

Perspectives of L2 graduate students and their professors about students' academic writing practices: Patchwriting or plagiarism?

Naser Rashidi*

Professor, Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, Shiraz University

Mohamad Rahimi

Associate professor, Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, Shiraz University

Farzaneh Dehghan

Visiting Professor, Teaching English as a Foreign Language Group, Farhangian University, Shahid Bahonar Branch of Shiraz

Abstract

Writing academic texts is a challenging endeavour for novice L2 writers, which causes them to rely heavily on the original texts. Some studies have differentiated intentional acts of fraud (like plagiarism) from patchwriting which they claim is unintentional source text reliance. However, others have a negative view toward it. The present study explores L2 graduate student writers and their professors' perspectives about these different writing practices and how they may work for or against developing professional writing expertise in a discipline. Survey questionnaires and interviews were used to collect data. The results were analysed through calculating frequencies and percentages as well as inductive data analysis for transcribed interviews. The results showed that many graduate students used patchwriting in their attempts to write academic texts unintentionally and intuitively. The reasons identified for patchwriting were students' lack of confidence to write independently, inability to paraphrase or fear of not expressing the writer's message thoroughly, and, in some cases, the writers' intention to get around plagiarism detection softwares. However, both students and their instructors had negative views about patchwriting. They believed that writing strategies like patchwriting could not lead to professional writing practices in a discipline. More importantly, the students seemed to continue this practice all through their studies, which may be a sign of not receiving enough instruction and feedback in this regard. The role of explicit teaching is emphasized in making students familiar with the differences between paraphrasing and patchwriting.

Keywords: Academic Writing; Apprenticeship; Disciplinary Literacy; Patchwriting; Plagiarism

* Professor, Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, Shiraz University, Iran

-Received on:25/08/2016

Accepted on: 25/11/2016

Email: nrashidi@shirazu.ac.ir

1. Introduction

While the booming of information technology at the present time provided a unique opportunity for researchers as well as students to have unlimited access to information via Internet and other electronic databases, it has also paved the way for a problematic issue, i.e. plagiarism. As cases of plagiarism are growing worldwide, so is research conducted on different aspects of the issue (Pecorari, 2003; Yamada, 2003). Anderson and Steneck (2011, p. 90) quoting the U.S. Federal definition of research misconduct define plagiarism as “appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit”. In this report, plagiarism along with fabrication and falsification are three important research misconducts prevailing in research communities. Plagiarism as the most important type of academic dishonesty has long been debated and researched both in L1 and L2 writing academia.

Although plagiarism is a matter of concern in both L1 and L2 academic writing (Yamada, 2003), EFL/ESL writers, especially novice graduate students, “may be more vulnerable to accusations of fraud” for many reasons (Abasi & Graves, 2008, p. 222). Lack of proficiency, different cultural backgrounds regarding textual ownership and borrowing (Benesch, 2001; Pennycook, 1996; Pecorari, 2003), the biased view of professional communities towards L2 writers especially students (Lillis & Curry, 2010; Pecorari, 2003; Salager-Meyer, 2008; Valentine, 2006) and unintentional or non-prototypical plagiarism practiced by novice L2 students as a means of literacy practice (Valentine, 2006) are just a few reasons provided for L2 student-writers accusations of plagiarism in the literature.

A main question that may be raised here is to what extent such acts like inappropriate source attribution or copying may be caused by intentional “cheating”, on the one hand or unintentional, “literacy practices” by L2 writers on the other. In other words, it can be claimed that L2 novice students turn into copying because they are not familiar with the norms of academic writing in a foreign language and that these attempts can be signs of their trying to practice disciplinary writing, enter their related discourse community, and establish their identity (Abasi, Akbari & Graves, 2006) as members of their related discourse communities and competent authors and researchers. Such alternative views make the concept of plagiarism and its interpretation complex and controversial. The present study aims to investigate perspectives and experiences of L2 graduate students and their professors in an EFL university context regarding plagiarism and students’ attempts and strategies to write academically. In particular, the study intends to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the viewpoints of L2 graduate students and their professors about the acts of copying by novice writers? Are they regarded as cases of plagiarism?

