
Incorporation of source material: the effect of instruction

NEOMY STORCH
University of Melbourne

An important aspect of advanced academic writing is the ability to incorporate source material. Yet this ability often poses considerable challenges for international ESL students. Although a number of scholars have called for the explicit teaching of how to acknowledge and incorporate source materials, research evidence on whether explicit instruction is effective is relatively scarce. This paper reports on a classroom based study which investigated the efficacy of such instruction. Using ESL learners' performance on two integrated tasks (pre and post instruction), the study investigated whether learners' use of sources improves in response to instruction. The study found that instruction seems to lead to a reduced reliance on the language of the source materials. However such decreased reliance on the language of the sources may lead to greater inaccuracies in the attempted interpretation and incorporation of ideas from the source texts. The findings suggest that the ability to incorporate source materials may follow a gradual developmental path and this in turn has implications not only for instruction but also for the development of appropriate descriptors to assess the ability to incorporate sources.

Keywords: *integrated tasks; use of sources; citation analysis; plagiarism*

Introduction

Academic writing assignments, particularly at the tertiary level, involve the ability to incorporate information from source materials. Studies investigating the nature of academic writing tasks in Western universities (e.g. Hamp-Lyons & Kroll, 1996; Leki & Carson, 1997; Moore & Morton, 2005; Weigle, 2002, 2004) have shown that academic writing is almost always based on research of some kind. That is, students in content courses are rarely asked to complete written assessment tasks which draw solely on their own knowledge. Students are also expected to employ linguistic and rhetorical conventions to distinguish their own words or ideas from those of the sources.

However, a large body of research has shown that students do not always incorporate and acknowledge sources correctly. Perhaps of greater concern is the amount of unintentional or intentional textual borrowing, the latter labelled as plagiarism, often evident

in ESL students' assignments and dissertations (Pecorari, 2003; Shi, 2004, 2010). This is perhaps not surprising. The ability to interpret and incorporate the ideas of others requires not only knowledge of the mechanics of citation and of the literacy practices of specific disciplines, but also a certain level of linguistic expertise (Campbell, 1990; Gu & Brooks, 2008; Howard, 1995). The reliance on the words of others has led to a debate in the literature about whether plagiarism among second language (L2) writers is an intentional transgression, an unintentional result of cultural attitudes towards the use of sources (Chandrasoma, Thompson & Pennycook, 1994) or indeed a strategy used by learners in their path towards appropriating unfamiliar ideas and complex language structures and making it their own (Currie, 1998; Howard, 1995).

Most scholars writing on the topic of plagiarism inevitably conclude with a call for appropriate instruction on the use and incorporation of source materials (e.g. Howard, 1995; Keck, 2006; Pecorari, 2001, 2003; Shi, 2010). Indeed it seems that mere exposure to academic conventions may be insufficient to instil acceptable ways of incorporating source materials and acknowledging sources. In an earlier study (Storch, 2009) I found that even after one semester of academic study at an English medium university, ESL learners tended to rely heavily on the language of the source materials and cited sources incorrectly. This is despite the fact that many of these students were graduates, were required to produce research-based assignments, and were probably exposed to university and faculty produced information about how to cite sources and the perils of plagiarism. What seems to be needed is instruction which includes not only explicit information about how and why sources should be acknowledged, but also sustained practice and feedback on the use of sources.

To date there has been little research on the implementation and impact of such pedagogy. One such study is by Wette (2010) who investigated the impact of eight hours of instruction on ESL students' ability to use and incorporate sources. The major sources of data in Wette's study were pre- and post-instruction questionnaires, pre- and post-instruction tests as well as students' graded assignments completed out-of-class. The tests had two parts: the first part tested students' declarative knowledge of citation conventions; the second part assessed their ability to summarise or paraphrase a set of short excerpts. The out-of-class assignments required students to embed a set number of citations (eight to ten) from four to five source texts. Analysis of the test data found significant improvements in the students' declarative knowledge about citation conventions and decreased reliance on direct copying. However, analysis of citations used in the assignments showed that direct copying was still prevalent and that over half the citations were flawed. As students attempted to paraphrase or summarise instead

of copy source material, they encountered difficulties which in turn resulted in frequent flaws in citations. These difficulties correlated to the students' ESL proficiency. A comparison of the test performance of a small sub-set of the students with overall course marks suggested that students with higher overall marks were better able to utilise what they had learnt. One limitation of Wette's study was that it was conducted with students from a range of disciplines. Thus the source texts in the tests and the topics set for the assignments had to be quite general, rather than be related to the students' field of study. Furthermore, the tests were not for assessment purposes. These factors could have influenced the participants' ability (and motivation) to perform well on the tests.

