

Gönderim Tarihi: 04.11.2019

Kabul Tarihi: 05.12.2019

EXPLORING PARAPHRASING AMONG L2 ACADEMIC WRITERS

İkincil Dilde Akademik Yazarların Açıklama Süreçlerinin İncelenmesi

Oktay YAĞIZ

Atatürk University
Faculty of Education
yoktay@atauni.edu.tr

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7076-7774

Çalışmanın Türü: Araştırma

Abstract

Paraphrasing is an essential component of academic writing to transform knowledge and avoid plagiarism. This study aimed to determine the misconception phenomena regarding paraphrase, L2 writers' background knowledge, and paraphrasing strategies through a writing task. A paraphrase task in English was conducted to 105 L2 writers and the paraphrased texts were analyzed to see the strengths and weaknesses of these products. Reflection notes were the other data collection tools. Results showed that L2 writers perceive paraphrasing as replacing some of the words by their synonyms with little syntactical modifications. Some of the participants suggested adding some personal views when paraphrasing.

Keywords: academic writing, paraphrase, text analysis

Öz

Açıklama akademik yazım sürecinde bilgiyi dönüştürme ve intihalden kaçınmanın önemli bir parçasıdır. Bu çalışma açıklama ile ilgili olarak İngilizceyi ikinci dil olarak kullanan yazarların kavramsal yanlışlarını, altyapı bilgilerini ve açıklama stratejilerini yazma etkinliği yoluyla incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Açıklama etkinliği konusunda katılımcıların güçlü ve zayıf yönlerini görmek üzere 105 yazar üzerinde açıklama etkinliği uygulandı. Yansıma notları da bir diğer veri toplama aracı olarak toplandı. Sonuçlar, yazarların açıklamayı eşanlamlılar üzerinden birkaç kelime değişikliği ile nadir yapısal değişiklik olarak algıladıklarını göstermiştir. Katılımcılardan bazıları ise açıklım yaparken kişisel yorumlara da yer verilebileceğini önermiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: akademik yazım, açıklama, metin analizi

1. INTRODUCTION

Using others' ideas, arguments or findings in a written product is natural as well as a must in advanced academic literacy. This is achieved by an analytical change of the source text by strict maintenance of the original meaning, literally called paraphrasing. Paraphrasing is a common way to critically writing without violating flow and avoiding plagiarism. Connectedness is one of the basic components of flow in written discourse (Hinkel, 2004; Swales & Feak, 2004). One of the many ways to ensure cohesion and coherence is to paraphrase others' expressions as this strategy prevents writers from direct quotations, which can jeopardize flow in the

text. Using other authors' opinions, arguments and research findings in an academic text is inevitable and necessary (Flowerdew & Li, 2007; Keck, 2006, as cited in Davis, 2013, p.126). However, the overuse of direct quotation deviates the harmony of the discourse and decreases readers' attention and interest in reading. Academic writers need not only use other sources at surface level but these writers are also expected to transform the available knowledge which is an essential feature of scholarly writing.

Lack of knowledge and awareness of correct and appropriate paraphrasing can lead writers to legal and ethical violations. Even partial paraphrasing performance is not adequate for the violations. These unsuccessful paraphrasing attempts, literally called patch writing, comprise a surface level of synonym change, deletion, the addition of some words (Keck, 2006; Shi, 2004; Sun, 2009). Likewise, lack of paraphrasing knowledge can cause plagiarism, which is one of the important risks of academic failure at the undergraduate and graduate level.

Despite the significance of paraphrasing in academic L2 writing to acquire academic literacy, attention to the appropriate paraphrasing instances according to the conventions and norms of scholarly writing seems to be inadequate. Novice writers need to also gain a textual strategy to paraphrase a source text. To achieve this, the current knowledge and perceived misconceptions of university undergraduates need to be investigated. This study, therefore, will provide some insights through student-generated text analysis of paraphrasing and their reflections about their practices. Among a variety of writing tasks, paraphrasing can be said to offer dependable evidence of almost all conventions and norms of scholarly writing such as word selection, structural accuracy, connectedness, and knowledge transformation writing skills.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Reading source text and writing from this content is one of the common and important instructional and implementation phases of education and the academic community. However, writing from source texts is one of the challenging activities among writers for academic purposes not only for nonnative speaking individuals but even native speakers of a language, and achievement of writing using other sources causes difficulties and demands considerable efforts (Grabe & Zhang, 2013). The ability to write from source text is a phase of being involved in academic discourse community as well as a requirement for completing tasks and degrees (Hirvela, 2011; Hood, 2008; 2004; Leki, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2010). The

