Black, White, and Grey: (Re)Constructing the One-Size-Fits-All Approach to Plagiarism

Lindsay Cowley

A thesis submitted to
The Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Masters of Arts
in
Applied Linguistics and Discourse Studies

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario

©2016

Lindsay Cowley

Abstract

The purpose of this qualitative study is to explore how plagiarism is discursively constructed and taken up within a North American university and what challenges result from its multiple interpretations. Rhetorical move analysis (Swales, 1990) is used to investigate how plagiarism is constructed in the university's Academic Integrity Policy (AIP) and how it is (re)constructed in course outlines from the departments of Education Research and Life Sciences. The study further uses concepts of intertextuality and uptake to investigate how professors and students from different disciplinary discourse communities interpret the institutional definition of plagiarism by either adopting it in its entirety or by adapting it. Move analysis indicates that the AIP constructs a universal interpretation of plagiarism while the analysis of interviews with four professors points to a three-to-one split: three professors took up the AIP by reinterpreting it and implementing their own way of dealing with instances of plagiarism and one took up the AIP in expected ways. Students, however, seem to understand plagiarism, partially, in ways similar to the AIP and, partially, similar to professors. The findings of the study suggest that the "one size" institutional AIP may not address possible types and interpretations of plagiarism.

Keywords: academic integrity, academic writing, intention, intertextuality, plagiarism, textual borrowing, uptake, voice

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I would like to acknowledge that, like any research endeavour, this study was truly collaborative. With the encouragement and support of the following contributors, this study was possible. I would like to thank my co-supervisors, Dr. Natasha Artemeva and Dr. Guillaume Gentil, for their undying support, thoughtful discussions, and meticulous feedback, throughout every stage of this study. You have both taught me valuable lessons about academic writing and research.

I would also like to thank my participants, for without them I would not have been able to complete this project. I have learned so much from each one of your perspectives. Thank you all for your time and your thoughtful insights.

I would also like to thank my ALDS friends for their insightful discussions about theory, methods, and academic life in general.

A special thanks goes out to my dad who has always been my number one supporter. No matter what I do, you are always there cheering me on. I would also like to thank Yves and Lynda for your endless support, encouragement, and feedback. Last, but certainly not least, thank you Jason for always being there no matter what.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS	IV
LIST OF TABLES.....	VI
LIST OF FIGURES	VII
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	VIII
ABBREVIATIONS	IX
GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS.....	X
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	5
DEFINING PLAGIARISM	5
INSTITUTIONAL ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICIES AND PLAGIARISM	8
DISCIPLINARY APPROACHES TO WRITING AND PLAGIARISM.....	11
PERCEPTIONS OF PLAGIARISM	13
<i>Professors' perceptions of plagiarism</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Students' perceptions of plagiarism.....</i>	<i>15</i>
CHAPTER SUMMARY	17
CHAPTER THREE: CONCEPTUAL APPROACH.....	18
ENGLISH FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES	18
<i>Discourse community</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Communicative purpose(s).....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Rhetorical structure analysis.....</i>	<i>22</i>
BAKHTINIAN VIEW OF LANGUAGE	24
<i>Dialogism and intertextuality.....</i>	<i>24</i>
Voice.....	26
UPTAKE.....	27
CHAPTER SUMMARY	29
CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY.....	30
RESEARCH DESIGN	30
RESEARCH SITE.....	31
PARTICIPANTS.....	31
INSTRUMENTS	33
<i>Text-based activity.....</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>Interview guide.....</i>	<i>35</i>
DATA COLLECTION AND DATA COLLECTED	35
<i>Textual data collection</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Interview data collection.....</i>	<i>36</i>
TRANSCRIPTION AND RESEARCHER'S ROLE.....	37
UNIT OF ANALYSIS	38
<i>Unit of analysis for textual data</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>Unit of analysis for interview data</i>	<i>38</i>
METHOD OF ANALYSIS	39
<i>Textual data.....</i>	<i>39</i>
<i>Interview data.....</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>Categorizing and connecting.....</i>	<i>42</i>
<i>Memo writing</i>	<i>43</i>
MEMBER CHECKING	43
CHAPTER SUMMARY	44
CHAPTER FIVE: THE INSTITUTION'S CONSTRUCTION OF PLAGIARISM	45
CONSTRUCTING PLAGIARISM: THE POLICY	45

<i>Analyzing the introduction section of the Policy</i>	47
<i>Analyzing the scope section of the Policy</i>	49
<i>Analyzing the plagiarism section of the Policy</i>	51
<i>Analyzing the procedures (alleged violation) section of the Policy</i>	55
<i>Analyzing the sanction section of the Policy</i>	57
CONSTRUCTING PLAGIARISM: COURSE OUTLINE PLAGIARISM STATEMENTS	60
<i>Analyzing the COPS corpus</i>	61
CHAPTER SUMMARY	67
CHAPTER SIX: HOW PROFESSORS CONSTRUCT PLAGIARISM	69
DEFINING PLAGIARISM	70
DETECTING PLAGIARISM: INDICATORS	73
EVALUATING PLAGIARISM: FACTORS TO CONSIDER.....	74
<i>Students' intention</i>	76
<i>Students' circumstance</i>	77
<i>Length of borrowed text</i>	79
<i>Students' cultural background</i>	79
<i>Combining factors</i>	80
RESPONDING TO PLAGIARISM.....	81
<i>Teaching moment</i>	82
<i>Following the institutional plagiarism rules</i>	85
DISCIPLINARY DIFFERENCES	86
ACCEPTED STANDARDIZATION: A COMMON WAY	89
CHAPTER SUMMARY	92
CHAPTER SEVEN: HOW STUDENTS CONSTRUCT PLAGIARISM	93
DEFINING PLAGIARISM	93
STRATEGIES FOR AVOIDING PLAGIARISM	94
<i>Adapting to the expectations of the local community</i>	95
<i>Referencing borrowed text</i>	96
<i>Imitation</i>	98
STUDENTS' PERCEIVED NEEDS IN RELATION TO PLAGIARISM.....	98
CHAPTER SUMMARY	100
CHAPTER EIGHT: DOES ONE SIZE FIT ALL?	101
INTENDED AND INTERPRETED PURPOSE(S) OF THE POLICY	103
TEXT IN CONTEXT: INTERPRETATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POLICY	104
<i>Interpretation of the AIP and plagiarism</i>	105
<i>Students' intention</i>	108
<i>Intertextuality</i>	109
<i>Implementation of the AIP rules</i>	111
CHAPTER SUMMARY	112
CHAPTER NINE: CONCLUSION	114
LIMITATIONS.....	116
IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH, POLICY DEVELOPMENT, AND PEDAGOGY	116
REFERENCES.....	120

List of Tables

TABLE 1. PROFESSOR PARTICIPANT INFORMATION.....	31
TABLE 2. STUDENT PARTICIPANT INFORMATION	32
TABLE 3. TEXT-BASED ACTIVITY: DISCIPLINES, SECTIONS BORROWED FROM, AND SOURCES.....	34
TABLE 4. SAMPLE INTERVIEW CODES	41
TABLE 6. RHETORICAL STRUCTURE OF THE AIP INTRODUCTION SECTION	48
TABLE 7. RHETORICAL STRUCTURE OF THE AIP SCOPE SECTION	50
TABLE 8. RHETORICAL STRUCTURE OF THE AIP PLAGIARISM SECTION	52
TABLE 9. RHETORICAL STRUCTURE OF THE AIP ALLEGED VIOLATION SUB-SECTION.....	56
TABLE 10. RHETORICAL STRUCTURE OF THE AIP SANCTION SECTION.....	58
TABLE 11. SAMPLE MOVE/STEP STRUCTURE OF EDR COURSE OUTLINE PLAGIARISM STATEMENT.....	62
TABLE 12. SAMPLE MOVE/STEP STRUCTURE OF LS COURSE OUTLINE PLAGIARISM STATEMENT..	63
TABLE 13. RHETORICAL STRUCTURE OF COPS CORPUS.....	64

List of Figures

FIGURE 1. EXAMPLE OF THE TEXT-BASED ACTIVITY	34
FIGURE 2. SAMPLE MEMO EXCERPT	43
FIGURE 3. AIP TABLE OF CONTENTS	46
FIGURE 4. TEXT-BASED ACTIVITY ONE. THE UNDERLINE PORTIONS OF THIS EXAMPLE INDICATE BORROWED TEXT.	70
FIGURE 5. CONTINUUM ILLUSTRATING TWO EXTREME APPROACHES TO DEALING WITH PLAGIARISM	75
FIGURE 6. TEXTUAL ACTIVITY EXCERPTS ONE AND TWO. THE UNDERLINE PORTIONS OF THIS EXAMPLE INDICATE BORROWED TEXT.....	86

List of Appendices

APPENDIX A: ETHICS CLEARANCE FOR RESEARCHER’S HOME INSTITUTION	131
APPENDIX B: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY SECTIONS	132
APPENDIX C: COPS CORPUS 10 EXAMPLES	137
APPENDIX D: RECRUITMENT STATEMENT POSTED ON A PROFESSOR’S COURSE WEBSITE	140
APPENDIX E: INDIVIDUAL STUDENT RECRUITMENT FORMS	141
APPENDIX F: TEXT-BASED ACTIVITY	142
APPENDIX G: INTERVIEW GUIDE	143
APPENDIX H: FULL RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SANCTION SECTION OF THE AIP	144

Abbreviations

AIP: Academic Integrity Policy

APA: American Psychological Association

COPS corpus: Course Outline Plagiarism Statement corpus

EdR: (Department of) Education Research

ESP: English for Specific Purposes

FOA: Faculty of Arts

FOS: Faculty of Science

LS: (Department of) Life Science

NAU: North American University

Glossary of Key Terms

Academic Integrity Policy: A text that constructs how matters of academic integrity such as plagiarism should be interpreted, namely, what is considered academic misconduct and how it should be dealt with within an institution.

Communicative Purpose: The communicative goal of or the reason for the text (Swales, 1990).

Dialogism: A quality of any utterance to be produced in response to a previous utterance and in anticipation of a response (Bakhtin, 1986).

Discourse Communities: The “sociorhetorical networks that form in order to work towards sets of common goals” (Swales, 1990, p. 9). Discourse communities can be defined by their focus or their location (Swales, 2016).

Intertextuality: The notion that every text draws on previous texts (Kristeva, 1980).

Move: A larger chunk of text, defined as “a discoursal or rhetorical unit that preforms a coherent communicative function in a written or spoken discourse” (Swales, 2004, p. 228).

Non-transgressive Intertextuality: Acceptable textual borrowing practices.

One-Size-Fits-All Plagiarism Policy: Construction of only one “acceptable” way of conceptualizing the issue of plagiarism and only one solution.

Patchwriting: The “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).

Plagiarism: The taking of someone else’s thoughts, ideas, and words without attribution.

Rhetorical Structure: The combination of moves and steps in a text (Swales, 1990).

Step: A building block of a move, specifically, one of the smaller units that realize a move (Swales, 1990, 2004).

Textual Borrowing: The integration of someone else's work into your own. Textual borrowing can be transgressive or non-transgressive.

Transgressive Intertextuality: Unacceptable textual borrowing practices.

Uptake: The process of texts responding to each other.

Voice: "A metaphorical concept capturing the sense of author identity that comes through when readers interact with text" (Tardy, 2012, p. 39).

Chapter One: Introduction

Academic, or scholarly (Giltrow, Gooding, Burgoyne, & Sawatsky, 2014, p. 6), writing relies on situating one's research in previous literature (Hyland, 2004) while drawing on pre-existing texts to build and support one's ideas. Integrating and/or drawing on previous texts in one's academic writing, or *intertextuality* (Bazerman, 2004; Kristeva, 1980), plays an important role in academic writing; however, a question of what types of intertextuality are institutionally acceptable persists. Rules governing institutionally acceptable intertextuality are defined by academic institutions as part of their policies on academic integrity. The policies tend to devote much attention to what is considered unacceptable intertextuality—plagiarism. *Plagiarism* is broadly defined as the taking of someone else's thoughts, ideas, and words and integrating them in one's own writing without attribution and is considered an unacceptable, or transgressive, form of *textual borrowing* (Borg, 2009). Potential problems, however, arise at the interplay between the intertextuality rules that are stipulated by the academic integrity policies (AIP) and how professors and students actually understand and practice intertextuality, and, particularly, how they understand plagiarism and what they think they should do to avoid, prevent, or deal with it.

This study aims to explore the relationship between how one North American University (NAU) constructs plagiarism through its AIP and how members of disciplines, namely, professors and students, interpret the institution's view of plagiarism by either adopting and/or adapting the rules established in the Policy. Previous research has argued that institutional definitions of plagiarism are ambiguous, oversimplified (Howard, 1995), and “limiting if not hopelessly confusing or even entirely flawed” (Haviland & Mullin,

2009, p. 12). Recognizing there are issues arising from the definitions and interpretations of plagiarism, a large body of research has advocated for redefining plagiarism to acknowledge the diverse types of textual borrowing that could be interpreted as plagiarism by AIPs, but may not be considered academic misconduct by academic writers in the disciplines (e.g., Chandrasoma, Thompson, & Pennycook, 2004; Howard, 1993, 1995; Li, 2013; Pecorari, 2008; Pennycook, 1996). Recent discussion on redefining plagiarism has focused on the notions of intertextuality and intent of the student. For example, Chandrasoma et al. (2004) have advocated for differentiating between two types of intertextuality: 1) *transgressive intertextuality*, which refers to unacceptable textual borrowing practices and 2) *non-transgressive intertextuality*, which refers to acceptable textual borrowing.

Additionally, researchers have indicated that issues arise when plagiarism is defined without consideration of contextual factors (Park, 2004; Price, 2002; Jamieson, 2008) and may be (mis)interpreted by members of the academic community (Devlin & Gray, 2007; Flint et al., 2006; Gullifer & Tyson, 2010; McCabe, 1993; Roig, 1997, 2001). For example, research on professors' perceptions of student plagiarism suggests that professors have subjective interpretations of the rules described in their institutions' AIPs. As a result of these interpretations, professors may choose to selectively follow the plagiarism-related rules of the institution (see Flint et al., 2006). There is additional research focusing on students' perception of plagiarism, specifically how they conceptualize plagiarism. Such research finds that students, as novice academic writers, tend to misunderstand plagiarism-related policies and exhibit confusion about what is considered acceptable in textual borrowing practices within the academic context (e.g.,

Roig, 1997). Several studies have focused on how plagiarism is constructed at the institutional level through AIPs (e.g., Pecorari, 2001; Sutherland-Smith, 2011), with findings indicating similarities between institutions, wherein plagiarism is conceptualized as academic misconduct and the intentions of the students' textual borrowing are not considered. Together, these lines of research provide insight into the complex, subjective, and contextually dependent interpretations of plagiarism and implementation of rules related to it. However, despite the breadth of research on plagiarism and calls for reassessing approaches to it in tertiary institutions, research has had little impact on pedagogical practice (see Pecorari, 2015). Moreover, while previous research has shown the importance of considering contextual factors when implementing AIPs, the alignment between perspectives on plagiarism at multiple levels (i.e., institutional, faculty, disciplinary, professor, and student) within a single institutional educational context appears to be under-explored.

This study aims to address this research gap by exploring how plagiarism is constructed at multiple levels within a single institution. Specifically, I aim to investigate how one AIP interprets plagiarism and is interpreted—or *taken up*—by professors and students from different disciplines. The study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How does the institution discursively construct plagiarism in its academic integrity policy and related documentation?
2. How do professors and students, from the departments of Life Science and Education Research, interpret the institutional construction of plagiarism?

3. To what extent does the institution's academic integrity policy account for the perspectives on plagiarism that exist within the institution?

Drawing on the concepts of uptake (Freadman, 1994, 2002) and intertextuality (Bahktin, 1986; Bazerman, 2004; Kristeva, 1980), I argue that, due to the complex and subjective nature of plagiarism, the current institutional approach to interpreting and implementing plagiarism does not account for the disciplinary perspectives of what counts as (un)acceptable textual borrowing.

In the next chapter, Chapter Two, I situate this study within the relevant literature on plagiarism in tertiary institutions. Chapter Three introduces the key analytical and theoretical concepts that I use to inform the study, which are drawn from English for Specific Purposes (ESP), Bakhtinian ideas about language, and Freadman's work on uptake. In Chapter Four I describe the methods used, namely the emergent research design, participants, data collection, and data analysis. Chapter Five presents the analysis and findings from the rhetorical structure analysis of the textual data (i.e., the AIP and a corpus of course outline plagiarism statements), and then, in Chapters Six and Seven, I describe the thematic analysis and the subsequent findings from the participant interviews. Chapter Eight discusses the findings presented in the previous two chapters in light of the reviewed literature and key theoretical and analytical concepts. In the final chapter I summarize the conclusions that are drawn from the study, discuss limitations, provide practical suggestions, and describe implications for future research.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

In this chapter, I provide an overview of key trends in recent research on plagiarism in tertiary institutions of relevance to this study. Specifically, I review four strands of research on: 1) difficulties in defining plagiarism; 2) plagiarism in relation to institutional academic integrity policies; 3) disciplinary differences in writing and plagiarism; and 4) professors' and students' perceptions of plagiarism.

Defining Plagiarism

A number of researchers argue that plagiarism is a complex and evolving issue that cannot be captured in a single universal definition (e.g., Bouville, 2008; Briggs, 2003; Haviland & Mullin, 2009; Howard & Robillard, 2008; Maruca, 2003; Pecorari & Shaw, 2012; Pennycook, 1996; Weber-Wulff, 2014). These researchers maintain that the major issue with plagiarism is the broad way in which it is defined and understood. For example, plagiarism has been defined as the theft of intellectual property wherein the words or ideas of others are taken as one's own and the borrowed text is not considered general knowledge (Park, 2003). This definition, like many others, metaphorically frames plagiarism as a crime against the academy (see Bouville, 2008; Briggs, 2003; Pennycook, 1996). Other definitions suggest that the underlying issue with plagiarism is not the borrowing of someone else's ideas, but submitting another's work as one's own without acknowledging the source (Briggs, 2003; Park, 2004). As evident in these definitions, plagiarism is a broad term that could be applied to both intentional and non-intentional forms of problematic textual borrowing.

To address the issue of multiple interpretations researchers advocate for understanding the complexity inherent in the phenomenon of plagiarism, calling for

alternative terms to refer to intentional and unintentional plagiarism (Howard, 1993, 1995, 1999; Pecorari, 2008). One of these terms is *patchwriting*, introduced by Howard (1993), which refers to the “copying from a source text and then deleting some words, altering grammatical structures, or plugging in one-for-one synonym substitutes” (p. 233). Howard (1999) suggests that patchwriting is a textual strategy that emerges when novice students are writing for a new, unfamiliar academic community and are in the process of learning how to produce discourse for that community. She further states, “we all patchwrite, all the time. There is no ‘my’ ‘own’ language; there is only the shared language, in its shared combinations and possibilities” (Howard, 1999, p. 91). Based on this assumption, Howard has advocated for patchwriting to be treated as a natural and beneficial part of the learning process with responses of instruction rather than being metaphorically treated as an academic “crime.”

Pecorari (2008) views plagiarism in a similar light. She has argued that the current binary (i.e., no plagiarism versus plagiarism) approaches to plagiarism, that predominantly refer to warning students not to plagiarize but not teaching them how to avoid it, do not capture the complexity of the issue. Pecorari upholds that the interpretation of plagiarism should be reframed as a linguistic phenomenon, that is, “an undesirable textual feature” (p. 2). This reframing would allow us to understand that certain types of plagiarism as natural occurrences in the writing completed by novice students. In cases where plagiarism occurs unintentionally, Pecorari assumes that novices will gradually learn from their mistakes as they acquire the writing practices of their disciplinary community. Pecorari introduces the broad category of *textual plagiarism* to refer to the borrowing of another’s words and ideas without attribution. Under the broad

umbrella category of textual plagiarism Pecorari (2008) has suggested that there are two types of plagiarism: patchwriting, a term she borrows from Howard (1993) to refer to unintentional plagiarism, and *prototypical plagiarism*, a term she introduces to refer to the use of another's words/ideas without attribution with the intent to deceive. By redefining plagiarism this way, Pecorari shifts the focus from views of plagiarism as a "crime" (in a metaphorical sense) to the understanding that borrowing text without attribution does occur unintentionally.

Chandrasoma et al. (2004) also argue that current conceptualizations of plagiarism as intentional are insufficient because they construct plagiarism as a decontextualized set of rules. The authors instead advocate for redefining plagiarism in terms of transgressive (i.e., unacceptable) and non-transgressive (i.e., acceptable) intertextuality. Further developing the notion of plagiarism in terms of intertextuality, Pecorari and Shaw (2012) proposed a framework that allows professors and administration to view plagiarism as a four-part typology of intertextuality which can accommodate different perspectives on textual borrowing. Two types of intertextuality, considered "legitimate" or acceptable, are defined as: *indirect*, which refers to formulaic phrases and does not draw from any specific sources, and *conventional*, which refers to information that has either been directly borrowed from a source and quoted and cited, or indirectly borrowed from a source, paraphrased and cited. The other two types of intertextuality, considered "illegitimate" or unacceptable, are defined as: *unconventional*, whereby borrowed text is not signalled by quotations, but is not always considered to be intentional, and *deceptive*, wherein text is borrowed verbatim from a source without indicating where the material

came from (Pecorari & Shaw, 2012, p. 158). By distinguishing between types of plagiarism institutions can redefine plagiarism as varying degrees of (un)acceptability.

These new approaches to defining plagiarism in terms of intentionality and intertextuality provide ways of analyzing the multiple interpretations of plagiarism and the subtle complexities of it, which are overlooked by dichotomous definitions that treat problematic intertextuality as either plagiarism or not. According to Pecorari (2015), however, these new ways of conceptualizing plagiarism have had little pedagogical impact on the ways in which plagiarism is understood and dealt with in tertiary academic institutions. This disconnect between research and practice indicates the need for more research on approaches to plagiarism in pedagogical settings, particularly, the need to analyze in what ways current Academic Integrity Policy approaches to plagiarism account, or fail to account, for the various ways novice academics actually write and learn to write.

Institutional Academic Integrity Policies and Plagiarism

As previously introduced, there is a large amount of literature on what plagiarism is, and how it should be defined (e.g., Howard, 1995; Pecorari, 2008; Pecorari & Shaw, 2012). However, there is less research on how plagiarism is constructed through AIP within an institution (e.g., Kaktiņš, 2014; Pecorari, 2001; Sutherland-Smith, 2011). This line of research generally acknowledges that plagiarism policies are necessary in that they aim to define “the textual objectives of all writers in college” and provide “the tools with which instructors and students navigate a textual event, determining its acceptability and consequences” (Howard & Robillard, 2008, pp. 5-6; see also Park, 2004; Price, 2002). To achieve this purpose, most policies attempt to present a unified definition of plagiarism,

which is generally represented in a set of abstract rules (what I will further refer to as one-size-fits-all) that apply to all disciplines within the institution. In this section, I first discuss the ways previous researchers have analyzed AIPs and findings of their research, and then introduce literature that discusses alternative approaches to the standard AIP plagiarism definition.

The largest known systematic study of plagiarism-related policies was conducted by Pecorari (2001) and included 54 universities from the U.S., the UK, and Australia. Pecorari collected four types of documents that provided: 1) a formal definitions of plagiarism; 2) university regulations regarding plagiarism; 3) procedures professors are to follow if they encounter cases of plagiarism; and 4) instructions given to students for appropriate source use from each university. She found that definitions of plagiarism were consistently similar across the universities in that most universities defined plagiarism as textual borrowing and paraphrasing without attribution and only differed in the amount of detail provided. By and large, the most significant difference among the academic integrity texts was the presence or absence of references to the notion of intentionality. The majority of texts defined certain forms of textual borrowing as plagiarism regardless of the writer's intention, while only a minority of texts defined students' intent to deceive as a factor to consider. Based on these findings, Pecorari (2001) called for policy refinement that permits students to make unintentional mistakes without the error being treated as an academic "crime."

Other researchers have also identified similarities in university plagiarism statements. For example, Sutherland-Smith (2011) evaluated institutional plagiarism policies from Australia, Canada, the U.S., and the UK. She found textual similarities

among the policies. The texts analyzed tended to frame plagiarism as a deceptive act which resulted in punitive outcomes. She also found, however, that the kinds of textual activities considered to be plagiarism differed across institutions: some policies included general or detailed examples of what may constitute plagiarism, others considered the “level of seriousness” of the suspected plagiarism and intention (p. 131), yet other policies followed strict rules. In another, more recent study of plagiarism statements in AIPs, Kaktiņš (2014) attempted to better understand the attitudinal stance that 39 Australian universities’ institutional policies take on plagiarism-related issues. She found that the “widespread and ingrained punitive stance” (p. 135) taken on plagiarism in university integrity policies have shifted to more positive pedagogically oriented approaches. Kaktiņš’ (2014), and, to some extent, Sutherland-Smith’s (2011), findings illustrate a gradual change from the primarily one-size-fits-all approach to a more positive pedagogically oriented approach to plagiarism in which students are constructed as apprentice community members who may make textual borrowing errors unintentionally.

Researchers (e.g., Pecorari, 2001; Sutherland-Smith, 2011) have thus indicated that uniform definitions of plagiarism included in the majority of institutional policies do not typically reflect the range of transgressive and non-transgressive textual borrowing practices that occur in academic contexts. The scholars have advocated for policy reform in at least two ways: 1) that AIPs be contextualized within specific institutions and/or disciplines and 2) that institutions adopt new perspectives on plagiarism that would acknowledge the intentions of students. To do so, some researchers propose that policies can still be developed at the institutional level in ways that account for different types of

plagiarism and variation within the institution (Howard, 1995; Park, 2004), while others propose more narrow, local policies be developed within specific disciplinary communities (Jamieson, 2008; Price, 2002). For example, Howard (1995) proposed a policy that intended to clarify the concept of plagiarism by explicitly acknowledging the complexities inherent in it. In her proposed policy she advocated for viewing plagiarism on a continuum that differentiates between intentional and unintentional forms. Although she included a sample AIP in her publication, she did not recommend borrowing the policy as a whole, suggesting instead that approaches to defining plagiarism and implementing responses to it should be contextualized within the specific institution. Park (2004) has also stated that AIPs need to differentiate between different types of plagiarism. He suggested differentiating between minor offences such as poor adherence to writing conventions versus major offences such as intentional deception. By proposing to revise policies in this way, these researchers advocate for focusing on the pedagogical interpretation of plagiarism rather than on the dichotomous definitions of what is right versus what is wrong. Kaktiņš (2014) has illustrated that some, but not all, institutional policies have recently adopted such a pedagogical orientation. Despite progression towards approaches that consider factors such as the intent of the student, there still remains a need for more awareness and implementation of the alternative approaches to the so-called one-size-fits-all AIP.

