Japanese University Students' Task Representations of Paraphrasing and their Experience with it

Fumiko Yoshimura

Introduction

This paper reports on Japanese university students' task representations of paraphrasing and their experiences with it.　The importance of appropriate and sufficient paraphrasing has been recognized in the past decade not only to avoid plagiarism accusations (e.g., Roig, 2006) but also to integrate other voices in the writer's own argument effectively (e.g., Axelrod et al, 2008 ; Bazerman, 1995 ; Shaw & Pecorari, 2013).　According to Hirvela and Du (2013), students need to exhibit "the ability to find a new way to capture the gist of what was stated in the original passage" (p. 2) to be accepted as a member of the academic community.　Recently paraphrasing is discussed in the context of "source use" and it is said that paraphrased texts written by others, should be used in order to construct the writer's own argument, which Shaw and Pecorari (2013) term "paraphrased intertextuality" (p. A2).

The issue of plagiarism has attracted the attention of researchers and practitioners in English-speaking countries in the past decades (e.g., Buranen & Roy, 1999 ; Eisner & Vicinusm, 2008 ; Howard, 1993, 1995, 1999 ; Pennycook, 1994, 1996 ; Pecorari, 2003, 2006, 2008 ; Shi, 2004, 2006, 2008). Since the 1990s, researchers have concluded that the act of plagiarism varies in terms of the degree of textual borrowing and intention to deceive and efforts have been made to categorize plagiarism into different types.　For example, Howard categorized plagiarism as "cheating," "non-attribution," and "patch-

writing" in 1995 (p. 799), and later reworded the labels as "fraud," "insufficient citation," and "excessive repetition" in 2000 (p. 488). "Cheating" is defined as a clear attempt to portray someone else's work as one's own. "Non-attribution" means that the work includes passages copied from someone else's work without acknowledgement or quotation marks, while "patchwriting" is borrowing from someone else's work with some minor changes in the language form.

Originally patchwriting was defined as "copying from a source text and then deleting some words, altering grammatical structures, or plugging in one-for-one synonym substitutes" (Howard, 1993, p. 233), but has later come to be seen as insufficient paraphrasing. Roig (2006) classified plagiarism into the categories of "plagiarism of ideas" (p. 4) and "plagiarism of text" (p. 6) and asserts that "plagiarism of text," that is, insufficient paraphrasing, is the most common form of plagiarism among researchers.

Insufficient paraphrasing may result from students' inadequate linguistic skills as is shown in Keck's (2006) research, which compared L1 and L2 writers' usage of paraphrasing in writing a summary. The results indicated that while L1 writers had made substantial paraphrases to the original source, L2 writers had not been able to make sufficient changes, thus exposing them to charges of unintentional plagiarism.

Another source of insufficient paraphrasing may be inappropriate task representations of the act of paraphrasing. According to Flower et al. (1990), task representation is an image of the task an individual constructs for him or herself (p. 37), which may include representing "the givens and constrains of this situation, the goals she would attain, and the strategies or actions she might take" (p. 38). Though task representation exerts a great influence on all the following process, it is often said that students' task representations of academic tasks are considerably different from those of the professors' (p. 21). Yamada (2003) analyzed explanations and examples of paraphrasing used on ten US websites, and from this analysis Yamada pointed out potential problems for students. Among the problems she identified were (a) the discrepancy between what acceptable paraphrasing usually entails, that is, a faithful repre-

sentation of writer's meaning in different expressions, and what seems to be expected by college level writing, that is, the writer's own unique interpretation of the text meaning and (b) the difficulty of teaching "inferential thought processes" (p. 251) which underlie such paraphrasing. Thus, what is expected in paraphrasing may differ between secondary and post-secondary education and between Japanese and American universities and raises the following questions :

1. What is meant by appropriate paraphrasing in American universities?
2. What are students taught about paraphrasing in American universities ?
3. How do Japanese students perceive paraphrasing?
4. Why do Japanese students perceive a text should not be copied but be written in the writer's own words in order to be perceived as appropriate ?
5. What do Japanese students think are the characteristics of appropriate paraphrasing ?
6. How can Japanese university students' answers to these questions be compared with or contrasted against task representations of paraphrasing in American universities ?

In this study, relevant websites and textbooks for American university students are analyzed in order to learn about what is expected of students when they paraphrase an academic text. Then, a survey is conducted in order to investigate Japanese university students' experience with and task representations of paraphrasing. Finally, the survey results are compared with findings from the analysis of American websites and writing textbooks for students. The importance of paraphrasing in order to avoid plagiarism has seldom been discussed in Japan. This study attempts to increase Japanese university professors' and students' awareness of the importance of paraphrasing as a means to avoid plagiarism.