The study reported in this paper aimed to gauge the effect of explicit instruction on learners' use of sources in a task that more closely resembled the kind of writing the students were required to complete in their discipline. Specifically, the study aimed to investigate how students used sources in such tasks, whether they paraphrased, summarised or merely copied from the source materials. I begin by describing the context in which this study was conducted, including the nature of the instructional program. I then detail how the data for this study were collected and analysed, before discussing the findings.

The Study

The study was conducted in a large metropolitan university in Australia. The university has a large and growing number of ESL students at both the graduate and undergraduate level. The disciplinary areas which draw the largest number of international ESL students, particularly at the undergraduate level, are Engineering and Economics/Business. In order to support the language needs of these students, a number of credit-bearing ESL subjects, both discipline specific and general, have been developed. These subjects aim to develop the learners' academic language abilities, with a particular focus on developing their academic writing, given that most assessment tasks at the university are written assignments and examination.

One such subject is Academic English: Economics/Commerce (AE: Eco/Com). The students who enrol in AE: Eco/Com are predominantly from Mainland China, the main source country of many of the international students in the Economics/Business Faculty. Their proficiency is considered high intermediate; that is, they have satisfied the university's threshold ESL proficiency (IELTS score of 6.5, with no band score of less than 6 or an equivalent TOEFL or Australian ESL Year 12 score). These students enrol in the ESL subject either because they are recommended to do so by their course advisor, a recommendation based on their score on the university's ESL diagnostic test, or they self-identify as needing additional

English language support. The number of students who tend to enrol each year ranges from 50–80.

The subject was designed in consultation with staff from the Economics/Business Faculty. It adopts a content and task-based approach to instruction. The content is based on key topics in macroeconomics (e.g. macroeconomic objectives, fiscal and monetary policy instruments). This content is delivered via lectures (video excerpts of lectures delivered by economics lecturers and live lectures delivered by the ESL teacher) as well as course readings. The tasks include short reports and assignments that require students to draw on the content material and apply it to discuss contemporary economic issues.

There are four hours of classes per week (over a 12-week semester): a one-hour lecture, a one-hour tutorial devoted to discussing the readings and lecture, and a two-hour tutorial devoted to teaching and practising academic writing skills. These two-hour tutorials provide instruction and practice in writing data commentary texts, writing extended definitions, structuring assignments and reports, and using and incorporating source materials.

Assessment is based on three short tasks completed in class, two tests (discussed below) and two assignments. The first assignment (about 800 words in length) requires students to discuss a macroeconomic objective (e.g. low unemployment), in terms of past and future trends. The second assignment (1200 words in length) requires students to discuss a contemporary economic issue (e.g. skill shortage). These assignments are research-based. They require students to draw on a range of sources and cite the sources used correctly.

Three two-hour sessions (six hours in total) are devoted to the use of source materials. In the first session we discuss what needs to be acknowledged, why and how. Students are given explicit instruction and handouts on how to acknowledge various source materials (e.g. texts, newspapers, websites). They also complete an editing exercise which contains typical errors in acknowledgement conventions and in listing references.