2. What are the reasons for different copying practices performed by novice L2 writers?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Novice practitioners, disciplinary writing, and plagiarism

Students learn the discourse of a discipline through a process which is referred to as “apprenticeship” (Flowerdew, 2013), “legitimate peripheral participation” (Lave and Wenger, 1991), or “appropriation” (Abasi, Akbari & Graves, 2006). As Woodward-Kron (1999) states, there are two orientations towards the way graduate students become induced into the culture of their related disciplinary community. The enculturation model or the implicit model focuses on the students’ “socialization into the discursive practices of a discipline” (Woodward-Kron, 1999, p. 1), while the writing apprenticeship or integration model is concerned with identifying the “written features of disciplinary discourses and their genres” (p. 1) and integrating these features into curriculum design. While the first model supposes that students absorb the disciplinary practices of academic literacy, the integration model concerns with learning such practices through explicit teaching (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995).

The idea of appropriation proposed by some writers can also be synonymous with apprenticeship models of academic writing. Many scholars emphasize the importance of appropriation in human learning in considering academic writing as a social practice. This sociocultural view about students’ writings proposes that as students produce more and more texts, they construct new identities as authors, researchers, and members of their disciplinary discourse community and, as a result, make a transition from novice to threshold practitioners (Woodward-Kron, 1999).

In such a transition, a novice graduate student practicing disciplinary writing in a foreign language may use what some writers (Howard, 1993, 1995; Pecorari, 2003, 2008) have termed it patchwriting. Howard (1993), who coined the term for the first time, defines patchwriting as “copying from a source text and then deleting some words, altering grammatical structures, or plugging in one-for-one synonym-substitutes” (p. 213). Patchwriting is claimed to be different from prototypical plagiarism in the sense that “prototypical plagiarism is a form of cheating”, an intentional act done with the purpose of deception, whereas patchwriting or “source-dependent composition” (Pecorari, 2003, p. 320) is the result of a lack of knowledge or fluency in academic writing and relying on references (Li & Casanave, 2012; Pecorari, 2008). According to this view, instructors must be cautious not to reject all students’ attempts of textual borrowing as plagiarism, at least by novice writers. As Howard (2001) explains, novice writers learning the new discourse of a community need support and, as a result, they rely completely

on the language and the linguistic practices of the professional writers in the field. Howard (1995) considers it as the writer's failed attempts at paraphrasing stemming from failures in reading comprehension of the original text due to its difficulty or students' newness to the discourse and attempts to approach their voices to those of the experts.

Therefore, in view of some scholars patchwriting is "an essential phase through which writers pass en route to a stage at which their voices can emerge. As a developmental stage, rather than a form of deliberate deception, patchwriting deserves a pedagogical, rather than a punitive, response" (Pecorari, 2003, p. 320). Regarding viewpoints of the students towards patchwriting, Pecorari (2008) showed that, many student-writers in the study viewed patchwriting as a legitimate alternative to quotation and paraphrasing due to the problems which they attributed to these practices. In their views, using too many quotations was inappropriate and paraphrasing was also difficult as they were afraid of not being able to convey the content of the source text.

These supporting views about textual copying are not approved by many other scholars who believe that, except for paraphrasing, every other act of copying is dishonest, and that patchwriting, even if it is performed unintentionally, is not justified (Abasi and Akbari, 2008; McCabe, 2003, McCabe, Trevino & Butterfield, 1999, 2001). This view holds that such a reliance on source texts cannot help student writers acquire the autonomous, professional textual practices in a discipline. They also argue that by justifying practices such as patchwriting, we are actually encouraging plagiarism.

Taking into account these different views, in this study, we aim to examine the viewpoints and perspectives held by L2 graduate students and their instructors regarding textual practices of student writers in an EFL university context including their views about copying, plagiarism, and patchwriting. As a second objective, the study aims at exploring what these students and their instructors think about the reasons of different acts of plagiarism, patchwriting, and copying.

3. Method

To answer the research questions, two survey questionnaires were constructed to probe graduate students and their professors' viewpoints and experiences about academic writing, plagiarism, and patchwriting. In order to support the results of the two questionnaires, in-depth interviews were also held with one university professor and three students to find out more about those points the answers to which were not clear enough in the questionnaires.