Disciplinary Approaches to Writing and Plagiarism

One of the primary reasons for calls for policy reform, as I discussed previously, is that there is no shared understanding of what plagiarism is and how it should be addressed. This is exemplified by research on disciplinary writing and citation practices,

presented below. The literature on disciplinary writing suggests that knowledge is constructed and understood differently in different academic domains such as the arts and the sciences (e.g., Bazerman, 1995; Borg, 2009; Bruffee, 1986; Buranen & Stephenson, 2009; Cargill & O'Connor, 2013; Dowdey, 1992; Hyland, 2004, 2006).

Research has demonstrated that writing practices are embedded in disciplinary knowledge. Disciplines have their own knowledge-making practices wherein texts produced in a discipline shape and are shaped by the social context of the discipline, in a dialogic relationship (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Hyland, 2004; Myers, 1990). The interconnected relationship between text and context results in different conceptualizations of the purpose of academic writing, and different ways rhetorical conventions are realized to achieve this purpose. For example, Hyland (2006) states that writing in the sciences generally aims to produce public knowledge that is “able to withstand the rigours of falsifiability and develop through relatively steady cumulative growth” (p. 36) whereas writing in the arts and social sciences tends to be “more interpretive and less abstract, producing discourse which often recasts knowledge as sympathetic understanding, promoting tolerance in readers through ethical rather than cognitive progression” (p. 37).

The different ways writing is conceptualized in the disciplines result in different approaches to referencing borrowed material (Hyland, 2004). A common referencing feature across all disciplines is that all writers refer to previous research emphasizing the idea that academic writing must be situated in previous research (Hyland, 2004). However, the ways in which writers reference previous literature vary by discipline. On the one hand, in the arts and social sciences, scholars tend to adhere to citation style

guides such as Modern Language Association (MLA), Chicago, and American Psychological Association (APA), use direct quotes, and cite previous literature to set up the context of their study. On the other hand, in the sciences, there is no widely accepted citation style guide, writers tend to use citations to acknowledge others' works but without focusing on specific wordings or textual excerpts, given that the terminology tends to be standardized and knowledge claims are assessed based on who made them rather how they were worded (Dowdey, 1992). Knowledge of these disciplinary writing practices and referencing strategies seem to be acquired by novices gradually through acculturation into the disciplinary community (Jamieson, 2008). Thus, these disciplinary differences in writing and referencing create tension with the one-size-fits-all AIP that attempts to enforce and regulate one uniform perspective on how to write appropriately in an academic context (Jamieson, 2008).

Perceptions of Plagiarism

The literature reviewed above indicates that researchers consider students' intent to deceive as an important factor in understanding plagiarism in an institutional context. To attain a better understanding of the relationship between the writer's intention, the nature of textual borrowing, and plagiarism researchers (e.g., Bennett, Behrendt, & Boothby, 2011; Haviland & Mullin, 2009; Roig, 1997, 2001) have surveyed professors and students. Research has illustrated that professors and students have various and sometimes contrasting understandings of what is and is not considered appropriate textual borrowing (e.g., McCabe, 1993; McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 2001; Wilkinson, 2009). In this section, I briefly discuss the interpretation of plagiarism by professors, before discussing its interpretation by students.

Professors' perceptions of plagiarism

In attempt to better understand how professors conceptualize plagiarism, recent research has primarily focused on uncovering the underlying perceptions of professors as to what constitutes (un)acceptable textual borrowing (e.g., Bennett, Behrendt, & Boothby, 2011; Borg, 2009; Flint, Clegg, & Macdonald, 2006; Pincus & Schmelkin, 2003). The literature suggests that professors from various academic disciplines believe that plagiarism is a complex issue (Buranen & Stephenson, 2009; Pincus & Schmelkin, 2003) and have a variety of interpretations of what types of textual borrowing would be considered plagiarism (Haviland & Mullin, 2009; Howard & Robillard, 2008). For example, Pincus and Schmelkin's (2003) study aimed to better understand the perceptions of professors and how they conceptualized issues related to plagiarism. Drawing attention to the complexity of plagiarism, they found that professors viewed academic dishonesty on a continuum of severity rather than as an "all or nothing" dichotomy (p. 206). By conceptualizing plagiarism on a continuum of minor to major violations of the AIP rules, professors in the study were better able to unpack and clarify what plagiarism was in the context of their classrooms.

Other studies (e.g., Borg, 2009; Flint et al., 2006; Haviland & Mullin, 2009; McCabe, 1993) found complex differences in how professors labelled and responded to suspected plagiarism, revealing how their personal and disciplinary subjectivities influenced their interpretation and implementation of institutional plagiarism-related rules. For example, Roig's (2001) study of the criteria professors use in labelling textual borrowing as acceptable or unacceptable showed that professors did not unanimously agree on whether given texts were paraphrased (acceptable) or plagiarized

(unacceptable). Borg (2009) also noted that professors adapted their responses to suspected cases of plagiarism based on personal and disciplinary reasons. Flint et al. (2006) further found that professors had “internalized definitions of plagiarism” which “means that all instances of plagiarism are mediated by” the subjective professors’ definitions “before consulting the policy” (p. 152). In other words, professors tended to respond to cases of suspected plagiarism based on their own interpretation of textual borrowing rather than following the institutional rules. McCabe (1993) similarly found that professors tended to deal with issues of academic dishonesty directly with the students rather than following the AIP rules. These findings illustrate a complex tension between following the rules for consistency and the subjective ways in which professors deal with the situations of suspected plagiarism.

Students’ perceptions of plagiarism

Studies investigating the understanding of plagiarism by students have primarily been interested in unpacking how students conceptualize (un)acceptable textual borrowing in their institutional context and the strategies they use for successful academic writing (e.g., Devlin & Gray, 2007; Gullifer & Tyson, 2010; McCabe & Trevino, 1997; Roig, 1997). Studies indicated common themes of misunderstanding, confusion, and perceived lack of clear standards as factors influencing the lack of understanding students have of plagiarism. In particular, students seem to have different understandings of what types of textual activities constitute plagiarism, sometimes indicating (mis)alignment with the institution’s AIP and the interpretations professors have of the concept (Devlin & Gray, 2007; Yeo, 2007). This misalignment highlights the potential misunderstanding that novice students have of the rhetorical conventions valued

in their academic community (Marshall & Garry, 2005; McCormick, 1989; Roig, 1997). For example, in a two-part study, Roig (1997) assessed the ability of students to appropriately paraphrase borrowed text and to identify acceptable and unacceptable borrowed text in a paragraph. Roig's findings showed that students lacked the ability to paraphrase, and that the ways in which they were paraphrasing texts would be considered (inadvertent) plagiarism by expert academic community members. Furthermore, almost half of the participants identified plagiarized texts as acceptable paraphrasing, primarily basing their assumptions on whether or not a citation was present. These findings indicate that novice students may lack knowledge and understanding of appropriate writing practices that are valued by the academic community.

Other research on student perceptions of plagiarism has concluded that students struggle understanding what textual practices constitute plagiarism. Research has indicated that students have difficulties in understanding what is expected of them (Ashworth, Bannister, & Thorne, 1997), what actions constitute plagiarism, and how professors may have different expectations with regard to plagiarism (Power, 2009). For example, Power's (2009) study elaborated on issues students had had with professors who tended to describe plagiarism in a similar standardized way while simultaneously enforcing the institutional AIP rules in different, inconsistent ways. Power discovered that this perceived inconsistency contributed to the students' confusion about what practices are or are not acceptable. These findings point to the need for clearer information about plagiarism and consistent responses to cases of plagiarism, or a discussion of why approaches to dealing with plagiarism are complex.

Chapter Summary

The literature reviewed in this chapter has demonstrated a disconnect between what professors and students understand as plagiarism in given institutional contexts. This tension indicates a need for more research on perceptions of plagiarism at various levels to better understand how interpretations of plagiarism differ and how they can be aligned to create common ground that promotes learning. Literature reviewed in this chapter has also indicated that plagiarism is a contextualized phenomenon. Despite all the research on how plagiarism is constructed at various levels within one or more postsecondary institutions, no research appears to have studied the alignment between how an institution constructs plagiarism in its AIP and how students and professors in the same institution interpret plagiarism within their specific disciplinary contexts. Research does indicate a gradual shift from mono- towards multi-dimensional approaches to plagiarism that take into account the complexity of the issue and consider the intent of the textual borrowing (e.g., Kaktiņš, 2014). However, more research is needed to better understand the alignment in interpreting what does and does not represent plagiarism across the various levels—institutional, departmental, individual—within a single institution. This study, therefore, addresses the under-explored relations among the perceptions of plagiarism at different institutional levels and by different stakeholders (professors and students) to obtain a holistic perspective on how plagiarism is constructed at one institution.

Chapter Three: Conceptual Approach

In this chapter, I present the key analytical and theoretical concepts that inform the study. First, I introduce the English for Specific Purposes (ESP) definition of genre and genre analysis concepts and tools (Bhatia, 1993; Swales, 1990), such as discourse community, communicative purpose, and the rhetorical move/step approach to genre analysis. Second, I discuss concepts that developed on the basis of Bakhtin's theory of language (1984, 1986), namely, dialogism, intertextuality, and the concept of voice, which brings the discussion to the notion of uptake (Freadman, 1994, 2002).

English for Specific Purposes

Swales (1990, 2016) had proposed an ESP-based theoretical and analytical approach to textual analysis, which was further developed by other researchers (e.g., Askehave, 1999; Bhatia, 1993). This approach focuses on uncovering the function (i.e., communicative purpose) and form (i.e., rhetorical structure) of written scholarly texts (see Bawarshi & Reiff, 2010; Hyon 1996). Swales's (1990) approach is built on three key concepts: 1) *discourse community*, which refers to "sociorhetorical networks that form in order to work towards sets of common goals" (p. 9) and which can be defined by their focus or their location (Swales, 2016), a point to which I return in the Discourse Community section; 2) *communicative purpose*, which refers to the communicative goal of or the reason for the text (p. 10); and 3) *genre*, which Swales defines as the rhetorical and linguistic actions of a discourse community (p. 58). Elaborating on Swales's definition, Bhatia (1993) defines genre as:

a recognizable communicative event characterized by a set of communicative purpose(s) identified and mutually understood by the members of the professional or academic community in which it regularly occurs. Most often it is highly structured and conventionalized with constraints on allowable contributions in terms of their intent, positioning, form and functional value. These constraints, however, are often exploited by the expert members of the discourse community to achieve private intentions within the framework of socially recognized purpose(s). (p. 13)

Like Swales's, Bhatia's (1993) definition highlights the importance of the communicative purposes of a genre in achieving a community goal, thus turning communicative purpose into a centrepiece of the ESP genre analysis.

Discourse community

Discourse community is a central concept in the ESP genre analysis. Although the concept of discourse community is a central concept in the ESP approach to genre analysis, it has also been contentious. Researchers such as Borg (2003) and Prior (1998) have argued that the concept is too static and over-deterministic, noting that members of a discourse community rarely form a community within a specific location.

In response to these criticisms, Swales (2016) reevaluated the notion and revised the definition of discourse community, differentiating between “focal discourse community,” which refers to groups of individuals who share common interests—typically associations—but do not share a common location, and “local discourse community” (pp. 12-13). Of importance to this study is Swales' notion of local discourse community, which refers to a localized group of individuals who generally work in the

same building, share a specialized lexicon, have knowledge of the work environments, have implicit shared value systems which guide their understanding between right and wrong, and “have acquired expectations and conventions of behaviour that orchestrate their working days” (p. 12). Swales (2016) notes that local discourse communities have “apprentice arrangements (such as probationary periods) whereby new members are scrutinized as they attempt to acculturate into accepted occupational behaviours” (p. 12). This reference to apprentice members of a discourse community applies to students (novices) who are in the process of acquiring the knowledge of the community from the expert members.

Burke’s (1973) parlour metaphor describes the process of entering a discourse community:

Imagine that you enter a parlor. You come late. When you arrive, others have long preceded you, and they are engaged in a heated discussion, a discussion too heated for them to pause and tell you exactly what it is about. In fact, the discussion had already begun long before any of them got there, so that no one present is qualified to retrace for you all the steps that had gone before. You listen for a while, until you decide that you have caught the tenor of the argument; then you put in your oar. Someone answers; you answer him; another comes to your defense; another aligns himself against you, to either the embarrassment or gratification of your opponent... However, the discussion is interminable. The hour grows late, you must depart. And you do depart, with the discussion still vigorously in progress. (pp. 110-111)

This metaphor emphasizes new discourse community members’ (e.g., novice students)

gradual acculturation to the “conversation of the discipline” (Bazerman, 1980). More specifically, in the context of higher education, it may describe students who, metaphorically speaking, spend time listening to the more knowledgeable community members (i.e., professors) before they gain familiarity with the community. This metaphor echoes Berkenkotter and Huckin’s (1995) and Prior’s (1998) observations that genre knowledge is acquired through apprenticeship, and that as students write, they socialize into a disciplinary community. This notion is particularly noteworthy as novice students gradually become more knowledgeable members of their discourse community, specifically, the discipline they major in, through learning the rules of how and what constitutes acceptable writing practices from their professors and from course readings.

The concept of discourse community is also useful for the development of a better understanding of disciplines as groups of individuals with a broad set of shared goals, purposes, genres, and writing practices (Hyland, 2004; Swales, 1990). Conceptualizing disciplines in this way is useful for this study because it provides a way to understand disciplinary variation on perceptions of plagiarism. For the purpose of this study, disciplines within the North American University are conceptualized as local discourse communities.

Communicative purpose(s)

As proposed by Swales (1990) and further developed by Bhatia (1993) and Askehave and Swales (2001), communicative purpose(s) is(are) the communicative goal(s) that can be achieved through language. In 1990, Swales suggested that because communicative purpose is a starting point for genre analysis, it should be identified before the text is analyzed. However, in 2001, Askehave and Swales noted the difficulties

of identifying the communicative purpose of a text before its analysis, as discourse can have more than one purpose that is not always clear to all members of the community. Askehave and Swales exemplified this point by investigating the communicative purpose(s) of diverse genres such as shopping lists, response letters to recommendations, and company brochures. For example, although the communicative purpose of company brochures tends to be identified as promoting something, there are other underlying purposes or private intentions of the brochure such as presenting a new company “as a qualified partner” (p. 204). Biber, Connor, and Upton (2007) further emphasize that not everyone may be able to recognize the purpose(s) of a genre, in that while expert members of a community are more likely to recognize the purpose, novice members are less likely, and non-members are not likely to recognize it.

Despite possible difficulties in uncovering the purpose of a genre, Askehave and Swales (2001) contend that the communicative purpose(s) of a genre may have heuristic value. Based on the heuristic value of communicative purpose, Askehave and Swales propose an analytical approach to uncovering the purpose(s) of a genre by first identifying its provisional purpose, then conducting the analysis of the rhetorical structure and then repurposing the genre, that is, reevaluating the provisional purpose based on the analysis. In the next section, I turn to the discussion of rhetorical structure analysis.

Rhetorical structure analysis

Swales (1990) argues that series of functional units called *moves* and *steps* comprise texts. A move is a larger chunk of text, defined as “a discoursal or rhetorical unit that preforms a coherent communicative function in a written or spoken discourse” (Swales, 2004, p. 228). Moves are flexibly realized by clauses, sentences, and/or other

lexio-grammatical features (Pho, 2008), which form steps, the building blocks or smaller units that realize a move (Swales, 1990, 2004). Each move and step has its own “local” purpose while also contributing to the communicative purpose of the text (Biber et al., 2007). In other words, texts in a genre are constructed through moves and steps to achieve communicative purpose(s). Together, the combination of moves and steps creates the *rhetorical structure* of a genre (Swales, 1990).

A common example of a finding that emerged from Swales’s rhetorical structure analysis of introductions to research articles in experimental sciences is the Create a Research Space (CARS) model. Swales conducted the move/step analysis and discovered that the majority of introductions in his corpus shared the same rhetorical structure. The CARS model consists of three moves and corresponding purpose(s): Move 1, establishing a territory, introduces the topic of the research; Move 2, establishing a niche, identifies the specific area of research; and Move 3, occupying a niche, situates the current research in previous research. Each of these moves can be realized by a number of steps. For example, Move One can be achieved through three steps: 1) establishing a territory and/or 2) making topic generalizations and/or 3) reviewing items of previous research (step 3) (p. 141). Combined, the purposes of each move/step achieve the overall purpose of the research article introduction.

Some researchers have analyzed pedagogical genres (e.g., Swales & Feak, 2004). Other researchers have conducted their own move/step analysis of other genres by drawing on the CARS model, and developed their own rhetorical structure models of diverse academic and non-academic texts such as the research article (Kanoksilapatham, 2005; Tessuto, 2015), as well as other genres such as the abstract (Pho, 2008), the call for

papers (Yang, 2015), and statements of purpose for graduate program applications (Samraj & Monk, 2008) to reveal the underlying communicative purpose of the genre, thus illustrating the diverse use of the analytical tool for analyzing both pedagogical and research genres.

For the purpose of this study, a rhetorical move/step analysis is used to investigate the AIP and how professors present the Policy in their course outlines. The analysis allows me to go beyond describing the linguistic features to interpret the purpose(s) of the AIP and other related texts. However, to develop a better understanding of plagiarism policies and responses to them and to elaborate on the relationship between text and context, other, complementary, concepts are necessary to consider. For these purposes, I draw on Bakhtin's (1986) notions of dialogism and intertextuality.

Bakhtinian View of Language

Dialogism and intertextuality

Bakhtin's (1986) theory of dialogism provides the basis for the understanding of relationships among texts. Dialogism is understood by Bakhtin as a quality of any utterance to be produced in response to a previous utterance and in anticipation of a response. Bakhtin (1986) emphasizes that all spoken and written language is constructed from a particular point of view, in a particular context, for a particular audience, in response to previous utterances, and in anticipation of following utterances. Based on this point of view, he contends that utterances are inherently social, whereby the spoken and written word is always dialogically responding to the social situation to make meaning (p. 94). He further suggests that every utterance is a "link in the chain of speech communication" (p. 76), wherein all texts dialogically respond to each other. Similarly,

Bawarshi and Reiff (2010) assert that there is a horizontal relationship among texts in that texts dialogically interact in response to one another. In other words, any text attains meaning dialogically in relation to other texts. This dialogically interconnected view of language establishes the preliminary understanding of language as intertextual. Bakhtin (1986) describes intertextuality in the following words:

all our utterances . . . are filled with others' words, varying degrees of otherness or varying degrees of 'our-own-ness,' varying degrees of awareness and detachment. The words of others carry with them their own expression, their own evaluative tone, which we assimilate, rework, and reaccentuate. (p. 89)

Intertextuality (Chandrasoma et al., 2004; Kristeva, 1980; Pecorari & Shaw, 2012), the notion that every text draws on previous texts is a salient concept for the study of plagiarism. The concept is particularly important to this study for two reasons: first, intertextuality helps to conceptualize types of textual borrowing such as transgressive and non-transgressive (Chandrasoma et al., 2004), thus contributing to the discussion of the nature of plagiarism. Second, the concept assists in clarifying the relationship between the AIP and the participants' interpretations of plagiarism.

Bazerman (2004) explains intertextuality using an analogy: "we create our texts out of the sea of former texts that surround us, the sea of language we live in" (p. 83). He further explains that sometimes the connection to previous texts is *explicit* and sometimes it is *implicit*, in that texts can be recognized by readers as coming from another source, and sometimes they are "so dispersed within the sea, that they can no longer be associated with a particular time, place, group, or writer" (p. 84). Based on the idea that every text is connected to other texts, Bazerman proposes that there are different levels of

intertextuality. For example, texts can draw on other texts as a source of meaning to be taken as authoritative; they draw on other texts explicitly as background, support, and contrast, or implicitly, through the use of recognizable language; or they can draw on other texts as a general rhetorical resource without calling attention to the source text (pp. 87-88). These levels of intertextuality can be indicated by the techniques writers use to from other sources such as direct quotations, indirect quotations, mentioning of a source of information (i.e., person, document, or statement), commenting on a text, using recognizable phrases and terminology, and using certain forms of language to reflect a certain way of communicating (pp. 88-89). Bazerman's (2004) and Bakhtin's (1986) conceptualizations of intertextuality are useful to assist in describing how meaning is constructed from other utterances. In this study, the concept of intertextuality allows for tracing of how academic community members implicitly and explicitly interpret the AIP. Complementary to the concept of intertextuality is the notion of voice (Bakhtin, 1984, 1986).

Voice

In Bakhtin's (1984, 1986) work, the notion of voice is also connected to the theory of dialogism. For Bakhtin (1984), voice encompasses the rhetorical habits of a writer that indicate who is talking in a text. Bakhtin highlights that within a novel each character is known by their voice. Much like the narrator in a novel, writers draw on others' voices to develop their story (e.g., an argument within a research article). Bakhtin's interpretation of voice has been taken up by writing researchers to investigate the construction of individual and social style in discourse (e.g., Bazerman, 1995; Dressen-Hammouda, 2014; Prior, 2001; Tardy, 2012). Hyland and Sancho-Guinda (2012)

define voice as the “the expression of point of view in speech and writing” and as a way writers and speakers engage with others (p. 1). In a similar vein, Tardy (2012), by drawing on Bakhtin, describes voice as a result of the writer’s worldview and the social context, defining voice as “a metaphorical concept capturing the sense of author identity that comes through when readers interact with text” (p. 39). The concept of voice provides a useful lens for understanding how plagiarism may be identified in a text.

As previously described, Bakhtin’s view of language conceptualizes the relationship between texts. Complementary to this understanding is Freadman’s (1994) notion of uptake which also assists in describing the relationship between texts, as well as text and context. In the following section, I elaborate on the notion of uptake.

Uptake

Building on the socio-rhetorical understanding of genre as social, Freadman (1994) introduces the notion of uptake, borrowing the concept from Austin’s (1975) speech act theory which refers to how an illocutionary act (e.g., stating an utterance) gets taken up as a perlocutionary effect (e.g., the effect of the utterance on the interlocutor). In the most basic sense, uptake refers to what one does and how one does it in response to some kind of discourse, for example, how a conference proposal is a result (an uptake on) of a call for papers. In this sense, Freadman (1994, 2002) and others (e.g., Bastian, 2015; Emmons, 2009) view uptake as the relation between genres or the process of texts responding to each other. In other words, uptake is viewed as “the result of genre action” (Bawarshi, 2015, p. 189).

Freadman (1994) views genres as consisting minimally of two texts—a text and its uptake. In the context of this study, I am investigating disciplinary community

members' uptake of one text, namely, the AIP. According to Emmons (2008), "uptake operates as a recognition of the previous text and an enactment of the text that follows from it" (p. 3). Viewing uptake in this light is complementary to the notion of intertextuality as uptake can be similarly identified through the textual traces it leaves behind (Emmons, 2009).

An important aspect of uptake, in this study, is *selection*. Selection or the "hidden dimension" of uptake refers to how an uptake "selects, defines, or represents" a text or genre, wherein one's interpretation "is taken from a set of possibilities" (Freadman, 2002, p. 48). The selective nature of uptake highlights individuals' rhetorical agency in their choice of what to take up, how, and when to react to generic situations by confirming (i.e., an expected or dominant uptake), modifying minimally, or not confirming (i.e., an unexpected or dismissed uptake) (Bawarshi, 2015; Freadman, 2002). In a similar vein, Bawarshi and Reiff (2010) observe that knowledge of uptake is acquired through socialization: what is taken up, how, and when results from the recurrent nature of a genre in that we learn to recognize the significance of the genre for our discourse community, and over time the uptake becomes habitual. The selective and habitual nature of uptake positions uptake as a complex site of agency in which individuals can "select from a set of possibilities and, in the process, exclude a range of others which might serve them just as well, if not better" (Bawarshi, 2015, p. 200). Similarly, Bawarshi (2008) uses the concept of uptake to illustrate that the broad all inclusive plagiarism statements do not account for the complex nature of genres and disciplines, arguing that knowledge of what and how much to borrow and imitate is contextualized, learned knowledge. Overall, the

notion of uptake, coupled with Bakhtinian view of language as dialogical and intertextual, helps to trace the relationship between the AIP and responses to it.

Chapter Summary

This chapter has provided an overview of the key analytical and theoretical concepts used as lenses to guide the study. In the chapter, I have introduced the ESP approach to genre analysis, which provides me with useful concepts such as discourse community, communicative purpose, and a tool, such as rhetorical move analysis to analyze and interpret a sample of the University AIP genre and a corpus of course outline plagiarism statements. I have also introduced key concepts such as Bakhtin's dialogism, intertextuality, and voice, and Freadman's notion of uptake, which help me explain the relationship between the AIP and participants' perceptions of the policy. In the next chapter I describe methods used in this study.

Chapter Four: Methodology

This chapter describes the qualitative methodology I use in this study. The study received full ethics clearance from the University Research Ethics Board, as the study involves human participants (see Appendix A, p. 131). The chapter begins with a discussion of the emergent research design, followed by a description of the research site and the participants who took part in the study. Following, instruments used, data collected, and transcription and the researcher's role are described. Unit of analysis, method of analysis, and member checks are subsequently presented in the final section of this chapter.