The subsequent session is devoted to instruction and practice of paraphrasing and summarising. Very little time is spent on direct quotes, since direct quotes are quite rare in Economics texts (Hyland, 1999). Students are provided with an example of a paraphrase and a summary of the same text, and we discuss what distinguishes the two forms of using sources. Instruction on paraphrasing emphasizes that paraphrasing involves not just replacing words with synonyms or changing the grammatical order of words, but it involves restating what the author has said in one's own words. Students then complete a set of exercises on paraphrasing and summarising. For example, in the practice exercise on paraphrasing, students are asked to paraphrase a short text about the role of the government

in the economy. Students' paraphrases are checked by the teacher for correct acknowledgement, for gist and for use of language. Two good examples are then selected and written on the board for other students to see. A similar procedure is used for practice in summarising information, except that students summarise a text in pairs rather than individually. They are first asked to discuss in pairs the main gist of the text and then to compose the summary collaboratively. Peer and teacher feedback is provided on the summaries.

Session 3 is devoted to work on synthesizing information. After explaining what a synthesis means and why it is an important academic skill, an example of a synthesis is shown. Students are then asked to synthesise information from a short text and from their lecture notes to explain the differences between two macro-economic policy instruments. Peer feedback and teacher feedback is provided on the synthesized texts and then a model synthesized text is shown and compared to students' synthesized texts.

Further practice in the use of sources is provided by the two assignments completed outside class time. The two assignments have a two-draft system. Students submit a first draft, receive feedback on the draft, including feedback on the use of sources, and then submit a revised version.

As mentioned earlier, assessment for this subject includes two tests. These tests are integrated tasks. These integrated tasks require learners to integrate material from oral (lecture) and written texts in a written response to a given question. Such tasks are now used by a number of ESL proficiency tests to assess learners' ability to incorporate sources (Gebril, 2009; Plakans, 2009a). For example, the Internet-based version of the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL iBT) includes an integrated writing task which requires test takers to read a text (200-300 words), listen and take notes from a short lecture or conversation (two minutes) and then write a response which incorporates what they have read or heard (Alderson, 2009). It should be noted, however, that research on the use of such tasks has been fairly limited, and what research exists has been carried out in proficiency test situations (see Cumming et al., 2006) rather than in classroom contexts.

Data collection

The study was classroom based. Data comprised 52 writing scripts from two integrated tasks. The first integrated task (IT1) was completed early in the semester (Week 5), prior to instruction on the use of sources. The second integrated task (IT2) was completed towards the end of the semester (Week 11), after instruction.

The two integrated tasks follow the same procedure. They are completed in class under test conditions. Students are given one hour to complete the task: 10 minutes to read the question and the given texts (about a page long in total), five to six minutes to listen to a short video excerpt and take notes, and 40 minutes to write

their answer to the question. The question topics are related to the topics that are covered in the course. The lecture excerpts are taken from lectures that the students heard previously during the semester. Students are allowed to use their own dictionaries in the tests.

Assessment of the integrated tasks is based on an analytic scale composed of three criteria: task fulfilment (whether all parts of the question are addressed and how fully), structure and language use. Task fulfilment is marked out of 10, the other two criteria out of five. Since use of sources is not taught prior to Integrated Task 1, students are not assessed on correct citations. However, the task instructions encourage students to draw on the sources provided but use their own language as much as possible (see Appendix 1). The instructions for Integrated Task 2 inform students that they should draw on the sources provided, cite these sources correctly, and use their own language as much as possible (see Appendix 2). In assessing Integrated Task 2, the criterion task fulfilment also takes into account whether sources are acknowledged and accuracy of citations. Integrated Task 1 contributes 10% and Integrated Task 2 contributes 20% to the total subject grade.

Data

The data for this study consisted of 52 test scripts: the scripts of 26 students from Integrated Task 1 and of the same 26 students from Integrated Task 2. The selection of the test scripts was random. Of the 68 students enrolled in the year in which the study was conducted, the test scripts of 30 students were selected. However, the scripts of four learners were omitted (two were too short, less than 50 words in length, and two because they completed only the first integrated task but not the second one).

Data analysis

In the first instance, the written scripts were divided into idea units. The idea unit is based on the work of Kroll (1977). It refers to a cohesive thought and generally tends to coincide with a sentence (Le Bigot & Rouet, 2007) or a major clause. In this study, the idea unit represented a thematic unit of information that dealt with a distinct issue (e.g. definition of a term, description of how a concept is measured). An idea unit could thus vary in length from one sentence to two or three sentences. This division into idea units was guided by the questions posed in the integrated task. A tutor who teaches the subject coded a random sample of 10 written scripts (five from each task). Inter-rater reliability was 100%.