members of higher education need to demonstrate their proficiency by writing and considerably use other sources without plagiarism and simply knowledge transmitting (Cumming et al., 2005; Gentil, 2011; Huang, 2010; Macqueen, 2012). Research evidence also highlights, accurate and appropriate writing from other sources is demanding and a challenge not only for students but also for the course instructors to decide and achieve the best instructional approaches and methods (Pecorari & Petric, 2014). Though writing from sources has been stated as one of the fundamental characteristics of scholarly writing (Leki, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Melzer, 2009) relevant research concluded that inaccurate or inappropriate intertextual attempts such as paraphrasing occur due to lack of awareness of discourse with some discursive and rhetorical norms (Shi, 2010).

Available experiences are basically within free writing based tasks and surface-level knowledge transmitting without evaluative lens and knowledge transforming (Kang, 2005). In addition to the inadequate linguistic skills, students' lack of confidence to master a second language appropriately also leads students to avoid knowledge transforming with an evaluative stance (Cheng & Unsworth, 2016; Loi et al., 2016).

Several research studies found that students rely on the source text when they are sought to write using other sources (Shi, 2004). Shi (2004) noted that English L1 and L2 (Chinese) students exact or very nearly relied on the original texts in their products. Cultural differences played a significant role in terms of citing references. In another study, Keck (2006) L2 writers employed a more near copy paraphrasing strategy in English than their L1 counterparts. Nevertheless, Keck's subsequent research (2014) highlighted that as the students' academic experiences increased their tendency to copy from the source texts decreased. This awareness still verifies the presence of inadequate paraphrasing of the source text, literally called patch-writing, among L2 writers.

Hirvela and Du (2013) spot another significant issue, which may shed light on the cause of the poor performance of English L2 writers in paraphrasing as a tool questioning the meaning and value of paraphrasing through the eyes of students. Their participants' challenge to move from only knowledge transferring to transforming as good writers within the awareness of the value of paraphrasing which is not a way to avoid plagiarism only. In line with the marginal prior knowledge of the undergraduate students about paraphrasing, it will most likely cause negatively affective repercussions towards this writing procedure. For example, In Wette's study (2017), novice students highlighted their concerns

and negative attitudes to the conventions and norms of paraphrasing tasks. Research into the effectiveness of explicit instruction on the use of other texts written by undergraduate students showed that as their background knowledge and experiences enhanced they began to less copy the source text without referencing but overreliance on the synonymy and ignoring other aspects of using other sources (Wette, 2010). In pre and post instruction writing tasks, Storch (2012) investigated the students' improvement in using other sources.

Results showed that instruction contributed to better writing using others' sources except for a somewhat increase in inaccuracy in the integration of the ideas from the target texts. The study suggested that the achievement of accurate use of other sources is a developmental process that needs not only an instructional format but also needs some descriptors which can accurately target the assessment part of using other sources.

Academic writing types (e.g. research articles, critiques, theses, proposals, and reviews) at the university level requires integrating information from different types of sources. Using other authors' published opinions, claims and research findings is a requirement as well as natural and inevitable. In fact, academic writing tasks seek a research-based content with a multiple sources of knowledge and almost no type of writings are expected which is only based on a single source of thoughts and arguments (Leki & Carson, 1997; Moore & Morton, 2005) For this reason, research into paraphrasing studies particularly among undergraduates can provide insights for the pedagogical dimensions that instructors can hold and some cognitively developmental procedures of the students as the consumers of knowledge at a scholarly axis.

3. METHOD

This action research study aimed at identifying the undergraduates' misconceptions of L2 paraphrasing, and to understand the problematic aspects of the use of source texts and offer some immediate solutions at a higher education setting. This problematic issue has been considered significant and needs to be improved throughout students' tertiary level positions. To investigate this issue, the following questions guided the study:

- i. What are the paraphrasing strategies, misconceptions and flaws of undergraduates before and after relevant instruction?
- ii. What are paraphrase performances of the undergraduates at the pre and post-unit writing tasks according to the determined model?