Task representations of paraphrasing in American universities

What American university websites tell students about appropriate paraphrasing

Many universities, university libraries, and university writing centers in the U.S. offer information about academic writing, including its characteristics and conventions, on their websites. On these websites, paraphrases are defined and when, how, and why to use paraphrasing are explained. For example, a webpage by Purdue OWL (Driscoll & Brizee, 2013) compares quotations, paraphrasing, and summarizing, and explains paraphrasing as follows :

> Paraphrasing involves putting a passage from source material into your own words. A paraphrase must also be attributed to the original source. Paraphrased material is usually shorter than the original passage, taking a somewhat broader segment of the source and condensing it slightly.

Paraphrasing also appears in another page on the same site (Stolley, Brizee, & Paiz, 2013) that explains how students can avoid plagiarism by crediting the source and writing from memory without looking at the source when paraphrasing. The website by the University of Southern Mississippi offers "Plagiarism Tutorial," where students are tested whether they can distinguish between acceptable source use and plagiarism (University of Southern Mississippi, n.d.). The examples include texts with different degrees of copying and source acknowledgement. The website by Indiana University offers a certification program which tests students' ability to identify plagiarism (Indiana University, 2008). In this test, students are asked to compare the original text and the paraphrased examples and choose from "word-for-word plagiarism," "paraphrasing plagiarism," "not plagiarism," or "I do not know." If a student receives a passing grade on the test, he or she will be awarded a certificate. What is emphasized in these examples are "plagiarism of text" in Roig's term (2006) and changing the language form sufficiently.

Drawing from these standards, two important characteristics of appropriate paraphrasing are : (a) acknowledging the source appropriately and (b) including very little verbatim copying.

What American university writing textbooks tell students about appropriate paraphrasing

Next, ten writing textbooks for undergraduate and graduate students used in America were analyzed (Refer to Appendix A). The main characteristics found across the textbooks include (a) paraphrasing is explained in the context of avoiding plagiarism, (b) important features of appropriate paraphrasing emphasized in the textbooks include rewording, different sentence structures, and acknowledging the sources, and (c) paraphrasing is often explained in comparison with quoting and summarizing.

Some textbooks explained how to avoid paraphrasing too closely to the original by recommending that students write without looking at the source (e.g., Callaghan & Dobyns, 2007 ; Howard, 2010 ; Reinking & von der Osten, 2005 ; Swales & Feak, 2004). Other textbooks (e.g., Harvey, 2008 ; Kennedy & Smith, 2006) warn students to differentiate paraphrasing from quoting clearly, as emphasized by Kennedy and Smith (2006) who write, "there is no acceptable middle ground between an adequate paraphrase and a direct quotation. You must either reword or quote word for word" (p. 54). In terms of the degree of condensation, the textbooks can be grouped into the following two categories. The first is textbooks (Alexelrod, et al. 2008 ; Bazerman, 1995 ; Behrens & Rosen, 2005 ; Callaghan & Dobyns, 2007 ; Howard, 2010 ; Kennedy & Smith, 2006 ; Rinking & von der Osten, 2005) that suggest that paraphrases should be as long as the original and include all important information, while the second group (Harvey, 2006 ; Swales & Feak, 2004) see paraphrasing as a kind of summary that includes only the main points.

While many textbooks suggest paraphrasing as a technique for avoiding plagiarism, some textbooks advocate its inherent properties and rhetorical functions in academic writing and recommend that students use paraphrasing to improve their writing skills. For example, Behrens and Rosen (2005) view paraphrasing as a tool for clarifying the meaning of texts which are "dense, abstract, archaic, or possibly confusing" (p. 30). Bazerman (1995) considers it as a sort of catalyst to promote deeper comprehension of source texts. According to him, paraphrasing can serve rhetorical purposes such as simplify-

ing complex texts so that the reader can understand them better, making the writer's interpretation of the source text explicit so that it can be compared and discussed in his or her own argument, and changing the emphasizing points to fit the writer's own context. Callaghan and Dobyns (2007) encourage paraphrasing as a means to introduce others' ideas legitimately and naturally in the writer's own argument.

Thus, American writing textbooks teach students that appropriate paraphrasing is important to avoid plagiarism, that it involves the process of rewording and sentence rearrangement, and that it can serve crucial rhetorical functions in academic writing : that is, to clarify the meaning of the source text to promote the writer's deeper understanding of the source, show readers the writer's interpretation of it, and integrate others' ideas naturally into the writer's text.

