科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告
期末報告

<div style="border:1px solid black">

大學教師對於改述中的剽竊之觀感：以自然與社會科學為例

</div>

計 畫 類 別 ： 個別型計畫
計 畫 編 號 ： MOST 106-2410-H-343-013-
執 行 期 間 ： 106年09月01日至107年08月31日
執 行 單 位 ： 南華大學外國語文學系

計 畫 主 持 人 ： 游東道

計 畫 參 與 人 員 ： 大專生-兼任助理：廖俊堡

中 華 民 國 107 年 11 月 16 日

中 文 摘 要 ： 在英文學術寫作中，改述(paraphrasing)為一重要的寫作技巧。在學術寫作中，改述常與作者引用(citations)以及內文引用(quotations)搭配使用，主要目的為避免剽竊。但文獻顯示出，學術寫作者常常無法清楚的定義合法的改述。此外，自然科學領域與社會領域的學者對於原文改述的程度常常抱持著不同的標準與意見。正因為合法的改述定義不明，本研究旨在探索南台灣一所私立大學中不同領域的教師對於四個改述種類的意見。改述辨認測驗與訪談為本研究主要的兩種研究工具。該私立大學的自然科學與社會科學領域的各十位老師為本研究的研究對象。研究者將比較自然科學與社會科學領域教師對於這四種改述種類的意見，用以判斷兩個領域的教師對於改述中的剽竊是否有認知上的落差。此外，研究者將訪談所有二十位教師，以探詢他們對於剽竊的定義，以及他們如何教導學生避免剽竊。研究結果顯示不同領域教師對於四種改述種類觀感並無明顯差異，完整改寫(Substantial Revision)、適度改寫(Moderate Revision)與小幅改寫(Minimal Revision)皆為可接受的改述種類，而大幅照抄(Near Copy)則不可接受。而有許多大學教師甚至認為即使改述中含有大量原文中的文字，只要有作者引用(citations)就不算抄襲。兩個領域的教師對於作者引用的使用時機有不同意見。社會科學老師認為當使用了其他作者的概念(ideas)與文字(words)時，必須使用作者引用，而自然科學教師則認為只有當使用了其他作者的概念(ideas)時才需要引用。除了使用引用之外，大學老師亦會教導學生改述與其它方式以避免剽竊。但絕大多數老師對於改述並沒有一個準則，而有些老師的準則過於寬鬆，甚至可以接受在改述中照抄原文一個段落。缺乏改述準則的結果，可能導致大學教師過度仰賴引用來避免剽竊。

中文關鍵詞 ： 改述，改述種類，剽竊

英 文 摘 要 ： Paraphrase is an essential skill in writing for academic purposes. When properly used, paraphrasing is a means to avoid plagiarism, along with citations and quotations. However, paraphrasing is notoriously known as lacking commonly criteria for evaluating the acceptability. Also, scholars from the fields of natural sciences and social sciences might hold different opinions on the extent to which a source text should be paraphrased. Due to the ambiguous nature of paraphrases, the study attempts to explore how college teachers of different disciplines in a private university in Southern Taiwan perceive four paraphrase types. Data were collected from two sources, including an identification task and a semi-structured interview. Specifically, 10 college teachers of natural sciences and 10 teachers of social sciences were invited to identify the four paraphrase types, including Near Copy, Minimal Revision, Moderate Revision, and Substantial Revision. After the identification task, all the teachers were interviewed to express their opinions on paraphrasing and plagiarism. The results showed that no obvious

disciplinary differences were found in the teachers'
perceptions of plagiarism in the four paraphrase types.
Most of them agreed that Substantial Revision, Moderate
Revision and Minimal Revisions are acceptable paraphrase
types, while Near Copy is unacceptable. Many of the
teachers, regardless of their disciplines, stated that
poorly paraphrased texts are excused from plagiarizing, as
long as citations are given. With citations provided, one
has no deliberate intention to plagiarize. The disciplinary
differences were found in how teachers of different
disciplines viewed the borrowing of ideas and words from
some source texts. Teachers of social sciences believe that
both the words and ideas borrowed from a source text should
be acknowledged, while teachers of natural sciences insist
that only ideas, not words, borrowed from someone's work
should be acknowledged. That is, citations are needed only
when one borrows someone else's ideas. Further analysis of
the interview transcripts showed that citing is the primary
means for the teachers to prevent students from
plagiarizing, followed by paraphrasing and raising the
awareness of plagiarism. However, teachers had either no
criteria or loose criteria for the acceptability of
paraphrases, ranging from copying one complete sentence to
a whole paragraph. It is therefore assumed that the
teachers' overreliance on citations to avoid plagiarism
might be due to the lack of a complete and thorough
understanding about paraphrasing. Thus, it is suggested
that the role of paraphrasing in academic writing in Taiwan
needs to be reevaluated and foregrounded.

英文關鍵詞：Paraphrasing, paraphrase types, plagiarism

The Disciplinary Differences in College Teachers' Perceptions of Paraphrase Types and Plagiarism

Tung-tao Yu

Assistant professor, Department of Foreign Languages and Literature,

Nanhua University

Abstract

Paraphrase is an essential skill in writing for academic purposes. When properly used, paraphrasing is a means to avoid plagiarism, along with citations and quotations. However, paraphrasing is notoriously known as lacking commonly criteria for evaluating the acceptability. Also, scholars from the fields of natural sciences and social sciences might hold different opinions on the extent to which a source text should be paraphrased. Due to the ambiguous nature of paraphrases, the study attempts to explore how college teachers of different disciplines in a private university in Southern Taiwan perceive four paraphrase types. Data were collected from two sources, including an identification task and a semi-structured interview. Specifically, 10 college teachers of natural sciences and 10 teachers of social sciences were invited to identify the four paraphrase types, including Near Copy, Minimal Revision, Moderate Revision, and Substantial Revision. After the identification task, all the teachers were interviewed to express their opinions on paraphrasing and plagiarism. The results showed that no obvious disciplinary differences were found in the teachers' perceptions of plagiarism in the four paraphrase types. Most of them agreed that Substantial Revision, Moderate Revision and Minimal Revisions are acceptable paraphrase types, while Near Copy is unacceptable. Many of the teachers, regardless of their disciplines, stated that poorly paraphrased texts are excused from plagiarizing, as long as citations are given. With citations provided, one has no deliberate intention to plagiarize. The disciplinary differences were found in how teachers of different disciplines viewed the borrowing of ideas and words from some source texts. Teachers of social sciences believe that both the words and ideas borrowed from a source text should be acknowledged, while teachers of natural sciences insist that only ideas, not words, borrowed from someone's work should be acknowledged. That is, citations are needed only when one borrows someone else's ideas. Further analysis of the interview transcripts showed that citing is the primary means for the teachers to prevent students from plagiarizing, followed by paraphrasing and raising the awareness of plagiarism. However, teachers had either no criteria or loose criteria for the acceptability of paraphrases, ranging from copying one complete sentence to a whole paragraph. It is therefore assumed that the teachers' overreliance on citations to

avoid plagiarism might be due to the lack of a complete and thorough understanding about paraphrasing. Thus, it is suggested that the role of paraphrasing in academic writing in Taiwan needs to be reevaluated and foregrounded.

Key Words: Paraphrasing, paraphrase types, plagiarism

大學教師對於改述中的剽竊之觀感:以自然與社會科學領域教師為例

游東道
南華大學外國語文學系助理教授

中文摘要

在英文學術寫作中，改述(paraphrasing)為一重要的寫作技巧。在學術寫作中，改述常與作者引用(citations)以及內文引用(quotations)搭配使用，主要目的為避免剽竊。但文獻顯示出，學術寫作者常常無法清楚的定義合法的改述。此外，自然科學領域與社會領域的學者對於原文改述的程度常常抱持著不同的標準與意見。正因為合法的改述定義不明，本研究旨在探索南台灣一所私立大學中不同領域的教師對於四個改述種類的意見。改述辨認測驗與訪談為本研究主要的兩種研究工具。該私立大學的自然科學與社會科學領域的各十位老師為本研究的研究對象。研究者將比較自然科學與社會科學領域教師對於這四種改述種類的意見，用以判斷兩個領域的教師對於改述中的剽竊是否有認知上的落差。此外，研究者將訪談所有二十位教師，以探詢他們對於剽竊的定義，以及他們如何教導學生避免剽竊。研究結果顯示不同領域教師對於四種改述種類觀感並無明顯差異，完整改寫(Substantial Revision)、適度改寫(Moderate Revision)與小幅改寫(Minimal Revision)皆為可接受的改述種類，而大幅照抄(Near Copy)則不可接受。而有許多大學教師甚至認為即使改述中含有大量原文中的文字，只要有作者引用(citations)就不算抄襲。兩個領域的教師對於作者引用的使用時機有不同意見。社會科學老師認為當使用了其他作者的概念(ideas)與文字(words)時，必須使用作者引用，而自然科學教師則認為只有當使用了其他作者的概念(ideas)時才需要引用。除了使用引用之外，大學老師亦會教導學生改述與其它方式以避免剽竊。但絕大多數老師對於改述並沒有一個準則，而有些老師的準則過於寬鬆，甚至可以接受在改述中照抄原文一個段落。缺乏改述準則的結果，可能導致大學教師過度仰賴引用來避免剽竊。

關鍵字:改述，改述種類，剽竊

INTRODUCTION

Writing for academic purposes, according to Grabe and Kaplan (1996), involves not only writing skills, but also a rhetorical attempt to be recognized as a part of the academic community. Writers incorporate a set of recognized norms, regulations, and conventions to signal their identity, and then deliver their ideas and arguments in a conventionalized way to meet the disciplinary requirements. The value embedded in the written discourse, thus, is socially constructed in that writers must write in a way accepted and recognized by their readers so that knowledge is constructed in a mutually recognized manner (Ferris & Hedgcock, 1998; Li, 2006).