4. PARTICIPANTS AND SETTING

105 undergraduate sophomore students were enrolled in the required course of *Critical Reading and Writing*. These prospective L2 English teachers were scheduled to take the advanced level of academic reading and writing at the tertiary level for 2 hours a semester-long. They were expected to read critically and use other sources and completing critical analysis writing tasks and literature reviews. To obtain the ability to be a critical reader and writer in academic studies was considered problematic as well as essential since they had marginal prior knowledge about paraphrasing, and knowledge transforming. The researcher as the instructor of the course conducted this intervention.

5. PROCEDURE

For the first phase, the theoretical framework of critical reading and academic writing with examples has been taught to the students for five weeks. Before the commencement of the instruction, the pre-unit test assignment was implemented. The students were given a text 200-word referenced passage selected from *English Teaching Forum*, which was considered to have a salient language and appropriate for their field by two writing instructors at the English teaching department, and the students were sought to paraphrase the source text at the very first day of the semester without any instruction, corrective feedback and direction before, during and after the task. They were merely asked whether they had paraphrased a text until this course began. The reason for single-source text to paraphrase was that the subjects had not used multiple sources to paraphrase. The students had no background knowledge and experience in scientific research, which often requires citation practices from multiple source texts in a single study yet. Two of the students stated that they had no paraphrase experience and no schematic knowledge about paraphrasing. Then these two students were excluded from the study since the nature of this intervention had aimed to identify the misconceptions, strengths, and weaknesses of the subjects about paraphrasing. Students were encouraged to complete the task without time restriction to eliminate the major extraneous variable often mentioned in writing classes by the writers.

As shown in the course syllabus, the topic of paraphrasing, in week 6, was explained and the legitimate and illegitimate instances were shown with reasons. At the end of the instruction, the researcher administrated a post-unit test. The same text was sought to paraphrase again with the same conditions with more awareness and knowledge about the conventions and

norms of the genre of paraphrase.

The pre-unit and post-unit tests consisted of two phases; a reflection paper for each student was kept to deeply understand their approaches and the knowledge of conventional paraphrasing practice. Concerning the pre-unit test, the students, at the end of the task, were asked to write what strategy they used, to where they paid attention and their challenges throughout paraphrasing.

Following the post-unit test, another reflection paper was given to each student what changed between two tasks, what prominent features they thought to be wrong occurred in their minds until the paraphrase unit was explained. To ensure reliability 30 paraphrased texts for each unit were randomly selected to analyze by another rater who is a PhD candidate in ELT major.

Separate evaluation of these papers was compared and discussed. No revision as well as conflict between the types of change between two raters was required. The codes and categories for the reflection papers were also checked and another researcher did some minor revisions. These final codes and categories were also shown to the students if they agreed on the displayed data to strengthen the reliability.

6. DATA ANALYSIS

Two-period test scores and the reflection papers of the students were compared. The analysis scheme was based on Keck's (2006) paraphrasing taxonomy. However, as the current intervention employed single source text, two linguistic characteristics (i.e. *length in words and reporting phrase*) of the attempted paraphrases were ignored. The other characteristics (*unique links and general links*) were used to categorize the attempted paraphrases according to the Keck's taxonomy.

Keck (2006, p.266) explains unique links as "individual lexical words (i.e., nouns, verbs, adjectives, or adverbs), or exactly copied strings of words used in the paraphrase that (a) also occurred in the original excerpt but, (b) occurred in no other place in the original text." He also defines general links "as lexical words used in the paraphrase that occurred in the original excerpt but that also occurred elsewhere in the original text." After identifying the categories in terms of unique and general links each attempted paraphrase was coded according to the labels of the taxonomy are shown in Table 1 (Keck, 2006, p.268):

Table 1*The Taxonomy of Paraphrase Coding*

Linguistic Criteria		Examples
<i>Original Excerpt</i>		
‘Comparable worth,’ the notion that different jobs can be rated equal and paid equally.		
Near Copy	50% or more words contained within unique linksComparable worth.....is an idea that different jobs can be rated equal and paid equally.
Minimal Revision	20–49% of words contained within unique linksComparable worth.....is the idea that different jobs can ^[SEP]be rated equal by a set of standards and be paid equally.
Moderate Revision	1–19% words contained within unique linksComparable worth.....is the idea that various may ^[SEP] be ranked equally and therefore, should be paid equally.
Substantial Revision	No unique links	This article discusses the concept ofcomparable worth....., a concept set on balancing out wages for all workers ^[SEP] of the same job level.