3.1 Participants

Sixty-eight graduate students (23 males and 45 females) who were following the first or the second year of their M.A. or Ph.D. programs in TEFL at Shiraz University and Shiraz Islamic Azad University participated in this study. Some of them were writing their theses or their proposals. All of them had the experience of writing research articles as a requirement of their course fulfillments and only a few had published papers in scholarly journals. Three students (one Ph.D., one first-year MA and one second-year MA) were interviewed individually in the second phase of the study. The Ph.D. student had three articles published in different journals and was writing other research articles with the purpose of publishing them or presenting them in conferences; the second-year MA student had written one research paper to be published in a journal and was writing his thesis at the time of the interview; and the first-year MA student had just started to write a research paper as the fulfillment of one of her courses. These three students were selected as representatives of novice, threshold, and practitioner writers.

Five university instructors (four males, one female) also participated in this study. They had been teaching at graduate courses for between 6 to 11 years. They had co-authored many research articles with students, and had supervised many theses for a couple of years. One of the professors was interviewed individually. He had taught at postgraduate levels in TEFL for 9 years, supervised more than 20 M.A. theses, and co-authored many research articles.

3.2 Instruments

Data for the purpose of this study were collected through survey questionnaires and interviews. Two semi-structured questionnaires were developed by the researchers in order to gather data from students and professors separately. The items of the questionnaires were developed based on the ideas from literature. Two reviewers examined the content of the questionnaires to check their credibility. The questionnaires probed graduate students' and university professors' experiences and viewpoints about issues in academic and discipline-specific writing including conducting research, copying, patchwriting, and plagiarism. The questionnaires also examined the participants' views regarding different causes of plagiarism. The second source of data came from transcribed interviews which were held in order to delve more deeply into these issues from the points of view of both instructors and learners.

3.3 Data collection and analysis

The students completed the questionnaires both in their usual classroom time and individually. The interviews were also held individually. As this study was based on both qualitative and quantitative data sources, data analysis

processes included internal evaluation (Bazargan, Hejazi & Eshaghi, 2007) of the likert-type questionnaires as well as interpretive and holistic procedures used to interpret interviews. All interviews were transcribed and in order to secure credibility, the transcripts were returned to the respondents so that they could review their opinions and check their answers written in detail.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 The graduate students' experiences and viewpoints

The first part of the questionnaire investigated the students' experiences of plagiarism. Most respondents claimed that they never performed inappropriate borrowing (at the levels of idea, phrase, sentence, etc.). The most important reasons for avoiding plagiarism mentioned by the students are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

Reasons for avoiding plagiarism

<i>Reasons</i>	<i>%</i>
1. Illegality of this behaviour in general (against ethics)	76%
2. Fear of being caught red-handed	62%
3. Fear of not getting published	88%
4. Illegality of this behaviour in Iranian culture	63%
5. Explicit instructions received on plagiarism	82%

Two points can be elaborated on regarding the results of Table 1. First, the extrinsic motivation is apparent in making students avoid plagiarism (publishing the paper, punishment). The second point relates to the emphasis put on the role of explicit teaching in making students familiar with the concept of plagiarism as is evident from item 5.

Few students confessed that they had experiences of plagiarism. Though there is no way to confirm these results at the questionnaire level, the following reasons, illustrated in Table 2, were emphasized by those few students as their motives for copying.

According to Table 2, lack of time and being sure that the instructors will never read the papers are the most important reasons students plagiarize. On the other hand, as is indicated by the answers to items 2 and 3, most of the respondents maintained that lack of familiarity with academic writing strategies or research article genre has caused them to turn to plagiarism. In other words, when students have not received enough instruction about genuine academic writing strategies or the way that a research article must be organized and written, it is probable that they (perhaps even unintentionally) turn to alternative ways to accomplish their textual course requirements.

The third part of the students' questionnaire dealt with their general viewpoints and experiences about text copying, patchwriting, and academic writing. Table 3 summarizes the results of this part.

Table 2

Reasons for plagiarism

<i>Reasons</i>	<i>%</i>
1. Lack of confidence to put ideas in their own words	70%
2. Unfamiliarity with professional academic writing practices	83%
3. Unfamiliarity with research article genre in the discipline	80%
4. Time shortage	89%
5. Being sure that the instructor is too busy to read or find out about cases of fraud	83%
6. Lack of difference between plagiarizers' and non-plagiarizers' marks	60%
7. Lack of strict rules against plagiarism	62%
8. Not knowing that plagiarism is illegal and unethical	58%

