focus here; my university has a Language and Academic Skills (ESL) unit that works with students whose first language is not English, and the role

of Faculty-based ALL advisers like myself is to work largely with local English-speaking-background students. We are available for students to consult, either on their own initiative or with a lecturer's referral, when they want advice about writing they are doing or have done for their disciplines, and we draw on what we learn from them to design classes and materials on common questions or problems. From this perspective, over twenty years, I know that local students also struggle to understand and comply with university practices of attribution, and drawing on our conversations about this as we look at their work together, I have taken steps to learn about why this is the case.

In this article, I discuss students' answers to a survey that sought to learn what kinds of training in attribution they brought with them from school to university. I will suggest that we can find a logic to students' (mis)understandings about attribution in Bakhtin's characterisation of 'monologic' vs. 'dialogic' discourse. This logic may then help us to make sense of a particularly puzzling practice when students provide a reference for 'clearly' plagiarised material – that is, copied without quotation marks, but with the reference supplied. This was one of the practices examined in the Humzy-Hancock case, and one that has been noted among Australian students more widely. It is inconsistent with an intention to cheat, but not with a monologic view of discourse. Finally, I discuss the kind of teaching that would be necessary to mediate the gap between students' and lecturers' understandings of the purposes of attribution in scholarly writing.

Unethical or ignorant behaviour…. Or not?

Rebecca Moore Howard noted, in 1995, that "In composition studies, most published discussions of student plagiarism proceed from the assumption that plagiarism occurs as a result of one of two possible motivations: an absence of ethics or an ignorance of citation conventions". The discussion has evolved, since then, to recognise that the situation is less clear-cut. For example, Ashworth, Bannister and Thorne have found, in a study of students' views on cheating, that "It can be very difficult [for them] to work out what constitutes plagiarism" (1997, p. 191), while Macdonald and Carroll (2006, p. 241) find that teaching staff themselves have "no consistent understanding and/or definition of plagiarism" (see also Carroll 2003, pp. 12-14). Research by linguists and others, including learning advisers, has produced a more complex and nuanced picture that problematises both 'ethics' and 'ignorance'. Western practices of use and attribution of sources have been shown to be culturally specific (e.g., Chanock, 2003a; East, 2005; Howard, 1995, p. 14; Leask, 2006; Pennycook, 1996), and their normative status questioned as a form of cultural imperialism (Leask, 2006). In this context, the 'ignorance' so often attributed to international students (for discussions of this stereotype see, for example, Handa & Fallon, 2006, p. 128; Leask, 2006; Marshall & Garry, 2006; Melles, 2003, p. 72) becomes a difference of perspective on the ethical construction of knowledge. It is inappropriate then, Leask (2006) suggests, to persist with a discourse that frames dealing with plagiarism as a 'battle', and more appropriate to use, instead, the metaphor of a game.

> [Students] are, in effect, playing an old game [that is, academic study] by a new and unclear set of rules. They begin the game believing that they know the rules, for they have always won this game in the past – they've been good and successful students. Usually we don't tell them that the rules are different, because we don't always know that they are different (Leask 2000, p. 3, as cited in Leask 2006).

Leask argues that students who have played 'efficiently' by one set of rules should not be seen as 'deficient' when they encounter a different set of rules; they should just be properly informed that the rules have changed, and their teachers should be aware that students are having to become proficient in a new set of rules, and trust in their ability to do so.

Leask is writing primarily about international students, but she also sees local students as 'cultural others' to some extent (2006). Nonetheless, it is common for lecturers to expect local students to arrive at university trained in the attribution and referencing of sources. Since Australian students' secondary and tertiary education takes place within the one culture, if they do not know how to reference 'properly', it is often inferred that the schools have neglected to teach them a set of ethics and practices that are assumed to apply across both sectors. Colleagues of mine who lecture in the disciplines have complained that students were not trained in the proper use of sources at their secondary schools, a view that Melles endorses (2003, p. 74).