Note: unique links are in bold; general links are underscored with dashed lines; reporting phrases are in italics.

Table 2*Numbers of Attempted Paraphrases According to Type*

	Pre-unit test		Post-unit test		Chi-Square	P
	N	%	N	%		
Near Copy	998	91.98	736	73.96	39.587	<0.001
Minimal Revision	60	5.52	151	15.17	39.246	<0.001
Moderate Revision	21	1.93	64	6.43	21.753	<0.001
Substantial Revision	6	.55	44	4.42	28.880	<0.001
Total	1085	100	995	100		
Chi-square					125.808	
p	<0.001					

Table 2 shows academic writers' pre and post-unit paraphrase attempts and their identified types. Based on the taxonomy of paraphrase

coding, it is seen that writers over-relied on the source text despite certain changes. As the types of coding display that most of the writers' changes are limited to a few words which correspond to 50% and over the total words (near copy paraphrasing). Writers performed very low achievement about appropriate rewriting, which can be accurately labeled paraphrasing with substantial revision. However, except for the near copy performance few of the attempts consist of a revision less than 50% of the entire attempt. Writers' revision achievements show a decreasing profile in terms of the type of revision. However, following the post-unit test writers were found to be more successful in revising the source text. After the paraphrasing instruction the number of minimal revision, moderate revision and finally the substantial revision increased. To determine whether such an increase was found to be statistically significant, chi-square analysis was implemented. Chi-square is used to test any difference between two observations obtained from the same group at different times or situations. The result showed that the difference in performances between the two phases was statistically significant. Further, what was striking that, in addition to the types of revisions and the number of sentences tended to decrease as a result of the effect of instruction.

7. QUALITATIVE DATA

Reflection papers comprising open-ended questions were employed as another data collection tool to diagnose L2 academic writers' misconceptions about paraphrasing. On completing the pre-unit paraphrasing task, novice writers were asked for reporting how they paraphrased the target text, what strategies they benefited from and where they attached importance during this writing task. This procedure gave an opportunity to deeply understand the conceptual basis of using other sources through practical concurrence. The open-ended questions were posed in writers' native language to enhance their self-reflection capacity. The researcher designed the questions through relevant literature (Keck, 2006; Wette, 2010). Other researchers who have investigated into paraphrasing also were consulted to construct the questions. On one hand, the current paraphrase quality of the novice academic writers was aimed to diagnose, on the other hand, to understand the conceptualization as well as understanding the way of writing could provide data. To analyze the data, the researcher first identified the codes out of the reflection papers. Creswell (2012, p.243) defines coding as "the process of segmenting and labeling text to form descriptions and broad themes in the data." On determining the codes, the categories were reached, as the theme was already predetermined following the research questions

that are the paraphrasing strategies of the L2 academic writers prior to the explicit instruction. The determined codes and categories were then consulted to verified by another colleague. No major revision was needed.

The qualitative portion of this study also included a then-now survey. The then-now survey is very common in educational research that students self-evaluate once at the beginning (pre-test responses) and the end of their study (post-test responses). In this study, academic writers retrospectively assess their abilities and understandings before the learning procedure (labeled as then) and their subsequent ratings and understandings after the instruction (labeled as now). Lam and Bengo (2003) and Rohs and Langone (1997) claim that a then-now evaluation provides more reliable insights about themselves.