Usually, if not always, the acculturation into academic communities is manifested in intertextual strategies (Costley & Doncaster, 2001; Abasi et al. 2006). Writers' bring the previously established theories, conceptions and research findings into their own text to enhance the credibility. Unlike the essays that purely address the writers' personal ideas and opinions, writing for EAP usually requires writers to refer to outside sources to echo their own viewpoints. To newcomers of academic communities, it is especially essential that the previously learned knowledge from the leaders of a certain community be incorporated, since it is the key to entering the community, and the prerequisite to be recognized (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996).

The practices of intertextuality through textual appropriation or textual borrowing can generally take the forms of direct quotation and paraphrasing (Johns & Mayes, 1990; Glenn & Goldthwaite, 2008). The former is an academic writing technique that involves directly quoting a chunk of a source text or some key terms into one's won writing, emphasizing the acknowledgement of the authors of the source texts. The latter aims at transforming a part of a source text into one's own words and then incorporates the rephrased version into the writer's text. Both techniques, generally, require citation practices. While direct quotations usually require the writers to familiarize the academic writing formats, paraphrasing a source text is considered a more complex and advanced writing technique (Shi, 2008; Suh, 2008; Shi, 2012).

In academic writing, paraphrasing and summarizing source texts are frequently adopted as intertextual strategies (Yamada, 2003; Glenn & Goldthwaite, 2008), and thus deserve further attention. Paraphrasing typically is to convey the meaning of a source text by rewording, restructuring and reorganizing without the author's original intention being lost. In the same vein, summarizing further condenses the source text with a major focus on delivering the gist. Properly used, these two writing techniques are a must for intertextuality, leading to strengthening the credibility of one's own writing. However, improper use of these two skills, along with poor citation practices, may cause severe consequences in academic communities (Ercegovac & Richardson,

2004; Glenn & Goldthwaite, 2008).

Textual borrowings have been found to differ in writers' cultural backgrounds (Keck, 2006; Shi, 2004; Shi, 2006; Keck, 2010; Shi, 2012; Weigle & Parker, 2012). In the Western culture, intellectual properties are highly valued, leading to rigid restrictions on citations, quotations, and intertextual strategies. On the contrary, writers in Asian countries are apt to adopt loose intertextual strategies that often result in being accused of plagiarism based on the academic criteria in Western countries. Exploring the cultural differences in textual borrowings, many researchers have attempted to compare the paraphrasing and summarizing strategies employed by L1 writers and L2 writers in the ESL context (Shi, 2004; Shi, 2006, Keck, 2006; Keck, 2010; Shi 2012). For example, Shei (2005) made an attempt to explain EFL students' improper textual borrowings from the perspective of how Chinese writers learn the literacy skills in their L1. Sun (2009) further investigated whether graduate students of different disciplines in an EFL context could identify poor paraphrasing strategies. However, much is needed to examine how college teachers perceive legitimate paraphrase types, because teachers' perceptions of paraphrase types and plagiarism will have a direct and strong influence on how the students in Taiwan avoid plagiarism through proper paraphrasing.

The Purpose of the Study

The related literature demonstrated the importance of paraphrasing in writing for academic purpose and their roles in avoiding plagiarism. In order to investigate how college teachers of different disciplines perceive plagiarism, this study adopts an identification task to see how they define plagiarism in paraphrases. In addition, the study makes a further attempt to explore how college teachers instruct their students to avoid plagiarism. To meet the purposes of the study, the research questions are addressed as follows:

1. How do college teachers in the fields of natural sciences and social sciences perceive paraphrase types?
2. How do college teachers instruct students to avoid plagiarism?

The Significance of the Study

In EAP, paraphrasing serves not just as the device for intertextually incorporating someone else's ideas in one's own writing. When used properly, it facilitates one's viewpoints by appropriating other authoritative figures. However, when writers use it improperly, the paraphrased texts are on the verge of being accused of violating academic integrity.

The significance of the study is manifested in two aspects. First, most literature

had been done in ESL contexts to compare the paraphrasing strategies between L1 and L2 writers. Little has been explored to examine how college teachers of different disciplines in Taiwan perceive the acceptability of paraphrases. Second, the present study specifically attempts to probe how college teachers of different disciplines instruct students to avoid plagiarism. It is hoped that a discipline-specific guideline can be established to prevent students or novice researchers form plagiarizing.

Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations in the study. First, the number of participants is limited. There are only 10 teachers of social sciences and 10 teachers of natural sciences. Furthermore, among more than 200 full-time faculty members in the private university, there are just around 30 teachers holding doctorate degrees in natural sciences. The rest of the faculty members are teachers of social sciences. The uneven numbers of teachers of social and natural sciences limits not only the representativeness of the sampling, but also the generalizability. Second, the interview was conducted either in person or online. Ideally, all the participants should have been interviewed in person. However, some teachers, especially teachers of natural sciences, were not available for a face-to-face interview. They chose to answer the interview questions online. Lacking the face-to-face interaction, I was not able to ask follow-up questions to gain in-depth understanding of some teachers' opinions.

Key Terms

Paraphrasing Strategies

They refer to the strategies that writers use to transform a source text into one's own, while the original meaning must be retained. The strategies can be lexical changes and syntactical changes.

Paraphrase Types

According to Keck (206), paraphrase types can be defined by the extent to which an original text is paraphrased by changing the lexical items and the syntactic structures. They are categorized into four types, based on the degree of the changes made, including, "Near Copy", "Minimal Revision", "Moderate Revision", and "Substantial Revision" (p. 268-270). The less resemblance to the original text is, the higher acceptability of the paraphrased text will be.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is an ethical defect in a writer's use of other authors' sources without acknowledgement (The American Psychological Association, 2010). Pecorari and Shaw (2012) attributed plagiarism to the improper implementation of intertextuality with a deceptive intention.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The section begins with discussing the relationship between intertextuality and writing for academic purposes. Then, intertextual strategies in writing from sources are addressed. Afterwards, the plagiaristic issues concerning patchwriting and legitimate paraphrasing are explored. Finally, studies on paraphrasing strategies are reviewed.

Intertextuality in EAP

Based on the social constructivist viewpoints, writing for EAP is not the mere conveyance of facts, but is shaped by collectively recognized norms in a community (Bruffee, 1986). In an academic community, the norms have been previously developed, and are served as the gate-keeping instrument to exclude outsiders. To accommodate one's self to the community of a given discipline, a novice writer must first equip him/herself with essential writing skills to establish his/her academic credibility in order to be recognized by the gatekeeper of the community (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). The major tactic for writers to sell their ideas to the members of a community usually relies on intertextual borrowings (Faigley, 1986), through which writers resort to previous sources produced by significant figures.

To explore graduate students' intertextual practices in EAP writing, Abasi et al., (2006) investigated how two MA students as novice academic writers and three PhD students as experienced academic writers constructed their identities in academic community by collecting relevant writing samples and final papers in a graduate course, and interviews. The results showed that the construction of identities in an academic community was achieved by citation and referencing practices, and that the three PhD students were more capable of using sources to represent themselves as academically competent writers than the two MA students. In order to meet the requirement of the professor in the course, the three PhD students incorporated references to support their arguments. The two MA students' failure to construct their identities as successful academic writers can result from the lack of originality, suggesting that academic writers must not lose their voice while using source texts to facilitate their arguments. Essentially, they were replicating the knowledge without critical analysis, rather than transforming the knowledge (Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1991). The lack of transforming knowledge can be further evidenced as the two novice academic writers were found that, instead of paraphrasing the source texts, they patchwrote from source texts, which, according to Howard (1995), is characterized by writers excessively appropriating large chunks of the original texts without quoting and acknowledging the authors and the sources. The two MA students' patchwriting could be attributed to their academic background. As Iranians,

they have never had training in academic writing prior to studying in an ESL context, nor did they equip with such intertextual strategies as paraphrasing, summarizing and quoting to enhance their identity when writing academic papers. As a result, their writings for the course were not only short of their own arguments, but also plagiaristic.

The result of Abasi, Akbari and Graves's study (2006) clearly illustrates that, to effectively convey arguments and ideas, writers must harness not only the essential writing skills, but also intertextual strategies that incorporate relevant sources in a rhetorically coherent manner. More importantly, the intertextually borrowed texts should only serve as a supporting device to facilitate one's viewpoints and arguments in academic writing.

Writing from sources is a typical characteristic manifested in writing for EAP, and requires such writing skills as paraphrasing, summarizing and quotation (Barks & Watts, 2001; Keck, 2006; Shi, 2012), which will be discussed in the later session.

Writing from Sources

The strategies used to write from sources can be approached as a "triadic model", consisting of "paraphrase", "summary", and "quotation" (Barks & Watts, 2001, p. 252). To use them as textual-borrowing strategies, writers also need citations to avoid plagiarism (Glenn & Goldthwaite, 2008). Altogether, they are regarded as intertextual strategies.