In sum, appropriate paraphrasing should exhibit the following characteristics : crediting the source accurately and changing the language form of the source text while retaining the same meaning. To paraphrase sufficiently is important not only to avoid plagiarism but also to play important rhetorical roles.

The survey

In September 2013, a survey was conducted to investigate Japanese university students' experience with and task representations of paraphrasing. Questionnaires 1 and 2 were created for the survey and the copies were distributed in a freshmen class in the English department of the university the author works for. Students were asked to fill in the questionnaires at home and turn them in in the following class. Thirty-nine students turned in the Questionnaire 1, which asks for students' experience with and task representations of paraphrasing, and twenty-three students turned in the Questionnaire 2, which asks students to judge if the given example paraphrases are appropriate or not and to put the rank order of the example paraphrases in terms of the appropriateness.

Questionnaire 1 asked the students' experience of learning paraphrasing,

their knowledge of the rules of crediting sources and using the writer's own words in paraphrasing, and their interpretations of the reasons for the rules. Specifically, the following items were given :

Q1. Background information : Year in school, gender, and name (Name is optional)

Q2. Have you ever learned about paraphrasing, either in Japanese or English ?　If yes, have you also received training on how to paraphrase ?

Q3. Are you aware that you are supposed to credit the source when you cite someone else's text ?

Q4. Are you aware that you are supposed not to borrow words from the source text but to use your own words when you cite someone else's text, unless you put the text part in quotation marks ?

Q5. Can you describe some characteristics of "good paraphrases" ?

Q6. Why do you think you are not supposed to copy expressions from the source text when you cite someone else's text, unless you put it in quotation marks ?

Q7. Why do you think you are supposed to use your own words when you cite someone else's text, unless you put it in quotation marks ?

In Questionnaire 2, students were asked to judge if example paraphrases are appropriate or inappropriate, to rank them according to its appropriateness, from 1 (the most appropriate) to 5 (the least appropriate), and to give their reasons for the rankings.　Both the source and paraphrased texts were given in Japanese, which is students' L1 (Refer to Appendix B), so that they could take advantage of their native speaker's intuition and experience as a reader of L1 texts.　The underlines in the examples indicate the usage of the same form as the original.　Paraphrases were created from a text by Greene (1993, p. 36). The main characteristics of example paraphrases are highlighted as follows.

Paraphrase A is a faithful and careful representation of the meaning of the source, attempting to capture every nuance.　Though it was written without looking at the source, the resultant paraphrase includes some identical words found in the original.　Paraphrase B was created by copying the source text

and substituting synonyms for selected words, a typical example of "patchwriting" in Howard's term (1993, p. 233).　Paraphrase C is the most reader-friendly paraphrase, in which the sentence structures are simplified, some words are replaced with easier and more familiar ones, and some linking words and phrases (e.g., "by taking another step further", "the purpose is") are inserted in order to make the information relationships more explicit.　In paraphrase D, the meaning is changed though some similar expressions from the source are used, and thus represents an inaccurate paraphrase of the original text.　Paraphrase E is the researcher's interpretation of the source text rather than a faithful representation of the text meaning.　The text information is located in a broader context of "reading-writing connection studies" (e.g., Belcher & Hirvala, 2001 ; Hirvela, 2004).　Originally the paraphrase appeared in the author's paper (Yoshimura, 2009) in order to summarize a quotation and use it to develop her own argument as follows :

> Greene (1993), an advocate of mining, explains it as follows, "Whereas teachers often encourage a critical reading of individual texts as an end in itself, mining is part of an ongoing effort to learn specific rhetorical and linguistic conventions.　The strategies students observe in reading can become part of their own repertoire for writing on different occasions" (p. 36).　In mining, therefore, learners are expected not only to passively decode the text meaning, but to actively engage in the text to dig up valuable input for their own writing [underline added].　By providing the kinds of information learners should look for in advance and offering guidance while reading, teachers can ensure that learners encounter the elements of L2 writing they need exposure to in order to bring those elements into their own writing repertoires. (p. 59)

　In the above paraphrase (underlined), some information is added and some is omitted to fit the new purpose.　Specifically, the word "decoding" is used in place of "reading" to contrast the passive nature of usual reading with the productive feature of "mining", "engage actively" is added to emphasize the active and dynamic process, while other information is de-emphasized by exclusion.　Paraphrase E was included in order to reflect the recent conceptu-

alization of "paraphrasing" which stresses the importance of demonstrating the writer's understanding of the text which is "embedded within a larger communicative framework" (Hirvela & Du, 2013, p. 93).