Table 3 shows the prominently strategical preferences with potential misconceptions about paraphrasing before the instructional phase. As no external information was provided, students were sought to write based on their background knowledge and assumptions. The following findings of paraphrasing strategies were highlighted as a result of the content analysis:

Table 3

Paraphrasing Strategies and Tendencies of the Novice Writers

<p>Category 1: Paraphrasing Tendency & Appropriacy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attention to full understanding • Sentence by sentence paraphrasing • Translation from L2 into L1 and then rewriting • Very rare accuracy check of the paraphrased text • Providing the similar meaning is acceptable • No referencing
<p>Category 2: Lexical Change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adherence to synonym use as the changing tool • Partial vocabulary change by synonyms • Mutual exclusiveness to structural change • Certain attempts to change the terminological words
<p>Category 3: Structural Change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rare structural change • Attempting to change by merely adding or changing conjunctions • Based on active vs. passive voice change • No attempt to change allegedly structurally difficult sentences

Table 3 shows the paraphrasing tendency of the participants before taking explicit instruction, which could meanwhile provide some insights

about the misconceptions and flaws. In the reflection notes, participants stated that they paraphrased the source text sentence by sentence instead of transforming the knowledge by changing the words and structure based on the essential parts of the source information. Those who have rewritten a text often used translation from the native language into English. This strategy has been often referred to as an easy way to rewrite among the writers.

Participants' responses, as well as their written products, revealed that only one level of change has been employed in the attempts. Changing meant at the level of vocabulary through synonym use only. Though synonym is the most common strategy in paraphrasing, almost all writers used only synonyms to change the source text. Referring to writers' strategies that meanwhile showed their misconceptions one of the participants explained their common strategy as follows:

As possible I could, I changed the vocabularies through synonyms; I left some of the sentences as they were since I couldn't understand the sentence. (Participant 17)

The lexical and structural changes seem to substantially rely on the source text. On one hand, the lexical change is based on merely synonym use, on the other hand, structural change was thought to be achieved by changing or adding the conjunctions or rare modification of the sentence voice (i.e. active vs. passive voice). The participants stated that compared to lexical changes they nearly never changed the structure. Based on their grammatical proficiency they could attempt to change sentence structure but was not due to a norm of using other sources, as some of the participants stated that:

Firstly I identified the sentences of which I could change the structure. (Participant 90)

I didn't change the sentence types not to ruin the coherence. (Participant 53)

I tried to change the structure of the sentences from active to passive. (Participant 15)

I tried to change the structure by replacing the conjunctions. (Participant 7)

In some of the sentences, I used the same words or I reorganized by removing some of them." (Participant 66)

One of the identified flaws in paraphrasing is related to terminological and widely acknowledged phrases or words. While rewriting a source text requires writers' own words, the terminological words or

phrases in the used source text (e.g. rhythm, stress and intonation, and syntax) were forced to be changed. Reflection papers included no statement about preserving the terminology when transforming the source text. Another significant misconception in paraphrasing was related to a lack of referencing. Neither attempted paraphrases and nor personal reflection included referential use as a requirement. This inattentiveness seems to correlate with the carelessness whether the attempted paraphrases were accurate. Very few writers stated that they checked the paraphrased text's accuracy in terms of content after they completed the task.

8. THEN-NOW SURVEY

To obtain some comparable data including pre and post-unit practicum and more knowledge about the inadequacy and misconceptions of L2 paraphrasing, a now-then survey comprising open-ended questions was also conducted. The participants were asked to compare their past and present approaches and implementation when paraphrasing.

The open-ended questions focused on the description of the paraphrasing, and their misconceptions about the appropriate paraphrasing. In line with the reflection paper responses, actual paraphrasing tasks and the then-now survey seem to validate each other. Most of the responses showed that paraphrasing was based on merely word change. This type of change comprised of synonym use only. The then-now survey asked participants their mistake they had thought to be right before the instruction. Almost all the participants expressed their thoughts in line with the following statement of participant 5:

Before the instruction, I used to replace the vocabularies by their synonyms, because I did not know that I had to change the structure too.

Supporting this approach, two participants justified this limited modification as follows:

*I used to avoid structural change lest meaning might deviate.
(Participant 66)*

*The lexical change was more important than any structural change.
(Participant 70)*

According to survey data, participants indicated that changing some of the words was adequate and acceptable for appropriate paraphrasing. Even though post-unit instruction provided useful information about paraphrasing, according to their statements, their attempted phrases were still

found to be near copy which indicates that the vocabularies were %50 and over based on the source text.