Shi (2006) made an attempt to capture differences in textual borrowing between L1 writers and L2 writers from cultural, linguistic aspects, and novice EAP writers cope with plagiarism in college writing. From the cultural aspect, most L1 students received instructions and practice in citation and referencing in senior high school. On the contrary, only two students from Asian countries have had some practice in citation and referencing in high school. Most reported that their teachers did not concern citing and referencing an issue during high school education, and that, in their native language, they did not even have an equivalent term for "plagiarism", which was a rather foreign concept to them prior to pursuing higher education in the U.S. Thus, Asian students regarded plagiarism as a cultural challenge as they have to adapt themselves to the new standard. To all novice EAP writers, to cite or not to cite and to quote or not to quote seemed to be problematic. The majority of the participants cast doubts on whether ideas and wordings are shared or self-owned. That is, the boundary between common knowledge and special knowledge is so vague that they have difficulty differentiating between the two, leading to the further problem of whether it is necessary to cite or not.

Shi (2008) continued to investigate the citation practices adopted by 16

undergraduate students, 13 of whom do not speak English as their first language, by analyzing their course papers and interviews. When students decided to incorporate sources into their papers, they used three intertextual strategies to do so, summarizing, quoting and paraphrasing. As demonstrated in the interview data, the major reason to cite was to enhance and support their own viewpoints. Despite the fact that the participants knew the importance of citations, they were still unsure when to cite. Also, among summarizing, quoting and paraphrasing, they seemed to have not yet been able to handle paraphrasing, and thus it was barely used.

As implied in Shi's study (2006, 2008), the participants were concerned with when to cite and how to cite. This leads to their decision on whether a piece of information that they want to appropriate is common knowledge or specific knowledge (Shi, 2008). This question has also been addressed in Shi's previous study (2006). The distinction cannot be clearly clarified, and it is usually, if not always, the gatekeeper (e.g., the teacher of a course, or the editor of a journal) that can make the call. Compared with citation and quotation, summarizing and paraphrasing require more sophisticated writing skills. As evidenced in Suh's study (2008), when students have not yet mastered how to paraphrase, they often resort to patchwriting source texts, which will be further discussed in the following sessions.

Paraphrasing and Patchwriting

Paraphrasing and summarizing are defined by Glenn and Goldthwaite (2008) as the same writing skill, with the former as an umbrella terms that covers the latter. Empirical studies on paraphrases have also operationalized them as essentially the same writing technique (e.g., Keck, 2006; Shi, 2012). Glenn and Goldthwaite (2008) explain the function and the usage of paraphrase as follows:

Properly used, paraphrase is a valuable rhetorical technique. You should use it to simplify or summarize so that others' ideas or information, properly attributed in the introduction and documented in a parenthetical citation, may be woven into the pattern of your own ideas. You should not use paraphrase simply to avoid quotation; you should use it to express another's important ideas in your own words when those ideas are not expressed in a way that is useful to quote directly (p. 83-84).

As the above definition highlighted, summarizing also requires the technique of paraphrase with a further focus on condensing the source text to convey the main idea. The definition points out two important features of good paraphrase. First, in line with D'Angelo's explanation of paraphrase (1979), good and legitimate paraphrase is

characterized as both being truthful to the meaning of the source text and being original in one's own wording. Second, personal ideas and interpretations can be further synthesized with the paraphrase, as also suggested by Yamada (2003). The above definition indicates that good paraphrases have to be substantially rewritten in one's words, while the original meaning is retained, and personal interpretations and ideas are added.

Thoroughly paraphrased texts are usually characterized as consisting of features as adding, deleting, replacing with synonyms (Keck, 2010; Shi, 2012), while appropriating large chunks of words from the original source without citations is considered poor paraphrases. Superficial paraphrases, as characterized by the features above, are defined by Howard (1995) as patchwriting. Hacker (1998) stressed that even if documentation and quotations are used, a patchwritten text is still plagiaristic. Hacker's claim (1998) is only applicable to the disciplines of social sciences, since writers of the disciplines of natural sciences hold the belief that it is the plagiaristic appropriation of the idea from an original text that counts as plagiarism, instead of the appropriation of wording (Shi, 2012).

Looking into patchwriting in an ESL college writing course, Howard et al., (2010) reviewed 18 students' papers from a sophomore writing class, and searched the sources they used in their research papers in order to detect whether they correctly used the sources or patchwrote. They found that 89% of the papers contained patchwritten texts from sources, and that over 70% of the papers were found to contain direct copying without citations and quotations. In terms of the two highly-valued writing skills in research writing, paraphrasing and summarizing, none of the 18 students incorporated summaries in their papers, while all of them paraphrased, but only at a sentence-level. Students' backgrounds, however, were absent to verify whether Student's cultural backgrounds correlated the incidence of patchwriting.

To inspect students' cultural backgrounds as a factor in textual borrowing strategies in an ESL context, Shi (2006) found that L1 writers held the belief that, in most cases, the wording of a particular author is unique, and thus must be acknowledged. However, Asian students regarded wording as a shared property, and can be used without acknowledging the authors. This can be attributed to the way Asian students learn the literacy skills in their native language by imitation and direct copying. To transfer their experience in learning their L1 literacy, L2 students treated imitation and copying as means of learning how to write in English. Unaware of the Western writing conventions, Asian students are frequently found to patchwrite the source texts.

To specifically look at EFL students' ability to differentiate paraphrasing and

patchwriting, Hu and Lei (2012) investigated whether Chinese undergraduate students were able to detect two distinctive plagiaristic behaviors, "blatant plagiarism (i.e., unacknowledged copying)" and "subtle plagiarism (i.e., unacknowledged paraphrasing)" (p. 823), from paraphrased texts, and whether students' academic experience was related to their capability to detect and explain plagiarism and paraphrases. Sixty-five percent of the participants were not able to identify direct copying the source text without acknowledging the author as plagiarism, whereas 88% failed to identify the close paraphrased text without acknowledging the author as plagiarism. The researchers attributed the finding to the fact that Chinese students might understand roughly what plagiarism is, but might not fully understand how to avoid it. As for the relationship between academic experience in tertiary education and detecting plagiaristic behaviors, contradicted with Chandrasegaran's finding (2000), no statistically significant relationship was found. This implied that cultural factor might be a more significant indicator of students' plagiaristic detection ability.

Examining patchwriting (Howard, 1995) from the perspective of the Chinese tradition, Shei (2005) argued that when Chinese learners start to learn to write in our native language, they model a piece of writing, extracting good sentence patterns into our own writing. It is natural for us to write in this way as a learner. However, the same learning technique is apparently not acceptable in writing for EAP purposes. Shei (2005) further divided the direct copying into three types: blatant stealing, close imitation and integrated borrowing, all of which show different degree of patchwriting, and can be accused of plagiarism. To view patchwriting from an eclectic perspective, Shei (2005) argued that it can be regarded as the interlanguage development as long as no obvious intention to cheat is involved. As also suggested by Marton et al. (1996), Suh (2008), and Hu and Lei (2012), the direct appropriation of chunks of words and ideas is an intertextual strategy to enhance Chinese writers' authoritative figure during the learning process. Thus, patchwriting can and should eclectically be treated as a transitional phase, in which novice writers have been gradually transforming their knowledge of paraphrasing (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987) and heading toward more academically competent writers.

Studies in Paraphrasing

Paraphrasing strategies have long attracted writing teachers' and researchers' attention (Roig, 1997, Roig, 2001; Keck, 2006; Sun, 2009; Shi, 2012). When I was a college student, I had been instructed with the "three-consecutive-word" rule, meaning that no more than three consecutive words can be appropriated from the original text in paraphrases. This rule, even though it is rather general and limited, has been engraved in my mind as the rule of thumb in paraphrasing. However, not until

recently did I start to reconsider what it meant by good paraphrases when a college professor told me that he wished that he had a guideline to evaluate students' paraphrases! Indeed, measures of paraphrases varied tremendously in empirical studies.

Roig (1997) designed an identification task, presenting 316 participants 10 re-written versions of an original paragraph, only two of which were correctly paraphrased and cited. Improperly paraphrased versions here were operationalized as the rewritten texts containing more than five consecutive words appropriated from the original paragraph. Participants, who were undergraduates, from various disciplines were then asked to identify whether any of those rewritten versions were plagiarized. It was found that even if a paragraph was not properly paraphrased, with a citation provided, students generally accepted that no plagiarism was involved. The result also pointed out that freshmen were less capable of identifying plagiarism than sophomores and seniors, but not juniors; the result is consistent with Deckert's finding (1993), who also found that juniors were more sensitive to detect plagiarism. To specifically target at paraphrase alone without citations involved, the researcher later modified the rewritten versions of the same original text, with 6 rewritten versions left, and having all the citations removed. Seventy-two percent of the participants correctly identified the plagiarized versions. Along with the results of the previous study, the findings showed that some students, to a certain degree, might not know precisely the rules of academically acceptable paraphrases, and that sixty percent of them admitted that they might accidentally plagiarized in their previous assignments.

Roig (2001) further conducted a study, which was consisted of three sub-studies, targeting at college teachers' criteria for paraphrasing and plagiarism. In the first sub-study, he sent out a survey, containing two correctly paraphrased versions of an original text and four improperly paraphrased versions, to college teachers across different disciplines. The findings showed that no consensus on judging legitimate paraphrases was reached among teachers of different disciplines. In the second sub-study, he further had college teachers paraphrase the original two-sentence text. Surprisingly, 30% of the college teachers' paraphrases were found to borrow at least five-word chunks from the original text, and 24% distorted the meaning of the original text. The reason could be due to the fact that those teachers might not be familiar with the content knowledge embedded in the original text, which was related to psychology. The finding further led to the third sub-study, in which an easier-to-read text was presented to students and college teachers to paraphrase. As a result, fewer of the participants produced longer strings of words appropriated from the original text. The researcher concluded that the readability of a text is directly related to the quality of the paraphrased version.