I do not think, however, that ignorance is the whole story; it appears, from twenty years of conversations with students who consult me as their ALL adviser, that they fail to reference 'properly' not because they do not know about attribution, but because they *do* know about it and think that they are doing it right. Their schools have trained them in particular practices of quoting, paraphrasing, and referencing, and they do not at first expect that university practices will be different. Certain scenarios are enacted again and again in my office, as individual students consult me for help in making sense of the marks and comments they have received on written work. When the lecturer has written 'source?' in the margin, students say things like, "I thought if you changed the words you didn't have to give a reference" or "But I put that article in my bibliography". As Leask says, they think they know the rules.

In fact, it is probably their confidence that they know the rules that allows them to ignore the copious guidelines set out in their subject guides, and choose from scratch, as it were, practices that run counter to the instructions they receive from lecturers in every subject in which they are enrolled. For, despite the wide variety of referencing conventions prescribed in different disciplines, all of the subject guides I have seen since the mid-1980s require the same practices that Howard has described in the US:

> ....American academic culture demands that writers who use the exact words of a source supply quotation marks at the beginning and end of the quotation, so that the reader can know where the voice of the source begins and ends. In addition, the writer must use footnotes, parenthetical notes, or endnotes to cite the source, so that the reader can consult that source if he or she chooses. Writers must also acknowledge the sources not only of words but also of ideas, insofar as is possible, even when they are not quoting word for word (1995, p. 11).

Asking our students

What, then, are the rules that local students think they know? I decided to investigate this when I became involved in discussions about revising the plagiarism policy at my university. I thought it would be useful to have more information on students' knowledge about attribution at the time that they commence their studies, to share with my colleagues in the disciplines; so I surveyed students in two large sociology classes in the Faculty where I work, asking them to fill out a very brief questionnaire about the ways they were expected to use sources in their writing for the final year of high school (see Appendix). (Although I asked students to indicate where they had been educated, the differences between the answers of local and international students to the survey questions were negligible, nor did they fall into any noticeable patterns. This is possibly because they did not come from any shared cultural tradition of education, being from Canada, US, Colombia, Sweden, Norway, Austria, Arabia, Zimbabwe, the Maldives, Guam, South Korea, and Japan.)

Table 1. Responses to questions about referencing

Response	Number (n=298)	%
A. In year 12, did you have to give a reference when you **quoted directly?**		
1. no	101	34%
2. yes, **both** in my essay **and** in a bibliography	122	41%
3. yes, but **only** in my bibliography	75	25%
(one student added "only in essay"!)		
B. In year 12, did you have to give a reference when you discussed, **in your own words**, something you had learned from reading?		
1. no	197	66%
2. yes, **both** in my essay **and** in a bibliography	44	15%
3. yes, but **only** in my bibliography	57	19%

As Table 1 shows, 34% of the students surveyed said they had not been expected to reference even direct quotations, and 66% said they had not been expected to reference their own discussions of material found in sources. Twenty-five percent said they had been expected to reference quoted material only in their bibliography, and 19% said that when they drew on other sources, but used their own words, they were expected to reference such discussions only in their bibliography. Only 41% said they had been required to follow practices that are the same as those required at university, when quoting directly, and 15% when using their own words. These results were startling even to me, and more so to my colleagues in the disciplines when I shared them at a 'Good Teaching' seminar.

I have been careful to say that students "said they had been expected to…" do one thing or another, because I am well aware that what is taught and what is learned are often not the same. It is not possible, on the basis of this data, to say what is taught in secondary schools in our region, but it is possible at least to say what some of our students think are correct practices of referencing and attribution when they begin their courses.

Students' answers to Questions C and D (see Appendix One), about voice and originality, also showed considerable variation in the students' prior experience of using evidence, and in the meanings they gave to originality. These meanings have a bearing on students' use of sources in that, if lecturers ask them to submit 'original' work, and a student thinks this means that they must "come up with ideas...not encountered...in reading", s/he is not going to be able to fulfill the lecturer's expectations. Eighty-four students, comprising 28% of respondents, did indeed think this was the meaning of originality.