Table 3

Students' viewpoints on plagiarism and academic writing

<i>Items</i>	<i>%</i>
1. I think graduate students can practice writing research papers by copying.	9%
2. If students copy at the first stages of writing (as a kind of practice) it is OK.	17%
3. When I use a source text and I want to use some part of it in my own writing, I sometimes change every single word with synonyms.	89%
4. Changing words in a source text with synonyms and using them in my paper is not a case of plagiarism.	47%
5. If students copy for their paper assignments, they will later be able to avoid copying as they gradually become familiar with paper writing.	13%
6. Professors should not punish those students who copy their first papers.	60%
7. Replacing the words in a source text with synonyms and changing the structure is a good practice for learning academic writing.	13%

Answers to items 3, 4, and 7 show that patchwriting is a common practice among these student-writers and that they do not regard it as plagiarism. However, they have strict views against plagiarism. They believe that copying cannot be regarded as a kind of textual practice while patchwriting can. As item 5 illustrates, the students maintained that those who plagiarize even at their first practices of writing term assignments cannot avoid such an act in their later practices. Nearly all of them, however, agreed that patchwriting is an acceptable way for learning to write academically.

The last part of the student's survey questionnaire explored students' reasons for patchwriting. This section was an answer to the item "When I use a source text in my own writing and I replace words with synonyms and change the structure, I do it because...". Table 4 illustrates the results.

Table 4 indicates three important reasons for patchwriting. Two unintentional reasons mentioned are lack of confidence in writing

independently and fear of not being able to convey the writer's message. The important intentional reason mentioned by participants is that in performing plagiarism, they have the intention of not getting detected by the plagiarism detection programs or softwares. More notably, most of the respondents agree that they did not receive any instruction on patchwriting and the fact that it might be considered as an act of fraud. Other reasons include their inabilities in paraphrasing, not being a good writer in general, and using too many quotations.

Table 4

Students' reasons for patchwriting

<i>Items</i>	<i>%</i>
When writing my academic texts, I sometimes replace every word in a source text with synonyms or change the structure. My major reason is that	
1. I do not know how to write academic texts.	59%
2. I am afraid that my own writing may not convey the same meaning as in that the source text.	88%
3. I do not feel confident enough to write by myself.	90%
4. I am weak in paraphrasing.	80%
5. I am afraid of using too many quotations in my text.	75%
6. It is a kind of practice for me.	43%
7. I am not a good writer in general.	80%
8. In doing so, I am considering the possibility that it is less likely to be caught by plagiarism detection programs and softwares.	95%
9. I am not told by my instructors that this may be a case of plagiarism.	90%

4.2 The university professors' experiences and viewpoints

The most important findings of the second questionnaire can be summarized in two parts. First, all the professors participating in this study had the experience of detecting plagiarism in students' writings. However, they strongly disagreed (90%) that the students were unfamiliar with academic writing or discourse. They attributed copying mostly to students' intention to deceive their instructors (95%), and laziness (82%).

The second part of their questionnaire was related to the instructors' general viewpoints about plagiarism. Table 5 summarizes the results of this part.

As mentioned earlier, the instructors strongly disagreed with the idea that copying or patchwriting can be a kind of literacy practice for novice student-writers (items 1, 2, 6, 7, 13, 14, and 15). Regarding the issue of intention, it seems that the university instructors do not accept that plagiarism can be unintentional. It seems that most of them agree that plagiarism is an

intentional act of deception and fraud. The issue of cultural difference (items 11 and 12) was also rejected as not playing an important role in plagiarism in the view of these university professors. Answers to the last three items show the negative views of university professors towards patchwriting. Copying sentences and replacing words with synonyms, fabrication, and falsification were the most common types of research misconduct from the point of view of the professors as also mentioned in the interviews.

Table 5

Instructors' viewpoints on plagiarism and academic writing

<i>Items</i>	<i>%</i>
1. Copying is a strategy used by novice graduate students' practicing paper writing.	12%
2. Copying model sentences and words (even without acknowledging the author) help novice writers become enculturated into the disciplines' textual practices.	6%
3. Inappropriate source attribution may be the result of students' lack of knowledge regarding plagiarism.	21%
4. Plagiarism may be the result of students' lack of knowledge regarding academic writing.	34%
5. There are cases of intentional and unintentional plagiarism.	59%
6. Copying can be accepted from novice students as they are practicing academic writing.	10%
7. Copying is acceptable from novice writers but not from threshold practitioners.	8%
8. Plagiarism is not acceptable at all.	100%
9. The existence of plagiarism detection websites has decreased the cases of fraud these days.	11%
10. Students need to receive explicit instruction regarding the dominant genres of disciplinary writing in courses like "Advanced Writing".	90%
11. There is a difference between Anglophone and Oriental cultures regarding the concept of plagiarism.	9%
12. As a result of such difference, Iranian students need to get explicit instruction on academic writing.	13%
13. In my point of view, if students replace every single word in the source text with synonyms and use them in their writing this is acceptable.	9%
14. Replacing words with their synonyms in the source text is a case of plagiarism and as dishonest as it is.	93%
15. Replacing words from a source with synonyms can be regarded as an academic literacy practice.	8%