Employing a different task to probe ESL students' paraphrasing technique as Roig did (1997, 2001), Keck (2006) explored whether L1 and L2 undergraduates used different paraphrasing strategies in a summary task. Seventy-nine L1 writers and 74 L2 writers, as well as 12 bilingual writers, wrote a summary in response to one of the two source texts, randomly distributed to them. In her study, she made a distinctive category, "attempted paraphrase" (p. 263), to exclude the participants' exact copy of words from the source texts. It was defined as a summary containing minimally one change in words from the original text; that is, only a lexical change that counts as an "attempt" to paraphrase. She further proposed two concepts to define the acceptability of paraphrases, "unique links" and "general links" (p. 266-267). When writers try to paraphrase or summarize a source text, the former refers to extracting individual words or word strings that do not occur elsewhere in the original text, while the latter refers to the use of individual words or word strings that occur more than once in the source text. She also claimed that general links are more acceptable than unique links in summaries and paraphrases. Derived from the frequency and percentage of unique links, four paraphrase types were proposed, including "Near Copy", "Minimal Revision", "Moderate Revision", and "Substantial Revision" (p. 268-270).

The findings in Keck's study (2006) showed that no statistical differences were found between L1 and L2 writers' attempted paraphrases. However, L2 writers used more Near copy, while L1 writers used more Minimal Revision, Moderate Revision and Substantial Revision. The result suggested that L1 writers did possess better strategies in paraphrasing. In Keck's later study (2007), she further found that Asian students who were in their first year in the tertiary education in the US were mostly likely to patchwrite in their summaries.

Keck (2006, 2007), though adopted four distinctive paraphrase types, still found that there existed a gray area, in which Minimal Revision might be as academically unacceptable as Near Copy, implying that the criteria of plagiarism might not be so clear-cut, and that disciplinary differences might be the major contributor in deciding whether a paraphrase fails to be a legitimate paraphrase. The fine line of whether one plagiarizes or not is still left undecided.

Using students' actual writing sample as prompts for interviews, Shi (2012) explored how students and college instructors across different disciplines viewed two paraphrased texts, a summarized text and a translated text. The two paraphrased texts, which consisted of excessive borrowing from original texts, were written by a college freshman whose native language is Chinese, and the summarized text and the translate text were written by a Japanese exchange student and a Korean exchange student, respectively. In terms of paraphrase, there apparently existed a discrepancy as to how students and teachers of natural science and those of social science viewed what

counted as an academic legitimate paraphrase. The interviewees from science-related fields held the position that it is the appropriation of ideas without citation that counts as plagiarism, not that of wording, while the interviewees from art/humanity-related fields believed that both ideas and wordings of sources texts are valued and should be cited and quoted whenever and wherever necessary. A similar finding that manifested the disciplinary differences was also found in Flowerdew and Li's study (2007). As claimed by Jameson (1993), the criteria of academically legitimate intertextual borrowings should be built on a disciplinary basis, instead of an overarching grounding across different disciplines.

Besides the disciplinary differences in paraphrases, content knowledge about a given field clearly influences the quality of paraphrase, as one of the professors apparently can further paraphrase the original text that contained a great of medical terms. The instance clearly shows that lacking the content knowledge of a given discipline leads to the direct appropriation of large strings of words from the original text since the writers are restricted by the limited lexical repertoire to paraphrase.

In Taiwan, Sun (2009) did a survey study to explore Taiwanese graduate students' ability to identify and explain cases of inappropriate paraphrasing strategies. Of the 141 graduate students, 81 were MA students, and 60 were PhD students. As to their previous experience in learning paraphrasing, only 18.4% of the participants have had formal training. Participants were required to fill out a two-layered survey. The first layer had the graduate students read given examples to explore their ability to detect acceptable paraphrasing strategies, consisting of "quotation", "thorough rewriting", "reordering", "using synonyms", inserting", "deleting", "syntactic change", "combining" and "copying verbatim" (p. 402). The first two strategies were considered good paraphrasing strategies, while the rest were defined as poor strategies. The second layer aimed at investigating their ability to explain the acceptability of each paraphrase strategy. She found that the majority of the participants considered minor changes in paraphrased texts acceptable, and that graduate students who majored in language teaching were more aware of plagiarism and were more capable of explaining the more acceptable ways to paraphrase source texts. It might due to the longer exposure to English language and culture, even though the exposure might be limited to Taiwan. The findings implied that students in postgraduate education in EFL contexts might not fully aware of what constitutes plagiarism.

Since few studies related to teachers' perceptions of legitimate paraphrases were conducted in Taiwan, this study aims to examine how college teachers of different disciplines perceive legitimate or poor paraphrases by using the four paraphrase types proposed by Keck (2006, 2007) as prompts.

METHODOLOGY

The section begins with the background of the participants. Then, the two instruments for data collection are elaborated, including the identification task and the interview. Afterwards, data analysis is introduced.

The Participants

College teachers of different disciplines in a private university in Southern Taiwan were invited to share their perceptions of plagiarism and legitimate paraphrase types. To explore the disciplinary differences in their perceptions of legitimate/poor paraphrase types, 10 teachers in the field of natural sciences and 10 teachers in the field of social sciences were recruited. Their backgrounds were illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1. The Backgrounds of the Participants

NO.	Position	Major	Learning experience in paraphrasing	
			Yes	No
SS1	Professor	Education		✓
SS2	Associate Prof.	Communication		✓
SS3	Associate Prof.	Foreign Languages & Literature	✓	
SS4	Associate Prof.	Education		✓
SS5	Assistant Prof.	Education	✓	
SS6	Assistant Prof.	Information management	✓	
SS7	Assistant Prof.	Social Welfare	✓	
SS8	Assistant Prof.	Education		✓
SS9	Assistant Prof.	Buddhist Studies	✓	
SS10	Assistant Prof.	Physical Education	✓	
NS1	Professor	Science		✓
NS2	Professor	Marine Biology	✓	
NS3	Professor	Computer Science	✓	
NS4	Professor	Science		✓
NS5	Associate Prof.	Engineering		✓
NS6	Associate Prof.	Science		✓
NS7	Associate Prof.	Computer Science		✓
NS8	Associate Prof.	Engineering		✓
NS9	Assistant Prof.	Physical Education		✓
NS10	Assistant Prof.	Computer Science		✓

Note. SS = Social Science, NS = Natural Science, Prof. = Professor

Prior to participating in the study, the participants were informed that the identification task is written in English. They could decide whether or not they are willing to participate in the study. With their permission, they were asked to identify whether the four paraphrase types are plagiaristic or acceptable. Then, they were interviewed to elaborate how they instruct their students to avoid plagiarism and how they perceive plagiarism in paraphrases. It is hoped that, through the investigation of the disciplinary differences in the perceptions of the four paraphrase types, a guideline can be formulated for students of natural sciences and social sciences to be better aware of plagiarism and academic integrity. After the research project is finished, the researcher would share the results and the findings of the study with the participants in order for them to learn how teachers of different disciplines viewed paraphrase types and plagiarism.

Data Collection

In this study, data were collected from two sources. First, the results of the identification task of the four paraphrase types were used to explore whether there are disciplinary differences in college teachers' perceptions of plagiarism. Second, the interview data from the teachers of different disciplines were used to examine how teachers of different disciplines prevent their students from plagiarism.

The Identification Task

Aiming at probing college teachers' perceptions of plagiarism, the identification task (Appendix 1) is designed based on Keck's paraphrase types (2006). According to Keck's definition (2006), a unique link is word(s) or strings of words that occur only once in an original text. If a paraphrase contains too many unique links, it is considered unacceptable or even plagiaristic. The unique links are underlined. Each paraphrase type is calculated by its percentage of unique links. The four paraphrase types are defined and exemplified as follows.

Near Copy: 50% or more words contained within unique links
Source: There are two advantages to live in the countryside, fresh air and a relaxing pace of life. However, sometimes it is inconvenient for people living in the countryside to get access to public facilities.
Paraphrase 1 (Near copy): The two advantages of living in the suburban area are fresh air and a relaxing pace of life. However, people living in the countryside may not have the full access to public facilities. (19/33 = 58%)

Minimal Revision: 20 – 49% words contained within unique links

Source: There are two advantages to live in the countryside, fresh air and a relaxing pace of life. However, sometimes it is inconvenient for people living in the countryside to get access to public facilities.

Paraphrase 2 (Minimal Revision): The good things about living in the countryside are fresh air and a slower pace of life. Nevertheless, being not able to have more access to public facilities is a disadvantage for them. (13/39 = 33%)

Moderate Revision: 1 – 19% words contained within unique links

Source: There are two advantages to live in the countryside, fresh air and a relaxing pace of life. However, sometimes it is inconvenient for people living in the countryside to get access to public facilities.

Paraphrase 3 (Moderate Revision): Suburban dwellers can enjoy better air quality and a leisurely life, but they might not be able to make the best use of public facilities. (3/24 = 13%)

Substantial Revision: No unique links

Source: There are two advantages to live in the countryside, fresh air and a relaxing pace of life. However, sometimes it is inconvenient for people living in the countryside to get access to public facilities.