Practical steps

Clearly, these findings supported institutional thinking that we needed to do more to educate our students about the use of sources, and to raise awareness among teaching staff of the complexity of 'unwitting plagiarism'. In consultation with the University's working group, the ALL advisers and the Academic Development Unit collaborated to produce a variety of activities and resources addressed to both students and staff. We now have accessible materials on the web that students can

consult – *Plagiarism: Explanation for students,* 'Using sources in your writing' (Chanock, 2003b), – so that they are not dependent upon struggling to understand the more official language of the far more lengthy academic misconduct policy available on the University's website (La Trobe University, 2007). The *Explanation for students* addresses common misconceptions about the meaning of originality in academic work; presents referencing as a service to readers, as well as a responsibility to sources; discusses whether, why and how much to quote, and why this varies across disciplines; gives examples of acceptable and unacceptable paraphrasing; and introduces the two kinds of referencing systems, notes or in-text references. In addition, we have a WebCT resource that students can work their way through at various levels. We also have materials addressed to academic teaching staff to help them in "Implementing the La Trobe University Policy on Academic Misconduct: Plagiarism" (La Trobe University, Academic Development Unit 2008).

An insight into students' understandings

Apart from the practical implications of the data I collected, however, I am interested in their implications for our understanding of the differences between many students' and lecturers' conceptions of the purposes of academic work. We may accept that some students who use only their bibliography for attribution do so because they think it is what they are supposed to do. Still, we must wonder, why does this practice, which so offends lecturers, seem acceptable to students? And similar questions can be asked about a further practice, which was not included in my survey but has begun to emerge both in my teaching and in the wider literature. This is the practice of referencing material that has been copied but not put in quotation marks, like this example from an essay a student brought to me: "Clarissa characterises herself as virginal, and in some ways inept with people (Littleton, 1995)". When I went to the online source (which she had listed in her bibliography – Littleton, J. (1995) "Mrs Dalloway": portrait of the artist as a middle-aged woman. *Twentieth Century Literature* 41 (1)) I found the identical wording. The literature suggests that this practice is not uncommon among undergraduates. In McGowan's (2005) experience,

> Staff are particularly puzzled by blatantly obvious cases where the
> students innocently provide full reference to the plagiarised material and
> also sign statements attesting to their 'own work'. Students, on the other
> hand, frequently express their dismay and confusion...at finding that
> they have failed to satisfy the required standards and that they simply
> do not know how to avoid inadvertent lapses into plagiarism.

East too has found that "Sometimes students will copy chunks of another's work to their text, and even though there is acknowledgement it is not made clear that the words and ideas are not the students'" (2005). Parker (2003, p.4) quotes a lecturer talking about apparently inadvertent plagiarism by students who are "new to university": "The most apparent form is when the original source is reproduced and given as paraphrase rather than as a quote [i.e. referenced but not identified with quotation marks]. I see plenty of this and often with substantial chunks of text." Similarly, in students' work examined by Anyanwu, "Quotes were used without quotation marks but with accurate citation" (2004, p. 179). Emerson, Reese, and MacKay (2005) refer to a larger study in which "Rennie and Crosby (2001) report that 61% of the students they surveyed said they did not see a problem with copying from a source as long as the reference was in the reference list". In some cases, then, the reference follows the material, while in others, it is only in the bibliography. But the interesting thing is that the reference is provided, which seems inconsistent with the intention to deceive that lecturers so often attribute to students who do this. Indeed, in the Humzy-Hancock case, the judge was in no doubt that "the attribution was insufficient"; however, he pointed out, "it would be a curious form of plagiarism which would refer the reader to the very work which was being copied" (Humzy-Hancock [2007] QSC 034, para. 20). He was, therefore, not persuaded

that the student had "mean[t] to represent the work of others as his own work" (Humzy-Hancock [2007] QSC 034, para. 14).

While intent is difficult to determine, the importance given to it is consistent with the view that plagiarism can be unwitting, which informs efforts such as Carroll's framework for deciding penalties for plagiarism. Her criteria – (from most to least important) "extent" of plagiarism, student's year level and knowledge of the institution's "academic regulations, assumptions and rules", and the "rules of the discipline" (Carroll, 2003, p. 19) – acknowledge that understanding must precede intent, and that understanding comes with experience. It is unwise, however, to rely on experience alone, for students will not necessarily grasp the underlying reasons for their subjects' prescriptions.