Paraphrasing requires being attentive to the norms of using other sources to prevent plagiarism which reduces the value of the product as well as the efforts of the writer. As for the L2 academic writers' tendencies to cite in the current findings, there appeared another misconception regarding the value of making reference in L2 paraphrasing even though these writers construct new sentences in their own words. This justification appeared to be one of the most pervasive misconceptions of the writers. Most of the participants highlighted that they have first learned this requirement during the paraphrase-unit instruction despite their previous paraphrasing experiences at university. To support this finding, it is seen that the writers' pre-unit test papers included no citation of the source text. It is also seen that writers' misconceptions about acceptable paraphrasing led them to be unaware of plagiarism as legal and ethical misconduct. In the then-now survey, participants several times wrote that until the relevant instruction was presented, they had not known the requirements to cite source text when paraphrasing. The following statements were mostly seen in the survey:

In this unit, I first learned that I had to cite source text when paraphrasing. (Participant 13)

I learned to cite the source after this instruction. (Participant 20)

I should have given a reference at the end of the paragraph. I did not know this. (Participant 29)

Not only did the misconceptions stem from the lack of citation but also the content construction led the writers to erroneous paraphrasing. For example, when using others' sources writers should be adhered to the original text's contents without adding new information or argument. However, some of the participants approached the issue from a different perspective that some other personal opinions might be added to the paraphrased text and this would allegedly make the text more comprehensive. One of the participants stated in the survey that

I had thought that some extra information would be harmless. (Participant 41)

I right now know that we should not include our own opinions and comments in the paraphrased part. (Participant 24)

I had thought that adding our comment was a necessity while paraphrasing and it would make it comprehensive. (Participant 104)

Taking the misconceptions and flaws of L2 academic writers'

paraphrasing into account, the data revealed that L2 writers referred to some problems and inadequacy about appropriate and accurate paraphrasing. While the participants highlighted the remedial influence of explicit instruction to write better, even the post-unit writing task had several flaws. As such the number of words still needed to be changed and this change should not be limited to lexical modifications. As for the structural level change, it was seen that writers were mostly unaware of it as they were expected.

Results indicated that participants' paraphrasing performance showed statistically better outcomes as their awareness was strengthened through explicit instruction once. However, it should be noted that the aforementioned and acknowledged awareness could not be effective at an immediate instance at an optimum level. In contrast, through further practicum, writers can minimize their inappropriate use by knowing the conventions and norms of the task in the long run.

9. DISCUSSION

Using other sources in one's own words is one of the significant components of scholarly writing. Researchers need to benefit from other researchers' opinions, arguments, and research findings to establish credibility and persuade their readers. Paraphrasing is the natural, inevitable and functional way of using other sources to allow the writer to take control and maintain flow without redundant use of direct quotations. This linguistic tool with normative and conventional features, meanwhile, appears to be one of the problematic aspects of writing and demanding for all writers to accurately achieve. Particularly less experienced writers due to some reasons often fail appropriately to rewrite other sources in their studies. Such a challenge often leads them to risk of plagiarism or have unconnected, novice text causing rejection or having low scores in educational or exam settings. For this reason, learning the fundamentals of how to accurately paraphrase at the tertiary level becomes a must for undergraduate and graduate students for their academic achievement. This action research study, thus, aimed to analyze undergraduates' perceptions, adequacy, strategies and their performances of paraphrasing to improve their schematic knowledge and launch further attempts in academic writing. Their misconceptions and flaws through pre and post-unit tests and students' reflections were thought to provide significant findings about the inadequacy and misconceptions of the writers. Between the pre and post-unit tests, paraphrase instruction was held. Two phases of paraphrase tasks were analyzed according to Keck's (2006) taxonomy and students' reflections were investigated through a then-

now survey.

The study revealed that writers substantially relied on the source text since they merely changed some of the words in the pre-unit writing task. The other type of change that is structural revision was ignored. In line with the reflections, it was seen that they lacked the norms of accurate paraphrasing. Students had a conception that using the synonyms of some words were acceptable to paraphrase. They were also unaware of making reference, which is one of the requirements of academic writing. Their source change was near to copy or patch-writing. However, in the second writing task, after the instruction, their awareness enhanced and their revision performance significantly increased. Besides, they cited their attempted paraphrases. In their then-now survey, they indicated that they had no background knowledge about the requirements of referencing even if they allegedly rewrote the source text in their own words.