Research Design

This qualitative research study was designed to inductively investigate a North American University's construction of plagiarism in its Academic Integrity Policy and in course outline plagiarism statements as well as professors' and students' perceptions of plagiarism. I employed qualitative methods, in two phases, to address the three research questions:

1. How does the institution discursively construct plagiarism in its academic integrity policy and related documentation?
2. How do professors and students, from the departments of Life Science and Education Research, interpret the institutional construction of plagiarism?
3. To what extent does the institution's academic integrity policy account for the perspectives on plagiarism that exist within the institution?

The first phase involved rhetorical structure analysis of sections of the institution's Academic Integrity Policy (see Appendix B, p. 132) and the course outline plagiarism

statements (COPS) collected from the department of Life Sciences (LS) and the department of Education Research (EdR)¹ (see Appendix C, p. 137). In the second phase, I used a single session semi-structured informal interviews with faculty and upper-year undergraduate students recruited from the corresponding disciplines, to explore and better understand participants' perceptions of plagiarism.

Research Site

This research study took place at a North American University (NAU) during the fall of the 2015/16 academic year. All data were collected from the University professors who taught and students who were enrolled in the University courses at the time of the study. Interviews took place at various locations on the university campus.

Participants

A total of seven participants took part in this study. Four of the participants were professors: two Assistant Professors from the department of EdR, two Associate Professors from the LS department, one of whom was former associate Dean (see Table 1).

Table 1. *Professor participant information*

Name²	Department	Title	Interview Code
Professor Anderson	Education Research	Assistant Professor	PA_P1_Oct14
Professor Abe	Education Research	Assistant Professor	PA_P2_Oct19
Professor Boyd	Life Sciences	Associate Professor	PB_P1_Oct22
Professor Black	Life Sciences	Associate Professor	PB_P2_Oct22
			PB_P2_MC (member check)

¹ The names of the departments have been changed to protect the participants' identities.

² All names have been changed to pseudonyms to protect the identities of the participants.

Additionally, three third-year student participants participated in the study, two from the department of EdR and one from the LS department.

Table 2. *Student participant information*

Name	Department	Year in Program	Interview Code
April	Education Research	Third	PA_S1_Nov17
Amanda	Education Research	Third	PA_S2_Nov26
Brittney	Life Sciences	Third	PB_S1_Dec16

Participants were recruited through criterion and convenience sampling means (Dörnyei, 2007). In other words, professor participants who fulfilled the criteria of teaching an upper-year, third or fourth, undergraduate class in either LS or EdR were initially selected and recruited through the campus course selection website. Then a recruitment letter outlining the study was emailed to them. Professors who positively responded to the email were selected to participate.

Professor participants were then asked to help facilitate student recruitment by allowing me access to their upper-year undergraduate classes to talk to students about participating in my study. Upper-year students, in their third or fourth year of study, were recruited because they were assumed to be more aware of the issue of plagiarism and appropriate academic practices within their discipline and the institution. They have had more exposure to the writing practices of their respective disciplinary discourse communities and the concept of plagiarism, as compared to first and second year students. Three of the four professor participants were teaching classes that fit the criteria, and allowed me access to their classes. One EdR professor posted a recruitment speech for the study on her course website (see Appendix D, p. 140). The other EdR professor

and one LS professor allowed me to recruit student participants from their third-year classes by providing class time for me to give a brief recruitment presentation for the study. Following the presentation students were given the option to fill out individual forms (see Appendix E, p. 141) indicating interest in participating in the study. Of the seven EdR students that expressed interest in participating two were able to meet with me to take part in the study. Of the six LS students that expressed interested in participating one student was able to take part in the study.

Instruments

Two instruments were used in the data collection process, a written text-based activity (see Appendix F, p. 142) and an interview guide (see Appendix G, p. 143). In what follows I describe each instrument used.

Text-based activity

The text-based activity took place prior to the interview with the intention of being used as a tool to explore participants' implicit understanding of plagiarism and textual borrowing practices that are deemed acceptable and unacceptable in their disciplines before discussing the issue in more detail. The activity intended to elicit participants' views about different types of textual borrowing, particularly which types they considered to be plagiarism. Ideas about how to design the activity were borrowed and adapted from previous research on plagiarism (e.g., Bradley, 2012; Howard, Serviss, & Rodrigue, 2010).

The activity comprised four short excerpts ranging from one to two sentences. In each excerpt the author of the text had borrowed text from a published research article

(see Figure 1 below for an example of the text activity). In the activity, borrowed text was underlined to indicate to the participant that it had been borrowed from another source.

4. In recreating the Holmes (1997) study, thirty articles were selected for analysis, ten from each of the disciplines, history, political science and sociology.

Figure 1. Example of the text-based activity

Participants were asked to make judgments about whether or not the way the borrowed portion of the source text was integrated into the new text constituted plagiarism and if they considered the textual borrowing in the excerpt to be plagiarism and/or a violation of the institution's AIP (2015). The AIP requires that all professors report all cases of suspected plagiarism to the Dean. To better understand if this course of action is followed, professor participants were asked if they would send the case to the Dean of their faculty for adjudication. To attain a better understanding of the participants' beliefs from a disciplinary perspective, two of the excerpts were selected from published articles from each discipline (see Table 3).

Table 3. *Text-based activity: Disciplines, sections borrowed from, and sources*

Activity Number	Discipline	Section	Source
1	Life Sciences	Introduction	Oide et al. (2006)
2	Education	Introduction	Bruffee (1986)
3	Life Sciences	Methods	Oide et al. (2006)
4	Education	Methods	Holmes (1997)

The research articles were selected, as they are believed to be representative of articles from each of the disciplines. The texts, used in the textual activity, were borrowed from the introduction and the methods section of the research articles to investigate whether

the participants viewed borrowing text from certain sections of a research article as acceptable. Previous research on writing in the sciences suggests that the methods section of research articles tends to be accepted as formulaic and boiler plate in nature (Li, 2013; Vessal & Habibzadeh, 2007). Previous research on research article structure has shown that introductions to research articles in empirical sciences follow a relatively standardized sequence of rhetorical moves (Swales, 1990), my assumption in designing the activity was that participants in the study would be less accepting of direct textual borrowing in the introduction as compared to the methods excerpts. Participants were not told what section the excerpts belonged to.

Interview guide

The qualitative interview guide was designed to elicit perceptions of students and professors concerning their experience with the concept of plagiarism. The interview guide included 11 core questions that each participant was asked (see Appendix G, p. 143). Interview questions were derived from the analysis of the Policy, as well as from previous research (e.g., Haviland & Mullin, 2009; Pennycook, 1996). For example, I asked participants, How would you define plagiarism? And with regards to textual borrowing/plagiarism, what do you think is acceptable? New questions that emerged throughout the co-occurring data collection and data analysis (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014) were integrated into the interview guide for subsequent interviews.

Data Collection and Data Collected

In this section I outline the two types of data collected for this study. First I describe the textual data and then I describe the interview data.

Textual data collection

The textual data consist of the institution's recently revised AIP (2015), specifically, the Introduction, Scope, Academic Integrity Standards, Alleged Violations, and Sanction sections. A corpus of plagiarism statements from EdR and LS course outlines was also collected. Most of the textual data, including the Policy and some of the course outline plagiarism statements, were collected from the University's publicly accessible website. Additional course outlines were collected from academic departments and from the professor participants. The corpus contains 23 course outline texts, 10 from LS and 13 from EdR. The statements were collected from course outlines produced between 2007 and 2015 from a range of first to fourth year undergraduate classes in both disciplines. Course outline statements, in the context of this study, are viewed as instantiations of a genre, that is, a recurrent type of discourse created by a community in order to achieve a particular communicative purpose within the discourse community (Bawarshi & Reiff, 2010).

Interview data collection

Interview data were collected from two groups of participants, professors and students, from each discipline. The faculty members were individually interviewed. I conducted four individual single-session semi-structured interviews with four professors, two from LS and two from EdR. Three of the four interviews took place in the professor's offices, while one professor chose to be interviewed at the campus coffee shop. The interviews lasted between 44 and 50 minutes. All interviews were audio-recorded for later transcription. Each interview began with the text-based activity, followed by a semi-structured interview. Although the text-based activity was designed to

elicit written responses, all professor participants chose to orally discuss the activity questions instead.

Upper-year students from each discipline were also individually interviewed. I conducted three individual semi-structured interviews with students; I interviewed one student majoring in LS and two students majoring in EdR. Interviews were conducted at various locations at the university. The student interviews lasted between 29 and 49 minutes. The interviews followed the same structure as the faculty interviews, beginning with the text-based activity, followed by semi-structured interview questions. To attain consistency between the professor interviews and the student interviews, students were encouraged to orally discuss the text-based activity questions.

Transcription and Researcher's Role

I transcribed all audio-recorded data using Transcribe Wreally software. Roberts (1997) alludes to a shortcoming of the transcription process stating, “all transcription is a representation, and there is no natural or objective way in which talk can be written” (cited in Dörnyei, 2007, p. 247). Taking this idea into consideration, interviews were transcribed as close to the recorded data as possible. I listened to recordings one time fully, before transcribing the data in slow motion (approximately 0.5 times slower than natural speech). When necessary—primarily when I did not understand the participant's utterance or could not transcribe the utterance as fast as the participant was speaking—I would stop the recording and replay the segment that I had been in the process of transcribing to ensure that the transcript, as accurately as possible, reflected the participant's expressed meaning. All transcripts omit false starts, and pauses as I was interested in attaining the participants intended meanings not their formulation errors.

Additionally, I believe it is important to discuss my role in the transcription process, as the researcher participates in the construction of reality. Charmaz (2014) states, “if we start with the assumption that social reality is multiple, processual, and constructed, then we must take the researcher’s position, privileges, perspective, and interactions into account as an inherent part of the research reality” (p. 13). Therefore, the discursal reality that is presented in the transcripts and the study in its entirety is a subjective co-construction of reality by the participants and myself. That being said, throughout the transcription process I was careful to stay as close as possible to the participants’ expressed meanings. This was accomplished through multiple processes of listening to the transcript recordings and reading the transcripts; however, some participants’ meaning was lost due to a loss in intonation, gestures, pitch, facial expressions, and other information.

Unit of Analysis

Unit of analysis for textual data

The unit of analysis for the textual data is both the move and its steps. The text was divided in a series of moves, defined as a rhetorical unit that achieves a communicative purpose, and steps, defined as the building blocks that realize the moves (Swales, 1990).

Unit of analysis for interview data

Once transcribed, interview data were segmented into meaningful chunks of data (Maxwell & Miller, 2008). Data were segmented based on content cues. In essence, when the perceived meaning of the text progressed to a different meaning or topic, the text was segmented into two data segments. These meaningful chunks became the unit of analysis

for the interview data. The content cues suggested that each segmented chunk of data contained one idea pertaining to various issues about plagiarism.

Method of Analysis

Textual data

Data collected in this study were analyzed in two iterative stages. In the first stage I analyzed the textual data: the AIP (2015) and the COPS corpus. As I was primarily interested in better understanding the communicative purpose(s) (Askehave & Swales, 2001) of these texts and how they discursively construct the concept of plagiarism, I used a genre-based rhetorical move/step analysis (Swales, 1990) as an analytical tool to analyze the five sections of the Policy that pertained to plagiarism as well as the statements on plagiarism in the COPS corpus.

The Policy was analyzed top-down on the basis of content (Pho, 2008). I first identified the provisional purpose(s) of the text, then looked at the function of each text segment, organizing the text into a series of moves and steps, and then “repurposed” the text, that is, reevaluated the provisional purpose after analysis (Askehave & Swales, 2001). Once the rhetorical moves and steps were identified, each move/step was then analyzed bottom-up, where the moves previously distinguished for their content were now analyzed based on linguistic signals (i.e., modals, attitudinal and epistemic adjectives, adverbs, and nouns) (Pho, 2008).

The COPS corpus was separated into two smaller corpora, one EdR corpus and one LS corpus. Each corpus was analyzed separately to establish provisional purpose(s) and a rhetorical structure of moves and steps (i.e., a sequence of moves and steps that capture the communicative purpose of the text), which was then compared to the Policy’s

rhetorical structure. As discussed in Chapter Three, each move is defined by a communicative purpose, and steps are viewed as ways that the move achieves its communicative purpose (Swales, 1990). Course outline statements were analyzed for their overarching communicative purpose(s) as well as sub-purposes as indicators of what the texts were trying to accomplish in context. Following Askehave and Swales (2001), once the move/step structure of the course outlines in each sub-corpus was established, the move structures were compared across the sub-corpora in order to look for similarities and difference as a way to see if the course outline statements in each discipline could be considered a genre, sharing communicative purpose(s), and rhetorical goals.

Interview data

Concurrently with the rhetorical move/step analysis I used qualitative thematic coding to inductively analyze the interview transcripts (Charmaz, 2014; King, 2004). All interview transcripts were read over multiple times to identify recurring ideas. Data were coded using initial coding methods (Charmaz, 2014; Saldaña, 2009), wherein a code is defined as “a label attached to a chunk of text intended to make the particular piece of information manageable and malleable” (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 250). In the first round of transcript data analysis, data chunks or segments were labeled with initial codes, primarily descriptive and value related. Once the entire transcript was coded, initial codes were hierarchically categorized (King, 2004). In other words, similar codes were compared and then grouped together to categorize and reduce initial codes into emerging patterns and higher-level categories. After initial codes were categorized into patterns they were further analyzed and abstracted into higher-level categories, and then into the

highest-level themes until no new patterns emerged (i.e., until saturation was reached).
See Table 4 for an example.

Table 4. *Sample interview codes*

Interview Code	Text Excerpt	Initial Code	Focused/Category Code	Theme
PB_P2_Oct22	There are no citations at all, so in my mind the student is trying to pass that off as their own writing and their own ideas.	Equating lack of citation with intention	Factor: Intention	Evaluating
PB_P2_Oct22	Again it's that sliding scale of what's the student's intent and what does that student know.	Circumstantial	Factor: Circumstance & Intention	

Borrowing a procedure from King (2004), I then used the thematic framework inductively realized through analysis of the first interview transcript as a template to analyze the remaining three professor interview transcripts. In other words, I used the recurrent codes and codes that I deemed “most significant” (based on my research questions), which had been abstracted to categories and tentative themes to systematically “sift through and analyze large amounts of data” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 138). Once similar patterns and themes were realized and subsequently coded, the uncoded sections of each interview transcript were then analyzed in a recursive cyclical manner. After each cycle of coding, the thematic template was revised and subsequently used on the analysis of transcripts that followed. When new categories or themes emerged that were not initially realized in the previous analysis, I went back to the previous transcripts to see if the themes were apparent in the data. Data obtained from professor participants in each

discipline were constantly compared to each other individually as well as disciplinarily. In other words, comparisons between data and data, codes and codes, codes and categories, and so forth, were made at each stage of analysis (Charmaz, 2014, p. 342).

Student interview transcripts were coded in the same manner, where one interview was initially coded, and then those initial codes were categorized and reduced to higher-level patterns and themes. Once the first transcript was fully coded, reaching saturation, the codes derived from that analysis were then used as a template to analyze the remaining two interviews. New codes were developed for sections of the transcript that did not fit the initial template, and were constantly compared until all data acquired from participant interviews reached saturation.

Categorizing and connecting

Thematic analysis and coding are by and large considered categorizing strategies (Maxwell & Miller, 2008), in that data is deconstructed from its original context and then reordered and categorized. Maxwell and Miller advocate for combining categorizing strategies such as thematic analysis with connecting strategies where researchers look for connections between the data rather than sorting and categorizing data based on thematic similarities. Following Maxwell and Miller, after interviews were deconstructed from their original context and recontextualized into patterns and themes, codes were cross-referenced with the original transcripts and were reevaluated holistically, investigating whether the connections made during the thematic analysis reflected the co-constructed reality in context.

Memo writing

An important technique used in the data analysis was memo writing (Charmaz, 2014; Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014; Saldaña, 2009). Throughout various stages of data collection and data analysis I wrote memos about emerging themes, patterns, and connections within and between participants (see Figure 2).

Emerging Connections in the Data	November 11, 2015
<p>After looking at the data it seems as though some key themes/patterns are emerging. It seems one pattern is the circumstantial nature of sending cases to the Dean. It seems, at least from PB_P2's perspective that it is important to consider the time/place of the student in their academic career before penalizing them for what they borrowed/stole. This pattern is closely linked to intention, I think. It seems as though perceived intention plays a large role in whether the student's plagiarism or textual borrowing is treated as a teaching moment or if they are sent to the Dean because they "should know better". Keep these connections in mind when coding other interviews.</p>	

Figure 2. Sample memo excerpt

Memo writing was a useful way to explore, categorize, and make connections between initial codes, abstract concepts, emerging themes, and any questions I had about the data. Through the use of memos I was able to better understand the data and to develop the study's emergent conceptual approach.

Member Checking

My understanding of the data was evaluated through the use of participant feedback (Dörnyei, 2007). Participants were asked how well my interpretation captured the views of plagiarism they were trying to express. Each participant was asked to evaluate and comment on tentative themes that emerged from their interviews. Of the seven participants, six verified that the interview transcripts satisfactorily captured their intended meanings and one participant made minor changes. One of the participants

provided me with suggestions on the themes that emerged from the interviews.

Suggestions were incorporated. All participants that responded agreed with the overall accuracy of my interpretation.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I have described the methodological approach used in this study, including the research design, research site, participants, instruments used, data collected, transcription process, and my role as the researcher. I also discussed the unit of analysis, method of analysis, and member checking strategies. In the next three chapters, I turn to the findings.

Chapter Five: The Institution's Construction of Plagiarism

In this chapter, I present and discuss my interpretation of the findings that emerged from the rhetorical move analysis (Swales, 1990) in an attempt to address research question one: How does the institution discursively construct plagiarism in its academic integrity policy and related documentation? The chapter consists of two parts. The first describes the rhetorical analysis of the Policy (Appendix B, p. 132), focusing on how the institution discursively constructs plagiarism. The second presents the analysis of the course outline plagiarism statement (COPS) corpus (Appendix C, p. 137) which uses the AIP as a source document, to further construct plagiarism, intertextually (Bazerman, 2004), within the institution. Together, these textual and intertextual analyses provide a glimpse of how the institution discursively constructs plagiarism.

Constructing Plagiarism: The Policy

The Policy was constructed by key decision-making bodies within the institution (i.e., the Senate and committees of faculty members) in an effort to address the issue of plagiarism and other matters of academic integrity. In other words, to draw from genre theory (e.g., Miller, 1984), the Policy, as a sample of the University Academic Integrity Policy genre, can be seen as emerging in response to the social needs of a given rhetorical situation. The primary purpose of the AIP, a 21-page document, consisting of 13 sections, including appendices, seems to be to present a particular interpretation on matters of academic integrity at NAU. Figure 3 illustrates the overall structure of the Policy.

AIP Section
1. Introduction
2. Scope
3. Principles
4. Definitions
5. Rights and Responsibilities
6. Academic Integrity Standards
6.1. Plagiarism
6.2. Unauthorized Resubmission of Work
6.3. Unauthorized Co-operation or Collaboration
6.4. Misrepresentation
6.5. Impersonation
6.6. Withholding
6.7. Obstruction and Interference
6.8. Disruption of Classroom Activities, Periods of Instruction, or Examinations
6.9. Improper Access
6.10. Improper Dissemination
6.11. Knowingly Assisting in the Violation of the Standards of Academic Integrity
6.12. Tests and Examinations
7. Procedures
7.1. Alleged Violation
7.2. Review of Allegation by Faculty Dean
7.3. Contacting the Student
7.4. Checking for Previous Violations
7.5. Determining Whether a Violation Has Occurred
7.6. Notification of Decision
7.7. Procedures for Recommending a Sanction to the Provost or Senate Executive
8. Sanctions
8.1. Sanctions that may be imposed by the Faculty Dean
8.2. Additional Sanctions that may be Recommended to the Provost by the Faculty Dean
8.3. Additional Sanctions that may be Imposed by the Provost on Recommendation of the Faculty Dean
8.4. Sanctions that may be Recommended to Senate Executive by the Provost
8.5. Sanctions that may be Imposed by Senate Executive on Recommendation of the Provost
9. Transcription Notations
9.1. Petition to Remove Notation
10. Appeal of Sanction
10.1. The Appeal Process
10.2. Decision Making Process
10.3. Membership of the Committee
11. Records
11.1. Destruction of Records Related to Violations of this Policy
11.2. Destruction of Records in Cases where there is no Violation of this Policy
12. Report to Senate
13. Appendix: Senate Student Academic Integrity Appeals Committee: Rules and Procedures for Appeals

Figure 3. AIP table of contents

I have focused on the bolded sections of Figure 3 (i.e., introduction, scope, academic integrity standards, procedures, and sanctions) to answer the first research question: How does the institution discursively construct plagiarism in its academic integrity policy and related documentation? In what follows, I introduce each bolded section and interpret the corresponding communicative purpose(s) (Askehave & Swales, 2001).

Analyzing the introduction section of the Policy

I first analyzed the structure of the introduction section of the Policy to better understand what the Policy does rhetorically. Prior to analysis, I labelled the section with a provisional purpose (Askehave & Swales, 2001): introduce matters of academic integrity. Analysis indicated that the introduction section of the Policy is composed of four moves and various steps within each move (see Table 6).

Move 1 (Table 6), justifying the institutional communities commitment to academic integrity, appears to be discursively constructing issues of academic integrity and the institution's stance on these issues by depicting the University as a community (Step 1) and establishing the community's commitment to academic integrity principles, namely, honesty, trust, respect, fairness and responsibility (Step 2). Combined, the move and steps appear to justify the institution's commitment to matters of academic integrity based on these principles.

After constructing the institution as a community based on these principles, the introduction section of the Policy frames academic misconduct as destructive to the principles of the community of scholars (see Move 2, Table 6). Move 2 highlights that any form of academic misconduct is considered to be destructive (Step 1) and will be treated as a serious matter (Step 2). By framing plagiarism as a case of academic

misconduct that is classified as destructive and unacceptable, Move 2, and the entire section more broadly, constructs the institution's stance on academic integrity whereby matters such as plagiarism are constructed as negative.

Table 5. *Rhetorical structure of the AIP introduction section*

Policy Text	Move	Step
NAU is a community of scholars dedicated to teaching, learning and research. Sound scholarship rests on a shared commitment to academic integrity based on principles of honesty, trust, respect, fairness and responsibility.	1: Justifying institutional communities commitment to academic integrity	1: Depicting the University as a community 2: Establishing the community's commitment to academic integrity principles
Academic misconduct, in any form, is ultimately destructive to the values of the University. Conduct by any person that adversely affects academic integrity at NAU is a serious matter.	2: Constructing misconduct as negative	1: Presenting misconduct as destructive 2: Presenting misconduct as serious
The University demands, unequivocally, academic integrity from all of its members, including students. Misconduct in scholarly activity will not be tolerated.	3: Establishing the University's stance on negative behaviour	1: Demanding integrity from community members 2: Establishing misconduct is unacceptable
The Academic Integrity Policy is concerned with student academic integrity. The integrity of a student's academic work is critical to enabling student success. Students who violate the principles of academic integrity undermine the quality of their education and the value of a NAU degree.	4: Establishing importance of academic integrity	1: Stating the focus of the Policy 2: Describing importance of integrity 3: Justifying why integrity is valued

Move 3 (Table 6) elaborates on the negative construction of matters of academic integrity introduced in Move 2 by establishing misconduct as a non-tolerated activity at

NAU (Steps 1 and 2). This seems to clearly establish the institution's non-tolerance for misconduct from its novice members (i.e., students). Move 4 establishes the importance of academic integrity at NAU by first stating that student integrity is the focus of the Policy (Step 1) and second, that integrity is "critical" to a student's success (Step 2). The final step of Move 4 further positions matters of academic integrity, such as plagiarism, in a negative light by equating AIP violations with undermining "the value of a NAU degree" (AIP, 2015, p. 2), achieving the purpose of establishing NAU's commitment to academic integrity.

The purpose I provisionally assigned to the introduction section was to introduce matters of academic integrity. Based on my analysis, my sense is that the actual purpose might be to construct the policy reader's first impression of NAU's position on matters of academic integrity. The moves and steps combined seem to co-construct the communicative purpose of introducing NAU as a community of scholars that does not tolerate academic misconduct.

Analyzing the scope section of the Policy

Before analyzing the Scope section of the Policy I proposed a provisional communicative purpose of the section: describe the scope of the Policy. After establishing the provisional purpose of the section, I analyzed the text to uncover the rhetorical structure, which revealed two primary moves and accompanying steps (illustrated in Table 7).

Table 6. *Rhetorical structure of the AIP scope section*

Policy Text	Move	Step
<p>The Academic Integrity Policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • describes those actions and behaviours which violate NAU's standards of academic integrity; • defines the responsibilities of various offices and individuals in upholding the policy; • specifies the procedures and processes to be followed when an allegation of violating these standards has been made against a student; • specifies the sanctions that may be applied to a student who has been found to have violated these standards; and, • describes the appeal and petition processes open to students who feel they have not been treated fairly under this policy. <p>It is our goal to ensure that all involved in student academic integrity at NAU are treated in a fair, transparent and consistent manner.</p> <p>This policy applies to all students as defined by this Policy.</p>	1: Establishing the scope of the Policy	<p>1: Describing, defining, and specifying the scope of the Policy</p> <p>2: Describing the goals of the Policy</p> <p>3: Defining who the Policy applies to</p>
Any student who violates the standards of academic integrity set out in this policy will be subject to appropriate sanctions.	2: Establishing violations result in sanctions	1: Notifying readers that violations result in sanctions

Move 1 of this section establishes the scope of the Policy by describing, defining, and specifying the institution's intended purpose of the Policy: informing students what the purpose of the entire document is, and establishing the academic actions and behaviours that violate the AIP resulting in processes and procedures that must be followed, with the possibility of sanctions (Step 1). Move 1 reiterates the principle of fairness introduced in the introduction section, in describing the goals of the Policy (see Table 7, Step 2). The purpose(s) of this move seems to establish the Policy's purpose and inform students of what they can expect the Policy to cover. The primary purpose of Move 2 appears to establish that violation of the standards of academic integrity results in

sanctions; a purpose that seems to be important throughout the entire text.