I think that both the practice of referencing copied material without quotation marks, and the various failures to provide references canvassed in my survey, may be explicable in terms of Bakhtin's (1981) characterisation of certain kinds of discourse as 'monologic', that is, purporting to be a single-voiced, authoritative utterance of fact. This is in contradiction to the reality that all utterances are 'dialogic'; that is, they draw on what others have said, respond to what others are saying, and anticipate what others will say. How far any individual recognises the dialogic nature of a discourse depends very much on the cultural context. For example, while scripture is perhaps the best example of a discourse that purports to come unmediated from a single author, and to convey an unproblematic truth, scientific theory can also look like this to people for whom 'theory' means 'how something works' rather than 'the most satisfactory current explanation, constructed by members of a discipline community, for how something works'. For academics – the members of those discipline communities – the interplay of ideas, and the management of that interplay, are fundamental to the collective endeavour of constructing knowledge. It is essential for academic authors to identify who said what, where and when, and to do this *as* their discussion develops, in the body of their writing, not only in the reference list supplied for the readers' convenience.

We should not be surprised, however, if the importance of this is not so apparent to our students. It is not that they are unaware of the dialogic nature of interpretation, for from earliest childhood it is through talk that people work out the meaning of various kinds of experience. Moreover, students often focus on the interplay of opinions as part of their schooling. In my State of Victoria, for example, the English curriculum for the Victorian Certificate of Education asks students to look at debates in the media on the handling of public issues. When they pick apart opinion pieces in the newspaper, they pay attention to who said what, recognising that authors bring a variety of motives, viewpoints, and competences to the dialogue they wish to join. At the same time, however, much of the academic knowledge that students encounter at school does not present itself dialogically as interpretation, but monologically as facts for them to learn; and they often expect this to be the case at university, even when a task has been set with the purpose of focusing students on the dialogic nature of knowledge-making.

If the material is monologic, it doesn't matter how it was said (fact is fact); and giving the reference, either following the material or in the bibliography, should satisfy the requirement of honesty in showing where it came from. Often, the bibliography alone is felt to cover this requirement. Students know that the only audience for their writing is their tutor, and most of the time s/he does not need to be directed to the original source for the reasons that are commonly given for referencing (to check on the context, to see what else it said, to judge whether it means what the writer who has drawn upon it thinks it means). The tutor, who set the reading for the assignment, can be assumed to know what it said and what was meant. The reference, therefore, in the text or in the bibliography, is just to show that the student has done the reading and brought home the bacon.

I recognise this monologic 'reading' of academic texts when I ask a student "Do you think this is a satisfactory answer to the question?" and s/he replies, "It's what the article

said". And I see cracks appearing in the assumption of monologic discourse when a student asks me, "How can I write about this when the experts don't agree?". It is an essential step, in the transition from school to university, for students to recognise that knowledge is interpretation, and thus that every discourse they encounter is dialogic, and the interplay of voices is an integral part of the process by which interpretation is constructed. Simply setting out the format for referencing in each subject does not foster this recognition, and legalistic rhetoric about violating other authors' intellectual property rights does not address it either. This is well put by Rose, writing that "Treating language and thought as *object*, as a product of individual labour...explanations such as these obscure an understanding of language and thought as collaborative *action* as well" (1996, p. 37). Thompson (2005) finds, moreover, that the combination of the Western idea of the author with the collective practice of knowledge-making leads to mystification: "students feel…confused by unified and autonomous concepts of authorship and originality that fail to take account of the 'shared' nature of the processes of text/knowledge production". While plagiarism policies insist upon 'original' work, in fact, as Johnson and Clerehan point out:

> In academic writing the emphasis on citation and referencing suggests a culture of continuing and developing existing ideas, rather than a culture that seeks to break decisively with the past, or that only values the breaking of completely new ground (2005, p. 5).