The data were then coded for a number of parameters thought to capture the skills needed to acknowledge and transform source material for the purposes of answering a question. The coding categories were informed by the literature (particularly Cumming et al., 2006) and by an iterative reading of the data. The four major

coding categories used were: documentation, citation, presentation, interpretation and integration.

1. *Documentation*: Data were coded for whether sources of information were acknowledged, whenever appropriate, irrespective of whether they were acknowledged correctly or not.
2. *Citation*: This category considered whether the acknowledgment, if present, was correct. Three sub-categories were established:
 - a. correct
 - b. minor errors (e.g. a first name rather than a surname was used for the author, the publication date was omitted)
 - c. major errors/omissions (e.g. providing too much information such as the publisher information or providing insufficient information such as just the word 'lecture' when citing information from the lecture excerpt)
3. *Presentation*: Data were coded for how source materials were presented; that is for whether the sources appeared in the students texts as:
 - a. direct quote
 - b. paraphrase
 - c. summary
 - d. synthesis
4. *Interpretation*: Data were coded for whether the sources were interpreted correctly and integrated coherently in the response to the question.

As noted above, the coding category 'Presentation' distinguished between direct quotation (with quotation marks), paraphrasing, summarising, and synthesizing. A synthesis refers to idea units that contained information from more than one source (e.g. a reading text and the lecture). This form of using sources is considered more cognitively complex than paraphrasing or summarising (Hirvela, 2007).

Summarising and paraphrasing are similar in that they require the writer to reproduce the original text. However, whereas a paraphrase rephrases an original idea; a summary extracts the gist of the original idea, and as such it is a condensed version of the original idea expressed in the writer's own words (McAnulty, 1981). In this study, summaries included instances where writers used the gist from the text but added their own thoughts. The following is an example of a summary of this kind (the student names used are pseudonyms).

Example 1 Example of a student summary

Original text:	Student summary:
<p>The role of the government is to provide a stable environment in which the private sector can operate. (Kniest et al, 1998)</p>	<p>However, monetarist economists argue that although the government has an important role to provide stable environment for the operation of the business, the private sector can take care of its business cycle by itself. (Linda)</p>

Paraphrases were further distinguished based on the coding scheme developed by Keck (2006). Using the criterion of the proportion of words borrowed from the original sources, three types of attempted paraphrases were identified: Near Copies [NC], Moderate Revisions [MR], and Substantial Revisions [SR]. Near Copies were attempted paraphrases which contained 50% or more of borrowed words. Moderate Revisions were attempted paraphrases which contained between 10–49% of borrowed words and Substantial Revisions contained less than 10% of borrowed words. In determining how many words to count as borrowed words, only strings of more than two consecutive words which were exactly the same as the words in the original excerpts were counted. However, this analysis excluded strings of words which refer to common concepts in macroeconomics (e.g. consumer price index, base year) and proper nouns (e.g. The Bureau of Statistics).

Example 2 is of a student's attempted paraphrase which was coded as Moderate Revision [MR]. Of the 21 words in the idea unit, 10 (i.e. 46%) were the same as the in original source. The borrowed strings of words are shaded.

Example 2 Attempted paraphrase coded as Moderate Revision [MR]

Original text:	Student paraphrase:
<p>For example, if the price of the basket had increased 35% since the base year, then the index would be 135.0 (Australian Bureau of Statistics)</p>	<p>For example, if the price of a particular item rises 34% compare to the base year, the index would be 134. (Yuan)</p>

Example 3 below is of a Near Copy [NC]. As the student's paraphrase shows, of the 22 words in the idea unit, 16 words were borrowed from the original source (constituting over 50% of the words in the idea unit).