Overall, in combining the purposes of Moves 1 and 2 it seems that the primary goal of the Scope section of NAU's AIP is to explicitly establish the purpose of the 21-page policy through describing, defining, and specifying what the Policy covers and the institution's intended goal of the Policy.

Analyzing the plagiarism section of the Policy

The next section that contributes to the discursive construction of the institution's interpretation of plagiarism is Section Six, Academic Integrity Standards. This section provides 12 examples of academic misconduct that are considered a violation of the Policy (see Figure 3). Plagiarism is situated as number one on the list of possible misconducts, which is described as one type of academic integrity violation. As the institution's construction of the concept of plagiarism is the focus of research question one, I provide an in-depth rhetorical move/step analysis (Swales, 1990) of the plagiarism section to shed light on the communicative purpose(s) (Askehave & Swales, 2001).

Following Askehave and Swales (2001) I first established the provisional communicative purpose of the plagiarism section, specifically, define and exemplify plagiarism, and then analyzed the rhetorical structure (Swales, 1990, 2004) of section six in the Policy (see Table 8 below). The move/step analysis identified that the rhetorical structure of the Policy is represented by two rhetorical moves and a series of steps. The first move, realized through two steps, seems to achieve the purpose of constructing NAU's definition of plagiarism (see Table 8).

Table 7. *Rhetorical structure of the AIP plagiarism section*

Policy Text	Move	Step
Plagiarism is presenting, whether intentionally or not, the ideas, expression of ideas, or work of others as one's own.	1: Establishing University's position on plagiarism	1: Providing a general definition of plagiarism
Plagiarism includes reproducing or paraphrasing portions of someone else's published or unpublished material, regardless of the source, and presenting these as one's own without proper citation or reference to the original source.		2: Providing an inclusive definition of what is considered plagiarism
Examples of sources from which the ideas, expressions of ideas or works of others may be drawn from include but are not limited to: books, articles, papers, literary compositions and phrases, performance compositions, chemical compounds, art works, laboratory reports, research results, calculations and the results of calculations, diagrams, constructions, computer reports, computer code/software, and material on the internet.	2: Providing examples of what constitutes plagiarism	1: Providing examples of various sources from which ideas can be borrowed and considered plagiarism
Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • submitting a take-home examination, essay, laboratory report or other assignment written, in whole or in part, by someone else; • using ideas or direct, verbatim quotations, paraphrased material, algorithms, formulae, scientific or mathematical concepts, or ideas without appropriate acknowledgment in any academic assignment; • using another's data or research findings; • submitting a computer program developed in whole or in part by someone else, with or without modifications, as one's own • failing to acknowledge sources through the use of proper citations when using another's work and/or failing to use quotations marks. 		2: Providing examples of what could constitute plagiarism

Step 1, first provides a definition of plagiarism based on the conception that

certain forms of writing, for example, presenting the ideas of others as one's own,

“whether intentional or not” are considered plagiarism (see Table 8). The important point

for students—the novice members that the Policy applies to (see scope section)—to note in this move is the “intentional or not” statement, which highlights that if a student takes an idea without referencing the source by accident they are committing the same offence as someone who intentionally plagiarizes. In other words, this statement emphasizes the institution’s interpretation that it does not matter if a novice discourse community member didn’t know any better; they are still subject to sanction—although at this point in the Policy sanction has only been introduced as a result of violation but specific sanctions have yet to be described.

Following the broad generalization of what is considered plagiarism Move 1/Step 2 provides a situated definition by stating what types of discursive activity are included within the concept of plagiarism. For example, the Policy contends, “plagiarism includes reproducing or paraphrasing portions of someone else’s published or unpublished material, regardless of the source, and presenting these as one’s own without proper citation or reference to the original source” (AIP, 2015, p. 8, see Table 8). This statement suggests that borrowing any information from someone else’s work without proper citation is considered plagiarism. Essentially, the communicative purpose of Move 1 is to construct the “what” of plagiarism. In Move 1, the Policy establishes a clear-cut definition by developing guidelines that all students and instructors of NAU must follow, creating an expected uptake (Freadman, 2002).

After defining what plagiarism is, Move 2 elaborates on the “what” by providing a set of non-exhaustive examples. The elaborate examples signify the communicative purpose of Move 2: to inform students and professors of the types of textual borrowing that constitute plagiarism. The first step of Move 2 provides policy readers (i.e., students

and professors) with examples of the types of source borrowing that constitute plagiarism (see Table 8). In this step, the Policy provides a list of various sources of ideas where textual borrowing “may be” considered plagiarism, but acknowledges that the list is “not limited to” these sources of ideas (AIP, 2015, p. 8). For example, books, articles, papers, and various results are presented along with other possible plagiarizable sources such as chemical compounds and computer codes (see Table 8).

Two important observations can be made in Move 2/Step 1. The first is the use of the modal “may” which is then followed by “but are not limited to” (see Table 8). These linguistic features signify that the Policy is providing broad examples in an attempt to be inclusive of all discourse communities in the institution, but is also leaving room for other types of textual borrowing to be considered plagiarism. The second is the compilation of source examples such as books, papers, chemical compounds and computer codes, which seems to imply that borrowing ideas from any source could constitute plagiarism. Thus, in attempting to be inclusive, Step 1 of Move 2 seems so broad that it loses meaning.

Move 2 is further realized by Step 2, which provides examples of the types of textual borrowing that constitute plagiarism. Again, like Step 1, plagiarism is “not limited to” the examples provided. The examples provided (e.g., “using ideas or direct, verbatim quotations, paraphrased material, algorithms, formulae, scientific or mathematic concepts, or ideas without appropriate acknowledgement” [AIP, 2015, p. 8]), mirror Move 2/Step 1 in that they are broad, and at some points confusing, creating a catch-all definition without clarifying the notion of plagiarism for institutional disciplinary discourse community members (see Table 8). The question then arises as to whether the

broad definition may be a cause of confusion for professors and students, a point which I return to in Chapter Six.

The purpose I provisionally ascribed to the plagiarism section was to define and exemplify plagiarism. Based on my analysis, my sense is that the actual purpose might be to define and illustrate what plagiarism is, establishing how the concept should be taken up. It elaborates on “what” plagiarism is through examples of “where” plagiarism can come from (i.e., what sources) and examples of “how” students might plagiarize, or types of borrowing that would be considered plagiarism by the institution.

The plagiarism section of the AIP primarily aims to construct a clear standardized one-size-fits-all definition of plagiarism that facilitates institutional uptake. The section does not address the course of action professors should and/or are required to take when cases of suspected plagiarism occur, nor does it present possible academic sanction for committing the so called “crime” of plagiarism (Bouville, 2008, p. 311). Issues of how professors should deal with cases of plagiarism, and all other matters of academic integrity, are analyzed in the following two sections of the Policy: procedures and sanctions.

Analyzing the procedures (alleged violation) section of the Policy

As illustrated in Figure 3, the procedures section is composed of seven steps that are followed for all cases of suspected violations, such as review of allegation by Faculty Dean, contacting the student, checking for previous violations, and determining whether a violation has actually occurred (see Figure 3 for a full list of procedures). However, I believe the most relevant section to this research study is the alleged violation sub-section

which stipulates how professors *must* respond to suspected cases of plagiarism.

Therefore, I have only focussed on this sub-section of the Policy.

Before analyzing the rhetorical structure of the alleged violations sub-section, I first assigned a provisional purpose to the text: establish procedure for suspected cases of academic integrity violations. The move/step analysis depicted in Table 9 indicates that the rhetorical structure of the sub-section consists of one move and three accompanying steps.

Table 8. *Rhetorical structure of the AIP alleged violation sub-section*

Policy Text	Move	Step
Instructors, advisors and/or supervisors must report all suspected cases of violation of this Policy to the Faculty Dean.	1: Constructing requirements for educators	1: Requiring all cases be sent to the Faculty Dean
All evidence relevant to the alleged violation should be sent to the relevant Faculty Dean's office responsible for administering the course in which the alleged violation took place within five (5) working days after the discovery of the evidence. In academic units where consultation with the Chair (or delegate) is required, instructors will forward all appropriate documentation to the Chair who will, upon his/her judgment, forward it to the relevant Dean's office within five (5) working days after receiving it from the instructor.		2: Suggesting all appropriate documents be sent to the Dean in a specific timeframe
The Dean may advise the instructor to record a grade of GNA (grade not available) on the Final Grade Report. The grade of GNA will be replaced by an appropriate grade once the allegation has been resolved.		3: Providing possible suggestions from the Dean

Move 1, primarily through Step 1, in the alleged violation section constructs a protocol for professors when dealing with cases of plagiarism, whereby they *must* follow

a common and standardized procedure for addressing the issue (i.e., report the case to the Dean). By requiring all suspected cases of (perceived) misconduct to be sent to the Dean, the AIP is addressing one of the fundamental principles introduced in Section Two of the Policy, to treat academic integrity matters in a “fair, transparent and consistent manner” (AIP, 2015, p. 2; Table 7). To attain this goal, professors are denied pedagogical agency to deal with matters themselves and are instead positioned as enforcers of the rules, required to follow the Policy, and implement the rules in specific ways. Steps 2 and 3 provide additional requirements about the information to be submitted to the Dean and by when, as well as assignment of grades to students who have an alleged violation against them that is being investigated (see Table 9). Overall, based on my analysis it seems that this section, in one move and three steps, achieves the communicative purpose of constructing a required procedure for dealing with suspected AIP violations such as plagiarism.

Analyzing the sanction section of the Policy

In the final section of the Policy, possible sanctions, which have been alluded to throughout various sections of the document, are discussed. I labelled the section with the provisional purpose of establishing possible sanctions for AIP violations. The rhetorical analysis, illustrated in Table 10, found that the sanction section consists of three moves and various accompanying steps. Due to the length of the section in the Policy, I discuss the rhetorical moves/steps associated with the introduction of the section (Moves 1 and 2) and one sub-section of the sanctions, “sanctions that may be imposed by the Faculty Dean” (Move 3) (see Table 10, below). In the other sub-sections Move 3 occurs in a recursive manner (see Appendix H for full rhetorical analysis of the section).

Table 9. *Rhetorical structure of the AIP sanction section*

Policy Text	Moves	Step
<p>The Faculty Dean may apply any one or any combination of the following sanctions if, after hearing the student's response to the alleged violation, the Faculty Dean is satisfied that a violation of this Policy has occurred.</p> <p>Factors that may impact the sanction include: any record of previous violations, the seriousness of the violation, the relative weight of the work, the student's year standing, the rehabilitative benefit of the sanction, any mitigating circumstances.</p> <p>In the case of graduate students, consideration of the student's year standing in the graduate program and the work in which the violation occurred (e.g. an M.A. course paper versus comprehensive examination) may affect the sanction assigned. Recommendations by supervisory committee members may also be considered.</p> <p>Sanctions may be used independently or in combination for any single violation.</p> <p>Sanctions that may be imposed by the Faculty Dean</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A written reprimand. 2. Requirement to remain registered in the course in which the violation occurred... 12. Suspension for up to three (3) terms, normally beginning with the next academic term after the final decision has been made. Students are allowed to complete courses that are ongoing at the time of the decision but will be withdrawn from any courses in which they have registered and which would begin during the suspension. 	<p>1: Justifying when sanctions are applied</p> <p>2: Describing factors that influence the application of sanctions</p> <p>3: Establishing possible sanctions for violation</p>	<p>1: Presenting sanctions as occurring after violation is confirmed</p> <p>1: Listing factors that could affect the sanction applied</p> <p>2: Providing graduate student example</p> <p>1: Establishing sanctions can be applied individually or combined</p> <p>2: Listing possible examples of sanctions that can be imposed</p>

Move 1 of the section states that sanctions are only applied once the student has had the opportunity to respond to the alleged violation and the Dean has confirmed that a violation has occurred. The communicative purpose(s) of this move seems to establish

that sanctions are not applied without consideration of multiple factors such as the student's understanding of the possible violation, implementation of established procedures (see Figure 3) and confirmation that the Dean is certain a violation has occurred.

Move 2 establishes the factors that could influence the application of sanction (Step 1) such as “any record of previous violations, the seriousness of the violation, the relative weight of the work, and the student's year standing” (AIP, 2015, p. 14; see Table 10 for a list of other factors), before providing examples of how the Dean may consider these factors in evaluating cases of plagiarism and all other matters of academic integrity (Step 2). Move 2 of the sanction section, through its accompanying step, appears to achieve the purpose of describing factors that could influence the Dean's application of sanction to an AIP violation.

In the final move of the section, it is established that sanctions can be applied individually or combined (Step 1) and a list of possible sanctions is provided (Step 2). The possible sanctions listed in Table 10 illustrate a range of severity where students could receive a written reprimand, reduced grade, failing grade for the course, or suspension for up to three terms (see Table 10 and Appendix H for full sanction rhetorical structure). The purpose of Move 3 seems to highlight for students what the potential broad range of outcomes could be for violating the AIP. The section as a whole seems to achieve the purposes of establishing when sanctions are applied, what factors may be considered (when the Dean applies sanction[s] to cases of violation such as plagiarism), and provide students with a list of possible sanctions.

As I have illustrated in this section, the Policy plays a pivotal role in constructing

plagiarism as a universal concept where there is only one way to interpret cases of academic misconduct such as plagiarism, and what serves as a way to discursively respond to academic (mis)conduct, while also anticipating future misconduct. The way the Policy is discursively created, as I have claimed, acts as an institutionally constructed reality; that is, as an indicator “of a common belief system or set of taken-for-granted routines” of the institution (Atkinson, 2008, p. 363). The socially constructed reality or belief system is interpreted in this study through the rhetorical structure of various parts of the AIP such as the introduction, plagiarism, and sanction sections. The Policy constructs a series of rules and regulations that all students, no matter what discourse community they belong to, must adhere to in all of their academic work (AIP, 2015). The Policy is also positioned to dictate how professors should ideally manage all cases of suspected plagiarism and other academic misconduct, in turn imposing a particular view of plagiarism on professors that they must take up and perpetuate.

Constructing Plagiarism: Course Outline Plagiarism Statements

Important to note is that the AIP is not the only document that constructs plagiarism, at the institutional level, within NAU. The Policy seems to act as a source document to a common stock of knowledge for defining and responding to matters of academic integrity within the institution. Multiple institutional texts such as course outline plagiarism statements, the Student Affairs website, and the Instructor’s Guide to Academic Integrity all act, in Bakhtin’s (1986) terms, as intertextual “links in the chain of communication” (p. 76) that facilitate the institutional uptake of the Policy by professors and students. In this section, I investigate one of these intermediary texts or chain links, namely the course outline plagiarism statements (COPS), in an effort to show how they

contribute to the institution's construction of plagiarism as they draw on the Policy through various forms of intertextuality (Bazerman, 2004).

Statements on plagiarism in course outlines are one example of an uptake of the Policy as well as an intermediary text that mediates institutional uptake between the Policy and professors and students. Interestingly, not all faculties within NAU require professors to include these statements in their course outlines. For example, at NAU the Faculty of Arts (FOA) requires all departments (including EdR) to include statements on plagiarism verbatim from the Policy, while the Faculty of Sciences (FOS) does not have any requirements for their departments (including LS) regarding what to include in the course outlines. As I explained in the methodology chapter, I compiled a corpus of COPS, *the COPS corpus*. Below I present a move-and-step (Swales, 1990) analysis of this COPS corpus.

Analyzing the COPS corpus

Keeping the different disciplinary requirements in mind, I began analysis by labelling the plagiarism statements in the corpus with a provisional communicative purpose(s) (Askehave & Swales, 2001): to define plagiarism and specify actions that lead to sanction, through the use of examples. After establishing the provisional purpose(s), I analyzed the two partitions of the COPS corpus from both faculties. Illustrated in Table 11 and 12 below is the interpreted rhetorical structure of a plagiarism statement from both EdR and LS (see Appendix C for more examples from the corpus).

Table 10. *Sample move/step structure of EdR course outline plagiarism statement*

Course Outline Plagiarism Text	Move	Step
<p>The University Senate defines plagiarism as <i>“presenting, whether intentionally or not, the ideas, expression of ideas or work of others as one’s own”</i></p> <p>This can include: reproducing or paraphrasing portions of someone else’s published or unpublished material, regardless of the source, and presenting these as one’s own without proper citation or reference to the original source; submitting a take-home examination, essay, laboratory report or other assignment written, in whole or in part, by someone else; using ideas or direct, verbatim quotations, or paraphrased material, concepts, or ideas without appropriate acknowledgment in any academic assignment; using another’s data or research findings; failing to acknowledge sources through the use of proper citations when using another’s works and/or failing to use quotation marks; handing in “substantially the same piece of work for academic credit more than once without prior written permission of the course instructor in which the submission occurs.”</p>	1: Defining plagiarism	<p>1a: Providing an institutional definition of plagiarism</p> <p>2a: Providing general examples of what could constitute plagiarism</p>
<p>Plagiarism is a serious offence which cannot be resolved directly with the course’s instructor. The Associate Dean of the Faculty conducts a rigorous investigation, including an interview with the student, when an instructor suspects a piece of work has been plagiarized. Penalties are not trivial.</p> <p>They can include a final grade of "F" for the course.</p>	2: Identifying consequences	<p>1: Constructing as a serious issue</p> <p>2: Stating consequences</p>
<p>For further information on plagiarism and other aspects of academic integrity, please see the NAU University Student Academic Integrity Policy³.</p>	3: Referring to further information	<p>1: Advising students where to find more information</p>

³ Omitted is a link to NAU’s University website—included in the original course outline—to ensure confidentiality of the participants and research site. Italics in original.

Table 11. *Sample move/step structure of LS course outline plagiarism statement*

Course Outline Plagiarism Text	Move	Step
Plagiarism is the attempt to pass off another person's writings, images or ideas as your own work. In the context of this course, the most common form of plagiarism is using somebody else's completed assignment (or their code) to help complete your own. This is a big no, no. I'm happy that you work together during labs, but you must work independently for assignments.	1: Defining plagiarism	1: Providing a local definition of plagiarism
Plagiarism is a serious offense and is subject to University policy regarding Instructional Offenses	2: Identifying consequences	1: Constructing as a serious issue
(see the section on Academic Standing and Conduct in the front of the Undergraduate Calendar).	3: Providing sources for further information	1: Advising students where to find more information
If there is clear evidence of plagiarism, then a mark of F will be awarded.	2: Identifying consequences	2: Stating consequences
Any questions or concerns regarding this issue should be brought to me.	3: Providing sources for further information	1: Advising students where to find more information

The statement in Table 11 illustrates a common university general statement that has been copied and pasted from different sections of the Policy— primarily the plagiarism section but also the sanction and procedure sections— to the course outline, while Table 12 illustrates one of the various personalized ways LS professors inform their students about plagiarism in the context of their courses and their discipline. Apparent in Tables 11 and 12 is the different intertextual strategies (Bazerman, 2004) used to achieve what seems to be the same communicative purpose(s). As previously mentioned, EdR professors are required by the FOA to include verbatim statements, therefore utilizing direct quotations—although not consistently referenced to the Policy—in ways that defer to the AIP as authoritative. Conversely, LS professors are not required by the FOS to

include any statement about plagiarism, and instead seem to be drawing on their beliefs about plagiarism and what should be done about it. As they do so, intertextually they rely on indirect references (Bazerman, 2004) to the AIP. For example, while the EdR statement in Table 11 uses verbatim formal language from the Policy to create an institutional understanding, the LS statement in Table 12 uses informal language such as “passing off another person’s writing” and “this is a big no no” to inform students about issues of plagiarism in a local, contextualized manner.

Despite the different intertextual strategies used, the plagiarism statements in the COPS corpus seemed to exhibit a similar overall rhetorical structure, as summarized in Table 13.

Table 12. *Rhetorical structure of COPS corpus*

Move	Step	# of LS COs with M/S (x/10)	# of EdR COs with M/S (x/13)
1: Defining plagiarism	1a: Providing an Institutional definition of plagiarism	1	13
	1b: Providing a local/contextualized definition of plagiarism	4	1
	2a: Providing examples from the AIP of what could constitute plagiarism	1	13
	2b: Providing local/ contextualized examples of what could constitute plagiarism	5	0
2: Identifying consequences	1: Constructing as a serious issue and/or	4	12
	2: Stating consequences	5	11
3: Referring to further information	1: Advising students where to find more information	4	8

Note. 3/10 LS course outlines did not have a plagiarism statement

The statements in the corpus are compilations of sections of the Policy, namely, the introduction, the academic integrity standards, the procedures, and the sanction sections which explains why they accomplish similar moves as the sections of the Policy. Specifically Move 1 of the COPS corpus, defining plagiarism, illustrated in Table 13, seems to be derived from Move 1 of the academic integrity standards section of the Policy, establish University's position on plagiarism (see Table 8). Texts in the EdR corpus drew on the Policy directly through verbatim copying while the texts in the LS corpus drew from the Policy indirectly through reproducing the ideas from the Policy to reflect the LS professor's contextualized purpose. Based on the similarities between Move 1 of the COPS and Move 1 of the academic integrity standards section of the Policy, it seems that the overall communicative purpose(s) of Move 1 in both document types is the same, that is, to construct a definition of plagiarism. However, despite this commonality in purpose, one noticeable difference is that in the COPS corpus, Move 1 of the EdR texts use the words of others to establish authority, using the Policy as an authoritative voice while the LS texts do not. For example, many EdR statements begin by describing what is considered plagiarism by stating, "the University Senate defines plagiarism as..." (CO2_A1_F14)⁴. By deferring to the Senate (i.e., the policy-makers) as the source of the definition, the course outline positions the Senate as an expert voice, taking agency away from professor, and downplaying the role of the professor in dealing with issues of plagiarism.

⁴ To protect the identity of the departments and participants I have not provided citations for the course outlines. I have labeled segments with the codes I assigned to statements during the coding process and will refer to texts using this technique for the remainder of the thesis.

Table 13 helps to compare the frequency of each move across the two disciplines: Move 1 occurs in all 13 of the EdR course outline statements, while it only occurs in five of the 10 LS statements. Also reflected in Table 13 is the higher occurrence of Move 1 Steps 1a and 2a (i.e., providing an institutional definition and examples of plagiarism) in the EdR texts and the higher occurrence of Move 1 Steps 1b and 2b (i.e., providing a local/contextualized definition and examples of plagiarism) in LS texts. That all EdR statements include the institutional definition could be attributed to the requirement by the FOA to copy a statement verbatim from the Policy. As for Move 2, its main communicative purpose in the COPS corpus seems to be similar to that of the sanction section of the Policy, namely to identify the consequences of plagiarism.

Move 2, through Step 1 and 2 (see Tables 11, 12, & 13), is constructed in a way that appeals to the student by threatening them not to plagiarize. Step 1 constructs plagiarism as a serious issue. For example, an EdR course outline from the corpus states, “plagiarism is a serious offence, and must be reported to the faculty Dean’s office” (CO1_A4_F14). This step achieves the sub-purpose of informing students to not engage in plagiaristic activities because it is serious, which signifies serious consequences. Step 2 further contributes to the threatening construction, whereby an LS course outline states the consequences of plagiarism: “If there is clear evidence of plagiarism, then a mark of F will be awarded” (CO3_B3_F10). Essentially, it seems that one of the sub-purposes of Move 2, drawn from the sanction section of the Policy, is to operate as a scare tactic, whereby students are informed that sanctions may occur if they do not follow the academic integrity rules.

The final move in the COPS corpus presents students with alternative resources for finding more information about plagiarism, a move that did not occur in the sections of the Policy analyzed in the previous section. Move 3 seems to acknowledge the possibility that students may not understand the boundaries between acceptable (and encouraged) intertextuality and plagiarism. In the COPS corpus, Move 3 is a less frequent move as only twelve of the twenty-three statements include it. It looks like this move only serves a subsidiary purpose relative to the main purpose of the COPS, to define and illustrate plagiarism, as well as outline possible sanctions.

Rhetorical analysis indicated that course outline statements draw from various sections of the Policy (i.e., introduction, academic integrity standards, procedures, and sanctions), both directly and indirectly (Bazerman, 2004), to accomplish the main communicative purposes of the plagiarism statements: establishing a straightforward definition of plagiarism, presenting examples and consequences, and providing sources for more information (see Table 13). Analysis further indicated that although the Policy conveys the institution's view of plagiarism, LS professors, through their course outlines, illustrate alternative uptakes of the Policy by creating contextualized definitions rather than using the expected institutional definition. These alternative uptakes point to the role of subjectivity and rhetorical agency in the construction of course outlines in that professors can choose to include and exclude plagiarism information in keeping to the requirements of their faculty, which can be more or less constraining.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter I have introduced and discussed the moves and steps that emerged from the rhetorical analysis of the various sections of the Policy that relate to plagiarism.

The chapter also discussed the communicative purpose(s) that the moves/steps achieved in each section, providing a glimpse into how the institution discursively constructs plagiarism. In addition, the chapter identified the moves and steps that emerged from the analysis of the COPS corpus and showed how the purpose(s) of each of these moves contribute to the overall communicative purpose(s) of the COPS of which they are part. The findings indicated that the institution constructs plagiarism by defining it as a straightforward misrepresentation of other's work for one's work that violates the principles of academic integrity (e.g., fairness, responsibility, trust), presenting examples of what not to do, and establishing the sanctions if the academic integrity rules are not followed. Findings also suggested that the plagiarism statements in the COPS corpus draw from various sections of the Policy in ways that achieve an overall purpose similar to that of the Policy, namely to establishing a clear definition of academic misconduct—plagiarism, present examples, and consequences. To achieve this purpose, the professors use different intertextual strategies. However, the AIP has an additional purpose of informing professors of the expected procedures to dealing with cases of plagiarism and the texts in the COPS corpus have an additional purpose of informing students of additional resources.

Chapter Six: How Professors Construct Plagiarism

In this chapter, I present and discuss the findings that emerged from the thematic analysis (Charmaz, 2014; King, 2004) of the interviews with professor participants, describing how they define, detect, evaluate, and respond to plagiarism as ways of gaining insight into how they interpret and participate in the institution's construction of plagiarism.