Teaching to address this confusion

For all these reasons, it is important to share with students the cultural fact that "Credible citation practice is more than a matter of fluent paraphrase, accurate summary, avoidance of plagiarism, and precise punctuation. It is an act of building community, collaboratively constructing shared knowledge" (Rose, 1996, p. 45; see also Cleal, 2005). To communicate this to students, Rose urges, "Teachers…will need to draw on the resources of a rhetoric of citations that accounts for intertextuality in the construction of knowledge (1996, p. 37).

As Price (2002) says, "learning to avoid plagiarism is a process of learning conventions and customs, not an instantaneous event"; and I find that helping students to make an effective transition into this 'community' must be done carefully. For example, if students are told that the things they read are interpretations or arguments, whether or not this is apparent in the writing, there is a risk that they will apply the training they have had in scrutinising opinion pieces for bias and/or various forms of deceit. I see this often when students are told to read their sources 'critically', and they strain to find fault with the readings they have to review. One student gamely accused the author of a history book of 'anti-Hitler bias', when he could not find anything else to object to. The terminology of 'opinion', 'argument', and 'critical thinking' does not transfer seamlessly from the public to the academic arena, and if we want to invite students into the culture of enquiry at university, we need to talk with them about the different meanings of the deceptively similar terms they will encounter.

A program to achieve this in first-year tutorials is set out as an appendix in Chanock (2004), in the form of a kit that tutors in any Arts subject could use in their first few subject tutorials as an "Introduction to academic discourse"; and an updated version incorporating more work on avoiding plagiarism can be found on the website of the Association for Academic Language and Learning (AALL). Its brief readings, along with tutorial activities using whatever subject readings are assigned for that week, explicitly frame academic study as an apprenticeship in the students' chosen disciplines, and starting in Week One it explains how knowledge is constructed dialogically by members of a discipline (including, now, the students). The use of sources in academic writing is introduced within this framework, with attention to decisions about when, what, and how to quote or to paraphrase, and why and how to reference. The reading and activities for Week Four, which focus most closely on the

use of sources, are extracted in Appendix Two of this article. Another resource for focusing on the social purposes and meaning of incorporating and attributing other writers' work is Giltrow (2002), who speaks of these others as 'guests' who must be introduced to the reader and to one another, and handled in various ways to achieve the writer's purposes. Through her entertaining explications of passages of academic text, students may readily feel included in the academic community about which, and for which, she writes.

This sort of teaching goes well beyond the prescription of 'new rules' for an 'old game'. I think that Leask's (2006) metaphor of a game is very helpful in reframing errors of attribution as difficulties with conventions rather than, necessarily, cheating. At the same time, 'game' may suggest to some readers that the conventions are arbitrary or trivial (e.g., Lea & Street, 1998), whereas scholars of genre have found that genres develop to serve particular purposes and it is helpful to teach students to "explore the rationale behind discourse conventions, not just present them as necessary formulae" (Clark, 1999, p. 2). We should, I think, show our students how the conventions we use relate to those purposes even if, at one level, they are arbitrary. At another level, the *web* of practices in which they are enmeshed achieves particular purposes *within* the context of a particular discourse community.

More broadly, it is useful to bear in mind East's (2006) application of Hall's ideas (1981) regarding 'high context' vs. 'low context' cultures. Writing in Western cultures is often regarded as 'low context', meaning that writers do not assume a great deal of shared knowledge among their readers, and are explicit about their meanings. Nonetheless, East argues (2006), academic culture is unexpectedly 'high context' in certain respects, including its assumption that the meaning of plagiarism is transparent to all members of the academic community (or should be). Members do not explain what they do not recognise as needing explanation, so that newcomers continue to be excluded unintentionally. Insiders must make an effort to see academic culture *as a culture*, and as such, in need of explanation.

Conclusion

If the assumption that student plagiarism arises from either dishonesty or ignorance is not contradicted by the practices on which I have focussed in this article – and especially the referencing of 'plagiarised' material – such practices do at least complicate that assumption. The ignorance they attest to is not 'blank slate' ignorance, but a failure to learn new rules while old rules still seem fit for purpose. I have suggested that the rule of 'showing what you read' makes sense within a monologic view of information, while university practices of meticulously signalling quotations and referencing *in situ* follow from a dialogic view of knowledge as produced by discourse. If we want students to understand the practices that we prescribe, we must explicitly connect our referencing conventions to this underlying view of the construction of knowledge; and we must treat students as members of the discourse community that holds it.