If these examples are judged by the criterion of whether the paraphrases express the intended meaning of the source text, paraphrase D may be judged as inappropriate because the text meaning is changed.   If these examples are judged by the use of the same surface form, which is calculated by the percentage of the overlap, paraphrases E, C, D, A, and B contain approximately 12%, 26%, 35%, 40%, and 65% overlap with the source.

Results

Results of Questionnaire 1

Thirty-nine freshmen responded to the items in Questionnaire 1. Thirty-three were female and five were male students.   One student did not give his or her gender.

Regarding Q2, thirty-four students (87%) answered that they had never learned how to paraphrase either in Japanese or English.   Only four students (10%) had learned how to paraphrase and one student (2%) gave no response to this question.   Among students who answered that they had learned about paraphrasing, two had learned about English paraphrasing and two had learned about Japanese paraphrasing, though only one had actually practiced paraphrasing, which focused on English grammar points.   All of these four students had learned about paraphrasing in either high school or university classes.   Thus, very few students had learned about paraphrasing, or received training on how to paraphrase.

To Q3, twenty-six students (67%) answered that they were aware of the rule to credit the source, while twelve students (31%) answered that they were not aware of the rule and one student (2%) did not give his/her response.

To Q4, seventeen students (44%) answered that they were aware of the rule of paraphrasing, while twenty-one students (54%) answered that they were not aware of the rule and one student (2%) did not give his/her response. The percentage of students who were aware of the rule of paraphrasing (44%)

was much lower than that of students who were aware of the rule of crediting sources (67%).

Question 5 asked about characteristics of good paraphrasing, and to this question students gave various responses, including "ease of understanding" ($N=12$), "no change in the meaning" ($N=6$), "showing the writer's comprehension or interpretation" ($N=5$), "naturalness" ($N=2$), "excluding the writer's biases" ($N=1$), "showing the writer's voice" ($N=2$). Thus, students seem to have paid attention to the meaning, but not so much to the language form.

Regarding Q6, most students gave the reason of copyright rules ($N=18$). Other reasons include that it does not show the writer's opinion ($N=6$), that the writer will not learn how to write if he or she copies the original ($N=4$), that the text will be more persuasive by using the writer's own words ($N=2$), that the slight nuance the writer wants to express can be conveyed by using the writer's own words ($N=1$), that the expression should be changed to fit the other parts of the writer's text ($N=1$).

Students' answers to Q7 varied. Some focused on rhetorical issues, saying that it is more persuasive or effective if the writer uses his or her own words ($N=6$). Some used citation or copyright rules for their reasons ($N=3$) or the expectation of writing a paper at the university level ($N=4$). Finally others focused on learning and teaching issues ($N=5$), including the following : (a) that the writer can check if he or she has understood the content ($N=1$), (b) that the writer can improve his or her writing skill by practicing paraphrasing ($N=1$), (c) that the writer can absorb someone else's text content as his or her own ($N=1$), and (d) that the teacher can check how well the writer can write ($N=2$).

Results of Questionnaire 2

Twenty-three students completed Questionnaire 2. The results of Questionnaire 2 are summarized in Tables 1 to 4. In this part of the survey, students indicate their perceptions and reasons for the appropriateness of different paraphrases.

Table 1 indicates that paraphrases A, B, and C tend to be judged as appropriate, while paraphrases D and E tend to be judged as inappropriate.   Though the number is small, it should be noted that six students (29%) evaluated paraphrase E as appropriate.

Table 2 shows students' rank order of example paraphrases in terms of their appropriateness.   Though students' perceptions are varied, the general trend shows that paraphrases C, A, and B are chosen as the most or the second most appropriate, while paraphrases D and E are chosen as the least or the second least appropriate.   This trend is similar to Table 1 and verifies the results.   However, Table 2 shows students' perception differences between paraphrases D and E more clearly than Table 1 : that is, while students' evaluation of paraphrase D is uniformly low, their evaluation of paraphrase E is

Table 1.   Students' perceptions of the appropriateness of the example paraphrases

	Appropriate	Inappropriate	Not known
A :	N=14 (67%)	N=7 (33%)	
B :	N=14 (67%)	N=7 (33%)	
C :	N=11 (52%)	N=10 (48%)	
D :	N=3 (14%)	N=18 (86%)	
E :	N=6 (29%)	N=14 (67%)	N=1 (5%)

*Two students did not give their judgements.