Paraphrase 4 (Substantial Revision): Suburban dwellers are benefited from a healthy environment and a leisurely lifestyle, but the drawback is the relative shortage of services and resources provided by the government. (0/28 = 0%)

Texts of the four paraphrase types based on Keck's categorization (2006) were used in the identification task. The task aims to probe college teachers' perceptions of plagiarism. As pointed out by Keck herself (2006), even though it is generally agreed that Moderate Revision and Substantial Revision are acceptable paraphrase types, and Near Copy is unacceptable, there is still a gray area as to whether Minimal Revision is a legitimate paraphrase type. To clarify the doubt, college teachers' responses to the four paraphrase types are crucial to determine the extent to which a source text should be paraphrased.

The Interview

All of the 20 college teachers from the disciplines of natural sciences and social sciences in the university were interviewed to elicit their criteria on paraphrasing types (Appendix 2). First, their opinions on plagiarism and paraphrasing were explored. Second, they were asked about how they instruct their students to

paraphrase texts from sources, and the extent to which a paraphrase is considered legitimate. The interview data were first translated verbatim, and then further analyzed qualitatively.

Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed through descriptive statistics and content analysis. First of all, descriptive statistics was used to examine the result of the identification task to see whether there are disciplinary differences in their perceptions of plagiarism. Second, the teachers' interviews were qualitatively analyzed through content analysis. By analyzing the interview transcripts, a deeper understanding of how different teachers instruct their students to avoid plagiarism in EAP can be explored. Differences and similarities among teachers' opinions on good/poor paraphrases might serve as an initial step to establish a discipline-specific guideline for evaluating the acceptability of paraphrases.

RESULTIS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this section, I shall present the results of the study based on the two research questions. First of all, I will examine whether there are disciplinary differences in the perceptions of paraphrase types between teachers of natural sciences and teachers of social sciences (SS). Then, I will show the means by which college teachers prevent their students from plagiarizing.

College Teachers' Perceptions of Paraphrase Types and Plagiarism

To answer the first research questions, I present the results of the identification task on paraphrase types. Teachers were asked to identify whether the four paraphrase types contained plagiaristic expressions. The results are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2. College Teachers' Perceptions of Paraphrase Types

	Natural Sciences			Social Sciences		
	MANY	SOME	NO	MANY	SOME	NO
	plagiaristic expressions			plagiaristic expressions		
Subs. R.	0	0	10	0	0	10
Mod. R.	0	2	8	0	3	7
Min. R.	0	7	3	1	5	4
N. C.	4	6	0	7	2	1

Note. Subs. R. = Substantial Revision, Mod. R. = Moderate Revision, Min. R. = Minimal Revision, N. C. = Near Copy

In terms of Substantial Revision, both the NS teachers and SS teachers perceived it as non-plagiaristic. As to Moderate Revision, 8 NS teachers regarded it as non-plagiaristic, whereas 2 NS teachers perceived it as somehow plagiaristic. Similarly, 7 SS teachers believe that Moderate Revision has no plagiaristic expressions, whereas 3 SS teachers think it contains some plagiaristic expressions. In terms of Minimal Revision, 7 NS teachers regarded it as somehow plagiaristic, and 3 NS teachers think it is perfectly fine. Likewise, 6 SS teachers perceived Minimal Revision as seriously or somehow plagiaristic, while 4 SS teachers believed it is not plagiaristic. As for Near Copy, All of the NS teachers think it is seriously or somehow plagiaristic; similarly, 9 SS teachers regarded Near Copy as serious or somehow plagiaristic, but there was 1 SS teacher regarding Near Copy as non-plagiaristic.

Generally speaking, from the results in Table 2, there seemed to be no obvious disciplinary difference in the perceptions of paraphrase types between NS teachers and SS teachers. Table 3 further illustrated how teachers of the two disciplines perceived the acceptability of the four paraphrase types.

Table 3. College Teachers' Perceptions of the Acceptability of Paraphrase Types

	Natural Science		Social Science	
	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Subs. R.	10	0	10	0
Mod. R.	8	2	8	2
Min. R.	6	4	8	2
N. C.	3	7	3	7

Note. Subs. R. = Substantial Revision, Mod. R. = Moderate Revision, Min. R. = Minimal Revision, N. C. = Near Copy

In Table 3, it is quite clear that college teachers from different disciplines perceived Substantial Revision acceptable. In terms of Moderate Revision, the NS and SS teachers held similar opinion. The majority of them regarded Moderate Revision acceptable, while 2 NS and SS teachers, respectively, think it is unacceptable. As to Minimal Revision, 6 NS teachers believed it is acceptable, while 4 of the NS teachers perceived it as unacceptable. On the other hand, SS teachers seemed to be less strict on Minimal Revision. There are 8 SS teachers regarding it acceptable, while only 2 of them think it is unacceptable. Near Copy is believed by most of the college teachers of the two disciplines as unacceptable, but 3 NS and 3 SS teachers still regarded it as acceptable.

Basically, there is no apparent difference in the teachers' perceptions of the acceptability of the four paraphrase types. Teachers of social sciences are even less

strict on Minimal Revision than teachers of natural sciences. In Keck's study (2007), the acceptability of Minimal Revision was debatable, and in the present study, the teachers were inclined to the acceptable end of a continuum.

From the results in Table 2 and 3, one thing interesting about Minimal Revision is worth discussing. That is, even though most teachers regarded Minimal Revision as containing some or many plagiaristic expressions, some teachers still regarded it as acceptable. Here, citation is the deciding factor that accounts for plagiarism, which is in consistent with the findings in Roig's study (1997) that college students believed that improperly paraphrased texts were not plagiaristic with citations provided. However, in the present study, many college teachers, regardless of disciplines, believed that a poorly paraphrased passage is acceptable, as long as it is cited. Citations are seen as a way to acknowledge the author's work. A poorly paraphrased passage with citation is merely a result of poor writing skills. Different from the findings in Shi's study (2012), some of the teachers of social sciences in this study believed that a minor degree of plagiarism can be excused if citations are provided.

The disciplinary differences existed when the teachers of the two disciplines were interviewed to share their ideas about the importance of paraphrasing, citation, and direct quotation. The results are shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Teachers' Primary Technique to Avoid Plagiarism

NO.	Position	The primary technique(s) to avoid plagiarism			Learning experience in paraphrasing	
		Paraphrasing	Citation	Direct quotation	Yes	No
SS1	Professor	✓	✓			✓
SS2	Associate Prof.	✓	✓			✓
SS3	Associate Prof.		✓	✓	✓	
SS4	Associate Prof.		✓			✓
SS5	Assistant Prof.	✓	✓		✓	
SS6	Assistant Prof.	✓	✓		✓	
SS7	Assistant Prof.	✓	✓		✓	
SS8	Assistant Prof.	✓	✓			✓
SS9	Assistant Prof.		✓	✓	✓	
SS10	Assistant Prof.	✓	✓		✓	
NS1	Professor		✓			✓
NS2	Professor		✓		✓	
NS3	Professor		✓		✓	

NO.	Position					
NS4	Professor		✓			✓
NS5	Associate Prof.		✓			✓
NS6	Associate Prof.		✓			✓
NS7	Associate Prof.		✓			✓
NS8	Associate Prof.		✓			✓
NS9	Assistant Prof.		✓	✓		✓
NS10	Assistant Prof.		✓			✓

From the results of Table 4, it is quite clear that all the college teachers perceived citation as the most necessary technique to avoid plagiarism. Among the ten teachers of social sciences, all of them highlighted the importance of citation in writing from sources. Even though paraphrasing is regarded as an important technique in writing from sources in social sciences, the use of citation in academic writing eliminates the potential plagiarism in poor paraphrases.

The teachers from natural sciences were unanimously in favor of citation as more important than any other techniques to avoid plagiarism. All of them believe that plagiarism is not sustained as long as citations are provided. That paraphrasing is less important than citation implies that the borrowing of ideas from a source text is taken more seriously than the borrowing of words in natural sciences. Indeed, from the analysis of the interview transcripts, teachers from the two fields held different attitudes towards the borrowing of ideas and words in academic writing. The results are presented in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Teachers' Perceptions of the Acknowledgement of Ideas or Words

NO.	Position	The Borrowing of Ideas Must be Acknowledged	The Borrowing of Words Must be Acknowledged
SS1	Professor	✓	✓
SS2	Associate Prof.	✓	✓
SS3	Associate Prof.	✓	✓
SS4	Associate Prof.	✓	✓
SS5	Assistant Prof.	✓	✓
SS6	Assistant Prof.	✓	✓
SS7	Assistant Prof.	✓	✓
SS8	Assistant Prof.	✓	✓
SS9	Assistant Prof.	✓	✓
SS10	Assistant Prof.	✓	✓

NS1	Professor	✓	
NS2	Professor	✓	✓
NS3	Professor	✓	
NS4	Professor	✓	
NS5	Associate Prof.	✓	
NS6	Associate Prof.	✓	
NS7	Associate Prof.	✓	
NS8	Associate Prof.	✓	
NS9	Assistant Prof.	✓	
NS10	Assistant Prof.	✓	

The content analysis of the interview transcripts with the 20 college teachers showed that all the teachers of the social sciences insisted that both the words and ideas borrowed from source texts have to be cited. However, the teachers of the natural sciences think that it is necessary to cite when students borrow ideas from source texts, but whether or not the borrowing of words from source texts needs citations seems to be loosely regulated. The result is similar with Shi's finding (2012), and it further leads to the debate whether words or ideas should be treated as "knowledge", which was also highlighted in Shi's study (2008). It is generally accepted that knowledge borrowed from source texts should be cited. Teachers of the natural sciences regard ideas as knowledge, and words are treated as a shared property. The split opinions might further lead to different ways to instruct their students to write research papers. The gap between the two disciplines seems not uncommon since Flowerdew and Li (2007) found the same disciplinary differences in the use of citations. During the interview, some teachers of natural sciences specifically stated the importance of citing when borrowing someone else's ideas, but not words, as shown in the following excerpts.