Author Biography

Kate Chanock heads the Humanities Academic Skills Unit at La Trobe University, where she lectures on academic reading and writing, argument and evidence, audience, voice and language; and works with individual students, at all levels from first year to PhD, on their writing-in-progress for the disciplines. Her background is in Anthropology, African History, and Teaching English as a Second Language; her main research interests are the cultures and discourses of academic study and the challenges facing students with a learning disability.

References

Anyanwu, R. (2004). Lessons on plagiarism: Issues for teachers and learners. *International Education Journal, 4*(4), 178-187. Educational Research Conference Special Issue. Retrieved February 15, 2007, from http://iej.cjb.net.

Ashworth, P., Bannister, P., & Thorne, P., with Students on the Qualitative Research Methods Course Unit (1997). Guilty in whose eyes? University students' perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in academic work and assessment. *Studies in Higher Education, 22* (2), 187-203.

Association for Academic Language and Learning (AALL) website is at http://www.aall.org.au/teaching.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). Discourse in the novel. In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The dialogic imagination*. Trans. C. Emerson & M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Carroll, J. (2003). Six things I did not know four years ago about dealing with plagiarism. In H. Marsden & M. Hicks (Eds.). *Educational integrity: Plagiarism and other perplexities. Refereed Precedings of the Inaugural Educational Integrity Conference 21-22 November 2003* (pp. 12-20). Adelaide: University of South Australia.

Chanock, K. (2003a.) Before we hang that highwayman – The LAS advisers' perspective on plagiarism. In H. Marsden & M. Hicks (Eds.). *Educational integrity: Plagiarism and other perplexities. Refereed Precedings of the Inaugural Educational Integrity Conference 21-22 November 2003* (pp. 21-29). Adelaide: University of South Australia.

Chanock, K. (2003b). Plagiarism: Explanation for students – "Using sources in your writing". Retrieved March 6, 2008, from http://www.latrobe.edu.au/humanities/supportunits/hasu#handouts.

Chanock, K. (2004). *Introducing students to the culture of enquiry in an Arts degree*. Milperra, NSW: Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia.

Clark, I. (1999). Addressing genre in the writing center. *The Writing Center Journal, 20*(1), 7-31.

Cleal, J. (2005). The role of referencing policy and advice in supporting undergraduate learners*. Studies in Learning, Evaluation, Innovation and Development, 2*(2), 49-55. Retrieved January 25, 2007, from http://sleid.cqu.edu.au/viewissue.php?id=7

East, J. (2005). Proper acknowledgement? *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice, 2*(3a) 1-11. Retrieved January 20, 2007, from http://jutlp.uow.edu.au/2006_v03_i02/oregan008.html

East, J. (2006). The problem of plagiarism in academic culture. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 2*(2), 113-125. Retrieved January 20, 2007, from http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/journals/index.php/IJEI

Emerson, L., Rees, M., & MacKay, B. (2005). Scaffolding academic integrity: Creating a learning context for teaching referencing skills. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice, 2*(3a), 12-24. Retrieved January 20, from http://jutlp.uow.edu.au/2006_v03_i02/oregan008.html

Giltrow, J. (2002). *Academic writing* (3rd ed.). Orchard Park, NY: Broadview Press.

Hall, E. (1981). *Beyond culture*. New York: Doubleday.

Handa, N., & Fallon, W. (2006). Taking the mountain to Mohammed: Transitioning international graduate students into higher education in Australia. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 2*(2), 126-139. Retrieved January 20, 2007, from http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/journals/index.php/IJEI

Howard, R. (1995). Plagiarisms, authorships, and the academic death penalty. *College English, 57*(7), 788-807.

Humzy-Hancock [2007] QSC 034 (Unreported, McMurdo J, 26 February 2007) S 7012/ 2006. Retrieved August 23, from LexisNexis database (BC200700906).