Table 2.   Students' rank order of example paraphrases in terms of their appropriateness

	No. 1	No. 2	No. 3	No. 4	No. 5
A :	N=6 (27%)	N=5 (23%)	N=6 (27%)	N=3 (14%)	N=2 (9%)
B :	N=4 (18%)	N=11 (50%)	N=2 (9%)	N=4 (18%)	N=1(5%)
C :	N=8 (36%)	N=4 (18%)	N=4 (18%)	N=4 (18%)	N=2 (9%)
D :	N=1 (5%)	N=0 (0%)	N=5 (23%)	N=5 (23%)	N=11 (50%)
E :	N=3 (14%)	N=2 (9%)	N=5 (23%)	N=6 (27%)	N=6 (27%)

*No. 1 indicates the most appropriate and No.5 indicates the least appropriate.
**One student did not give her ranking.

mixed, showing students' uncertainty or even confusion.

Table 3 presents reasons why students ranked the paraphrases as No. 1 (the most appropriate) or No. 2 (the second most appropriate). Students tend to use ease of reading or comprehension and closeness of the meaning to the original as their judging criteria. Some students use the reason of the closeness of the expression to the original text as their criterion for good paraphrase.

Table 4 shows the reasons why students ranked the paraphrases as No. 5

Table 3. Reasons why students ranked the paraphrases as the most or the second most appropriate

A : Easy to read or easy to understand ($N=5$), Accurate interpretation or close to the meaning of the original ($N=4$), Close to the expression of the original ($N=1$), More expressions are changed than paraphrase B ($N=1$), Natural ($N=2$), Well rephrased ($N=2$)

B : Easy to read or easy to understand ($N=4$), Close to the meaning of the original ($N=3$), Close to the expression of the original ($N=2$), Includes the writer's own interpretation ($N=1$)

C : Easy to read or easy to understand ($N=6$), Used original expressions ($N=1$)

D : No reasons are given

E : Succinct ($N=3$), Easy to read or easy to understand ($N=1$), Used the writer's own words ($N=1$), Include the writer's own interpretation ($N=1$), Close to the meaning of the original text ($N=1$)

Table 4. Reasons why students ranked the paraphrases as the least or the second least appropriate

A : Some information is missing ($N=4$), Not changed much ($N=1$), Only expressions are changed ($N=1$)

B : Close to the expression of the original text ($N=5$), Difficult to understand ($N=1$)

C : The meaning has changed ($N=3$), Difficult to understand ($N=1$), Different from the original ($N=1$)

D : The meaning has changed ($N=8$), Difficult to understand ($N=2$), The rhetorical structure or relationship between information has changed ($N=3$), Some information is missing ($N=1$)

E : Too succinct or too much information is omitted ($N=8$), Difficult to understand ($N=2$)

(the least appropriate) or No. 4 (the second least appropriate). In general, students tend to use the amount of change or omission in the meaning as negative factors for their evaluation. Regarding paraphrase B as the most or second least appropriate, five students gave the reason of closeness of the expression to the original text, showing their understanding of the need to change the language forms in paraphrasing.

Discussion and conclusion

In this section, comparisons will be made between Japanese students' experience with and task representations of paraphrasing found in the survey and what is expected by paraphrasing in American academic communities identified by analyzing websites and textbooks for American students.

The findings from Questionnaire 1 show that very few Japanese university students learned about paraphrasing or received training on how to paraphrase. This makes a sharp contrast with the situations in the U.S., where students are advised to paraphrase in order to avoid plagiarism, where characteristics of appropriate paraphrasing are explicitly taught, and where exercises to identify appropriate and inappropriate paraphrases are given. Even greater differences can be found when the writing contexts are compared between the two countries. While writing constitutes a least exercised skill in Japan (e.g., Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2002), it is emphasized through the "writing across the curriculum" movement (Wells, n.d.) and "National Writing Project [NWP]" (NWP, n.d.) in America. In addition, little instruction is given on academic writing in Japanese universities (Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2005), while all American university freshmen are required to take "first-year composition" in order to learn academic writing skills and conventions (Council of Writing Program Administrators [WPA], 2008).

While some Japanese students knew the rule of crediting the source, much fewer students knew the rule of paraphrasing as a means to avoid plagiarism. In contrast, both crediting and paraphrasing the source in the writer's own words are explicitly taught and emphasized in writing textbooks for American students. Many Japanese students attributed the prohibition of

copying source texts to copyright rules, though other reasons were also given. When asked reasons for having to use the writer's own words in paraphrasing, students' answers were varied, showing various conceptualizations of the purposes and functions of paraphrasing.　In general, their conceptualizations seem to be appropriate because persuasiveness, which many students gave as their reasons for using the writer's own words, is an important consideration in writing an academic paper and learning and teaching functions are also given as reasons for using the writer's own words in textbooks or online information for American students.