Example 3 Attempted paraphrase coded as a Near Copy [NC]

Original text:	Student paraphrase:
<p>The role of the government is to provide a stable environment in which the private sector can operate. (Kniest et al, 1998)</p>	<p>The role of the government, in their point of view, is to provide a stable environment where the private sector can operate. (Xia)</p>

Use of sources was also evaluated. Each instance of paraphrase, summary and synthesis was evaluated in terms of accuracy of interpretation. Example 4, given below, is of a paraphrase that was coded as an inaccurate interpretation of the source. In the original text, the authors present Keynes' view that an equilibrium between supply and demand for goods and services does not exist, and that even if such a state of equilibrium were to exist it would not ensure full employment. The paraphrase (a near copy) suggests that Keynes stated that an equilibrium in the market always exists.

Example 4 Inaccurate interpretation of source

Original text	Student paraphrase
<p>Keynes demonstrated that the supply or output of goods and services does not necessarily equal planned expenditure or the demand for goods and services; and furthermore, where there is an equilibrium between production and planned expenditure, it does not necessarily correspond to full employment (Kniest et al., 1998)</p>	<p>Keynesian economists believe that there is an equilibrium between production and planned expenditure (Bonan)</p>

Example 5 is of a summary that was coded as inaccurate because it lacked coherence. Specifically, although the first part of the summary is a correct interpretation of the given text

(monetarists attribute the 1930s recession to government mishandling of monetary policy), it is not clear how it links to the point regarding the self-correcting activity.

Example 5 Incorrect (incoherent) interpretation of source

Original text	Student summary
<p>In contrast, monetarists see regulation of the money supply as a much more powerful tool for affecting the economy. They argue that the 1930's depression was as severe as it was, largely because governments did a particularly bad job of managing monetary policy. (Waud et al., 1996)</p>	<p>In contrast, monetarist economists point out that government's bad management on monetary policy results recession, when self-correcting activity does not happen. (Annie)</p>

It became apparent when coding for accuracy of interpretations that in some cases it was difficult to determine whether the citations presented an understanding of the source, particularly when the source text was completely or almost completely copied. Such instances were coded separately. For example, in describing how the Consumer Price Index (CPI) is constructed, Susan wrote:

Basically, the price of the CPI basket in the reference base period is expressed as an index by assigning it a value of 100 and the prices in other periods are expressed as percentages of the price in the base period.

However, this response is an almost exact copy of the source text. Susan's only original word is 'Basically'. Thus it was difficult to determine whether Susan's response shows an understanding of how the CPI is constructed.

Findings

Table 1 summarises the findings for three of the four parameters investigated, namely documentation, citation and representation. The table shows the number of papers (out of 26) that showed citations, and the percentage of correct and incorrect citations. Since none of the 26 Integrated Task 1 scripts contained acknowledgements, coding for correct citations was not applicable for Task 1. The table also shows how sources were used (total number of instances of source use) and the percentage that each type of use formed of total citations. Furthermore, in the case of paraphrases, the frequency of the

different types of paraphrases and what proportion they formed of total paraphrases is also shown.

Table 1 Use and acknowledgement of sources in the two integrated tasks

	Integrated Task 1	Integrated Task 2
Documentation: sources acknowledged	0	21 papers
Citation	N/A	76
Correct		35 (46.05%)
Minor errors		20 (26.32%)
Major errors		21 (27.64%)
Presentation: use of sources	206	174
Direct quotes	1 (0.48%)	6 (3.45%)
Paraphrases	154 (74.75%)	120 (68.97%)
Copy/Near copy	74 (48.05%)	37 (30.83%)
Moderate Revisions	31 (20.13%)	29 (24.17%)
Substantial Revisions	49 (31.82%)	54 (45%)
Summaries	47 (23.04%)	38 (21.84%)
Syntheses	4 (1.94%)	10 (5.75%)

As the table shows, on Integrated Task 1, none of the 26 papers analysed showed sources of information. This may have been due to the fact that students were not instructed explicitly in the task rubric to cite sources (see Appendix 1). However, information from the sources was clearly used. There were 206 idea units that relied on information from the sources provided, mainly in the form of attempted paraphrases (74.75%). Almost half of the paraphrases (48.05%) were copies or near copies. There were relatively few instances of syntheses.