Johnson, A., & Clerehan, R. (2005). A rheme of one's own: How 'original' do we expect students to be? *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice, 2* (3a), 37-47. Retrieved January 20, 2007, from http://jutlp.uow.edu.au/2006_v03_i02/oregan008.html

La Trobe University (2007). Academic misconduct. Retrieved March 6, 2008, from http://www.latrobe.edu.au/policies.

La Trobe University Academic Development Unit Implementing the La Trobe University Policy on Academic Misconduct: Plagiarism. Retrieved March 6, 2008, from http://www.latrobe.edu.au/adu/plagiarism.htm.

Lea, M., & Street, B. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education, 23*(2), 157-171.

Leask, B. (2000). *Teaching NESB and international students at the University of South Australia, teaching guide.* Adelaide: University of South Australia.

Leask, B. (2006). Plagiarism, cultural diversity and metaphor – implications for academic staff development. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 31*(2), 183-199.

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

Marshall, S., & Garry, M. (2006). NESB and ESB students' attitudes and perceptions of plagiarism. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 2*(1). Retrieved February 15, 2007, from http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/journals/index.php/IJEI/issue/view/4

McGowan, U. (2003). Plagiarism detection and prevention. Pedagogical implications for lecturers of first year university students. In D. Nulty & N. Meyers (Eds.) *7th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference Proceedings 9-11 July 2003.* Brisbane, Australia: Queensland University of Technology. [CD-ROM].

McGowan, U. (2005). Academic integrity: An awareness and development issue for students and staff. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice, 2* (3a), 48-57. Retrieved January 20, 2007, from http://jutlp.uow.edu.au/2006_v03_i02/oregan008.html

Melles, G. (2003). Challenging discourses of plagiarism and the reproductive ESL learner. In H. Marsden & M. Hicks (Eds.). *Educational integrity: Plagiarism and other perplexities. Refereed Precedings of the Inaugural Educational Integrity Conference 21-22 November 2003* (pp. 72-80). Adelaide: University of South Australia.

Parker, P. (2003). In your 'own' words: Learning advisers on student difficulties with avoiding plagiarism during the transition to university. In D. Nulty & N. Meyers (Eds.) *7th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference Proceedings 9-11 July 2003.* Brisbane, Australia: Queensland University of Technology. [CD-ROM]. Availability: email: fyhe@qut.edu.au

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

Price, M. (2002). Beyond "Gotcha!": Situating plagiarism in policy and pedagogy. *College Composition and Communication, 54*(1), 88-114.

Rose, S. (1996). What's love got to do with it? Scholarly citation practices as courtship rituals. *Journal of Language and Learning Across the Disciplines, 1*(3). Retrieved February 14, 2007, from http://wac.colostate.edu/llad.issures.htm

Thompson, C. (2005). 'Authority is everything': A study of the politics of textual ownership and knowledge in the formation of student writer identities. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 1*(1). Retrieved February 13, 2007, from http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/journals/index.php/IJEI/issue/view/3

Appendix One

Dear Students,

I am interested in how the university's referencing requirements compare with the ones you were trained in at school. This information will help me to understand why some first year students are confused by university referencing requirements, so that I can find ways to make these clearer. I hope you will help me by completing this anonymous questionnaire. Under each question, circle the number that matches your experience (or if none of them matches, write an accurate answer instead). **THANK YOU!**

[298 students responded; responses are shown in square brackets next to each question below]

A) In Year 12, did you have to give a reference when you **quoted directly** (i.e. copied, using quotation marks) from a source?

1. No **[101]**
2. Yes, **both** in my essay **and** in a bibliography at the end of the essay **[122]**
3. Yes, but **only** in my bibliography **[75]**

B) In Year 12, did you have to give a reference when you discussed, **in your own words**, something that you had learned from your reading?