　　Questionnaire 2 reveals students' task representations of paraphrasing and their judging criteria.　Many Japanese university students chose paraphrases C, A and B as appropriate paraphrases and the main reasons for their choices were the ease of understanding and the closeness of meaning to the original.　On the other hand, paraphrases D and E were chosen as least appropriate, because of the change of meaning in paraphrase D and too much omission in paraphrase E.　For many of them, good paraphrases should be easy to understand, retain the same meaning as the original, and show the writer's comprehension or interpretation.　This is in line with the perceptions of appropriate paraphrasing in American universities.　However, Japanese university students' attention was not directed to the language form, though closeness of the surface text structure to the original is an important criterion for judging plagiarism in American universities.

　　Another important criterion for appropriate paraphrasing is showing the writer's understanding of the text in a broader context of the targeted community as is shown in Hirvela and Du (2013).　However, few Japanese university students considered paraphrase E as an appropriate paraphrase.　This is not surprising because they do not possess the knowledge of "reading-writing connection studies" (e.g., Belcher & Hirvala, 2001 ; Hirvela, 2004).　To them, the focus and meaning of the original text may seem distorted.　Though more research (e.g., Hirvela & Du, 2013 ; Keck, 2010 ; Newell, Garriga, & Peterson, 2001) has emphasized the importance of paraphrasing as a means of demonstrating the writer's unique understanding of the text in a targeted research

field, it can only be done when they have accumulated sufficient knowledge in the targeted research community.

Based on the comparison, several suggestions are made. First Japanese university students should learn citation rules and the importance of avoiding plagiarism in academic writing. Recently more and more Japanese universities teach academic writing and citation rules in some introductory courses. Very few Japanese students learn citation rules before entering a university. According to the author's survey (Yoshimura, 2015), 55% of the students said they had learned citation rules and 73% of them had learned it in a university course "Introduction to university studies." Only 9% said they had learned the rules before entering university. Thus, university professors should remind themselves that they should teach citation rules and the importance of following them explicitly. Next, Japanese students should learn the importance of not only acknowledging sources but also paraphrasing the source text in order to avoid plagiarism. Teachers should explicitly teach the rule that using a long string of words is not acceptable in academic writing unless it is quoted.

Finally, caution should be exercised in deciding when and how to teach paraphrasing. In order to write an appropriate paraphrase, students need to practice the mechanical skills of rewording and reforming sentence structures while retaining the meaning. However, appropriate paraphrase should also demonstrate the writer's understanding of the source text contextualized in a targeted research field. Since it takes time to acquire the skill of paraphrasing, students may need to start learning it at an early stage. However, students may not have sufficient content knowledge if it is begun too early. Students may just practice the skill mechanically without really understanding their rhetorical effects and as a result they may not be able to transfer the skill when they need it in writing an academic paper. On the other hand, if students wait until they acquire sufficient subject knowledge, they may need to learn too much at the same time. Therefore, it is suggested that teachers find the right timing for teaching paraphrasing in students' academic studies.

This study is preliminary and has numerous limitations. For example, the number of the participants was rather small and may not constitute a rep-

resentative group of Japanese university students since they were all freshmen in the English department of one university. Despite its limitations, the study can make a valuable contribution to the field of second language writing because it is one of the first attempts of an empirical exploration of Japanese students' experience with and task representations of paraphrasing.

Acknowledgement

References

Axelrod, R. B., Cooper, C. R., & Warriner, A. M. (2008). *Reading critically writing well : A reader and guide* (8th ed.), New York, NY : Bedford/ St. Martin's.

Bazerman, C. (1995). *The informed writer : Using sources in the disciplines* (5th ed.). Princeton, NJ : Houghton Mifflin Company.

Behrens, L., & Rosen, L. J. (2005). *Writing and reading across the curriculum* (9th ed.). New York : Pearson Education.

Belcher, D., & Hirvela, A. (Eds.). (2001). *Linking literacies : Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections*. Ann Arbor, MI : The University of Michigan Press.

Buranen, L., & Roy, A. M. (Eds.). (1999). *Perspectives on plagiarism and intellectual property in a postmodern world.* Albany, NY : State University of New York Press.

Callaghan, P., & Dobyns, A. (2007). *A meeting of minds : Strategies for academic inquiry and writing.* New York : Pearson Education.