The interviews were designed to better understand how professors take up (Freadman, 2002) the institution's construction of plagiarism both implicitly and explicitly (Bazerman, 2004). I first used the text-based activity, which required participants to label four short excerpts from academic texts as acceptable or unacceptable textual borrowing, in order to identify professors' implicit interpretations of plagiarism in evaluating textual borrowings in texts from the arts and the sciences (see Appendix F, p. 141). Following the activity, I asked direct questions about how they, as professors, define plagiarism to elicit their explicit interpretation of the concept (see Appendix G, p. 143). Drawing on elicited interpretations of professors, I analyzed the interview data and determined six themes: 1) defining plagiarism; 2) detecting plagiarism; 3) evaluating plagiarism; 4) responding to plagiarism; 5) disciplinary differences; and 6) accepted standardization. In the following sub-sections, I introduce and elaborate on each of these themes to answer the first part of the second research question presented in Chapter One: How do professors from the departments of Life Science and Education Research interpret the institutional construction of plagiarism? (The second part of the question, focused on the students, will be the focus of the next chapter).

Defining Plagiarism

Based on the text activity and interview question responses, I observed that participants have shared views on how to *define plagiarism* explicitly. However, marked differences were apparent in the implicit definitions of plagiarism that emerged in the context of specific instances of textual borrowing. To elaborate, thematic analysis (Charmaz, 2014) revealed that all four professors defined plagiarism in a similar way, namely, the taking of another's words, thoughts, and/or ideas, and using them as one's own without acknowledging the source. For example, Professor Abe describes plagiarism as “basically stealing intellectual property and not attributing ideas, words, and thoughts to the right source” (PA_P2_INT1). This construction of plagiarism was also apparent in professors' responses to the text-based activity in which all four participants label activity number one (see Figure 4) as plagiarism because it lacks a reference. In this case, professors indicate the importance of attributing the thoughts and ideas to the original author. Constructing plagiarism in this way illustrates an expected uptake of the institutional policy.

1. Nonribosomal peptide synthetases (NRPS) are multifunctional enzymes that make small peptides independently of the ribosomal protein synthesis machinery. To date, the NRPS method of peptide biosynthesis has been described mostly for filamentous ascomycete fungi and for bacteria and has not been shown to occur in plants.

Figure 4. Text-based activity one. The underlined portions of this example indicate borrowed text.

All professor participants refer to plagiarism using a crime related metaphor. As illustrated in the example above, Professor Abe states that plagiarism is stealing.

Professor Anderson also describes the criminal aspects of plagiarism when comparing the text-based activity excerpts “in terms of hierarchy of offence, misdemeanour vs. criminal...” (PA_P1_INT1). Professor Anderson’s construction of plagiarism is further depicted when discussing ways of dealing with suspected plagiarism. She states, “I know when someone calls it a so-called crime, you can be tough on crime or you can say does this person benefit more from early intervention for something minor” (PA_P1_INT1). Similarly, Professor Boyd discusses the “penalty phase” associated with sending students to the Dean (see Appendix B, p. 132): if students are “recidivists,” they will get harsher punishment based on their “past track records” and if they have “paid their dues...we should expunge the files” (PB_P1_INT1). When discussing other faculty members’ approaches to plagiarism, Professor Black frames certain members of the community as “plagiarism police” who catch students to “turn them in” (PB_P2_INT1). By framing plagiarism in criminal terms, professors seem to be taking up the punitive aspects of the Policy and assuming that plagiarism is a crime against the academy rather than a novice’s misstep or a part of a normal process of novices situating themselves in the discourse community norms (see Pecorari, 2008). Previous research has highlighted the construction of plagiarism as a crime (e.g., Pennycook, 1996), with some researchers, such as Briggs (2003), arguing that framing plagiarism as a crime is “heavy handed” (p. 19), which may prevent detection and prevention. Thus an important question to keep in mind is whether the perceived “heavy handed” approach that is being enforced through the institution’s construction of plagiarism and taken up by professors inhibits the prevention of plagiarism.

Despite commonalities in how they define plagiarism at the basic level as taking

someone else's thoughts, ideas, words, or texts without proper attribution, professors differ in how they take up the institution's way of dealing with cases of plagiarism. The thematic analysis of the interviews with professors has indicated that different professors follow ideological approaches to interpreting and responding to plagiarism. Thus, Professor Boyd adopts the institutional rules as a way of keeping the institutional climate fair and consistent, constructing plagiarism as clear, straightforward, and unambiguous. This was evident in the text activity wherein Professor Boyd labels all excerpts as plagiarism and in his explicit *black-and-white* uptake of plagiarism. He states, "plagiarism is plagiarism" further stating that there is only one type "copying without attribution. It could be verbal copying, it could be written" (PB_P1_INT1). In this way, the institutional construction of plagiarism was taken up in the ways expected by the Policy and perpetuated by following the institutional rules.

In contrast, Professors Abe, Anderson, and Black redefine the construction of plagiarism by constructing the issue of plagiarism as a *complex*, murky, ambiguous, unclear, or grey matter. Their understanding of plagiarism as complex is apparent in the text-based activity wherein professors Black, Anderson, and Abe all struggle to label excerpts as absolute plagiarism requiring the student to be sent to the Dean for sanction. For example, Professor Anderson expresses that text excerpt one contains plagiarism due to lack of citation, however, she also stated that she did not "see it as a clear lack of attempt to give information that . . . [the student] created out of their own head" (PA_P1_INT1). Professor Abe describes that she cannot predetermine how she will respond based on the text alone. She expresses a need to consider different factors before labelling a case as suspected plagiarism and sending the student to the Dean

(PA_P2_INT1). Essentially, these views point to the complex nature of plagiarism, making it difficult for the three professors to state how they would react in all cases of suspected plagiarism. Professor Abe further highlights this contradiction when stating, “it’s [labelling borrowed text as plagiarism] very hard because it’s not like applying a formulae to something because there’s so many other factors that come in that I think it’s very difficult to say yes, this is what I would do, or no” (PA_P2_INT1). Thus, while the Policy offers a universalized definition of plagiarism, some professors believe it to be necessary to adapt the rules of the Policy in certain circumstances.

Detecting Plagiarism: Indicators

The second theme to emerge from the thematic analysis is the way in which professors *detected plagiarism*. Analysis indicates that regardless of how professors defined plagiarism, they all identified a number of textual indicators as signals of potential plagiarism. Professors mention that plagiarism can be signalled by a change in the writer’s voice. My analysis indicates that professors detect plagiarism through changes in the grammatical structure of a text wherein “the grammar is beautiful, the vocabulary is beautiful and the next one it’s like you just cringe” (PB_P1_INT1). In this example, Professor Boyd is demonstrating that the student’s voice is not as strong as the voice of the authors of the source texts. Professor Black agrees: “a student’s writing is really rocky and then all of a sudden there is a beautifully edited part, okay red flag goes up, Google it, and it comes up” (PB_P2_INT1). Professors Anderson and Abe also suspect plagiarism when there are differences between what they expect from a particular student and what the student produces. For example, Professor Abe notices that the text [submitted by a student] is “too good” because she knows the student’s writing abilities

and what they're able to do (PA_P2_ INT1). Professor Anderson suspects plagiarism when a student "continuously presents the data but not in the voice that I perceive typical of that particular student" (PA_P1_ INT1). These plagiarism indicators demonstrate that the student's grasp of how to weave the voices of other writers into their text is insufficient for the expectations of the expert discourse community members. In this way the novice writer does not have control over the use of intertextual resources, and is instead creating a collage or a mosaic of incompatible voices, masking others' words as one's own (Bakhtin, 1986; Bazerman, 1995, 2004).

These plagiarism indicators led the professors to adopt one of two courses of action: either to evaluating the factors that could have contributed to the suspected plagiarism, or directly following the rules and sending the student to the Dean for adjudication. In the next section, I elaborate on the factors considered in evaluating plagiarism.

Evaluating Plagiarism: Factors to Consider

The third theme to emerge from the thematic analysis of the interview transcripts refers to how professors *evaluate plagiarism* once they suspect that it has occurred. The analysis indicates that three of the professor participants consider one or more factors when evaluating their pedagogical response to suspected plagiarism, instead of reporting the suspected case to the Dean's Office right away, in keeping with the Policy. In other words, the professors' uptake of the Policy was not always consistent with the uptake expected by the Policy. Professor Boyd's uptake was the most consistent with the Policy, probably because of his black-and-white perspective on plagiarism. Professor Boyd's view indicates an expected uptake in selecting to follow the rules and to consider only

one factor, namely whether or not the text produced by the student contains plagiarism. Professors Black, Anderson, and Abe, express “agentive disagreement” with the AIP “at the point of uptake” (Tachino, 2012, p. 458) in constructing plagiarism as complex and grey. That is, their uptake is not the one expected by the AIP as they opt to consider multiple factors that could have contributed to the students’ acceptable and unacceptable textual borrowing. These professors discuss that labelling a text as plagiarized is contingent on factors such as the student's intention, circumstance, length of borrowed text, and culture, all of which need to be evaluated and may result in different pedagogical responses. Many of these factors are interconnected and dependent on one another when evaluating the course of action to deal with cases of possible plagiarism.

Figure 5 represents a continuum of two extreme approaches to plagiarism that I suggest constitute the process professors go through in assessing instances of plagiarism.

Figure 5. Continuum illustrating two extreme approaches to dealing with plagiarism

In “Course of Action A” only *one factor* is considered, *if the case is plagiarism or not* according to the AIP, while in “Course of Action B” *many factors* are considered. The

continuum presented in Figure 5 simplifies participants' actions into an abstract conceptual process. In what follows, I briefly explain each factor individually, before elaborating on the different ways professor participants consider combined factors to make decisions based on different contexts.

Students' intention

As discussed in Chapter Five, the Policy states that "whether intentional or not," borrowing another's text without attribution is considered plagiarism and must be sent to the Dean (AIP, 2015). One factor the three professor participants take into consideration when assessing cases of textual borrowings in students' texts is the student's intention, namely, whether the plagiarism is an *intentional* attempt to deceive or if it is *unintentional*. That is, the three professors develop an alternative approach to the AIP in arguing that the intention of the student is the most salient factor to consider. For example, Professor Abe states:

I think one of the problems with plagiarism is it doesn't take into account intention and it's one thing if I'm blatantly going there and I make this decision to steal. That is one thing but it's another if I did it inadvertently, if I wasn't trying to hurt anyone. I think the meeting with the student would identify if there was intent or if it was really an innocent thing. (PA_P2_INT1)

In other words, if the judgment is based on student writing only, it is possible for a professor, as a reader, to misinterpret the student writer's communicative intent or their understanding of the norms of an academic discourse community as a novice. As a result, by meeting with a student, Professor Abe makes sure that the suspected case is, in fact, intentional, before sending the student to the Dean. Similarly, Professor Black mentions

that she is more likely to treat cases of suspected plagiarism as an opportunity to teach the student how to avoid unacceptable textual borrowing when she considers the plagiarism to be unintentional, that is, in essence, if the student is “not trying to pull the wool over your eye” (PB_P2_INT1). These professors emphasize the importance of evaluating whether or not the suspected case of plagiarism is deliberate or inadvertent before applying any sanction.

Professor Boyd also discusses the importance of intention, stating, “I think intent really matters; it truly matters but it’s always a quandary in any sort of legal process, how do you show intent” (PB_P1_INT1). Here Professor Boyd highlights a potential issue in that the ability to uncover a student’s intent is difficult to operationalize in practice. Perhaps this is why the other three professor participants consider multiple factors in addition to intention.

Students’ circumstance

Another factor that professors consider when evaluating a case of plagiarism is the *circumstance* of the student. This factor includes history of plagiarism, year of study, and level of knowledge. Professors Anderson, Abe, and Black allude to the belief that there is a process for learning to know the difference between the correct and incorrect use of intertextual resources, which differs between disciplines, and between having the required skills or not to participate in the discourse community. Thus, they appear to believe a student’s degree of acculturation in their academic discourse community is a factor that must be evaluated.

Professor Black emphasizes the importance of considering the student’s expected degree of acculturation based on year of study. She contends that students in their first

year of university do not know any better, and that as a professor she cannot make any assumptions as to what they know with regards to the discipline's appropriate citation practices and ways of writing; however, by third year, Professor Black assumes that students should "know better" (PB_P2_INT1). To borrow from Burke's (1973) parlour metaphor, Professor Black's approach seems to be based on the assumption that students who are new to "the parlour" know little about the ongoing conversation, while students who have been at "the parlour" for some time have a better grasp of what is being discussed and how it is being discussed.

Considering what students may or may not know is also discussed by Professor Anderson, who states, "it's like a puppy that you hit because they've done something bad and they don't know what they've done they just know they get hit and they're frustrated because they don't know how to improve" (PA_P1_INT1). I believe this metaphor illustrates how Professor Anderson, in particular, takes the role of the expert discourse community member and a mentor who assesses the circumstances and chooses to teach the novice student the expectations of the community. This is similar to Chandrasoma et al.'s (2004) finding that before a professor can expect a novice student to work with new knowledge the student must first have acquired said knowledge; thus, if a student does not know how to write in an academic context they are more susceptible to plagiaristic behaviour. This calls attention to issues with NAU's current institutional approach that does not permit professors to consider factors such as circumstance when evaluating plagiarism.

Length of borrowed text

Professor participants also consider the *length of the borrowed text* to be a contributing factor that translates into how they would deal with the issue. For example, Professor Anderson specifies that she did not want to “ruin somebody’s life for a one-off” (PA_P1_ INT1). This leads her to consider the length of the borrowings in the student’s text, evaluating whether it was borrowed words, sentences, or paragraphs, whether the borrowed segments were small or large, and if extensive borrowing was consistent throughout the entire paper. Professor Abe also considers factors such as the length of borrowed text whereby a sentence might be treated as an opportunity to teach the student the writing practices of the discourse community but paragraphs where “too much has been taken” would “definitely” be sent to the Dean (PA_P2_ INT1).

Students’ cultural background

The EdR professors, Anderson and Abe, were the only participants who considered the *cultural background* of the student as a factor. They both state that international students sometimes struggle with Western expectations pertaining to notions of originality and language reuse. Thus in courses for English language learners (ELLs) professors Anderson and Abe acknowledged that the cultural beliefs of some students are different in that in their home countries they are “encouraged to recite the masters and experts, so they're encouraged to memorize and they're encouraged to regurgitate” (PA_P1_ INT1). When considering students’ cultural background, these professors expressed understanding and responsibility to teach students from non-Western backgrounds the expectations of their disciplinary discourse community.

Combining factors

More often than not, Professors Anderson, Abe, and Black explained that they evaluate suspected plagiarism based on a flexible combination of factors dependent on the context. Professor participants do not always consider all the factors in every case. For example, Professor Abe states in response to excerpt two from the textual activity (Appendix F, p. 142):

So this is definitely plagiarized, but then again it would all depend on who the student is what year they are in. When I say who this student is, I do not mean like do I know them or do I like them, I mean how much knowledge about this they would know and also how big is the text, is this a one instance in a five page text or is this every second paragraph. (PA_P2_INT1)

Here Professor Abe is considering the circumstance of the student and the length and how often transgressive borrowing occurs in the student's text. Thus, she is exhibiting a condensed version of the Course of Action B depicted in Figure 5. Similarly, Professor Black considers the factors contributing to the assessment of whether plagiarism had occurred on a sliding scale by stating, "again it's that sliding scale of what's the student's intent and what does that student know, what's their possible background with respect to what they know about what constitutes plagiarism" (PB_P2_INT1).

Alternatively, professors may consider only one factor and, based on that factor, decide that they have enough evidence to either send the student to the Dean or treat the issue as an opportunity to teach the student. For example, Professor Black considers the intention of the student when evaluating the accuracy of student citations. If a student's citations are fraudulent, Professor Black views this as an attempt to intentionally "pull the

wool” over her eyes and may send the student to the Dean for adjudication (PB_P2_INT1).

Analysis thus far has suggested that professor participants discursively construct plagiarism through defining what constitutes plagiarism and the factors to consider in making judgements about suspected plagiarism. Interpretations from the analysis further indicates that three of the four professors from two different disciplines, believe that within the academic context of the institution, transgressive intertextuality can be viewed as a lack of knowledge and not (in all cases) intentional academic dishonesty. In considering multiple factors that could have influenced the writing of novice academic students, three of the four professor participants are selectively taking up the perspective on plagiarism as presented in the AIP, indicating that the Policy is not fully and consistently adhered to at NAU. Professors are highlighting the fact that “knowledge is not neat and tidy, but often ambiguous, contested, and culturally specific, produced within a complex system of struggle” (Maruca, 2003, p. 91). Therefore, as illustrated in Figure 5, when considering multiple factors that could contribute to cases of plagiarism, the responding to plagiarism becomes complex, as professors are navigating through their own expectations as discourse community experts and the expectations of the institution. While the professor participants consider multiple factors in evaluating cases of plagiarism, they express diverse ways of responding to plagiarism. In the next section, I elaborate on this finding.

Responding to Plagiarism

The fourth theme that emerged from the interview data is *responding to plagiarism*. In line with the different ways of defining and evaluating cases of plagiarism,

professors also discuss responding to plagiarism in two different ways: following the AIP and sending students to the Dean or using the instance of plagiarism as a teaching moment. In what follows I describe both approaches to responding to plagiarism.

Teaching moment

Professors Abe, Anderson, and Black describe approaching some cases of suspected plagiarism as *teaching moments*. Analysis indicates that the three professors expect that students will go through a process of trial-and-error, while they are learning the knowledge-making ways of the their discourse community and how to write appropriately in their disciplinary discourse community (see also Buranen & Stephenson, 2009; Pincus & Schmelkin, 2003), thus, taking up the guidelines presented by the AIP as etiquette to follow rather than a set of fixed rules.

Professor Abe describes using teaching moments to “clear the air” by asking students what happened and if they understand, to make sure that she, as the reader, did not misinterpret the student’s intended meaning. She then uses teaching moments to show students what she as a professor expects, thus giving the student the “benefit of the doubt” (PA_P2_ INT1). Professor Abe seems to construct this response to plagiarism based on the shared responsibility between the student and the professor to create a learning environment in which students as novices have the opportunity to learn from the experts:

I know they say, well, the onus is on the student, they have to understand what this means . . . yes, but I think we also need to do our part, university professor or whoever, to really sort of explain that it is not okay to do this, and if you do, this is what it looks like, yes, it’s plagiarism. (PA_P2_ INT1)

Teaching moment responses, illustrated in the previous quote from Professor Abe, seems to indicate professors' responsibility as expert discourse community members to act as mentors and to teach students the acceptable writing practices of their discourse community. By choosing to treat cases of plagiarism in this way, professors are exercising their agency in the situation to resist the institutional uptake of the rules and regulations of the AIP and respond in ways that suit their pedagogical beliefs.

Professor Anderson uses teaching moments in a similar manner as Professor Abe; however, she also used mark deductions as a way of reinforcing the need for improvement. Professor Anderson talks to students about larger issues such as stringing together borrowed sentences where there is a citation, but “dings the student” and provides feedback for minor cases such as missing citations. This approach seems to be rationalized as a way to inform students of acceptable writing practices, as a way to construct knowledge rather than punish for academic missteps:

I can't imagine anyone getting that hard for a very very small offence at the beginning of a small assignment. I bet that happens more often than not that we would allow leniency with discussion, with concern, with response about different strategies that should be applied. And again you don't leave them hanging, you give them a way to learn how not to. (PA_P1_INT1)

Findings also suggest that the teaching moment approach may be constructed on the belief that students do not innately know how to avoid plagiarism based on the Policy or reading the course outline. Professor Black sheds light on the rationale behind teaching moments when explaining differing perspectives within her department: “some of us take the view that students have to kind of go through a process of learning and we can't

expect them to get it necessarily the first time” (PB_P2_INT1). Like many other writing practices, such as writing in paragraphs or using commas and periods, students need to learn how not to plagiarize (see Howard, 1995, 1999; Pecorari, 2008). In other words, students do not come to university knowing everything; instead, they must learn how to write for their professors in the ways acceptable institutionally and locally by their departmental and disciplinary discourse communities. This notion relates to the acculturation into the discourse community. Students do not automatically know how to be productive members in the community, they progress through trial-and-error, from novice to expert, much like new members to the Burkean Parlour (Burke, 1973) who must spend time listening to the conversation before they have enough knowledge to participate in the conversation. This finding aligns with the idea of academic literacy development as socialization into a discourse community wherein the experts of the community (professors) are inducting the novices (students) into the discourse of the community through acknowledgement that the novice writers do not yet have the skill and knowledge needed to navigate and use the rhetorical strategies valued in the discourse community (e.g., Swales, 1998).

By responding to cases of plagiarism as teaching moments professors choose to guide students to learn from their mistakes—indeed, an interesting way of constructing plagiarism, as this approach advocates for the evaluating each occurrence of plagiarism, and making judgment calls based on the context and the circumstances of the student instead of following the course of action for dealing with cases of plagiarism set forth by the institution. Here fairness is based on a case-by-case basis rather than on the institutional what-is-fair-for-one-is-fair-for-all approach.

Following the institutional plagiarism rules

The expected approach to dealing with cases of plagiarism that emerged from the analysis is to *follow the institutional rules* and send all suspected cases to the Dean. All professor participants agreed that in some cases, depending on certain factors, the rules should be followed. Professor Boyd, however, contends that, in his opinion, all cases should be sent to the Dean because that is what the Policy mandates: “To the Dean, go straight to the Dean. That’s what the rules say and I kinda like the rules” (PB_P1_INT1). Professor Boyd abides by the goals of the AIP, namely, fairness and consistency, because he believes the Dean is able to “see a broader swath of the university” (PB_P1_INT1). The Dean is seen as better able to apply consistent and fair treatment to all students that are sent to their office; a feature teaching moments cannot guarantee.

Professors Black, Anderson, and Abe are more likely to follow the institution’s rules when they are certain that a student has intentionally committed plagiarism; they have considered all the factors, believe that the student knew how to borrow text in academic appropriate ways and/or the students were culturally aware. Professor Black illustrates this when she considers the circumstance of the borrowing by stating:

But if this was third year and I realized the student was heard of time and time again from several professors, and knew this is not what you do, you have to cite the literature, and you can’t use any text verbatim, then at that point I just send it over to the associate Dean. (PB_P2_INT1)

Professors Black, Anderson, and Abe initially approach instances of plagiarism as teaching moments; if the issue persists they are more likely to follow the institutional policy and send students to the Dean. This illustrates the selective choice of professors to

take up the Policy in institutionally expected ways, depending on the context of the textual borrowing.

Disciplinary Differences

The fifth theme that emerged from the thematic analysis is *disciplinary differences* in how professors label plagiarism, use the course outline statement to inform students about plagiarism, and expect students to reference borrowed material.

Disciplinary differences between how LS and EdR professors view plagiarism were first elicited through the textual activity whereby participants made judgements about the appropriateness of the textual borrowing (Appendix F, p. 142). In all cases, ranking the text excerpts on the scale from unacceptable to (more) acceptable borrowings, professors ranked the excerpts from their discipline as more unacceptable examples of plagiarism. For example, Professors Boyd and Black, both from Life Sciences, found excerpt one to be the “most degrading” (PB_P1_INT1), while Professors Anderson and Abe, both from Educational Research, found excerpt two (Figure 6) to be the worst.

1. <u>Nonribosomal peptide synthetases (NRPS) are multifunctional enzymes that make small peptides independently of the ribosomal protein synthesis machinery.</u> To date, the NRPS method of peptide biosynthesis has been described mostly for filamentous ascomycete fungi and for bacteria and has not been shown to occur in plants.
2. <u>A social constructionist perspective in any discipline assumes that what we normally call reality, knowledge, thought, and fact are constructs generated by communities of like-minded peers.</u> According to Bruffee (1986), “ <u>social construction understands</u> ” these constructs as “ <u>community-generated entities that define or ‘constitute’ the community that generated them</u> ” (pp. 777).

Figure 6. Textual activity excerpts one and two. The underlined portions of this example indicate borrowed text.

Labelling excerpts from their own discipline as the worst instance of plagiarism illustrates their connectedness to their disciplinary ways of knowing and the conventions that are accepted in their local discourse community. When evaluating similar borrowings from a different discipline (i.e., excerpt one versus two) the professor participants did not view the excerpts as equally unacceptable. This observation confirms the view presented by Chandrasoma et al. (2004) that textual borrowings cannot be labeled as plagiarism out of context, as academic discourse communities interpret what kind of borrowing is acceptable in relation to their disciplinary textual practices.

Similarly, disciplinary differences were apparent when discussing with the professors whether or not plagiarism statements are included in their course outlines. Professor participants from EdR state that the FOA requires them to include verbatim plagiarism statements from the AIP, while professor participants from LS have academic freedom to include whatever they want about plagiarism in their course outlines, as FOS does not have any requirements. Professor Boyd explains that he believes they are not required to include statements pertaining to plagiarism “partly we don’t try to impose because, as department, we basically don’t have much writing” (PB_P1_INT1). This is an interesting point because the Policy refers to formulae, chemical compounds, and computer codes as possible sources of ideas that can be plagiarized in addition to “writing” related plagiarism (see Table 8). Professor Boyd’s assertion suggests a disconnect between what is considered to be plagiarism at the institutional level and what professors take up and interpret as plagiarism in the context of their classroom.