1. No **[197]**
2. Yes, **both** in my essay **and** in a bibliography at the end **[44]**
3. Yes, but **only** in my bibliography **[57]**

C) In Year 12, which of the following was true:

1. were you encouraged to express the evidence for your points **in your own words**? **[99]**
   OR
2. Were you expected to back up your points with **direct quotation** from a source? **[65]**
   [30 students wrote in "both"]

D. In Year 12,

1. did you understand "originality" to mean that you had to come up with ideas you had **not encountered** in your reading? **[84]**
   OR
2. Did you consider your work original, even if all the ideas came from elsewhere, as long as you had done the work of selecting them, explaining them, and relating them to the question you were working on? **[107]**
   [1 student wrote in "neither" and 2 students wrote in "both"]

E. In what country did you attend the final year of secondary school? (please write below)

Appendix Two (from http://www.aall.org.au/teaching)

Week Four: Notes

You need to be particularly careful when you make notes, because in your essays you're going to have to say exactly where everything came from. Since knowledge is made by people, the ideas you read are the ideas of particular people; and you're not just gathering facts – you're looking at the use that particular people have made of particular facts, in putting forward their ideas. As I've said, a discipline is a conversation that takes place in journals, books, and meetings around the world. If I participate in this conversation by publishing an article that comments on somebody else's ideas in some other article, a third reader may want to go back to those ideas and check on whether I understood them properly and what else that writer said, that I didn't discuss. What makes this conversation possible is the use of referencing.

Whenever you discuss an idea or any information that you found in your reading, you must include a reference to where it came from, so that other people can find it too. And since most essays are almost entirely discussions of reading, most things in them will need to be referenced. You may not like to do this, in case it looks as if you haven't had any ideas of your own. But don't worry; what is your own is your judgment of what is important in the reading and why, and your selection and organisation of material to discuss. You won't lose anything by saying where it came from. And if you don't reference adequately, it may look as if you are trying to claim credit for ideas you got from someplace else. As the handout "Using Sources in your Writing" explains, this is actually an offense called plagiarism, and carries penalties. Most students don't plagiarise intentionally, but many look as if they're doing this because they aren't aware of referencing requirements….

 [Here I omit technical information about how to reference, which is given in the resource, and move on to look at thinking and voice.]

In addition to making notes on the content of your reading, you should be making notes of your ideas about it as you go along (you could rule a wide right-hand margin to accommodate these, or write them in a different colour). What do you think of the idea you are reading? How does it relate to your other reading? How does it relate to your essay question or to your tutorial topic? Jot down what occurs to you, and you'll be doing a lot of the thinking for your essays as you read.

When you make notes on your reading, each time you read a section it's a good idea to turn away and summarise it briefly. This will develop your own voice and also cut down on the volume of notes you take. It also results in better notes than copying or underlining of passages, and makes the notes more memorable, because they've been processed through your brain and perhaps also related to other readings and/or the general concerns of the subject.

Tutorial Talk: In this reading, I have emphasised the scholarly rather than the legal reasons for meticulous referencing, because in my experience, students do not see themselves as training to participate in a wider conversation, and the idea goes down well. Tell them that in this tutorial, you're going to look at the technical aspects of showing whose ideas are whose in a piece of writing.

Tutorial Exercise: Give students a brief passage in which a scholar has done some paraphrasing and some direct quoting. Ask students why they think the writer has quoted in one place and not in another. Different disciplines have very different practices when it comes to direct quotation (much more of an English essay is likely to be quotation than a History essay, for example); this is a good opportunity to talk about what your discipline considers worth quoting and what other kind of comment should accompany quotation. Referring to the place in your passage where the writer

has paraphrased, show your students the original source that the writer was working from. What has this writer done, in moving from the original to his/her version of it? (What s/he has **not** done, presumably, is substitute two or three words from a thesaurus for words in the original; students often think that this will satisfy the requirement of putting material "in their own words", and this practice is responsible for some of the very peculiar wording we see these days. One student wrote "We can diocese the meaning" after looking up "see" in her thesaurus and finding "diocese" among the 'synonyms' offered!) Next, show students some more complicated examples of referencing in their reading for this week:

- Places where an author has referenced more than one source for the same point – how was this done? (Is it the same as in your subject's conventions, or different?)

- Places where an author has referenced a second author quoted or cited in a third author's work – how was this done? (Same or different in your subject?)

- How the author has integrated quotation into his/her own sentence or paragraph. How is it introduced? How is it punctuated? If it is dropped and block-indented, show them what that looks like, and why it has been done.

- The use of ellipsis and the use of square brackets.