4.3 Interviews

The interviews were conducted in order to inspect some ambiguous points not elaborated enough in the survey section of the study. Therefore, four

participants (a first-year MA student as a novice writer, a second-year MA student as a threshold writer, a doctoral student of TEFL as a practitioner and a university professor) were interviewed by one of the researchers. We were mostly interested in finding the participants' views on the position of plagiarism and patchwriting in textual practices of the student-writers and the reasons for their copying acts.

The first-year MA student was studying the second semester of her graduate studies in TEFL. She had passed the course "Research Method" in the previous semester and was taking the course "Advanced Writing" at the time of the study. She was writing her first paper and as such, can be a representative of novice writers. Meanwhile, she was completely familiar with plagiarism and expressed that she had received explicit instruction on the issue in the mentioned courses. She also disagreed with the idea that copying can be regarded as a literacy practice even for novice writers. She stated,

If students get used to copying their papers (even the ones written as term paper assignments), they cannot change this habit in their later practices...

She admitted that she had copied some sentences and paragraphs and had replaced some words with synonyms. However, she maintained that she did so because she did not feel confident enough to put the ideas in her own words,

I was afraid my writing might look ridiculous.

The second student writer was a second-year MA student of TEFL. He was following the fourth semester of his graduate studies, had finished writing two research term papers one of which was to be published and was writing his thesis. He mentioned two important points regarding committing plagiarism in textual practices,

Because we didn't have any practice in academic writing in our undergraduate courses, we found it quite a new skill in the graduate program. In fact, we are not even novice practitioners. The MA graduate program, however, is too short (only two years). We have not received sufficient explicit instruction in academic writing and that's why some students may turn to plagiarism.

He claimed that copying or inappropriate borrowing attempts may be unintentional,

Because we don't have enough time and we don't receive enough instruction on paper writing, we may use some parts of the published articles. Of course, I have tried to change the words and the structures, but this is not to deceive my teachers. However, there may be some students who do this in order not to be caught by plagiarism checker softwares.

The important point that this student mentions is the fact that it is not possible to identify intentional from unintentional patchwriting. In other

words, in performing such a practice, students may want to deceive their teachers. In this sense, patchwriting is no different from plagiarism. He continues to argue in favor of explicit instruction along with enough practice and feedback as the best policy university professors can follow in order to prevent plagiarism.

The third interviewee was a Ph.D. student in TEFL. She had the experience of writing a number of research articles, had published two papers in journals, and had of course written her MA thesis. She, too, emphasized the importance of explicit instruction as the best way to impede plagiarism,

Writing at advanced levels is a really difficult endeavor for novice writers ... students are supposed to infer the rules of academic writing in the discipline implicitly and many of them cannot reach this level.

However, she rejects the idea of considering patchwriting as a kind of literacy practice and maintains,

If you don't learn the principles of writing at an advanced level from the very beginning and turn to other strategies like copying, it will be difficult for you to learn them later.

The last interviewee was a university professor who had supervised many MA theses and taught the course "Advanced Writing" several times. She rejected the possibility of unintentional plagiarism and stated,

How can you tell which act of copying is intentional and which is not?

She also rejected the issue of not receiving enough explicit instruction raised by MA students,

In these courses, they receive enough information about how to write, what plagiarism is and how to cite others' works in their writings. However, if they turn to plagiarism, it relates to their lack of motivation or not having enough practice.

Regarding patchwriting, she asserted that this could not be a good practice for student writers and that it is impossible for their instructors to identify cases of fraud.

The students who participated in the present study used patchwriting quite extensively for different reasons. These reasons could be quite unintentional including not having enough confidence to write academic texts independently, not knowing how to paraphrase, and being afraid of not conveying the source writer's message. Meanwhile, one important intentional reason for using patchwriting was to get around plagiarism detection softwares. In addition, the students asserted that they did not receive enough instruction in this regard in their classes and only turned to patchwriting as a strategy that could help them approach professional writing. However, they strongly agreed that patchwriting could also be the result of intentional fraud.