Disciplinary differences are also apparent with regards to the purpose of writing and referencing in the two disciplines. Professor Boyd places emphasis on the importance

of the goal of publishing work in LS. He emphasizes that citation styles are based on journal requirements and expectations. Similarly, Professor Black states she does not have a preference for the type of citation style a student chooses, but she does not allow direct quotations. Reportedly, Professor Black tells her students:

Nothing is stated that eloquently in science. In general, there's no reason to be quoting people, just say it your way they haven't said it particularly well. It's just lazy using quotations, in science it's lazy, of course in the arts where people are saying things in a really beautiful way then it's poetic then yea you would want to quote it directly. (PB_P2_INT1)

Conversely, EdR professors require students to use a preferred citation style guide, in their case, APA, and encourage direct quotation, if appropriate. Professor Anderson also places more importance on knowledge construction through exposure to different genres, wherein students are learning through their writing. She believes that in order for students to write in the way she, as a disciplinary expert, expects them to, and to avoid plagiarism, they must first have the required knowledge of the content and the convention:

So, as a prof if you're concerned about plagiarism, you've got to give students the opportunities to understand what it means to know how to cite, to figure things out conceptually before they write it down and to give them tasks that don't depend on researched literature. Yes they have to learn how to write an essay that does depend on researched literature but until they're ready for that, give them smaller activities to build up to it... I think it's worth it because you want them to build up an understanding of critical reading. (PA_P1_INT1)

It seems that the professor participants largely depend on how knowledge construction, citation practices, and intellectual property are conceived in their discipline to determine when and if textual borrowing strategies are acceptable and legitimate (e.g., Bouville, 2008; Cargill & O'Connor, 2013; Hyland, 2004; Jamison, 2008). These disciplinary differences appear to call into question the feasibility of one generalized policy being able to account for the various approaches to writing used across an institution.

Accepted Standardization: A Common Way

The sixth and final theme that emerged from the analysis of professor participant data is *accepted standardization*, which relates to the notion that there are differences between writing as a novice student in a university context and writing as an expert in a professional context, both inside and outside the university. The difference between what is acceptable for novices and experts is clarified by Dias, Freedman, Medway, and Paré (1999) who explain that the social motive of student writing in university is dual: it is epistemic (i.e., related to knowledge, or, specifically, learning, in this case) and it is connected to ranking. This duality creates tension in students' writing. Professor Black explained in a member check that expert writers tend to write in a standardized way when topics have been written about frequently, under guidelines from journal editors to be as concise as possible. However, if students produce texts using "the same formulaic flow of ideas" it causes professors, such as Professor Black, to be suspicious of the originality of the text because students, as novices, most likely have not mastered the standardized "formula" or formulaic ways of writing (PB_P2_MC). This was most noticeable when professors were discussing sections of research articles where it is acceptable to write in a formulaic way, such as methods. For example, Professor Boyd states that borrowing text

is accepted in the methods section of gene sequencing research. In this type of research, researchers tend to copy and paste with slight modification the methods section, noting that in some cases it is usually several journal pages long. He further mentions, “it’s part of our convention and tradition. So, yes, I guess that’s the plagiarism template that we allow and it’s big blocks of texts” (PB_P1_INT1).

Professor Abe also states that sometimes there is a “standard form for writing things” or a “common way” and the methods section has a standardized accepted way of presenting information (PA_P2_INT1). Similarly, Professor Black pointed out that borrowing text is acceptable when “there’s only one kinda way to do it and one way to write about it” (PB_P2_INT1). However, Professor Black also expressed frustration when students write the methods section of their lab reports directly borrowing text from the lab manual in a template-like form to fill in their data. As novice academic writers students are not supposed to write like this:

Yea they don’t get it, they don’t get why that should be a problem because it’s like well you gave us the methods in the lab manual so why can’t we, this is what we did, why can’t we just reproduce it. And that makes a certain amount of sense, I can see where they’re coming from but when we specifically tell them no, we want you to practice doing it yourself. (PB_P2_INT1)

This further demonstrates the different ways borrowed texts can be perceived depending on the context within which the text is situated. As described above, professors treat students’ textual borrowing in classroom genres differently from the ways in which they themselves write in research articles or what they perceive as acceptable in the work of their colleagues. The double standard that LS professors assume, when they say that

students are not allowed to copy Methods sections even though experts do that, is related to the epistemic motive of student writing (Dias et al., 1999). In other words, professors want student to learn how to write the Methods section without copying and to demonstrate this learning to the professors. Once the experts (professors) assess (rank) student writing as appropriate, then students might be allowed to enter the community and follow the expert practices in their publications. But the students are expected to demonstrate that they have mastered how to write the section first. Pennycook (1996) further highlights this perspective when stating that there is “one set of standards for the guardians of truth and knowledge and another for those seeking entry” (p. 213).

The difference between what is expected from students and what is expected from professionals can also be interpreted in light of Bakhtin’s (1986) ideas about the significance of mastering a genre before breaking the rules: “to use a genre freely and creatively is not the same as to create a genre from the beginning; genre must be fully mastered in order to be manipulated freely” (p. 80). Indeed, it could be stated that the context of the writing event and the level of genre knowledge are important, and students need to be aware of the difference between borrowing as a novice who knows little about the practices of the discourse community and as an expert who has mastered the writing conventions valued by the community. Therefore, it seems pertinent that students, as novice academic writers, need to be able to see the difference between what is expected from them and what they see expert academic writers doing in the literature that they read.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter I have discussed the findings that emerged from the thematic analysis of the interview data collected from professors in EdR and LS. Findings indicate that, at the basic level, professors define plagiarism in similar terms as they are defined in the AIP. All professors also note that they detect plagiarism based on a change in the voice of the texts. Apart from these similarities, findings suggested that there was a three-to-one split between the professors in how they define, evaluate, and respond to cases of suspected plagiarism. One professor, Professor Boyd, defines, evaluates, and responds to plagiarism by following the AIP rules described in the Policy while Professors Abe, Anderson, and Black define, evaluate, and respond to plagiarism based on a set of factors that they considered on a case-by-case basis. These findings illustrate different types of uptakes of the AIP on plagiarism in that professors adopt and adapt the institution's official view of plagiarism in various ways. In the following section, I turn to students' perceptions of plagiarism.

Chapter Seven: How Students Construct Plagiarism

In this chapter, I discuss the findings that emerged from the student interview analysis to shed light on how students interpret the institutional construction of plagiarism (the second part of research question two). These findings are structured around three emergent themes: students' definition of plagiarism, the strategies student participants use for adapting their writing to the expectations of professors situated in the institutional and disciplinary context, and students' perceived needs.

Defining Plagiarism

From the student perspective, as elicited through the interviews, plagiarism is generally perceived as a clear concept. Participants describe an unambiguous distinction between what is and is not considered plagiarism. April and Amanda—both third-year EdR students and Brittney—a third-year LS student—label plagiarism as the taking of ideas and thoughts of others without giving credit to the original author of the text. For example, April describes plagiarism, similarly to the AIP, as “taking ideas without giving credit” (PA_S1_INT1). All student participants agreed that borrowing texts such as facts and common knowledge is not considered plagiarism. April and Amanda also agreed that the borrowing of another's work through either direct quotations and paraphrasing, followed by an in-text citation, are acceptable source use. Alternatively, Brittney discusses the use of direct quotations as unacceptable in LS. Additionally, Brittney and Amanda mention intention and effort as mitigating factors for unacceptable textual borrowing. For example, Brittney conceded that if the student “was trying” or “could have avoided plagiarism through effort” (PB_S1_INT1), then the unacceptable textual

borrowing was more acceptable than intentional plagiarism. These considerations are similar to those brought up by professors in their responses to plagiarism.

Although analysis indicates that the students primarily presented a clear understanding of what kinds of textual borrowing are acceptable and what kinds constitute plagiarism, issues arose when students were asked to identify instances of potential plagiarism in the text-based activity. Students struggled to apply their understanding of plagiarism in practice when considering what sorts of textual behaviours constituted plagiarism, a finding that aligns with previous research (e.g., Gullifer & Tyson, 2010; Shi, 2010; Yeo, 2007), in which students were able to define what plagiarism is but struggled to differentiate between plagiarized and paraphrased texts. While professor participants labelled excerpts one and two from the text-based activity (Figure 6, p. 86 as the most plagiaristic due to lack of citation and borrowing too much from the source, student participants saw these excerpts as acceptable. These differences between professors and students indicate a disconnect between taking up the institutional definition, and internalizing the concept and using the rules in practice.

Strategies for Avoiding Plagiarism

The second theme that emerged from the data analysis is students' use of discursive *strategies* to write from sources and avoid plagiarism. Three strategies for avoiding plagiarism emerged through the thematic analysis: 1) adapting to the expectations of their discourse community, 2) referencing borrowed texts, and 3) imitation. In this section I elaborate on each strategy.

Adapting to the expectations of the local community

Analysis showed that each student attempts to adopt the expectations of their local discourse community as a strategy for avoiding plagiarism. While April and Brittney welcomed the conventions of the discipline, Amanda struggled to adapt to the expectations of the community. Brittney, noting that she does not do much writing in the discipline, states she almost exclusively writes lab reports, a task that is generally accompanied by the use of a lab manual. When writing, she follows what the manual tells her to do, and cuts and pastes information that she thinks would be useful into a word document, and then she rewords and cites useful information (PB_S1_INT1). Brittney's strategic approach to writing, which includes cutting and pasting chunks of text with some modification, reflects the professional writing practices of the LS community, as described in Chapter Six. Brittney's strategy mirrors what professionals do in published articles. This exemplifies the tension between the dual motives of student writing tasks—the epistemic motive—to promote learning—and the evaluative motive—to assess and rank students (Dias et al., 1999).

Amanda's experience with writing for her discourse community can be described in terms of gradually acquiring disciplinary knowledge, whereby she went from a complete novice writer, not knowing how to reference properly and not being aware of plagiarism issues, to a more knowledgeable novice writer, equipped with discursive strategies, in her third year at NAU. Describing her past experience in composing texts for professors, Amanda states:

During that time, now that I think about it, I probably should have worried more about not citing properly, but you don't worry when you don't know what you're

doing wrong. Now I sometimes worry that I did not cite properly, and committed the crime of plagiarism without intending to. (PA_S2_INT1)

Carrying on with the Burke's (1973) parlour metaphor, in previous years when Amanda had just entered the parlour she was required by her professors to take part in the conversation, but struggled because she had not yet fully understood what was going on. As she stayed in the parlour longer, she acquired a better understanding of the conversation and the rhetorical practices of the community which enabled her to participate in the conversation. In other words, over time, as Amanda spent time in the parlour—listening and figuring out what goes on and taking part in the conversation to the best of her abilities— she gradually became more aware of the community norms and expectations, adopting the practices, discourses, and perspectives of her community.

Referencing borrowed text

Another strategy student participants use for writing in the institutional context and avoiding plagiarism is to *reference borrowed material*. All students were aware of the importance of referencing source material to avoid issues of plagiarism, using citation practices accepted by local discourse community as a primary strategy. April describes referencing as a strategy for demonstrating that her text is aligned with the literature. In first and second year, April said, students should be citing everything, but in third and fourth year students are more knowledgeable and can use their peers to make judgements about what is considered common knowledge and what must be cited:

But into third and fourth year I've found that classmates and I have had conversations about certain terms and ideas and it doesn't turn into "oh who did say this, who found this." It's kind of just like we've heard these studies enough

and these types of results and it's just kind of conversation and it's knowledge that everyone has within that year. So maybe that would be easier to not cite, if there has been expansive conversation about it and kind of everyone understands the ins and outs of what was thought and what was understood. (PA_S2_INT1)

Brittney also utilized referencing strategies to avoid plagiarism, advocating for citing when uncertain, wherein her main strategy was to “reword the lab manual” and then cite (PB_S1_INT1).

When using others' ideas Amanda stated one must “cite, cite, cite” because “you're never inventing the wheel” (PA_S2_INT1), constructing the referencing of others as a strategy to avoid plagiarism. She discussed that it is unrealistic to “reinvent the wheel,” instead finding it useful to strategically use others' ideas to situate her arguments in a wider context, thus situating herself in the discourse community in which she is a novice member. Although Amanda acknowledged referencing as an important strategy, she also acknowledged the possibility that academic missteps happen when students unintentionally plagiarize, an accident the AIP does not allow for (see Chapter Five). She stated:

Looking at my work, even when I get an A, you know, what happened to the other 15%, cause I obviously didn't get it right. So when it comes to citing that happens too. Even if you try, it might not work out exactly. Maybe you know you're tired and your eye fly over the sentence where you meant to put quotations and hell you're late and it all makes sense and you've read it a million times and you're sick and tired of it and it just happens. (PA_S2_INT1)

This quote outlines the view that trying does not always mean it is perfect. Yancy (2008) agrees with this finding, arguing that it is impossible to credit everyone's ideas that have contributed to a text.

Imitation

An important strategy for writing from sources that both Amanda and Brittney identified was *imitation*: they learned how to write for their local discourse community through imitating the work of other authors. Amanda described emulating “the big kids” (PA_S2_INT1) while Brittney placed extreme importance on imitating the lab manual (PB_S1_INT1). These students are using textual borrowing strategies through creating similar texts to build knowledge of the forms that are acceptable in their discourse community. Brittney and Amanda use this strategy as a way to gain control of their own rhetorical voices (Bazerman, 1995).

Students' Perceived Needs in Relation to Plagiarism

The third and final theme that emerged from the thematic analysis of interviews with student participants is their *perceived needs* in relation to plagiarism. Although the students demonstrated an understanding of plagiarism within the context of NAU, analysis indicates that, in learning about plagiarism, students have three perceived needs: 1) for more examples, 2) for explanation of consequences, and 3) for opportunities to learn through trial and error.

Analysis shows that April would like clarification at the classroom level. She states that it would be beneficial for all students if more contextualized examples were provided with an in-depth explicit discussion of what does and does not constitute plagiarism (PA_S1_INT1). In a similar vein, Brittney alludes to the need for more

discussion of the consequences of plagiarism (PB_S1_INT1). Similarly, Amanda discusses needing opportunities to make mistakes as a novice writer learning how to communicate in appropriate ways within the discipline arguing, “as students we should have a degree of leeway to kind of break the rules and learn” (PA_S2_INT1). This reflects the belief that I interpreted from Amanda’s interview, that she needs to know the conventions and expectation in order to avoid plagiarism. The needs described by the student participants in this section indicate a disconnect between the AIP’s intended purpose and what is interpreted by student community members. This disconnect leads to the question of whether the broad one-size-fits-all policy is a source of confusion rather than clarification, a point which I return to in Chapter Eight.

It is evident from their construction of plagiarism, evident in their approach to defining plagiarism, describing strategies for avoiding it, and indicating their needs as students, that April, Amanda, and Britney have varying degrees of awareness about what types of writing practices constitute plagiarism and different discursive strategies for avoiding it in their own work. Furthermore, their perspectives on plagiarism adopt part of the institutional definition, but not the entire definition. For example, all three students posit that plagiarism is the taking of others’ ideas without giving the original author due credit. This is only one subsection of the Policy’s definition. Students are potentially misunderstanding or are not aware of the other parts of the institution’s discursive construction of plagiarism such as taking the “the expression of ideas,” intentionality, and modifying someone else’s thoughts and idea (AIP, 2015, p. 8).

Chapter Summary

In this chapter I have discussed the findings that emerged from the thematic analysis of the interview data collected from students in EdR and LS. Findings suggest that students construct plagiarism based on the institution's definition but also adapt certain aspects of it. Findings further indicate that the ways the institution and professors inform students about plagiarism may not always be clear to students as they expressed needs for clarification.

Chapter Eight: Does One Size Fit All?

The overall aim of this research is two-fold: first, to uncover how the institution and its members, at multiple levels, construct and interpret the concept of plagiarism within a single institutional context; and second, to better understand the relationship between the perspectives on plagiarism developed at the various levels of the institution, and the extent to which one policy can account for these multiple perspectives. This chapter helps achieve this overall aim by bringing together and discussing the findings from the textual (Chapter Five) and thematic (Chapters Six and Seven) analyses. That is, this chapter compares the multiple constructions of plagiarism that emerged from the analysis of NAU's Academic Integrity Policy (Chapter Five) as well as the interviews with professors and students (Chapters Six and Seven) in order to investigate their interrelationships in light of the reviewed literature and key theoretical and analytical concepts that frame this study.

To elaborate, in Chapter Five, I have presented the findings from the textual analysis of the AIP and the COPS corpus, aiming to address research question one—How does the institution discursively construct plagiarism in its academic integrity policy and related documentation? The analysis provided in the chapter indicates that the five sections in the Policy (introduction, scope, academic integrity standards, procedures, and sanctions) contribute to establishing and mandating NAU's official stance on matters of academic integrity, notably with regard to plagiarism. The communicative purposes (Askehave & Swales, 2001) of the Policy that emerged through the textual analysis further indicate that the overall purpose of the AIP is to establish a definition of plagiarism, as well as prescribe ways to evaluate and respond to issues of plagiarism

within NAU. Another finding is that the AIP acts as a source document for texts such as course outline plagiarism statements, thus facilitating both explicit and implicit (Bazerman, 2004) institutional uptake. Based on these findings, I have argued that NAU appears to assume a one-size-fits-all policy position on matters of academic integrity.

Chapter Six has addressed research question two, namely, How do professors and students, from the departments of Life Science and Education Research, interpret the institutional construction of plagiarism? My interpretation of the findings from each interview suggests that there is a disagreement among the participants, which seemed to arise when they define plagiarism in the context of their local departmental and disciplinary discourse community (Swales, 2016). Professors appeared to draw on the Policy as a resource according to their pedagogical beliefs about textual borrowing—adopting the Policy in its entirety, or selectively adopting and/or adapting sections of it. In other words, the findings suggest that the Policy, which is built on principles of consistency and fairness, does not consistently attain its expected uptake (Freadman, 2002). Disciplinary differences in terms of what professors label as plagiarism and how they expect students to draw on sources were also apparent. The views of students echo both the official interpretation prescribed by the AIP, as well as their professors' reinterpretation of the plagiarism regulations. Findings from the student interviews suggest that students use a variety of strategies to avoid plagiarism, but need clarification with respect to what the AIP and their professors expect from them as novice academic writers. In light of the insights generated from the interviews with professors and students, the question arises as to whether the institution's one-size-fits-all policy

accounts for the diversity of views and practices on plagiarism across disciplines and contexts (research question three).

To address this question, in this chapter, I briefly describe the tension between the intended and interpreted purposes of the Policy, as well as the tension between the various interpretations of the Policy and its implementation.

Intended and Interpreted Purpose(s) of the Policy

Of central importance to this discussion is the uncovered tension between the definition presented in the AIP and the multiple uptakes of plagiarism interpreted from the interviews with professors and students. This tension is visible when comparing the intended and interpreted communicative purpose(s) (Askehave & Swales, 2001; Bhatia, 1993) of the Policy and professors' selective uptakes (Bawarshi, 2015; Freadman, 2002) of the definition and procedures presented in the AIP.

Findings from the study have indicated that the intended communicative purposes of the AIP, as stated in the Scope section (see Chapter Five), are similar to the communicative purpose(s) of the AIP as determined through the rhetorical move analysis of selected sections of the AIP (Swales, 1990). The intended purposes are to:

- describe the actions and behaviours that violate NAU's standards of academic integrity;
- define the responsibilities of various offices and individuals in upholding the policy;
- specify the procedures and processes to be followed when an allegation of violating these standards has been made against a student;
- specify the sanctions that may be applied to a student who has been found to

have violated these standards; and

- describe the appeal and petition processes open to students who feel they have not been treated fairly under this policy. (p. 3)

Based on the rhetorical move analysis, these purposes seem to be achieved in the Policy (see Chapter Five). The Policy defines, describes, and specifies what types of academic conduct are considered inappropriate in the NAU academic context, albeit in universalized way. Thus, it seems that, as an instance of the University AIP genre, the text achieves its purpose. The document raises awareness that plagiarism is defined as academic misconduct that is unacceptable. The text also provides professors with a standardized way of responding to plagiarism-related issues.

However, difficulties with the AIP arise when looking at the communicative purpose of the Policy in relation to the ways in which members of disciplinary and departmental discourse communities within the NAU adopt and adapt the Policy. To better explain the interaction between the AIP and its interpretation by professors and students, I use the concept of uptake (Freadman, 1994, 2002) as a lens to examine how meaning is made at the interaction between text and context (Freedman & Medway, 1994).

Text in Context: Interpretation and Implementation of the Policy

The Policy can be interpreted as emerging in response to the needs of the context in which it was written, which centrally include the need to define and regulate academic integrity for the institution as a whole. However, the Policy does not appear to take into consideration key contextual factors, such as its uptake, as a prescriptive text, by professors and students. Paré and Smart (1994) emphasize the importance, when

analyzing a text, of considering both textual patterns and contextual factors such as social roles, composing processes, and reading practices within the discourse community to which the text belongs. In this study, these factors are important to take into account not only in the analysis of the Policy, but also in the analysis of its influence on various institutional members affected by it. Important in understanding the AIP in its context is Freadman's (1994) notion of uptake. For the purpose of this study, as described in Chapter Three, uptake has been conceptualized as a two-stage process of recognition (i.e., interpretation) and enactment (i.e., implementation) (Emmons, 2009). In the following sections, I elaborate on each of these two stages to evaluate the suitability of the one-size-fits-all approach to plagiarism.

Interpretation of the AIP and plagiarism

Interpretation is viewed as the first stage in the process of uptake. Within the process of responding to the AIP, the Policy can be taken up as flexible "etiquettes," which Freadman (1994, p. 49) defines as the rules that are most appropriate for a situation, or "fixed law," which Freadman defines as the strict adherence to set rules, in this case as set forth by the AIP. Following Freadman's conceptualization, the findings of the analyses indicate that the professor participants interpret the AIP in two primary ways: either as "fixed law," such as Professor Boyd's literal interpretation of the Policy, or as flexible "etiquettes," in the case of Professor Abe, Professor Anderson, and Professor Black who reinterpret the AIP in the context of their personal experiences and their disciplinary backgrounds. These differing interpretations of the AIP point to differences between how the Policy is intended to be interpreted and how it is actually taken up by members of the academic community.

Such differences are evident when looking at how plagiarism is defined by the institution, professors, and students. As discussed in previous sections, the Policy defines plagiarism as a simple and straightforward issue in that a text is either plagiarized or not. Specifically, it defines plagiarism as “presenting, whether intentionally or not, the ideas, expression of ideas, or work of others as one’s own” (AIP, 2015, p. 8). This definition acts as a lens for how the entire institutional community should view matters of academic integrity. Through the AIP the institution is applying a narrow definition of a complex phenomenon that can manifest itself in a variety of ways in different disciplinary contexts. In this way, the institution expects a particular uptake that intends to limit alternative ways of responding to cases that are not clear-cut. The professor participants, on the other hand, described their own subjective approaches to defining plagiarism, indicating unexpected uptakes of the AIP. To simplify, they defined plagiarism in two ways: 1) as complex or 2) as straightforward. These subjective approaches to plagiarism illustrate the “hidden dimension” of uptake (Freadman, 2002) wherein professors’ agency plays a role in deciding how plagiarism is best conceptualized in the context of their classroom.

It is important to note that the definition of plagiarism most commonly adopted in the AIPs of most universities does not recognize variation in the knowledge-making practice of the disciplinary discourse communities which exist within each university. Previous research has acknowledged that different disciplines and academic domains such as the arts and sciences have different knowledge-making practices (e.g., Hyland, 2004). In particular, as noted in previous research (e.g., Borg, 2009; Haviland & Mullin, 2009; Jamison, 2008), and as confirmed by the professor participants of this study,

appropriate writing practices, referencing styles, and unacceptable textual borrowing vary according to the knowledge-making practices of disciplinary and local discourse communities. Differences in understanding how knowledge is constructed could thus help explain why professors do not interpret the Policy rules in expected ways, further indicating that the Policy might not achieve its purpose when applied in diverse disciplinary contexts within NAU.

Findings further suggest that students draw from both the AIP and the plagiarism-related information they receive from their professors to construct an interpretation of what plagiarism is and how to avoid it. As novices new to academic contexts, the student participants had expected uptake of the Policy; however, they do not seem to fully understand what constitutes plagiarism when required to identify appropriate and inappropriate textual borrowing in the text-based activity (Appendix F, p. 142). This finding echoes the research of Roig (1997), who found that students struggled to accurately identify if a text was appropriately paraphrased or plagiarized. Students' misunderstanding of and confusion about plagiarism could imply a disconnect between being aware of the rules about what constitutes unacceptable textual borrowing practices and understanding how to abide by them in academic writing—a disconnect that is not accounted for in the AIP.

The diverse interpretations of plagiarism by professors and students suggest a possible contentious relationship between how the AIP is intended to be taken up and how it is actually taken up. Two points of disagreement arise between what the Policy mandates and how NAU's disciplinary community members interpret the Policy in relation to plagiarism: students' intention and the intertextual nature of academic writing.

Students' intention

Based on the definitions of plagiarism given by professors and students, one important difference between the institution's view on plagiarism and its members' interpretation of plagiarism within the context of their local—disciplinary and departmental—discourse communities centres on the notion of intention. While the institution does not differentiate whether undocumented textual borrowing is intentional or unintentional, some professors indicate that the student's intent is important when considering how to deal with the student. Even professors whose views align with the Policy, such as Professor Boyd, indicated the importance of understanding the student's intention. The disconnect between policy and interpretations indicates issues with the intended uptake (Freadman, 2002) of the AIP. Analysis indicates that professors opt to interpret the institution's definition of plagiarism selectively, taking up parts of the definition while leaving out others based on how they believe plagiarism and issues of textual borrowing should be interpreted. The unexpected uptake or reinterpretation of the policy points to tension between the rules of the institution and its disciplinary members' agency to follow or not follow these rules. Reporting similar findings, other researchers have come to the conclusion that a shortcoming of narrow definitions of plagiarism—such as the one presented in NAU's AIP—is the lack of consideration of intent (Chandrasoma et al., 2004; Howard, 1995; Pecorari, 2008; Pecorari & Shaw, 2012). And thus, they have recommended that the term plagiarism be broadened to take into account the intention of the student when borrowing text from sources. Specifically, Pecorari (2008) advocates for differentiating between patchwriting and prototypical plagiarism, and Chandrasoma et al. (2004) and Pecorari and Shaw (2012) advocate for

reconceptualising plagiarism in terms of intertextuality (Bakhtin, 1986), a point to which I turn to in the following section.