In contrast, on Integrated Task 2, 21 of the 26 scripts documented sources of information. However, sources were not always cited correctly. Less than half of the sources (46.05%) were cited correctly, with 21 of the citations (forming almost 28%) having major errors. Attempted paraphrases were again the main form of using sources, but on Integrated Task 2, a large proportion of these paraphrases were substantially revised (45%). Nevertheless, almost a third (30.83%) of the paraphrases were copies or near copies, still relying heavily on borrowed words. Although there was more evidence of synthesis, overall there were few such instances of syntheses.

Table 2 shows the proportion of citations (paraphrases, summaries and syntheses) that were inaccurate or where accuracy was difficult to determine. Only those citations which excluded direct quotes were counted (see Table 2). As the table shows, in Integrated Task 1, only 22 instances (or 10.73% of citations) were coded as incorrect or incoherent interpretations. However, given the large proportion of paraphrases that were copies or near copies, there were a number of instances (34, representing 16.59%) where it was difficult to determine whether the chunks of copied source texts reflected an understanding of the source information. In the case of Integrated Task 2, the number of instances of incorrect or incoherent interpretation almost doubled (39), representing 23.21% of total citations. Most of these incorrect interpretations occurred when the learners tried to summarise or present the source information as a substantially revised paraphrase. There were fewer instances (5) where it was difficult to determine whether source information was understood.

Table 2: Accuracy of interpretation

	Integrated Task 1	Integrated Task 2
Total number of citations (excluding direct quotes)	205	168
Inaccurate/incoherent interpretation	22 (10.73%)	39 (23.21%)
Accuracy of interpretation hard to determine	34 (16.58%)	5 (2.98%)

Discussion

The study set out to examine what effect, if any, instruction had on students' ability to use source materials, and how students used sources on integrated tasks that formed part of the students' course assessment. The aim of the instruction was to encourage students to use sources correctly, including correct acknowledgement and citations, and to reduce reliance on the language of source materials.

On Integrated Task 2, the majority of students (21 out of 26) attributed information to sources used, and included citation information, albeit not always correctly. Whether the greater incidence of acknowledgement of sources is due to instruction is difficult to determine because students were not asked explicitly to show sources in the instruction for Integrated Task 1. In terms of using sources, although paraphrases continued to form the main way of using sources on both integrated tasks, on Integrated Task 2 there were fewer instances of copies or near copies, and more instances of

substantially revised paraphrases. Thus the instruction appears to have encouraged students to reduce their reliance on the language of the sources. Unlike the findings of my earlier study (Storch, 2009), where after a semester of studying in an English medium university, students still continued to omit sources and rely heavily on the language of sources, this study has shown that explicit instruction and classroom practice does improve students' ability to use sources and it reduces their reliance on borrowed words.

However decreased reliance on the language of the sources meant that the difficulties students experienced in transforming the source information or in understanding the source information became more overt. As in Wette's study (2010), many students experienced difficulties with either understanding the sometimes nuanced meanings of the texts provided, and/or in composing paraphrases or summaries that accurately reflected the ideas contained in the sources provided.

The findings suggest that use of sources involves a developmental process. Whereas the mechanics of citations may be readily acquired, even after a relatively brief period of instruction, the ability to transform and incorporate source information may take longer to acquire. The ability to incorporate source material may begin with incorrect citations and heavy reliance on the language of the source materials. It may then proceed to a stage where citations are correct and there is reduced reliance on the language of the sources but a high incidence of inaccurate transformation. The final stage is one where correct and accurate citations and transformation co-occur. Such a developmental path has implications for both pedagogy and assessment.

In terms of pedagogy, the findings suggest that although explicit instruction is beneficial, it may require a longer period of practice. Although six hours (three 2-hour sessions) were devoted to the use of sources, it is perhaps unrealistic to expect students to master the use of sources in such a relatively short time period. Nevertheless, the findings suggest that teaching students how to paraphrase is important, as it reduces direct copying of source materials. The implications for assessment are more complex.