In literature, there has been a great debate about the nature of patchwriting and its motives. According to Bloch (2012), negative views

about patchwriting consider it as a form of plagiarism and with the intention to deceive (Szabo & Underwood, 2004). Other positive views consider patchwriting as a strategy which novice writers use in their developmental process toward professional writing (Pecorari, 2003; Howard, 2010; Valentine, 2006). The instructors and graduate students in this study had a negative view about patchwriting proposing that copying sentences of others and replacing them with other structures and words could not be regarded as a beneficial textual practice in academic writing. Most university instructors and even graduate students rejected such kind of reliance on source texts as a genuine literacy practice and maintained that it could be a literacy practice for novice students if and only if it is accompanied by explicit instruction or as the interviewed instructor asserted it, in shape of an “informed practice”.

These views emphasize the importance of explicit instruction and the educational context regarding professional writing as well as plagiarism and patchwriting (Abasi & Akbari, 2008). It may be taken for granted that graduate students will absorb the principles of writing inductively as a result of mere exposure to published input by professional writers. However, as the results of this study demonstrated, this may not always be the case at least considering the time limit during which graduate students have to acquire all these competences. As the results of this study showed, the wide use of patchwriting among students may be a sign of lack of enough instruction. If newcomers or novices to a discourse community are to acquire disciplinary competence, they need to be enculturated to the discursive practices of the discipline (Woodward-Kron, 1999). Writing expertise is an important aspect of such a competence and as Harwood (2010, p. 309) believes, “students want and expect teachers to demystify and explicate dominant practices”. However, it should be noted that students need to become aware of writing practices and strategies by receiving explicit instruction in order to prevent them from getting accustomed to such practices as patchwriting, which may be regarded as plagiarism, instead of acquiring genuine writing practices of like paraphrasing.

As Howard, Serviss, and Rodrigue (2010) maintain the reason some students turn to plagiarism when they are writing from sources is that they have many difficulties understanding and summarizing the content of those sources. This kind of reliance on original texts, which is regarded by some researchers as a natural, developmental strategy (e.g. Howard, 2010), should be brought to the students’ awareness through explicit instruction. The apprenticeship approaches to academic writing can be beneficial for novice students to make them familiar with textual practices of the discipline. However, explicit instruction about the rules of academic writing is vital in order to make students aware of the cases of plagiarism, patchwriting and copying (Freedman, 1993). In this sense, patchwriting, if not accompanied

with enough instruction, may result in inappropriate writing habits and, as the results of this study show, to some intentional deception acts.

Finally, based on the results of this study, many students use patchwriting unintentionally. One reason may be that their awareness has not been raised towards the difference between patchwriting and paraphrasing (Li & Casanave, 2012) in their writings. As a result, they must be informed to approach patchwriting with great caution and do not rely on it and other deficit ways instead of learning paraphrasing as the best strategy in text borrowing (Hirvela & Du, 2013; Runić, 2013).

5. Conclusions and Implications

Writing at advanced levels is a great dilemma for many novice L2 graduate students and, as a result, they may turn to different practices and strategies some of which may be regarded as plagiarism. While there is not a consensus over the concept of plagiarism (intentional vs. unintentional; culture-bound vs. universal; etc.), students need to become aware of what is regarded as copying, inappropriate borrowing, or plagiarism through explicit instruction. In this way, modeling or patchwriting has been a controversial issue. As the results of this study showed, there are negative views about this kind of practice on the part of both students and university instructors. Nearly all participants of this study rejected patchwriting as a genuine literacy practice and believed that it would not help graduate students become professional writers in their field. The results also showed that many students use patchwriting intuitively and unintentionally for many different reasons the most important of which are lack of confidence, not knowing enough paraphrasing skills, and fear of not restating the writer's message. More notably, trying to get around the plagiarism checker softwares was also identified as an intentional reason for patchwriting.

The results of this study emphasize the importance of explicit instruction in advanced writing classes in order for graduate students to become familiar with other strategies which may distract them from genuine academic writing practices (Tomaš, 2010). It is important that students receive explicit instruction on the limitations of such writing strategies as well as other types of academic writing fraud like plagiarism as well as the differences between paraphrasing and patchwriting.