Keck's investigation of L2 writers' paraphrasing attempts found similar findings with the current findings. In his study Keck's comparison with L1 and L2 writers paraphrased summaries, L2 writers' reliance on unique links leading to near copy drew attention. In the current study, it was seen that particularly, in the pre-unit writing task, students nearly copied the source text rather than revise the same meaning at an acceptable level. This is most probably due to inadequate attention to writing conventions and norms in writing courses. Besides, given the FL curriculum, writing occupies rather a limited place to hold these issues comprehensively with practices. This lack of pedagogical share is probably one of the major reasons to be considered for the failure of this type of scholarly writing. Students' failure of appropriate paraphrase performance can be also attributed to their linguistic proficiency (Johns & Mayes, 1990; Shi, 2004) since paraphrasing expects writers to achieve a higher level of lexical and syntactical revision as well as full understanding. Thus, though the extraneous variables such as time restriction, anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation, were eliminated that participants' performances could be reduced. After the relevant instruction, the number of minor, moderate and substantial revisions were seen to significantly rise despite near copy attempts were still pervasive. This can be due to effective teaching strategies comprising the theoretical framework and implementational examples could contribute to their understandings. Besides, motivation and self-efficacy of the students and the critical importance of paraphrasing could make students approach the issue more attentively. The positive effect of practice and instruction on the quality of paraphrasing among undergraduates was also observed in similar

studies (Storch, 2012; Thompson et al., 2013; Wette, 2010). The interventions of pre and post instruction (Storch, 2012; Wette, 2010, 2017) showed significant improvements in accurate paraphrasing and decreasing near copy (Storch, 2012; Wette, 2010). However, unacceptable paraphrase attempts were still seen in students' practices.

Neumann, Leu, McDonough's (2019) argument highlighting the challenges regarding reading and writing phases of writing from other sources was also evidenced by the current study's findings. Participants' reflections highlighted their inadequate pedagogical knowledge at the reading phase as well. Many of the participants underlined that they had no idea or had misconceptions about how to revise the source text from note-taking to the elaboration phase as the final stage of paraphrasing.

This study has two limitations to be considered. First, students were asked for focusing on a single source text since they were inexperienced and had many misconceptions about paraphrasing. However, citation practices and knowledge transformation have a higher level of source diversity in graduate studies. Secondly, the obtained findings have no delayed data to see whether students' assets lasted long that would be integrated into their graduate education.

10. CONCLUSION

Investigations into undergraduate students' paraphrasing skills in scholarly writing provide beneficial insights, particularly for pedagogical purposes. This action research study has supplied data about not only participants' academic language background but also their conceptual understandings of source text use with their strengths and weaknesses. This study substantially contributed students to other assignments in which they need to show their knowledge as well as capabilities in other courses. This study highlighted writing skill is interrelated to other intellectual domains that should be simultaneously progressed and gradually improved through explicit attention. Steps taken from the undergraduate period in disciplinary writing with an attention of rhetorical, conceptual, and conventional emphasis will positively impact these students' undergraduate level performances and can support their academic careers. Further studies can be fostered using multiple sources to develop an awareness of citation practices. In this case, students' capability of transforming knowledge with an evaluative perspective can be developed. This critical stance is acknowledged as the core of academic writing, which integrates other sources to increase their credibility and persuasiveness.

11. REFERENCES

- Cheng, F. W., & Unsworth, L. (2016). Stance-taking as negotiating academic conflict in applied linguistics research article discussion sections. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 24, 43-57. 10.1016/j.jeap.2016.09.001
- Cumming, A., Kantor, R., Baba, K., Erdosy, U., Eouanzoui, K., & James, M. (2005). Differences in written discourse in independent and integrated prototype tasks for next generation TOEFL. *Assessing Writing*, 10(1), 5-43. Doi:10.1016/j.asw.2005.02.001
- Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. M. (2010). Academic research networks: Accessing resources for English-medium publishing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 29(4), 281-295. Doi:10.1016/j.esp.2010.06.002
- Davis, M. (2013). The development of source use by international postgraduate students. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12(2), 125e135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2012.11.008>.
- Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2007). Language re-use among Chinese apprentice scientists writing for publication. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(3), 440e465. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm031>.
- Gentil, G. (2011). A biliteracy agenda for genre research. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20(1), 6-23. Doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2010.12.006
- Grabe, W., & Zhang, C. (2013). Reading and writing together: A critical component of English for academic purposes teaching and learning. *TESOL Journal*, 4(1), 9-24. Doi: 10.1002/tesj.65
- Hinkel, E., (2004). *Teaching Academic ESL writing*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Publishers. Mahwah, New Jersey,
- Hirvela, A. (2011). Writing to learn in content areas: Research insights. *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional language*, 159-180.
- 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(2), 87-98. Doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2012.11.005
- Hood, S. (2008). Summary writing in academic contexts: Implicating meaning in processes of change. *Linguistics and Education*, 19(4), 351-365. Doi:10.1016/j.linged.2008.06.003
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ivanic, R. (2004). Discourses of writing and learning to write. *Language and education*, 18(3), 220-245. DOI: 10.1080/09500780408666877
- Kang, J. Y. (2005). Written narratives as an index of L2 competence in Korean EFL learners. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(4), 259-279. 10.1016/j.jslw.2005.10.002
- Keck, C. (2006). The use of paraphrase in summary writing: A comparison of L1 and L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(4), 261-278. Doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2006.09.006