Performance on Integrated Task 1 showed that students relied heavily on the language of source materials. Such reliance makes assessment difficult on two of the criteria used in assessing this task: language and task fulfilment. In terms of language, as Brown, Iwashita and McNamara (2005) note, learners' re-use of provided vocabulary makes it difficult to assess learners' lexical ability. Reliance on copies or near copies also makes assessment on the criterion task fulfilment difficult because in such instances it is difficult to determine whether the learner has understood the source material.

When, in response to instruction, learners begin to use their own language, we encounter another assessment difficulty: how

to account for any inaccuracy of reproduced information and how to assess such inaccuracies. It is not always clear by looking at a student's written response whether an inaccuracy should be interpreted as representing a problem in reading comprehension or as a weakness in writing, or perhaps a combination of both. To date there has been very little research on whether and how reading proficiency affects learners' performance on integrated tasks. Plakans and Gebril's (2012) study found a relationship between reading scores and scores on integrated tasks, but mainly at the lower level of proficiency. No connection was found at higher levels of proficiency. It should be noted, however, that in the Plakans and Gebril study, the learners' second language proficiency was lower (mean IELTS score of 5.27) than that of the participants in the present study. Clearly further research using post-task interviews or think-aloud protocols (see for example the study by Plakans, (2009b) on reading strategies used in integrated tasks) is needed to fully understand how comprehension affects the use of source texts, and the extent to which difficulties in comprehension affect task performance.

If, however, the inaccuracy in interpretation of source material is attributable to writing expertise, then this too has ramifications for assessment. The question that teachers and researchers need to consider is how to assess such attempts at paraphrasing. Should our assessment criteria reflect the developmental progression in the use of sources, and reward a reduced reliance on the language of the sources at the expense of accuracy of interpretation? That is, if we want to encourage students to reduce their reliance on the language of the text, should learners' attempts to use their own language be rewarded even if the end product is a somewhat incoherent representation?

Producing academic assignments which require incorporation of source materials involves a number of skills, including comprehension, reproduction and transformation of source ideas. We need further research which elucidates the relationship between these skills so that as second language writing teachers we provide our learners with effective forms of instruction and as assessors we develop appropriate assessment descriptors.

Appendix 1: Integrated Task I

-
- Lecture:** Richards, G. (1999). *Measurement of Macroeconomic Objectives*. (a 6 minute excerpt)
- Reading texts:** Extracts from:
 Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (2000) *A Guide to the Consumer Price Index*, pp. 1-11
 McTaggart, D., Findlay, C. & Parkin, M. (1994) *Economics*. Addison-Wesley, Sydney.

You are required to write *250-300 words* in response to the following:

The cost of living in Australia is measured by the Consumer Price Index (CPI). Give an extended definition of the CPI and explain briefly how it is calculated. What are some of the limitations of the CPI as a measure of the cost of living?

You should:

- take notes as you listen to the lecture excerpt
- use information from the lecture and from the reading extracts in your writing

Marks will be given for:

- comprehensive answers to the questions
- well-structured paragraphs
- grammatical accuracy
- appropriate choice of vocabulary
- using relevant ideas from the reading text and lecture excerpt and expressing them as far as possible in your own words

Appendix 2: Integrated Task 2

Lecture: Richards, G. (1999). Monetary Policy (a 5 minute excerpt)

Reading texts: Extracts from:

- Kniest et al. (1998). Introduction to Macroeconomics. Melbourne: Macmillan Education Australia.
- Waud, et al. (1996). Macroeconomics. Melbourne: Longman

You are required to write *250-300 words* in response to the following:

Explain the main differences between the views of Keynesian and monetarist economists on the role of the government and macroeconomic policy instruments. Why do they hold such different views? Would you classify the economic philosophy of the present Australian government as closer to Keynesian or to monetarist? Explain your answer by reference to current fiscal and monetary policies.