Council of Writing Program Administrators. (2008). WPA outcomes statement for first-year composition. Retrieved from http://wpacouncil.org/positions/outcomes.html

Driscoll, D. L., & Brizee, A. (2013). Quoting, paraphrasing, and summarizing. Retrieved from https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/563/1/

Eisner, C., & Vicinus, M. (2008). *Originality, imitation, and plagiarism : Teaching writing in the digital age*. Ann Arbor, MI : University of Michigan Press.

Flower, L., Stein, V., Ackerman, J., Kantz, M.J., McCormick, K., & Peck, W.C. (1990). *Reading-to-write : Exploring a cognitive and social process.* New York, NY : Oxford University Press.

Greene, S. (1993). Exploring the relationship between authorship and reading. In A. M. Penrose & M. M. Sitko (Eds.), *Hearing ourselves think : Cognitive research in the*

college writing classroom (pp. 33-51). New York, NY : Oxford University Press.

Harvey, G. (2008). *Writing with sources : A guide for students* (2ⁿᵈ ed.). Indianapolis : Hackett.

Hirvela, A. (2004). *Connecting reading and writing in second language writing*. Ann Arbor, MI : The University of Michigan Press.

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.

Howard, R.M. (1993). A plagiarism pentimento. *Journal of Teaching English 11*(3), 233-246.

Howard, R. M. (1995). Plagiarism, authorships, and the academic death penalty. *College English, 57*, 788-806.

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

Howard, R. M. (2000). Sexuality, textuality : The cultural work of plagiarism. *College English, 62*, 473-491.

Howard, R. M. (2010). *Writing matters : A handbook for writing and research*. New York, NY : McGraw –Hill.

Indiana University Bloomington, School of Education. (2008, March 19). Plagiarism test : How to recognize plagiarism. Retrieved from https://www.indiana.edu/~istd/plagiarism_test.html

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. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2006.09.006

Keck, C. (2010). How do university students attempt to avoid plagiarism ? : A grammatical analysis of undergraduate paraphrasing strategies. *Writing & Pedagogy, 2*(2), 193-222.

Kennedy, M.L., & Smith, H.M. (2006). *Reading and writing in the academic community* (3ʳᵈ ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ : Pearson Education.

Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2002). High school student perceptions of first language literacy instruction : Implications for second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*, 91-116.

National Writing Project. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.nwp.org/

Newell, G., Garriga, M.C., & Peterson, S.S. (2001). Learning to assume the role of author : A study of reading-to-write one's own ideas in an undergraduate ESL composition course. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies : Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 164-185). Ann Arbor, MI : The University of Michigan Press.

Pennycook, A. (1994). The complex contexts of plagiarism : A reply to Deckert. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 3*, 277-284.

Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words : Text, ownership, memory, and plagia-

rism.   *TESOL Quarterly, 30*, 201-230.

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

Pecorari, D. (2006).   Visible and occluded citation features in postgraduate second-language writing.   *English for Specific Purposes, 25*, 4-29.

Pecorari, D. (2008).   *Academic writing and plagiarism : An linguistic analysis.* New York, NY : Continuum.

Reinking, J.A., & von der Osten, R. (2005).   *Strategies for successful writing : A rhetoric, research guide, and reader.*   Upper Saddle River, NJ : Pearson Education.

Rinnert, C., & Kobayashi, H. (2005).   Borrowing words and ideas : Insights from Japanese L1 writers.   *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 15*(1), 31-56.

Roig, M. (2006).   Avoiding plagiarism, self-plagiarism, and other questionable writing practices : A guide to ethical writing.   Retrieved from http://www.cse.msu.edu/~alexliu/plagiarism.pdf

Shaw, P., & Pecorari, D. (2013).   Source use in academic writing : An introduction to the special issue.   *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 12*, A1-A3.

Shi, L. (2004).   Textual borrowing in second-language writing.   *Written Communication, 21*, 171-200.

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

Shi, L. (2008).   Textual appropriation and citing behaviors of university undergraduates.   *Applied Linguistics, 31*, 1-24.   doi:10.1093/applin/amn045

Stolley, K., Brizee, A., & Paiz, J.M. (2013). Avoiding plagiarism : Safe practice. Retrieved from https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/589/03/

Swales, J.M., & Feak, C.B. (2004).   *Academic writing for graduate students : Essential tasks and skills* (2nd ed.), Ann Arbor MI : The University of Michigan Press.

Yamada, K. (2003).   What prevents ESL/EFL writers from avoiding plagiarism ? : Analyses of 10 North-American college websites.   *System, 31*, 247-258.