- Lam, T. C., & Bengo, P. (2003). A comparison of three retrospective self-reporting methods of measuring change in instructional practice. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24(1), 65-80. DOI: 10.1177/109821400302400106
- Leki, I. (2007). *Undergraduates in a second language: Challenges and complexities of academic literacy development*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Leki, I., & Carson, J. (1997). "Completely different worlds": EAP and the writing experiences of ESL students in university courses. *TESOL quarterly*, 31(1), 39-69. 10.2307/3587974
- Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Loi, C. K., Lim, J. M. H., & Wharton, S. (2016). Expressing an evaluative stance in English and Malay research article conclusions: International publications versus local publications. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 21, 1-16. 10.1016/j.jeap.2015.08.004
- Macqueen, S. (2012). *The emergence of patterns in second language writing: A sociocognitive exploration of lexical trails*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.
- Melzer, D. (2009). Writing assignments across the curriculum: A national study of college writing. *College composition and communication*, 61(2), W240. Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/ccc/0612-dec09/ccc0612writing.pdf>
- Moore, T., & Morton, J. (2005). Dimensions of difference: A comparison of university writing and IELTS writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4(1), 43-66. 10.1016/j.jeap.2004.02.001
- Neumann, H., Leu, S., & McDonough, K. (2019). L2 writers' use of outside sources and the related challenges. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 38, 106-120. Doi: 10.1016/j.jeap.2019.02.002
- Pecorari, D., & Petrić, B. (2014). Plagiarism in second-language writing. *Language Teaching*, 47(3), 269-302. Doi: 10.1017/S0261444814000056
- Rohs, F. R., & Langone, C. A. (1997). Increased accuracy in measuring leadership impacts. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 4(1), 150-158. DOI: 10.1177/107179199700400113
- Shi, L. (2004). Textual borrowing in second-language writing. *Written communication*, 21(2), 171-200. 10.1177/0741088303262846
- Shi, L. (2010). Textual appropriation and citing behaviours of university undergraduates. *Applied Linguistics*, 31, 1-24. Doi: 10.1093/applin/amn045
- Storch, N. (2012). Incorporation of source material: The effect of instruction. *TESOL in Context*, 22, 38-55.
- Storch, N. (2012). Incorporation of source material: The effect of instruction. *TESOL in Context*, 22(1), 38. Retrieved from <https://search.informit.com.au/fullText;dn=596244689496152;res=IELHSS>
- Sun, Y. C. (2009). Using a two-tier test in examining Taiwan graduate students' perspectives on paraphrasing strategies. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 10(3), 399-408. DOI: 10.1007/s12564-009-9035-y

- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2004). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills* (2nd Ed.) Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Thompson, C., Morton, J., & Storch, N. (2013). Where from, who, why and how? A study of the use of sources by first year L2 university students. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12, 99–109. Doi: 10.1016/j.jeap.2012.11.004
- Wette, R. (2010). Evaluating student learning in a university-level EAP unit on writing using sources. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(3), 158-177. 10.1016/j.jslw.2010.06.002
- Wette, R. (2017). Source text use by undergraduate post-novice L2 writers in disciplinary assignments: Progress and ongoing challenges. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 37, 46-58. 10.1016/j.jslw.2017.05.015