Generally speaking, ideas are more important than words in my discipline. Researchers in natural sciences care more about results and ideas than just words. (NS4)

In my field of expertise, words are less important than ideas. (NS5)

Ideas are more important in research, so they need to be cited. If citations are provided, I have made it clear that it is not my ideas, but someone else's. (NS6)

The ideas with business values and inventions are important in my field. That is,

words are not important; the plagiarism of ideas is way more serious. (NS7)

We care more about numbers and statistics, not words. (NS9)

The above excerpts showed that teachers of natural sciences valued ideas more than words when writing research papers. As long as citations are provided, the borrowing of long strings of words from other source texts is excusable. On the contrary, teachers of social sciences believed that the borrowing of words and ideas should both be acknowledged, as shown in the following excerpts.

Basically there are two types of plagiarism. One is that someone copies the whole source text without paraphrasing and giving citations. It is plagiarism. The other type is using some ideas from other sources, but s/he did not provide citations. S/he paraphrases the source text, but did not provide citations. To a certain extent I think it is plagiarism. (SS1)

When you use others' words without citations, it is plagiarism, or when you appropriate a unique idea from another source as your own without citations, this is the most obvious case of plagiarism. (SS3)

Students often describe a viewpoint without acknowledging the authors of the particular viewpoint, and I think this is one kind of plagiarism.   Another kind is directly copying a source text without quotation. (SS4)

The most obvious case of plagiarism is to directly copy the content or result of someone's research. Even though appropriating someone's results and findings through poorly written paraphrases is a little better than direct copying, it is still considered plagiarism. (SS6)

To answer the first research questions, I found that the disciplinary differences did not lie in the teachers' perceptions of paraphrase types, but in the teachers' perceptions of what constitutes "knowledge". Teachers cite when they consider a certain piece of information knowledge. With this guideline in mind, teachers of social sciences stated that poor paraphrases with large chunks of words copied from a source text are somewhat plagiaristic even if citations are given. Teachers of natural sciences, however, insisted that only the borrowing of ideas from other sources should be acknowledged, and that poor paraphrases can be excused if citations are provided. This explains why the teachers of natural sciences regarded citing as the most

important technique in writing from sources.

Preventing Students from Plagiarism

When asked to share how the teachers instruct their students to prevent plagiarism, the 20 college teacher proposed that they guide their students to write their theses or research papers mainly through apprenticeship. Some common instructional means are utilized not only to raise students' awareness of plagiarism, but also to further avoid it. The results are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Means to Prevent Students from Plagiarism

Means to Prevent Students from Plagiarism	Social Sciences	Natural Sciences
	f	f
Citing	8	7
Paraphrasing	8	6
Raising the awareness of plagiarism	5	2
Avoiding copying charts, results or ideas	0	4
Referencing	2	0
Avoiding misusing second-hand resources	2	0
Using software to avoid excessive copying	0	2
Avoiding forging results of experiments	0	1
Going through multiple drafts	0	1

In Table 6, citing is the most common means adopted by teachers of both disciplines to prevent students from plagiarizing. Paraphrasing and raising the awareness of plagiarism are the 2nd and 3rd most commonly used means to avoid plagiarism, respectively. As indicated previously, the majority of the participants of the study generally agreed that the excessive borrowing of words in poorly paraphrased texts can be excused as long as citations are provided, which was also found in Roig's study (1997). This might be the major reason teachers of different disciplines all prioritize citing in writing from sources.

Paraphrasing is considered equally important as citing. However, most of the teachers do not have a specific criterion for evaluating the acceptability of paraphrases. Most of them make judgements by intuition. Four out of the 20 teachers gave specific criteria, but the criteria varied tremendously, regardless of their disciplines. The interview excerpts are extracted as follows.

My teacher taught me that it is plagiarism if you copy more than 20 words from a source text. (NS4)

It is plagiarism when someone copies more than 30 consecutive words from a source text. (NS8)

Plagiarism is when you copy someone's words verbatim, or copy more than 5 lines. (SS2)

In social sciences, plagiarism means copying someone else's articles more than one paragraph, or one complete sentence. (SS7)

From the above excerpts, it is found that the teachers' criteria for evaluating the acceptability of paraphrases are rather loose. In Roig's study (1997), if more than five consecutive words are copied from a source text, a paraphrase is considered plagiaristic. In the present study, however, the teachers' criteria for the acceptability of paraphrases will be considered not only as patchwriting (Howard, 1995), but also as plagiarism (Roig, 1997). When asked if they learned how to paraphrase before, 6 out of the 10 teachers of social sciences and 2 out of the 10 teachers of natural sciences said they did. It seems that the commonly accepted criteria for evaluating paraphrases in the academia in Taiwan are nowhere to be found.

In addition to teaching citations and paraphrasing, the teachers also raised students' awareness of plagiarism by explaining plagiarism, and warning them of the severe consequences of plagiarism. When they instruct graduate students, they will tell the students not to violate academic integrity through apprenticeship. Equipped with the awareness of plagiarism, students are expected to walk on the right path.

Of the means to prevent students from plagiarizing, teachers of natural sciences proposed some discipline-specific ways. Some teachers stated that researchers of natural sciences are prone to plagiarism when they directly appropriate charts and results from other sources. One teacher of natural sciences further said that he will warn students not to forge the results of experiments.

In this section, college teachers proposed some common means to prevent students from plagiarizing. The most commonly proposed means is citations, followed by paraphrasing, and explaining and warning of plagiarism. A further analysis indicated that teachers had either no specific criteria for evaluating paraphrases, or loose criteria that might be accused of plagiarism. It is quite obvious that college teachers rely very heavily on citations to avoid plagiarism, and that paraphrasing is underemphasized in the academia in Taiwan.

CONCLUSION

In this section, I shall begin with the summary of the present study. Afterwards, implications will be presented. Finally, I will address the limitations and suggestions for future study.

Summary of the Study

The study aims to explore whether there are disciplinary differences in the perceptions of plagiarism in paraphrase types between teachers of natural and social sciences. The participants were 10 teachers of social sciences and 10 teachers of natural sciences in a private university in Southern Taiwan. An identification tasked is employed to probe the perceptions of plagiarism in paraphrase types between teachers of different disciplines. An interview was utilized to explore an in-depth understanding of teachers' perceptions of plagiarism, and techniques to prevent students from plagiarizing. The results showed that, first, there were no disciplinary differences in teachers' perceptions of plagiarism in the four paraphrase types. They generally agreed that Substantial Revision and Moderate Revision are acceptable. Most teachers also think that Minimal Revision is acceptable, whereas Near Copy is an unacceptable paraphrase type. As long as citations are provided, poor paraphrases are considered only as a failed attempt, not plagiarizing. Second, disciplinary differences were found in how teachers viewed other writers' words or ideas in writing from sources. Teachers of social sciences believe that citations are needed when one borrows other writers' words and ideas. However, teachers of natural sciences insist that citations are required only when one borrows someone else's ideas; words are considered as a shared property. Third, there are no obvious disciplinary differences in how teachers prevent students from plagiarizing. Teachers of both disciplines prioritized citations, followed by paraphrasing and raising students' awareness of plagiarism. Nevertheless, even though paraphrasing is regarded by many teachers as an important way to avoid plagiarism, most teachers have no specific criteria for evaluating paraphrases. They make the judgement by intuition. Some teachers have such a loose criterion that copying 20 words to a whole paragraph is acceptable, as long as citations are given. From the results of the present study, paraphrasing is highly valued but underemphasized by the college teachers, and possibly by the whole academic community in Taiwan.

Implications

There are several implications in the study. First, paraphrasing is underemphasized and citation is overemphasized. Paraphrasing is an essential writing skill in writing from sources, while the use of citations is formulaic because writers

only need to know the format of citations. If Taiwanese researchers over-rely on citations in writing from sources, writing for academic purpose becomes nothing more than any other kinds of writing, plus citations. Thus, it is vital to raise the awareness that paraphrasing should be complementary to citing. Missing one or the other in academic writing results, one might be accused of plagiarism.

Second, paraphrasing is notoriously known for its lack of prescribed criteria for evaluating the acceptability. In the present study, the criteria varied tremendously from one teacher to another. Some teachers even make intuitive judgement on the acceptability of paraphrases. Without general criteria, novice writers seem to fight a battle with their eyes blind-folded. Thus, it is fundamental for the academia in Taiwan to clarify the extent to which a source text should be paraphrased. With commonly accepted criteria, for example, copying no more than 5 consecutive words (Roig, 1997), novice researchers can be more aware of the regulations, and will further utilize paraphrasing strategies to avoid patchwriting and plagiarism.

Suggestions

In closing, there are several aspects worth further explorations. First of all, the acceptability of both Chinese and English paraphrases can be compared. The present study adopted English paraphrases for teachers to identify the acceptability. However, most of the teachers published research papers in Chinese, and rarely produced articles in English. It is therefore worth exploring how teachers evaluate the acceptability of Chinese paraphrases. Second, teachers can be invited to write paraphrases from a source text. In this way, future researchers can further investigate both the acceptability of teachers' paraphrases and their paraphrasing strategies. The acceptability yielded from the teachers' paraphrases can serve as an initial step to formulating commonly accepted criteria for evaluating paraphrases.