Yoshimura, F. (2009).   Searching for reading instruction methods to promote the development of EFL writing ability.   *Journal of Institute for Research in English Language and Literature, 34,* 43-65.

Yoshimura, F. (2015).   Japanese university students' experience with and perceptions of citations in academic writing.   *Journal of Institute for Research in English Language and Literature, 40*, 1-27.

University of Southern Mississippi. (n.d.). Plagiarism tutorial : Test your knowledge. Retrieved from http://www.lib.usm.edu/legacy/plag/plagiarismtutorial.php

Wells, J. (n.d.). Writing across the curriculum : An introduction. Retrieved from https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/owlprint/671/

Appendix A

Writing textbooks for undergraduate and graduate students analyzed in this study

Axelrod, R.B., Cooper, C.R., & Warriner, A.M. (2008). *Reading critically writing well : A reader and guide* (8th ed.), New York, NY : Bedford/ St. Martin's.

Bazerman, C. (1995). *The informed writer : Using sources in the disciplines* (5th ed.). Princeton, NJ : Houghton Mifflin Company.

Behrens, L., & Rosen, L.J. (2005). *Writing and reading across the curriculum* (9th ed.). New York : Pearson Education.

Callaghan, P., & Dobyns, A. (2007). *A meeting of minds : Strategies for academic inquiry and writing.* New York : Pearson Education.

Faigley, L., & Selzer, J. (2004). *Good reasons with contemporary arguments : Reading, designing, and writing effective arguments* (2nd ed.), New York : Pearson Education.

Harvey, G. (2008). *Writing with sources : A guide for students* (2nd ed.). Indianapolis : Hackett.

Howard, R.M. (2010). *Writing matters : A handbook for writing and research.* New York, NY : McGraw-Hill.

Kennedy, M.L., & Smith, H.M. (2006). *Reading and writing in the academic community* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ : Pearson Education.

Reinking, J.A., & von der Osten, R. (2005). *Strategies for successful writing : A rhetoric, research guide, and reader.* Upper Saddle River, NJ : Pearson Education.

Swales, J.M., & Feak, C.B. (2004). *Academic writing for graduate students : Essential tasks and skills* (2nd ed.), Ann Arbor MI : The University of Michigan Press. pp. 158-159

Appendix B

Original text：「文章読解において、教員は個々の文章の批判的な読み方自体を目的として促進することが多いが、「採掘」は、特定の文体的、言語的慣習を学ぶための継続的な努力の一部なのだ。学生たちが読む時に認めた文章技術は、別の機会に文章を書く場合の自分自身の文章技術の持ち駒の一部となりうるのである。」（**Greene, 1993, p. 36**）.

Paraphrase A：文章を読む場合においては、一つ一つの文章を批判的に読むことそのものが教育目標になることが多々ある。しかし、「採掘」は、文章から慣習的に使われる文章構造や表現を学ぶために学生が行うさらなる努力の一つである。学生たちは、読むことから学んだ文章技術を、将来文章を書く時に自分の文章技術の一つとすることができる (Greene, 1993, p. 36) 。

Paraphrase B：文章理解において、指導者は各文章の批判的な読み方そのものを目標として促すことが多いが、「採掘」は、特有の文章構造や言葉的なしきたりを学ぶための持続的な勉励の一部なのだ。学生たちが読む時に気づいた文章技術は、異なる場合に文章を書く時の自分の文章技術の蓄えの一部となりうるのである (Greene, 1993, p. 36) 。

Paraphrase C：文章を読むとき、指導者は一つひとつの文章をよく考えながら注意して読むように学生に教える。多くの場合、このような読み方は、それ自体が教育目標となる。これに対し、「採掘」は、そこからさらに踏み込んで、学生に文章構造や表現でよく使われるものを文章から学ぶように促す。その目的は、学生たちが 読むことから学んだ文章技術を将来自分が文章を書く時に使うことである (Greene, 1993, p. 36) 。

Paraphrase D：「採掘」においては、指導者は学生に文章から慣習的に使われる文構成や表現を学ぶだけでなく、一つひとつの文章を批判的に読むように促すことが多い。学生たちは、自分自身の書くための文章技術の蓄

えの一部を、異なる機会に文章を読む時にそこで使われている文章技術に気づくために使うことができる (Greene, 1993, p. 36)。

Paraphrase E：「採掘」においては、学生は、文章の意味を分析的に解読するにとどまらず、積極的に文章と関わり、将来 自分自身が文章を書く時の技術とすべく、そこから貴重な文章情報を掘り出すことが期待されている (Greene, 1993, p. 36)。

*The underline indicates the same form use as the source.