Training scholars who are able to add to the body of knowledge in every particular discourse community is the ultimate aim of all graduate courses worldwide. The most important way of demonstrating this knowledge is through academic text. Becoming a professional writer in one's discipline is a skill which can be accomplished through a lot of exposure to published discourse accompanied with receiving explicit instruction on the principles of academic writing.

References

- Abasi, A. R., Akbari, N., & Graves, B. (2006). Discourse appropriation, construction of identities, and the complex issue of plagiarism: ESL students writing in graduate school. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15*(2), 102-117.
- Abasi, A. R., & Graves, B. (2008). Academic literacy and plagiarism: Conversations with international graduate students and disciplinary professors. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 7*(4), 221-233.
- Abasi, A.R. & Akbari, N. (2008). Are we encouraging patchwriting? Reconsidering the role of the pedagogical context in ESL student-writers' transgressive intertextuality. *Journal of English for Specific Purposes, 27*(3), 267-284.
- Anderson, M. S. & Steneck, N. H. (2011). The problem of plagiarism. *Urologic Oncology, 29*(1), 90-94.
- Benesch, S. (2001). *Critical English for academic purposes: Theory, politics, and practice*. Mahwah, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Berkenkotter, C. & Huckin, T. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bloch, J. (2012). *Plagiarism, intellectual property, and the teaching of L2 writing*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Flowerdew, J. (2013). English for research publication purposes. In B. Paltridge, and S. Starfield (Eds.), *The handbook of English for specific purposes*, (pp. 301-321). London: John Willy & Sons, Inc.
- Freedman, A. (1993). Show and tell? The role of explicit teaching in the learning of new genres. *Research in the Teaching of English, 27*(3), 222-251.
- Harwood, N. (2010). Research-based materials to demystify academic citation for postgraduates. In N. Harwood (Ed.), *English language teaching materials* (pp. 301-311). Cambridge: CUP.
- 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.
- Howard, R. M. (1993). A plagiarism pentimento. *Journal of Teaching Writing, 11*(3), 233-246.
- Howard, R. M. (1995). Plagiarisms, authorships, and the academic death penalty. *College English, 57*(7), 788-805.
- Howard, R. M. (2010). *Writing matters: The handbook of writing and research*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Howard, R. M., Serviss, T., & Rodrigue, T. K. (2010). Writing from sources, from sentences. *Writing and Pedagogy, 2*(2), 177-192.
- Li, Y. & Casanave, C.P. (2012). Two first year students' strategies for writing from sources: Patchwriting or plagiarism? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*(2), 165-180.

- Lillis, T. M. & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. London: Routledge.
- McCabe, D. L. (2003). Faculty and academic integrity: the influence of current honor codes and past honor code experiences. *Research in Higher Education*, 44(3), 367-385.
- McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (1999). Academic integrity in honor code and non-honor code environments- a qualitative investigation. *Journal of Higher Education*, 70(2): 211-234.
- McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: a decade of research. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11(3): 219-232.
- Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second-language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(4), 317-345.
- Pecorari, D. (2008). *Academic writing and plagiarism: A linguistic analysis*. New York: Continuum.
- Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(2), 201-230.
- Runić, J. (2013). The art of paraphrasing: Strategies for avoiding plagiarism with L2 English writers. 8th Annual Conference on the Teaching of Writing, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT.
- Salager-Meyer, F. (2008). Scientific publishing in developing countries: Challenges for the future. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7(2), 121-132.
- Szabo, A. & Underwood, J. (2004). Cybercheats: Is information and communication technology fuelling academic dishonesty? *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 5(2), 180-199.
- Tomaš, Z. (2010). Addressing writing instructors' needs for effective pedagogical resources on avoiding plagiarism. *Journal of Writing and Pedagogy*, 2, 223-250.
- Valentine, K. (2006). Plagiarism as literacy practice: recognizing and rethinking ethical binaries. *College Composition and Communication*, 58(1), 89-109.
- Woodward-Kron, R. (1999). Learning the discourse of a discipline: The nature of the apprenticeship. HERDSA Annual International Conference, Melbourne. Available at: www.herdsa.org.au/wpcontent/uploads/conference/1999/.../Woodward.PD.

Yamada, K. (2003). What prevents ESL/EFL writers from avoiding plagiarism? Analyses of 10 North-American college websites. *System*, 31(2), 247-258.