REFERENCES

Abasi, A. R., Akbari, N., & Graves, B. (2006). Discourse appropriation, construction of identities, and the complex issue of plagiarism: ESL students writing in graduate school. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15, 102-117.

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Barks, D., & Watts, P. (2001). Textual borrowing strategies for graduate-level ESL writers. In D. Belcher, & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 246-270). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Bruffee, J. (1986). Social construction, language, and the authority of knowledge: A bibliographical essay. *College English*, 48, 773-790.

Carter, M. (1990). The idea of expertise: An exploration of cognitive and social dimensions of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 41, 265-286.

Chandrasegaran, A. (2000). Cultures in contact in academic writing: Students' perceptions of plagiarism. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 10, 91–113.

Costley, C., & Doncaster, K. (2001). Citation as an argumentation strategy in the reflective writing of work-based learning students. In S. Mitchell, & R. Andrews (Eds.), *Learning to argue in higher education* (pp. 107-117). London: Boynton.

D'Angelo, F. J. (1979). The art of paraphrase. *College Composition and Communication*, 30, 255-259.

Deckert, G. (1993). Perspectives on plagiarism from ESL students in Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2, 131-148.

Ercegovac, Z., & Richardson, J. V. (2004). Academic dishonesty, plagiarism included, in the digital age: A literature review. *College & Research Libraries*, 65(4), 301-318.

Faigley, L. (1986). Competing theories of process: A critique and a proposal. *College Composition and Communication*, 48, 527-542.

Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. S. (1998). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2007a). Language re-use among Chinese apprentice scientists writing for publication. *Applied Linguistics*, 28, 440-465.

Glenn, C., & Goldthwaite, M. A. (2008). *The St. Martin's guide to teaching writing* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Bedford/St Martin's Press.

Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing*. New York: Longman.

Hacker, D. (1998). *The Bedford handbook* (5th ed.). Boston: Bedford Books.

Howard, R. M. (1995). Plagiarism, authorship, and the academic death penalty. College English, 57(7), 788-806.

Howard, R. M., Serviss, T., & Rodrigue, T. K. (2010). Writing from sources, writing from sentences. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 2, 177-192.

Hu, G., & Lei, J. (2012). Investigating Chinese university students' knowledge of and attitudes plagiarism from an integrated perspective. *Language Learning*, 62, 813-850.

Jameson, D. A. (1993). The ethics of plagiarism: How genre affects writers' use of source materials. *Bulletin of the Association for Business Communication*, 56(2), 18-28.

Johns, A., & Mayes, P. (1990). An analysis of summary protocols of university ESL students. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 253-271.

Keck, C. (2006). The use of paraphrase in summary writing: A comparison of L1 and L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15, 261-278.

Keck, C. (2007). University student textual borrowing strategies. Unpublished PhD. Dissertation, Northern Arizona University.

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

Li, Y. (2006). Negotiating knowledge contribution to multiple discourse communities: A doctoral student of computer science writing for publication. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15, 159-178.

Li, Y., & Casanave, C. P. (2012). Two first-year students' strategies for writing from sources: Patchwriting or plagiarism? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 165-180.

Marton, F., Dall'Alba, G., & Tse, L. K. (1996). Memorizing and understanding: The keys to the paradox? In D. Watkins & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological and contextual influence*s (pp. 69–83). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre.

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

Pecorari, D., & Shaw, P. (2012). Types of student intertextuality and faculty attitudes. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 149-164.

Roig, M. (1997). Can graduate 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 and Behavior*, 11, 307-323.

Scardamalia, M., & Bereiter, C. (1991). Literate expertise. In K. A. Ericsson, & J. Smith (Eds.), *Toward a general theory of expertise: Prospects and limits* (pp. 194-712). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shei, C. (2005). Plagiarism, Chinese learners and western convention. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL*, 2(1), 97-113.

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

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

Shi, L. (2008). Textual appropriation and citing behaviors of university undergraduates. *Applied Linguistics*, 31, 1-24.

Shi, L. (2012). Rewriting and paraphrasing source texts in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 134-148.

Sun, Y. C. (2009). Using a two-tier test in examining Taiwan graduate students' perspectives on paraphrasing strategies. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 10, 399-408.

Suh, S. J. (2008). *Plagiarism, textual borrowing, or something else?: An L2 student's Writing from sources tasks*. Unpublished PhD. Dissertation, University of Maryland.

Walker, A. L. (2008). Preventing unintentional plagiarism: A method for strengthening paraphrasing skills. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 35, 387-395.

Weigle, S. C., & Parker, K. (2012). Source text borrowing in an integrated reading/writing assessment. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 118-122.

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

APPENDIX 1
An Identification Task on Paraphrase Types

Part I: Background

1. Did you learn how to paraphrase texts in your postgraduate study?

    ☐Yes   ☐No

2. How do you categorize your doctoral degree based on disciplines?

    ☐The discipline of natural sciences   ☐The discipline of social sciences

3. What is the title of your doctoral degree?

    Ph. D. in _____

Part II: Please read the following 4 paraphrases to see whether the sources are appropriately paraphrased.

1. **Source text**: There are two advantages to live in the countryside, fresh air and a relaxing pace of life. However, sometimes it is inconvenient for people living in the countryside to get access to public facilities.

    Paraphrase 1: The good things about living in the countryside are fresh air and a slower pace of life. Nevertheless, being not able to have more access to public facilities is a disadvantage for them.

    ☐The paraphrase contains NO plagiaristic expressions.

    ☐The paraphrase contains SOME plagiaristic expressions.

    ☐The paraphrase contains MANY plagiaristic expressions.

    In general, I think Paraphrase 1 is   ☐acceptable, or   ☐plagiaristic.

2. **Source text**: There are two advantages to live in the countryside, fresh air and a relaxing pace of life. However, sometimes it is inconvenient for people living in the countryside to get access to public facilities.

    Paraphrase 2: Suburban dwellers can enjoy better air quality and a leisurely life, but they might not be able to make the best use of public facilities.

    ☐The paraphrase contains NO plagiaristic expressions.

    ☐The paraphrase contains SOME plagiaristic expressions.

    ☐The paraphrase contains MANY plagiaristic expressions.

    In general, I think Paraphrase 2 is   ☐acceptable, or   ☐plagiaristic.

3. **Source text**: There are two advantages to live in the countryside, fresh air and a relaxing pace of life. However, sometimes it is inconvenient for people living in the countryside to get access to public facilities.

   Paraphrase 3: The two advantages of living in the suburban area are fresh air and a relaxing pace of life. However, people living in the countryside may not have the full access to public facilities.

   ☐The paraphrase contains NO plagiaristic expressions.
   ☐The paraphrase contains SOME plagiaristic expressions.
   ☐The paraphrase contains MANY plagiaristic expressions.
   In general, I think Paraphrase 3 is ☐acceptable, or ☐plagiaristic.

4. **Source text**: There are two advantages to live in the countryside, fresh air and a relaxing pace of life. However, sometimes it is inconvenient for people living in the countryside to get access to public facilities.

   Paraphrase 4: Suburban dwellers are benefited from a healthy environment and a leisurely lifestyle, but the drawback is the relative shortage of services and resources provided by the government.

   ☐The paraphrase contains NO plagiaristic expressions.
   ☐The paraphrase contains SOME plagiaristic expressions.
   ☐The paraphrase contains MANY plagiaristic expressions.
   In general, I think Paraphrase 4 is ☐acceptable, or ☐plagiaristic.

APPENDIX 2
An Interview with College Teachers

1. Can you specifically define plagiarism in your discipline?

2. Is paraphrasing important in your discipline? Why or why not?

3. How do you define a legitimate paraphrase? Please specify.

4. How do you instruct your students to avoid plagiarism?

5. If paraphrasing is important in your discipline, how do you instruct your students to use paraphrasing in academic writing?

參與者同意書

Consent Form

國立中正大學人類研究倫理審查委員會

研究參與者同意書

(非人體研究參考範本)

105 年 06 月 29 日國立中正大學人類研究倫理審查委員會 105 年度第 6 次會議通過版

注意事項（填寫完畢後請將整段文字刪除）

※ 填寫前請先確認是否為最新版本。

※ 藍色字體為說明文字，請自行依研究計畫性質填寫內容後刪除。若有特殊項目不適用於此次研究計畫，請註明「不適用本研究」，請勿刪除該項目。

※ 文字內容力求親切且口語化，以國三程度能夠理解為原則。

※ 有可能阻礙參與者參與研究意願的內容，請務必說明。

※ 本同意書一式兩份，一份給予參與者留存，一份研究主持人備存。

研究參與者同意書版本	2017/09/12/Version.01		
研究計畫名稱	The Disciplinary Differences in College Teachers' Perceptions of Paraphrase Types and Plagiarism 大學教師對於改述中的剽竊之觀感:以自然與社會科學為例		
研究機構名稱	南華大學	經費來源	科技部
計 畫 主 持 人	游東道	職　稱	助理教授
聯 絡 電 話	0937-607257	職　責	執行計畫與知情同意程序
共 同 主 持 人	（請依研究計畫實際狀況增減欄位）	職　稱	
協 同 主 持 人	（請依研究計畫實際狀況增減欄位）	職　稱	
二十四小時緊急聯絡人	游東道	電　話	0937-607257