Intertextuality

Arguably the most salient difference between the institution's prescribed view on plagiarism and its members' uptake of plagiarism centres on the understanding of the very nature of writing and can be interpreted by means of Bakhtin's (1986) view of language as fundamentally intertextual. There seems to be a disconnect between how texts are intertextually produced and the definition of plagiarism described in the AIP. NAU's definition, as I have argued, constructs textual borrowing in straightforward terms, wherein a text is either acceptably or unacceptably borrowed, that is, plagiarized. The Policy positions acceptable writing as the drawing on one's own original thoughts. If content such as words, ideas, computer codes, or formulae are borrowed, they must be referenced back to the source (see Chapter Five for an in-depth discussion). While this interpretation of textual borrowing seems logical, it contradicts what we know about writing—and, indeed, any instance of language use—as dialogical. As Bakhtin (1986) argues: “each utterance is filled with echoes and reverberations of other utterances to which it is related by the communality of the sphere of speech communication” (p. 91). In other words, utterances themselves do not have stable meaning; they rely on the relationship between reader and writer to attain meaning.

In contrast to the Policy, three of the four professors defined the intertextual nature of writing by stating that novice student writers at the beginning of their academic career may lack the knowledge of how and when to draw from sources in discourse community accepted ways. Professors Abe, Anderson, and Black view plagiarism in fluid

terms whereby what is considered acceptable and unacceptable textual borrowing is based on multiple factors. These professors acknowledge that their view of plagiarism is more complex than how the Policy expects it to be interpreted and addressed. Based on this understanding they selectively took up the aspects of the Policy they agreed with to implement.

The study's findings also suggest that in considering multiple factors, professors are acknowledging that students gradually become aware of the acceptable ways to present intertextual links in the chain of communication (Bakhtin, 1986) that constructs the unfolding discourse of their discipline. This knowledge is gradually acquired through increasing awareness of the conventions and practices of their discipline's discourse community as well as the more local place discourse communities (Swales, 2016) developing in the departments in which they major. Much like new members to the Burkean parlour (1973) students must listen to the conversation of the discipline and have a chance to start participating before having adequate knowledge because they learn by doing. Professors' multi-factor (see Figure 5) uptake aligns with previous research, which indicates a need for reconceptualising plagiarism in terms of various types of textual borrowing (e.g., Pecorari & Shaw, 2012). The professors' selective uptake of the AIP is also consistent with previous policy research that advocates for contextualizing AIPs in specific institutional and disciplinary contexts (Price, 2002; Jamieson, 2008). Contextualized policies may create room for professors to flexibly choose appropriate responses to cases of suspected plagiarism, a point I return to in the final chapter of this thesis as I make suggestions for revising the NAU's policy in light of my findings and those of others.

In short, the findings of the study suggest that despite the intended purpose of the Policy, within the context of NAU, the interpretation of plagiarism presented in the AIP does not seem to have a unified expected uptake. The Policy does not appear to consistently attain its intended uptake because it does not address the complexity of defining what does and does not constitute plagiarism (i.e., the student's intention in borrowing and the nature of the intertextuality as presented in the student's text). Earlier on, in referring to the relationship between the AIP and professors' and students' interpretation of it, I distinguished two dimensions of the process of uptake on plagiarism: interpretation of the institution's construction of plagiarism and implementation of the rules of the AIP. To further interpret uptakes of the Policy, I now turn to the second part of uptake: implementation.

Implementation of the AIP rules

Differing interpretation—or uptakes—of the Policy and its conceptualization of plagiarism by the participants are interconnected with how they implement the rules outlined in the AIP. The findings of this study suggest that there are differences between how the Policy states professors are expected to respond to cases of plagiarism (AIP, 2015, p. 11) and how they do so in actual practice. The apparent disconnect between the intended uptake of the Policy, on the one hand, and its actual uptake, on the other, generates a number of issues having to do with fairness, consistency, and transparency. That is, the way of responding to plagiarism as presented in the Policy is constructed to achieve the Policy's goal of ensuring that students are treated with fairness, consistency, and transparency (see Table 7, p. 50). The selective uptakes of the Policy by the professors seem to create obstacles in achieving this goal. For example, Professor Boyd's

law-driven implementation of the Policy contrasts with Professor Abe's, Professor Anderson's, and Professor Black's pedagogically oriented approaches to the cases of unacceptable textual borrowing, which include consideration of the factors depicted in Figure 5 before deciding whether to follow the AIP rules or use the situation as a teaching moment. This contrast exhibits a lack of consistency across faculty, which appears to impact the fairness of the AIP. It appears that Professors Abe, Anderson, and Black interpret the rhetorical rules of the Policy as "etiquettes" rather than "fixed law" (Freadman, 1994, p. 49) in that they respond to each case of unacceptable textual borrowing based on what they perceive to be appropriate for a particular student in a particular situation. Considering the approaches to treating cases of unacceptable textual borrowing developed by the three professors as flexible etiquettes rather than fixed rules helps explain how they selectively draw on the AIP to support their decisions rather than subject their agency to the AIP. Individual variation in the interpretation of the Policy illustrates that the implementation is not consistent or transparent, and creates a gap between the AIP's intended communicative purpose(s) and how it is implemented in an academic context. This discrepancy suggests that the current one-size-fits-all approach to plagiarism may not accurately capture the needs of the academic institution.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter I have described how the intended and interpreted purpose(s) of the Policy do not fully align with NAU's members' understanding of plagiarism-related matters, raising the question of whether the one-size-fits-all approach to plagiarism is effective in the context of NAU. The main finding of this study confirms that of previous research (e.g., Jamieson, 2008; Park, 2004; Price, 2002), namely that such a one-size-fits-

all approach to defining and responding to plagiarism may need reassessment. The findings discussed above reveal that despite the one mandated interpretation of plagiarism through the AIP, some participants had produced alternative uptakes of the Policy, wherein they expressed their agency in adopting alternative interpretations of plagiarism. In what follows, I provide suggestions for broadening the institutional approach to plagiarism in ways that allow for the inclusion of different disciplinary knowledge-making practices and multiple ways of interpreting and responding to plagiarism.

Chapter Nine: Conclusion

The aim of this study is to explore how the notion of plagiarism is constructed at multiple levels within a single academic institution as well as how professors and students take up the institution's Academic Integrity Policy. The three research questions addressed in the study are: 1) How does the institution discursively construct plagiarism in its academic integrity policy and related documentation? 2) How do professors and students, from the departments of Life Science and Education Research, interpret the institutional construction of plagiarism? 3) To what extent does the institution's academic integrity policy account for the perspectives on plagiarism that exist within the institution?

Findings of an in-depth contextualized analysis of discursive construction of plagiarism within NAU suggest that, with regard to the first research question, the ESP move/step analysis of NAU's AIP, a sample of the University AIP genre, has indicated that the institution, through the Policy, constructs a universal interpretation of plagiarism that does not take into consideration disciplinary and other differences in what is seen as plagiarism in students' academic writing. This means that the AIP constructs only one acceptable way of interpreting undocumented textual borrowings in student papers—as plagiarism—and provides one possible response to all such cases of borrowing by requiring that all students suspected in plagiarizing be sent to the corresponding Associate Dean. With regard to second research question, thematic analysis of interviews with professor participants indicates that professors from Education Research and Life Sciences take up the Policy in different ways, in that their interpretations of what counts as plagiarism, what plan of action should be implemented, and how they implement the

policy may differ from what is stated in the AIP. The analysis of interviews with the four professor participants points to a three-to-one split: three professors took up the AIP by reinterpreting it and implementing their own way of dealing with instances of plagiarism, namely, considering factors such as students' intention, students' circumstance, size of the borrowed text, and the cultural background of the student, while one professor took up the rules developed by the AIP in the way expected by the policy. This finding illustrates the difficulties in developing and implementing a policy that defines in absolute terms where to draw the line between appropriate academic practice of textual borrowing and transgressive intertextuality. Moreover, that drawing the line between what is and is not acceptable is subjective and disciplinary.

Finally, students had a somewhat different uptake on the AIP. They were aware of the AIP, the plagiarism statements in course outlines, and their professors' explanation of plagiarism, but seemed to struggle with knowing how to assess the acceptability of textual borrowing practices in light of these documents and explanations, thus showing their novice status in the discourse community. These findings suggest that the ways in which disciplinary discourse community members take up the AIP may be different from how it is intended to be interpreted by the institution. This disconnect, therefore, impacts the consistency and fairness of the Policy implementation. Together, these findings help us to conclude, with regard to the third research question, that the "one size" approach to plagiarism described in the AIP may not address possible types and interpretations of plagiarism.

Limitations

As in all research, there are a number of limitations to my study. The first limitation relates to the sample size. Due to the limited scope of this study, I only recruited and interviewed seven participants in total. The study could have benefited from the perspectives of other members of the academic community. Additionally, only one student from LS participated in the study, which limited my discussion of LS students' understanding of what constitutes plagiarism and what faculty response to plagiarism can be expected. Reaching out to other students in LS may have been beneficial to the study. The second limitation, typical of the studies of similar nature, relates to the reliance of the study on participants' perceptions of the issue in question. One possible solution to this problem is triangulation of data. In this study, data were collected from different sources and analyzed using different approaches, and member checks were conducted, thus reinforcing the outcomes of the analysis. The third limitation relates to the disciplines that I have chosen as "typical" representations of "soft" (EdR) and "hard" disciplines (LS). The study may have benefited from eliciting perspectives of faculty and students from other departments and/or the perspectives of the university's Senate members and deans. These limitations can be addressed in future research.

Implications for Research, Policy Development, and Pedagogy

Despite the few limitations, the study has important implications for research, policy development, and pedagogy. In attempting to understand the communicative purpose(s) of the AIP and how the purpose(s) is(are) translated into the Policy uptake(s), it has become apparent that this is only possible in considering the context in which the AIP is situated. Therefore, considering the context in which texts such as the AIP are

situated is paramount for future studies.

As I have argued, understanding what is and is not plagiarism is complex, disciplinary, and occasionally subjective. By taking this understanding of plagiarism into consideration, future research can continue to unpack how institutions and individuals interpret plagiarism and implement policy rules. Future research could investigate how other departments, disciplines, administrators, and/or universities take up the notion of plagiarism. Future discussions of plagiarism could also benefit from a longitudinal study that would examine how novices' and experts' interpretations of plagiarism progress throughout their academic careers. Future research could also replicate the study presented in this thesis at another tertiary institution that has a policy that considers the complexity of textual borrowing and student intention in using different types of textual borrowing in their papers to see if discourse community members' interpretations of plagiarism are similar or different from the findings that emerged from the current study.

Based on the findings that emerged from the study, a number of suggestions for policy revision can also be made. First, the Policy can be reassessed from a bottom-up approach. That is, while the Senate committee on academic integrity did construct the Policy with the input of faculty members, it might be beneficial to consider perspectives of other professors as well as students when creating the institutional view of academic misconduct, and, in particular, the definition of and response to plagiarism. Similarly, findings from this study and previous research (e.g., Pecorari, 2008) suggest broadening the definition of plagiarism beyond the one-size-fits-all approach to take into account a) the student's intention in borrowing undocumented text from other sources and b) the intertextual nature of writing. By broadening the definition of plagiarism, NAU's AIP

might be able to better account for the alternative uptakes of the Policy. This could be achieved by adopting suggestions from previous researchers such as Pecorari and Shaw's (2012) four-part typology of intertextuality. By differentiating between two types of acceptable intertextuality (i.e., indirect and conventional) and two types of unacceptable (i.e., unconventional and deceptive) intertextuality, the revised Policy may provide professors with more choices for identifying cases of undocumented (or inappropriately documented) textual borrowing. In the Policy, each type of intertextuality could specify what may be identified as a particular type of textual borrowing, and what possible consequences such borrowing may lead to. For example, perhaps unconventional intertextuality could be labelled as borrowing text without proper referencing, a type of intertextuality that is not always considered to be intentional. Then, the Policy could specify that this type of intertextuality generally results in a meeting with the professor (i.e., teaching moment). However, if the issue persists, the student will be sent to the dean for possible sanction. By redefining plagiarism in terms of different types of intertextuality, the Policy in turn may allow professors to address less serious cases of inappropriately documented borrowing internally, thus allowing for students (novices) to be viewed as developing writers who make textual borrowing mistakes as they learn how to be productive members of their disciplinary discourse community.

As well, the study has pedagogical implications. First, in addressing the perceived needs of students and taking into account suggestions from professor participants, it may be useful for NAU to develop plagiarism workshops for both students and professors. Workshops could assist in clarifying definitions of plagiarism and offering ways to avoid it through writing activities and discussions. Another suggestion is to build on students'

interpretation of plagiarism so as to raise their awareness of the intertextual nature of academic writing and appropriate textual borrowing practices. This could be achieved by focusing on the positive and productive aspects of intertextuality rather than on the negative forms described in the Policy and course outline statements. By focusing on what students can do appropriately rather than what they are doing wrong, we may be able to reframe plagiarism from a metaphorical “crime” to the manifestation of the stages in students’ learning of the writing practices of their disciplines.

References

- Ashworth, P., Bannister, P., & Thorne, P. (1997). Guilty in whose eyes? University students' perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in academic work and assessment. *Studies in Higher Education*, 22, 187-203.
- Askehave, I. (1999). Communicative purpose as genre determinant. *Hermes*, 23, 13-23.
- Askehave, I., & Swales, J. M. (2001). Genre identification and communicative purpose: A problem and a possible solution. *Applied Linguistics*, 22, 195-212.
- Atkinson, T. N. (2008). Textual mapping of imitation and intertextuality in college and university mission statements: A new institutional perspective. *Semiotica*, 361-387.
- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford university press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986). The problem of speech genres. In C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Eds.) & V.W. McGee (Trans.), *Speech genres and other late essays* (pp.60-92). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bastian, H. (2015). Capturing individual uptake: Toward a disruptive research methodology. *Composition Forum*, 31. Retrieved from <http://compositionforum.com/issue/31/individual-uptake.php>.
- Bawarshi, A. (2008). Genres as forms of in(ter)vention. In C. Eisner & M. Vicinus (Eds.), *Originality, imitation, and plagiarism: Teaching writing in the digital age*. (pp. 79 - 89). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Bawarshi, A. (2015). Accounting for genre performances: Why uptake matters. In N. Artemeva & A. Freedman (Eds.), *Genre studies around the globe: Beyond the three traditions*. (pp. 186-205). Edmonton, AB: Inkshed.
- Bawarshi, A., & Reiff, M. J. (2010). *Genre: An introduction to history, theory, research, and pedagogy*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press and the WAC Clearinghouse.
- Bazerman, C. (1980). A relationship between reading and writing: The conversational model. *College English*, 41, 656-661.
- Bazerman, C. (1995). *The informed writer: Using sources in the disciplines*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Bazerman, C. (2004). Intertextuality: How texts rely on other texts. In C. Bazerman & P. Prior (Eds.), *What writing does and how it does it: An introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices* (p. 83-96). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bennett, K. K., Behrendt, L. S., & Boothby, J. L. (2011). Instructor perceptions of plagiarism: Are we finding common ground? *Teaching of Psychology*, 38, 29-35.
- Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. N. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication: Cognition/culture/power*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. London: Longman.
- Biber, D., Connor, U., & Upton, T. A. (2007). *Discourse on the move: Using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Borg, E. (2003). Discourse community. *ELT Journal*, 57, 398-400.
- Borg, E. (2009). Local plagiarisms. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 34, 415-426.

- Bouville, M. (2008). Plagiarism: Words and ideas. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 14, 311-322.
- Bradley, C. (2011). *Plagiarism Education and Prevention: A subject-driven case-based approach*. Oxford: Chandos.
- Briggs, R. (2003). Shameless! Reconceiving the problem of plagiarism. *Australian Universities' Review*, 46, 19-23.
- Bruffee, K. A. (1986). Social construction, language, and the authority of knowledge: A bibliographical essay. *College English*, 773-790.
- Buranen, L., & Stephenson, D. (2009). Collaborative authorship in the sciences: Anti-ownership and citation practices in chemistry and biology. In C. Haviland & J. Mullin (Eds.), *Who owns this text? Plagiarism, authorship, and disciplinary cultures* (pp. 49-79). Logan, UT: Utah University State Press.
- Burke, K. (1973). *The philosophy of literary form: Studies in symbolic action*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Cargill, M., & O'Connor, P. (2013). *Writing scientific research articles: Strategy and steps*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Blackwell.
- Chandrasoma, R., Thompson, C., & Pennycook, A. (2004). Beyond plagiarism: Transgressive and nontransgressive intertextuality. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 3, 171-193.
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Devlin, M., & Gray, K. (2007). In their own words: A qualitative study of the reasons Australian university students plagiarize. *High Education Research & Development*, 26, 181-198.

- Dias, P., Freedman, A., Medway, P., & Paré, A. (1999). *Worlds apart: Acting and writing in academic and workplace contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dowdey, D. (1992). Citation and documentation across the curriculum. In M. Secor & D. Charney (Eds.), *Constructing rhetorical education* (pp. 330-351). Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dressen-Hammouda, D. (2014). Measuring the voice of disciplinarity in scientific writing: A longitudinal exploration of experienced writers in geology. *English for Specific Purposes*, 34, 14-25.
- Emmons, K. (2008). "All on the List": Uptake in Talk about Depression. In B. Heiffron & S. Brown (Eds.), *Rhetoric of Health Care: A New Disciplinary Inquiry* (pp.159-180). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Emmons, K. (2009). Uptake and the Biomedical Subject. In B. Bazerman, A. Bonini, & D. Figueiredo (Eds.), *Genre in the Changing World* (pp. 134-157). West Lafayette, IN: Parlor.
- Flint, A., Clegg, S., & Macdonald, R. (2006). Exploring staff perceptions of student plagiarism. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 30, 145-156.
- Freadman, A. (1994). Anyone for tennis? In A. Freedman & P. Medway (Eds.), *Genre and the new rhetoric* (pp. 43–66). London: Taylor & Francis.
- Freadman, A. (2002). Uptakes. In R. Coe, L. Lingard, & T. Teslenko. (Eds.), *The rhetoric and ideology of genre: Strategies for stability and change*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

- Freedman, A., & Medway, P. (1994). Locating genre studies: Antecedents and prospects. In A. Freedman & P. Medway (Eds.), *Genre and the new rhetoric* (pp. 1–22). London: Taylor & Francis.
- Giltrow, J., Gooding, R., Burgoyne, D., & Sawatsky, M. (2014). *Academic writing: An introduction* (3rd edition). Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press
- Gullifer, J., & Tyson, G. A. (2010). Exploring university students' perceptions of plagiarism: A focus group study. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35, 463-481.
- Haviland, C. P., & Mullin, J. A. (2009). Introduction: Connecting plagiarism, intellectual property, and disciplinary habits. In C. P. Haviland & J. A. Mullin (Eds.), *Who owns this text? Plagiarism, authorship, and disciplinary cultures* (pp. 1- 19). Utah: Utah University State Press.
- Holmes, R. (1997). Genre analysis, and the social sciences: An investigation of the structure of research article discussion sections in three disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16, 321-337.
- Howard, R. M. (1993). A plagiarism pentimento. *Journal of Teaching Writing*, 11, 233-245.
- Howard, R. M. (1995). Plagiarisms, authorships, and the academic death penalty. *College English*, 57, 788-806.
- Howard, R. M. (1999). The new abolitionism comes to plagiarism. In L. Buranen & A. M. Roy (Eds.), *Perspectives on plagiarism and intellectual property in a postmodern world*, (pp. 87-95). New York: State University of New York Press.

- Howard, R. M., & Robillard, A. E. (2008). Introduction: Plagiarisms. In R. M. Howard & A. E. Robillard (Eds.), *Pluralizing plagiarism: Identities, contexts, pedagogies* (pp. 1-7). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Howard, R. M., Serviss, T., & Rodrigue, T. K. (2010). Writing from sources, writing from sentences. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 2, 177-192.
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Hyland, K. (2006). Disciplinary differences: Language variation in academic discourses. In K. Hyland & M. Bondi (Eds.), *Academic discourse across disciplines* (pp. 17-45). New York: Peter Lang.
- Hyland, K., & Sancho-Guinda, C. (2012). Introduction: A context-sensitive approach to stance and voice. In K. Hyland & C. S. Guinda (Eds.), *Stance and voice in written academic genres* (pp. 1-11). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hyon, S. (1996). Genre in three traditions: Implications for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, 693-722.
- Jamieson, S. (2008). One size does not fit all: Plagiarism across the curriculum. In R. Moore-Howard & A. E. Robillard (Eds.), *Pluralizing plagiarism: Identities, contexts, pedagogies* (pp. 77-91). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Kaktiņš, L. (2014). Appraising plagiarism policies of Australian universities. *Text & Talk*, 34, 117-141.
- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24, 269-292.
- King, N. (1998). Template analysis. In G. Symon & C. Cassell (Eds.), *Qualitative*

- methods and analysis in organizational research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in language: A semiotic approach to literature and art*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Li, Y. (2013). Text-Based plagiarism in scientific publishing: Issues, developments and education. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 19, 1241-1254.
- Marshall, S., & Garry, M. (2005, December). How well do students really understand plagiarism. In *Proceedings of the 22nd annual conference of the Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education (ASCILITE)* (pp. 457-467).
- Maruca, L. (2003). Plagiarism and its (disciplinary) discontents: Towards an interdisciplinary theory and pedagogy. *Issues in Integrative Studies*, 21, 74-97.
- Maxwell, J. A., & Miller, B. A. (2008). Categorizing and connecting strategies in qualitative data analysis. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Handbook of emergent methods* (pp. 461-477). New York: Guilford.
- McCabe, D. L. (1993). Faculty responses to academic dishonesty: The influence of student honor codes. *Research in Higher Education*, 34, 647-658.
- McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1997). Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: A multi-campus investigation. *Research in Higher Education*, 38, 379-396.
- McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11, 219-232.
- McCormick, F. (1989). The Plagiario and the professor in our peculiar institution. *Journal of Teaching Writing*, 8, 133-146.

- North American University⁵ (2015). *Academic Integrity Policy*. Retrieved from confidential source.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miller, C. R. (1984). Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70, 151-167.
- Myers, G. (1990). *Writing biology: Texts in the social construction of scientific knowledge*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Oide, S., Moeder, W., Krasnoff, S., Gibson, D., Haas, H., Yoshioka, K., & Turgeon, B. G. (2006). NPS6, encoding a nonribosomal peptide synthetase involved in siderophore-mediated iron metabolism, is a conserved virulence determinant of plant pathogenic ascomycetes. *The Plant Cell*, 18, 2836-2853.
- Paré, A., & Smart, G. (1994). Observing genres in action: Towards a research methodology. In A. Freedman & P. Medway (Eds.), *Genre and the new rhetoric* (pp. 146 -154). London: Taylor & Francis.
- Park, C. (2003). In other (people's) words: Plagiarism by university students--literature and lessons. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28, 471-488.
- Park, C. (2004). Rebels without a clause: Towards an institutional framework for dealing with plagiarism by students. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 28, 291-306.
- Pecorari, D. (2001). Plagiarism and international students: How the English-speaking university responds. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies*:

⁵ All identifying information has been removed to protect the identity of the institution and participants.

- Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 229-245). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Pecorari, D. (2008). *Academic writing and plagiarism: A linguistic analysis*. New York: Continuum.
- Pecorari, D. (2015). Plagiarism in second language writing: Is it time to close the case? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 30, 94-99.
- Pecorari, D., & Shaw, P. (2012). Types of student intertextuality and faculty attitudes. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 149-164.
- Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. *TESOL quarterly*, 30, 201-230.
- Pho, P. D. (2008). Research article abstracts in applied linguistics and educational technology: A study of linguistic realizations of rhetorical structure and authorial stance. *Discourse Studies*, 10, 231-250.
- Pincus, H. S., & Schmelkin, L. P. (2003). Faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty: A multidimensional scaling analysis. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 74, 196-209.
- Power, L. G. (2009). University students' perceptions of plagiarism. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80, 643-662.
- Price, M. (2002). Beyond "gotcha!": Situating plagiarism in policy and pedagogy. *College Composition and Communication*, 54, 88-115.
- Prior, P. (1998). *Writing/disciplinarity: A sociohistoric account of literate activity in the academy*. Mahwah, NJ: Routledge.
- Prior, P. (2001). Voices in text, mind, and society: Sociohistoric accounts of discourse acquisition and use. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 55-81.

- Roig, M. (1997). Can undergraduate students determine whether text has been plagiarized? *The Psychological Record*, 47, 113-122.
- Roig, M. (2001). Plagiarism and paraphrasing criteria of college and university professors. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11, 307-323.
- Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Samraj, B., & Monk, L. (2008). The statement of purpose in graduate program applications: Genre structure and disciplinary variation. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27, 193-211.
- Shi, L. (2010). Textual appropriation and citing behaviors of university undergraduates. *Applied Linguistics*, 31, 1-24.
- Sutherland-Smith, W. (2011). Crime and punishment: An analysis of university plagiarism policies. *Semiotica*, 187, 127-139.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M. (1998). *Other floors, other voices: A textography of a small university building*. New York: Routledge.
- Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Exploration and application*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M. (2016). Reflections on the concept of discourse community. *ASp. la revue du GERAS*, 69, 7-19.
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2004). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Tachino, T. (2012). Theorizing uptake and knowledge mobilization: A case for intermediary genre. *Written Communication*, 29, 455-476.
- Tardy, C. (2012). Current conceptions of voice. In K. Hyland & C. S. Guinda (Eds.), *Stance and voice in written academic genres* (pp. 34-48). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tessuto, G. (2015). Generic structure and rhetorical moves in English-language empirical law research articles: Sites of interdisciplinary and interdiscursive cross-over. *English for Specific Purposes*, 37, 13-26.
- Vessal, K., & Habibzadeh, F. (2007). Rules of the game of scientific writing: Fair play and plagiarism. *The Lancet*, 369, 641.
- Weber-Wulff, D. (2014). *False feathers: A perspective on academic plagiarism*. New York: Springer.
- Wilkinson, J. (2009). Staff and student perceptions of plagiarism and cheating. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20, 98-105.
- Yancy, K. B. (2008). Beyond plagiarism. In R. M. Howard & A. E. Robillard (Eds.), *Pluralizing plagiarism: Identities, contexts, pedagogies* (pp. 158-170). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Yang, W. (2015). "Call for papers": Analysis of the schematic structure and lexico-grammar of CFPs for academic conferences. *English for Specific Purposes*, 37, 39-51.
- Yeo, S. (2007). First-year university science and engineering students' understanding of plagiarism. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 26, 199-216.

Appendices

Appendix A: Ethics Clearance for Researcher's Home Institution⁶

Carleton University
Research Ethics Office
Research Ethics Board
511 Tory, 1125 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6 Canada
Tel: 613-520-2517, ethics@carleton.ca

Ethics Clearance Form – New Clearance

This is to certify that the Carleton University Research Ethics Board has examined the application for ethical clearance. The REB found the research project to meet appropriate ethical standards as outlined in the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Human*, 2nd edition, and the *Carleton University Policies and Procedures for the Ethical Conduct of Research*.

Date of Clearance: September 21, 2015

Researcher: Guillaume Gentil (Primary Investigator)

Lindsay Cowley (Student Research: Master's Student)

Natalia Artemeva (Research Supervisor)

Department: Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences\Linguistics and Applied Language Studies (School of)

University: Carleton University

Research Supervisor (if applicable): Prof. Guillaume Gentil

Project Number: 103533

Project Title: Unpacking the 'One Size Fits All' Definition of Plagiarism: Exploring Students' and Professors Perceptions of Plagiarism in [REDACTED]

Funder (if applicable): N/A

Clearance Expires: September 21, 2016

All researchers are governed by the following conditions:

Annual Status Report: You are required to submit an Annual Status Report to either renew clearance or close the file. Failure to submit the Annual Status Report will result in the immediate suspension of the project. Funded projects will have accounts suspended until the report is submitted and approved.

Changes to the project: Any changes to the project must be submitted to the Carleton University Research Ethics Board for approval. All changes must be approved prior to the continuance of the research.

Adverse events: Should a participant suffer adversely from their participation in the project you are required to report the matter to the Carleton University Research Ethics Board. You must submit a written record of the event and indicate what steps you have taken to resolve the situation.

Suspension or termination of clearance: Failure to conduct the research in accordance with the principles of the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*, 2nd edition and the *Carleton University Policies and Procedures for the Ethical Conduct of Research* may result in the suspension or termination of the research project.

Louise Heslop

Chair, Carleton University Research Ethics Board

Andy Adler

Vice-Chair, Carleton University Research Ethics Board

⁶ Information has been redacted to protect the identities of the study participants.

Appendix B: Academic Integrity Policy Sections

I INTRODUCTION

NAU is a community of scholars dedicated to teaching, learning and research. Sound scholarship rests on a shared commitment to academic integrity based on principles of honesty, trust, respect, fairness and responsibility. Academic misconduct, in any form, is ultimately destructive to the values of the University. Conduct by any person that adversely affects academic integrity at NAU is a serious matter. The University demands, unequivocally, academic integrity from all of its members, including students. Misconduct in scholarly activity will not be tolerated.

The Academic Integrity Policy is concerned with student academic integrity. The integrity of a student's academic work is critical to enabling student success. Students who violate the principles of academic integrity undermine the quality of their education and the value of a NAU degree.

II SCOPE

The Academic Integrity Policy:

- describes those actions and behaviours which violate NAU's standards of academic integrity;
- defines the responsibilities of various offices and individuals in upholding the policy;
- specifies the procedures and processes to be followed when an allegation of violating these standards has been made against a student;
- specifies the sanctions that may be applied to a student who has been found to have violated these standards; and,
- describes the appeal and petition processes open to students who feel they have not been treated fairly under this policy.

It is our goal to ensure that all involved in student academic integrity at NAU are treated in a fair, transparent and consistent manner.

This policy applies to all students as defined by this Policy. Any student who violates the standards of academic integrity set out in this policy will be subject to appropriate sanctions.

VI ACADEMIC INTEGRITY STANDARDS

Effective adherence to academic integrity requires that students understand the meaning of academic misconduct. The following list describes conduct that violates standards of academic integrity, which may lead to the imposition of sanctions pursuant to this Policy. It is important to note that this is neither a comprehensive nor a mutually exclusive list and should not be viewed as exhaustive.

1. Plagiarism

Plagiarism is presenting, whether intentionally or not, the ideas, expression of ideas, or work of others as one's own.

Plagiarism includes reproducing or paraphrasing portions of someone else's published or unpublished material, regardless of the source, and presenting these as one's own without proper citation or reference to the original source. Examples of sources from which the ideas, expressions of ideas or works of others may be drawn from include but are not limited to: books, articles, papers, literary compositions and phrases, performance compositions, chemical compounds, art works, laboratory reports, research results, calculations and the results of calculations, diagrams, constructions, computer reports, computer code/software, and material on the internet.

Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to:

- submitting a take-home examination, essay, laboratory report or other assignment written, in whole or in part, by someone else;
- using ideas or direct, verbatim quotations, paraphrased material, algorithms, formulae, scientific or mathematical concepts, or ideas without appropriate acknowledgment in any academic assignment;
- using another's data or research findings;
- submitting a computer program developed in whole or in part by someone else, with or without modifications, as one's own
- failing to acknowledge sources through the use of proper citations when using another's work and/or failing to use quotations marks.

VII PROCEDURES

1. Alleged Violation

Instructors, advisors and/or supervisors must report all suspected cases of violation of this Policy to the Faculty Dean.

All evidence relevant to the alleged violation should be sent to the relevant Faculty Dean's office responsible for administering the course in which the alleged violation took place within five (5) working days after the discovery of the evidence. In academic units

where consultation with the Chair (or delegate) is required, instructors will forward all appropriate documentation to the Chair who will, upon his/her judgment, forward it to the relevant Dean's office within five (5) working days after receiving it from the instructor.

The Dean may advise the instructor to record a grade of GNA (grade not available) on the Final

Grade Report. The grade of GNA will be replaced by an appropriate grade once the allegation has been resolved.

VIII SANCTIONS

The Faculty Dean may apply any one or any combination of the following sanctions if, after hearing the student's response to the alleged violation, the Faculty Dean is satisfied that a violation of this Policy has occurred.

Factors that may impact the sanction include:

- any record of previous violations,
- the seriousness of the violation
- the relative weight of the work,
- the student's year standing,
- the rehabilitative benefit of the sanction
- any mitigating circumstances

In the case of graduate students, consideration of the student's year standing in the graduate program and the work in which the violation occurred (e.g. an M.A. course paper versus a comprehensive examination) may affect the sanction assigned.

Recommendations by supervisory committee members may also be considered.

Sanctions may be used independently or in combination for any single violation.

Sanctions that may be imposed by the Faculty Dean

1. A written reprimand.
2. Requirement to remain registered in the course in which the violation occurred.
3. Completion of a remediation process. Completion of a remediation process may be either a sanction of its own accord or may be used to reduce a more severe sanction. Examples of remediation are attendance at a Writing Tutorial or study skills workshop, completion of an academic integrity computer tutorial or the submission of a new assignment for grading.
4. Resubmission of the piece of academic work in which the violation was committed, for evaluation with or without a grade penalty.
5. Assignment of a reduced grade (including a grade of zero or a failing grade) for the

piece of academic work in respect of which the violation was committed.

6. Assignment of a reduction of the final grade in the course in respect of which the violation was committed.
7. Assignment of a grade of unsatisfactory or failure for the course in respect of which the violation was committed.
8. Restitution of costs incurred by the University as a result of the violation of this policy.
9. Withdrawal from the course in respect of which the violation was committed. In certain cases, the Dean may decide that the student will not be allowed to enroll in the course again for up to three (3) terms.
10. An additional requirement of a maximum of 1.0 credit added to the student's program of studies.
11. Registration limited to a specified number of credits per term for up to three (3) terms.
12. Suspension for up to three (3) terms, normally beginning with the next academic term after the final decision has been made. Students are allowed to complete courses that are ongoing at the time of the decision but will be withdrawn from any courses in which they have registered and which would begin during the suspension.

Additional Sanctions that may be Recommended to the Provost by the Faculty Dean

1. Recommendation to the Provost that a student be suspended for more than three terms normally beginning with the next academic term after the penalty is assigned.
As part of a suspension imposed by the Provost, the student may be required to withdraw, without academic penalty, from courses unrelated to the violation, that were ongoing at the time of the imposition of the suspension. Students will be withdrawn from any courses in which they have registered and which would begin during the suspension. The Dean should clearly indicate if the recommendation includes a transcript notation.
2. Recommendation to the Provost that the student be expelled from the University with a corresponding transcript notation.
3. Recommendation to the Provost for rescission or suspension of one or more degrees, diplomas or certificates obtained by any student with a corresponding transcript notation.
4. Recommendation that a notation be added to the student's transcript.

Additional Sanctions that may be imposed by the Provost on Recommendation of the Faculty Dean.

1. Suspension for more than three (3) terms, normally beginning with the next academic term after the final decision has been made. Student may be required to withdraw, without academic penalty, from courses unrelated to the violation, that were ongoing at the time of the imposition of the suspension. Students will be withdrawn from any courses in which they have registered and which would begin during the suspension.
2. In the case of suspension for more than three (3) terms, the Provost may determine that

a notation be placed on the student's transcript in the form as set out in this policy. The notation may be permanent or for a limited period. In the case of a limited period, the notation shall be removed at the expiry of the set time limit.

3. Expulsion from the University with a notation on the transcript.
4. A notation may be added to the student's transcript.

Sanctions that may be Recommended to Senate Executive by the Provost

1. The rescission or suspension of one or more degrees, diplomas or certificates obtained by any graduate who, while enrolled at the University, committed any violation of this Policy.

Sanctions that may be Imposed by Senate Executive on Recommendation of the Provost

1. On recommendation of the Provost, rescission or suspension of one or more degrees, diplomas or certificates. In this event, a notation will be made on the student's transcript pursuant to Part IX.

Appendix C: COPS Corpus 10 Examples

(1) CO1_A4_F14:

Plagiarism must of course be avoided – i.e. presenting the work or ideas of another as one's own by copying from an author's work without proper referencing and quotation, using others' ideas or extensive paraphrasing without acknowledging the source, or submitting the work of another as one's own. Plagiarism is a serious offence, and must be reported to the faculty Dean's office.

(2) CO2_A1_F14:

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND PLAGIARISM

The University Senate defines plagiarism as “presenting, whether intentionally or not, the ideas, expression of ideas or work of others as one's own.” This can include:

- reproducing or paraphrasing portions of someone else's published or unpublished material, regardless of the source, and presenting these as one's own without proper citation or reference to the original source;
- submitting a take-home examination, essay, laboratory report or other assignment written, in whole or in part, by someone else;
- using ideas or direct, verbatim quotations, or paraphrased material, concepts, or ideas without appropriate acknowledgment in any academic assignment;
- using another's data or research findings;
- failing to acknowledge sources through the use of proper citations when using another's works and/or failing to use quotation marks;
- handing in "substantially the same piece of work for academic credit more than once without prior written permission of the course instructor in which the submission occurs."

Plagiarism is a serious offence which cannot be resolved directly with the course's instructor. The Associate Dean of the Faculty conducts a rigorous investigation, including an interview with the student, when an instructor suspects a piece of work has been plagiarized. Penalties are not trivial. They can include a final grade of "F" for the course. The University's Academic Integrity Policy can be accessed at...⁷

(3) CO3_A1_W15:

Academic integrity and plagiarism

In all written work, students must avoid plagiarism, i.e. presenting the work or ideas of another as one's own. Forms of plagiarism include copying from the work of another author without proper use of citations, references, and quotation marks; using the ideas of others without acknowledging the source, extensive paraphrasing; or submitting the work of another as one's own. Plagiarism is a serious offence, which will be reported to the Office of the Dean of the appropriate Faculty. Students are advised to consult the Undergraduate Calendar for further information on Instructional Offences.

⁷ Link to institution's AIP has been removed due to confidentiality concerns.

(4) CO4_A3_F13:

Plagiarism

The University Senate defines plagiarism as “*presenting, whether intentionally or not, the ideas, expression of ideas or work of others as one’s own.*” This can include:

- reproducing or paraphrasing portions of someone else’s published or unpublished material, regardless of the source, and presenting these as one’s own without proper citation or reference to the original source;
- submitting a take-home examination, essay, laboratory report or other assignment written, in whole or in part, by someone else;
- using ideas or direct, verbatim quotations, or paraphrased material, concepts, or ideas without appropriate acknowledgment in any academic assignment;
- using another’s data or research findings;
- failing to acknowledge sources through the use of proper citations when using another’s works and/or failing to use quotation marks;
- handing in "substantially the same piece of work for academic credit more than once without prior written permission of the course instructor in which the submission occurs."

Plagiarism is a serious offence that cannot be resolved directly with the course’s instructor. The Associate Dean of the Faculty conducts a rigorous investigation, including an interview with the student, when an instructor suspects a piece of work has been plagiarized. Penalties are not trivial. They can include a final grade of "F" for the course.

(5) CO5_A3_F13:

Plagiarism

The policy can be found at...

The University Senate defines plagiarism as “*presenting, whether intentionally or not, the ideas, expression of ideas or work of others as one’s own.*” This can include:

- reproducing or paraphrasing portions of someone else’s published or unpublished material, regardless of the source, and presenting these as one’s own without proper citation or reference to the original source;
- submitting a take-home examination, essay, laboratory report or other assignment written, in whole or in part, by someone else;
- using ideas or direct, verbatim quotations, or paraphrased material, concepts, or ideas without appropriate acknowledgment in any academic assignment;
- using another’s data or research findings;
- failing to acknowledge sources through the use of proper citations when using another’s works and/or failing to use quotation marks;
- handing in "substantially the same piece of work for academic credit more than once without prior written permission of the course instructor in which the submission occurs."

Plagiarism is a serious offence which cannot be resolved directly with the course’s instructor. The Associate Deans of the Faculty conduct a rigorous investigation, including an interview with the student, when an instructor suspects a piece of work has been plagiarized. Penalties are not trivial. They include a mark of zero for the plagiarized work or a final grade of "F" for the course.

(6) CO1_B2_F15:

The assignment you turn in must be your own work in your own words. If two or more people have effectively the same answers, I will send your papers to the dean for adjudication of possible plagiarism. Transcription of somebody else's written or spoken words without quotation marks or without citation to the original source constitutes plagiarism. Failure to include quotation marks (or other distinguishing marks) and a full citation constitutes a *prima facie* violation of the university's academic integrity policy, which will be immediately referred to the dean for adjudication. Copying of someone else's words but then substituting half of the words therein also constitutes a *prima facie* case of plagiarism. See the *Guardian's* hilarious article about "sinister buttocks" (here) for what this might entail, and note that this still would be sent to the dean as a presumptive case of plagiarism.

(6) CO3_B3_F10:

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the attempt to pass off another person's writings, images or ideas as your own work. In the context of this course, the most common form of plagiarism is using somebody else's completed assignment (or their code) to help complete your own. This is a big no, no. I'm happy that you work together during labs, but you must work independently for assignments. Plagiarism is a serious offense and is subject to University policy regarding Instructional Offenses (see the section on Academic Standing and Conduct in the front of the Undergraduate Calendar). If there is clear evidence of plagiarism, then a mark of F will be awarded. Any questions or concerns regarding this issue should be brought to me.

(7) CO4_B3_F15:

Instructional Offenses:

Cheating on quizzes and midterms and plagiarism are serious instructional offenses and will not be tolerated. Allegations of instructional offense will be referred to the Dean of Science.

(8) CO5_B1_W07:

Statement on Academic Ethics

You are expected to follow the Academic Regulations of the University. In particular, pay attention to Section E. Student Conduct.

If you are not sure about the definition of cheating, come and see me, and I will explain it to you.

(9) CO6_B2_F07:

Plagiarism is not tolerated in any form!!! A student suspected of plagiarism will be reported to the Dean of Science.

(10) CO7_B2_F10:

no statement on plagiarism

Appendix D: Recruitment Statement Posted on a Professor's Course Website

Hello Everyone,

My name is Lindsay Cowley and I am currently a Master's student. I am currently working on a research project under the supervision of Professor Guillaume Gentil and Professor Natasha Artemeva.

I writing to you today to invite you to participate in a research study that is part of my Master's thesis. The study focuses on perceptions of plagiarism in Education and Life Sciences⁸. The aim of the study is to examine and better understand professors' and students' beliefs about plagiarism in an academic context. I plan to compare students' and professors' perceptions within and between academic disciplines, as well as compare those perceptions to NAU's Academic Integrity Policy. Specifically, my study intends to investigate the influences of disciplinary values and beliefs on stakeholders' perceptions of plagiarism, and the extent to which the professors' and students' perceptions from differing disciplines align with each other as well as the Academic Integrity Policy.

Your participation in this study would involve one 45-60 minute focus group interview with two or three other students in your discipline, where you will answer questions regarding your beliefs about plagiarism and complete a short text-based scenario activity. If you would like to participate but for any reason cannot meet in person, I would be happy to interview you via Skype or by telephone.

I am not asking you about your personal experiences or details about whether or not you have plagiarized. Anything you say in the interview, specifically any admission of plagiarism, will be kept private, where only your fellow focus group participants and I will have heard your response. Any admission of plagiarism will not be used in the research or discussed after the interview.

No comments will be attributed to individuals and no record of your name will be kept in relation to your responses. Research data will only be accessible by my co-supervisors and myself; however, I will be the only person with access to the raw, uncoded audio-recordings. All research data, including audio-recordings, notes, and written documents will be kept on a password-protected computer.

If you would like to participate in this research project, or have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me by email, Lindsay.Cowley@carleton.ca. If you wish you may also contact my co-supervisors, Guillaume Gentil or Natasha Artemeva, through the School of Linguistics and Language Studies by email at Guillaume.Gentil@carleton.ca or Natasha.Artemeva@carleton.ca.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration.

⁸ Names of the disciplines have been changed to pseudonyms to protect the identity of participants

Appendix E: Individual Student Recruitment Forms

Name	Would you like to participate? (yes/no)	NAU Email Address	Best Day/Time to Participate

Appendix F: Text-Based Activity⁹

Instructions:

The activity presents four excerpts from hypothetical texts. The author of each text intends to publish and/or submit as an end of term project for grading. The underlined portion of the excerpt indicates text that has been borrowed from another source. Please read each text carefully and answer the following questions:

1. Do you think this example violates the Academic Integrity Policy? Explain
2. Does this example constitute plagiarism? Explain.

1. Nonribosomal peptide synthetases (NRPS) are multifunctional enzymes that make small peptides independently of the ribosomal protein synthesis machinery. To date, the NRPS method of peptide biosynthesis has been described mostly for filamentous ascomycete fungi and for bacteria and has not been shown to occur in plants.

2. A social constructionist perspective in any discipline assumes that what we normally call reality, knowledge, thought, and fact are constructs generated by communities of like-minded peers. According to Bruffee (1986), “social construction understands” these constructs as “community-generated entities that define or ‘constitute’ the community that generated them” (pp.777).

3. To identify NRPS genes five fungal strains were used: Cochliobolus heterostrophus C4 [MAT1-2; American Type Culture Collection 48331], Cochliobolus miyabeanus WK-1C (American Type Culture Collection 44560), Alternaria brassicicola Tf383 (a kind gift from Hiroshi Otani, Tottori University), Fusarium graminearum (Gibberella zeae) Gz3639 (Northern Regional Research Laboratory 29169), and Neurospora crassa 74-OR23-1A (FungalGenetics Stock Center 987)(4).

4. In recreating the Holmes (1997) study, thirty articles were selected for analysis, ten each from the disciplines of history, political science and sociology.

⁹ Depicted is a condensed version of the activity. Participants were provided with space to answer the questions on the activity sheet provided in the interview. Actual length, three pages.

Appendix G: Interview Guide

1. What kind of writing do you do in your courses?¹⁰
2. (a) How would you define plagiarism?
(b) What kind of things would fall under this category?
3. what do you think it means to use your own words? Or to tell students they must use their own words?
4. Are there department regulation which states you must include a statement on plagiarism/academic integrity in your course outlines? If yes, how strict is this policy? (Professors only)
4. Are you aware of any disciplinary differences in what constitute plagiarism? (Students only)
5. (a) With regards to textual borrowing/plagiarism, what do you think is acceptable?
(b) Is self-plagiarism acceptable?
6. (a) Do you think a writer can own language or an idea? Why/why not?
(b) If a writer can own an idea or language, at what point does it become public common knowledge?
7. What do you think is more important, original writing or original data? Why?
8. (a) Is there sections of a research article, or any other type of writing, where borrowing large chunks of other writers' work is acceptable? If yes, what are they?
(b) When/to what extent is it acceptable to borrow another writer's language or ideas?
9. What types of citation practices are prevalent in your discipline?
10. Are you familiar with the academic integrity policy?
11. Do you think the institutional Academic Integrity Policy appropriately captures your discipline's beliefs about plagiarism? Why/why not?
12. Is there anything else you would like to add? What should I have asked you that I didn't think to ask?

¹⁰ Question one was added to the interview protocol after the first two professor interviews to account for the recurring discussion of the types of writing students were required to produce.

Appendix H: Full Rhetorical Analysis of the Sanction Section of the AIP

Policy Text	Moves	Step
The Faculty Dean may apply any one or any combination of the following sanctions if, after hearing the student's response to the alleged violation, the Faculty Dean is satisfied that a violation of this Policy has occurred.	1: Justifying when sanctions are applied	1: Presenting sanctions as occurring after violation is confirmed
Factors that may impact the sanction include: any record of previous violations, the seriousness of the violation, the relative weight of the work, the student's year standing, the rehabilitative benefit of the sanction, any mitigating circumstances.	2: Describing Factors that influence the application of sanctions	1: Listing factors that could effect the sanction applied
In the case of graduate students, consideration of the student's year standing in the graduate program and the work in which the violation occurred (e.g. an M.A. course paper versus comprehensive examination) may affect the sanction assigned. Recommendations by supervisory committee members may also be considered.		2: Providing graduate student example
Sanctions may be used independently or in combination for any single violation.	3: Establishing possible sanctions for violation	1: Establish sanctions can be applied individually or combined
Sanctions that may be imposed by the Faculty Dean 1. A written reprimand. 2. Requirement to remain registered in the course in which the violation occurred. 3. Completion of a remediation process. Completion of a remediation process may be either a sanction of its own accord or may be used to reduce a more severe sanction. Examples of remediation are attendance at a Writing Tutorial or study skills workshop, completion of an academic integrity computer tutorial or the submission of a new assignment for grading. 4. Resubmission of the piece of academic work in which the violation was committed, for evaluation		2: Listing possible examples of sanctions that can be imposed

<p>with or without a grade penalty.</p> <p>5. Assignment of a reduced grade (including a grade of zero or a failing grade) for the piece of academic work in respect of which the violation was committed.</p> <p>6. Assignment of a reduction of the final grade in the course in respect of which the violation was committed.</p> <p>7. Assignment of a grade of unsatisfactory or failure for the course in respect of which the violation was committed.</p> <p>8. Restitution of costs incurred by the University as a result of the violation of this policy.</p> <p>9. Withdrawal from the course in respect of which the violation was committed. In certain cases, the Dean may decide that the student will not be allowed to enroll in the course again for up to three (3) terms.</p> <p>10. An additional requirement of a maximum of 1.0 credit added to the student's program of studies.</p> <p>11. Registration limited to a specified number of credits per term for up to three (3) terms.</p> <p>12. Suspension for up to three (3) terms, normally beginning with the next academic term after the final decision has been made. Students are allowed to complete courses that are ongoing at the time of the decision but will be withdrawn from any courses in which they have registered and which would begin during the suspension.</p>		
--	--	--

<p>Additional Sanctions that may be Recommended to the Provost by the Faculty Dean</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recommendation to the Provost that a student be suspended for more than three terms normally beginning with the next academic term after the penalty is assigned. As part of a suspension imposed by the Provost, the student may be required to withdraw, without academic penalty, from courses unrelated to the violation, that were ongoing at the time of the imposition of the suspension. Students will be withdrawn from any courses in which they have registered and which would begin during the suspension. The Dean should clearly indicate if the recommendation includes a transcript notation. 2. Recommendation to the Provost that the student be expelled from the University with a corresponding transcript notation. 3. Recommendation to the Provost for rescission or suspension of one or more degrees, diplomas or certificates obtained by any student with a corresponding transcript notation. 4. Recommendation that a notation be added to the student's transcript. 		<p>3: Listing possible examples of sanctions that can be recommended</p>
<p>Additional Sanctions that may be imposed by the Provost on Recommendation of the Faculty Dean.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Suspension for more than three (3) terms, normally beginning with the next academic term after the final decision has been made. Student may be required to withdraw, without academic penalty, from courses unrelated to the violation, that were ongoing at the time of the imposition of the suspension. Students will be withdrawn from any courses in which they have registered and which would begin during the suspension. 2. In the case of suspension for more than three (3) terms, the Provost may determine that a notation be placed on the student's transcript in the form as 		<p>2: Listing possible examples of sanctions that can be imposed</p>

<p>set out in this policy. The notation may be permanent or for a limited period. In the case of a limited period, the notation shall be removed at the expiry of the set time limit.</p> <p>3. Expulsion from the University with a notation on the transcript.</p> <p>4. A notation may be added to the student's transcript.</p>		
<p>Sanctions that may be Recommended to Senate Executive by the Provost</p> <p>1. The rescission or suspension of one or more degrees, diplomas or certificates obtained by any graduate who, while enrolled at the University, committed any violation of this Policy.</p>		<p>3: Listing possible examples of sanctions that can be recommended</p>
<p>Sanctions that may be Imposed by Senate Executive on Recommendation of the Provost</p> <p>1. On recommendation of the Provost, rescission or suspension of one or more degrees, diplomas or certificates. In this event, a notation will be made on the student's transcript pursuant to Part IX.</p>		<p>2: Listing possible examples of sanctions that can be imposed</p>