一、研究目的

研究者將比較自然科學與社會科學領域教師對於四種改述種類的意見，用以

判斷兩個領域的教師對於改述中的剽竊是否有認知上的落差。

二、研究對象

本研究受試者將由本人直接詢問學校老師是否有參與本研究的意願。本研究將以此方式招募自然學科與社會學科大學教師各 20 名參與本研究。

三、研究方法與程序

研究工具包含改述種類辨認測驗與訪談，而研究對象預期為自然學科與社會學科大學教師各 20 名。在受試者同意參與本研究之後，研究者將與受試者約定受訪時間。首先，受試者會針對改述種類辨認測驗作答，而在完成測驗之後，研究者將對受試者進行一對一訪談。過程估計約 30 分鐘。

四、參與研究應配合事項

受試者必須在現場針對四種英文改述種類判斷是否剽竊，若受試者需要更多的時間閱讀英文改述，可在施測前或施測中與研究者溝通。受試者有可能因為測驗時間耗時 30 分鐘，或是因為自身英文能力受限而拒絕參與本研究。

五、研究潛在風險與處理方式

本研究之改述種類辨認測驗以英文撰寫，若在施測過程中，受試者或許會因為英文能力受限而產生挫折感。若受試者因英文能力不足而導致作答困難，可與研究者商討延長作答時間或是尋求研究者的協助。倘若真的無法完成，受試者也可退出本研究。

六、研究益處

本研究旨在坦討自然科學與社會科學學門之大學教師對於剽竊的觀感與認知。其重要性為提供給學術界新進研究人員與教師剽竊的基本概念，並進一步利用改述預防剽竊。

七、研究參與者之權益

1. 參與本研究您不需負擔任何費用。
2. **個人資料保護機制**
    研究計畫主持人將依法把可辨識您身分的紀錄與個人隱私的資料視為機密處理，絕對不會公開。將來發表研究結果時，您的身份仍將保密。中央主管機關及人類研究倫理委員會在不危害您的隱私情況下，依法有權檢視您的資料。
3. **新資訊之提供**
    過程中如有新資訊可能影響您繼續參與本研究意願的任何重大發現，都將即時提供給您。

4. 損害賠償或保險

若您因參與本研究而發生不良事件或損害，得依法請求損害賠償。但可預期之不良事件，不在此限，如施測與訪談時間過長。

您簽署本知情同意書後，在法律上的任何權利不會因此受影響。

5. 聯絡方式

若您對研究有疑問時，您可以和計畫主持人聯絡，計畫主持人游東道，電話：＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿手機：0937-607257。

本研究已經過國立中正大學人類研究倫理審查委員會審查，審查內容包含利益與風險評估、研究參與者照護及隱私保護等，並已獲得核准。委員會係依規範運作，並通過中央目的事業主管機構查核認證之審查組織。若您於研究過程中有任何疑問，或認為權利受到影響、傷害，可直接與國立中正大學人類研究倫理中心聯繫，電話：05-2720411 分機 22236、E-mail：depthrec@ccu.edu.tw，或郵寄地址：621 嘉義縣民雄鄉大學路 168 號 國立中正大學人類研究倫理中心。

八、中止研究參與或退出

您可自由決定是否參加本研究，研究過程中不需要任何理由，可隨時撤回同意或退出研究。如果您拒絕參加或退出，將不會引起任何不愉快，也不會有任何的懲罰，更不會損及您的任何權益（工作、修課或醫療照護）。若您決定撤回同意或退出研究，可透過手機或電子郵件或當面通知計畫主持人，計畫主持人將會將您的個人資料、訪談錄音檔與訪談逐字稿抽出並銷毀。研究計畫主持人或研究計畫贊助或監督單位，也可能於必要時中止該研究之進行。

若您決定退出本研究(請勾選)：

☐同意研究者使用已提供之資料。

☐不同意研究者使用已提供之資料，研究者應將該資料銷毀。

九、研究可能衍生之商業利益及其應用之約定

無。

十、研究材料之保存期限及運用規劃

請說明研究材料之保存期限、保存方式、運用規劃。

參與者的個人資料、訪談錄音檔與談逐字稿將加密儲存於計畫主持人的個人電腦中，而訪談逐字稿列印之後之紙本，會歸檔於本人研究室。保存年限為五年，五年後銷毀。

十一、研究主持人/研究人員聲明

計畫主持人或研究說明者已詳細解釋有關本研究計畫中上述研究方法的

性質與目的，及可能產生的風險與益處。

研究主持人

正楷姓名： 游東道　簽名：　　　　　　日期：　年　月　日

研究說明者（擔任本研究計畫職稱：計畫主持人）

正楷姓名：　　　　　簽名：　　　　　　日期：　年　月　日

十二、參與者聲明

計畫主持人或研究說明者已完整地向本人說明本研究之性質與目的，且已回答本人有關研究的問題，同時也解釋本人有權隨時退出研究。

研究參與者

正楷姓名：　　　　　簽名：　　　　　　日期：　年　月　日

106年度專題研究計畫成果彙整表

計畫主持人：游東道			計畫編號：106-2410-H-343-013-		
計畫名稱：大學教師對於改述中的剽竊之觀感:以自然與社會科學為例					

成果項目				量化	單位	質化（說明：各成果項目請附佐證資料或細項說明，如期刊名稱、年份、卷期、起訖頁數、證號...等）
國內	學術性論文	期刊論文		0	篇	
		研討會論文		0		
		專書		0	本	
		專書論文		0	章	
		技術報告		0	篇	
		其他		0	篇	
	智慧財產權及成果	專利權	發明專利 申請中	0	件	
			發明專利 已獲得	0		
			新型/設計專利	0		
		商標權		0		
		營業秘密		0		
		積體電路電路布局權		0		
		著作權		0		
		品種權		0		
		其他		0		
	技術移轉	件數		0	件	
		收入		0	千元	
國外	學術性論文	期刊論文		0	篇	
		研討會論文		0		
		專書		0	本	
		專書論文		0	章	
		技術報告		0	篇	
		其他		0	篇	
	智慧財產權及成果	專利權	發明專利 申請中	0	件	
			發明專利 已獲得	0		
			新型/設計專利	0		
		商標權		0		
		營業秘密		0		
		積體電路電路布局權		0		
		著作權		0		
		品種權		0		
		其他		0		

	技術移轉	件數	0	件	
		收入	0	千元	
參與計畫人力	本國籍	大專生	1	人次	本研究計畫聘用一名大學兼任助理，主要工作負責核銷與中英文訪談逐字稿。
		碩士生	0		
		博士生	0		
		博士後研究員	0		
		專任助理	0		
	非本國籍	大專生	0		
		碩士生	0		
		博士生	0		
		博士後研究員	0		
		專任助理	0		
其他成果 （無法以量化表達之成果如辦理學術活動、獲得獎項、重要國際合作、研究成果國際影響力及其他協助產業技術發展之具體效益事項等，請以文字敘述填列。）					

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果自評表

請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況、研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）、是否適合在學術期刊發表或申請專利、主要發現（簡要敘述成果是否具有政策應用參考價值及具影響公共利益之重大發現）或其他有關價值等，作一綜合評估。

---

1. 請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況作一綜合評估
   ■達成目標
   □未達成目標（請說明，以100字為限）
   　　　□實驗失敗
   　　　□因故實驗中斷
   　　　□其他原因
   說明：

---

2. 研究成果在學術期刊發表或申請專利等情形（請於其他欄註明專利及技轉之證號、合約、申請及洽談等詳細資訊）
   論文：□已發表　□未發表之文稿　■撰寫中　□無
   專利：□已獲得　□申請中　■無
   技轉：□已技轉　□洽談中　■無
   其他：（以200字為限）
   本研究報告將於結案之後尋求資深學者的意見進行細部修正，進而投稿國內外期刊。

---

3. 請依學術成就、技術創新、社會影響等方面，評估研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性，以500字為限）
   本研究旨在探索社會與自然學門大學教師對於改述中剽竊的觀感，研究結果顯示不同領域老師對於改述中剽竊的觀感並無明顯差別。即使改述有抄襲的嫌疑，大學老師認為只要有引用(citations)，就沒有抄襲的意圖，也就不算抄襲。但對於國外學者來說，即使有引用，若用字與原文過於雷同，也算是一種剽竊。在這樣的觀感之下，國內學者投稿國外期刊時，有可能冒著被指控剽竊的風險。社會與自然領域老師對於引用其他學者的「文字」與「想法」抱持著不同的意見。社會科學老師認為當使用其他學者的文字(words)與想法(ideas)的時候，都需要使用引用(citations)，但自然科學老師認為只有使用別人的想法(ideas)的時候需要使用引用。試想，在學校教評會若是有一方認為另一方剽竊文字而爭執不下時，其實很有可能是學科領域不同導致。總結而論，國內學者對於改述的規範意見相當分歧，若是能在大學或研究所層級將改述納入學術寫作課程當中，即可避免未來遭指控剽竊的風險。

---

4. 主要發現

本研究具有政策應用參考價值：□否 ■是，建議提供機關<u>教育部,</u>
（勾選「是」者，請列舉建議可提供施政參考之業務主管機關）
本研究具影響公共利益之重大發現：■否 □是
說明：（以150字為限）
台灣學者對於改述中剽竊的定義與外國學者有差別，原因可能是台灣大學部和研究所層級並沒有把學術寫作視為重點，引用(citations)是一種形式上的標記，而改述(paraphrasing)才是真正的學術寫作技巧，因此大學院校課程若能更重視學術寫作，相信更能預防學生無意中遭到剽竊的指控。