You should:

- take notes as you listen to the lecture excerpt
- use information from the lecture and from the reading extracts in your writing

Marks will be given for:

- comprehensive answers to the questions
- well-structured response
- grammatical accuracy and appropriate word choice
- using relevant ideas from the reading texts and lecture excerpt and expressing them as far as possible in your own words
- acknowledging sources where appropriate

References

- Alderson, J. C. (2009). Test review: Test of English as a Foreign Language™: Internet-based Test (TOEFL iBT®). *Language Testing*, 26, 621-631.
- Brown, A., Iwashita, N., McNamara, T. (2005). *An examination of rater orientations and test-taker performance on English-for-Academic-Purposes speaking tasks* (TOEFL Monograph Series MS-29). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Campbell, C. (1990). Writing with others' words: Using background reading text in academic compositions. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 211-230). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chandrasoma, R., Thompson, C., & Pennycook, A. (2004). Beyond plagiarism: Transgressive and non-transgressive intertextuality. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 3, 171-193.
- Cumming, A., Kantor, R., Baba, K., Eouanzoui, K., Erdosy, U., James, M. (2006). *Analysis of discourse features and verification of scoring levels for independent and integrated prototype written tasks for the new TOEFL* (TOEFL Monograph Series MS-30). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Currie, P. (1998). Staying out of trouble: Apparent plagiarism and academic survival. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 1-18.
- Gebriel, A. (2009). Score generalisability of academic writing tasks: Does one test method fit it all? *Language Testing*, 26, 507-531.
- Gu, Q., & Brooks, J. (2008). Beyond the accusation of plagiarism. *System*, 36, 337-352.
- Hamp-Lyons, L., & Kroll, B. (1996). Issues in ESL writing assessment: An overview. *College ESL*, 6, 52-72.

- Hirvela, A. (2007). *Connecting reading and writing in second language writing instruction*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Howard, R. M. (1995). Plagiarism, authorship and the academic death penalty. *College English*, 57, 788-805.
- Hyland, K. (1999). Academic attribution: citation and the construction of disciplinary knowledge. *Applied Linguistics*, 20, 341-267.
- 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.
- Kroll, B. (1977). Combining ideas in written and spoken English: a look at subordination and coordination. In E. O. Keenan and T. L. Bennett (Eds.), *Discourse Across Time and Space*. Los Angeles, Calif.: University of Southern California.
- Le Bigot, L., & Rouet, J. (2007). The impact of presentation format, task assignment and prior knowledge on students' comprehension of multiple online documents. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 39, 445-470.
- Leki, I., & Carson, J. (1997). Completely different worlds: EAP and the writing experiences of ESL students in university courses. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 39-69.
- McAnulty, S. J. (1981). Paraphrase, summary, precis: Advantages, definitions, models. *Teaching English in the Two-year Colleges*, 8, 47-51.
- Moore, T. & Morton, J. (2005). Dimensions of difference: a comparison of university writing and IELTS writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4, 43-66.
- Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second-language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 317-345.
- Pecorari, D. (2001). Plagiarism and international students: How the English-speaking university responds. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking Literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 229-245). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Plakans, L. (2009a). Discourse synthesis in integrated second language writing assessment. *Language Testing*, 26, 561-587.
- Plakans, L. (2009b). The role of reading strategies in L2 writing tasks. *Journal of English for Specific Purposes*, 8, 252-266.
- Plakans, L., & Gebriel, A. (2012). A close investigation into source use in integrated second language writing tasks. *Assessing Writing*, 17, 18-34.
- Shi, L. (2010). Textual appropriation and citing behaviours of university undergraduates. *Applied Linguistics*, 31, 1-24.
- Shi, L. (2004). Textual borrowing in second-language writing. *Written Communication*, 21, 171-200.

- Storch, N. (2009). The impact of studying in a second language (L2) medium university on the development of L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18, 103-118.
- Weigle, S. C. (2004). Integrating reading and writing in a competency test for non-native speakers of English. *Assessing Writing*, 9, 27-55.
- Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wette, R. (2010). Evaluating student learning in a university-level EAP unit on writing using sources. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19, 158-177.

Neomy Storch is the ESL coordinator and a Senior Lecturer in ESL and Applied Linguistics at the School of Languages and Linguistics, the University of Melbourne. Her research has focused on issues related to ESL pedagogy. These issues have included the nature of peer interaction, the role of L1 in L2 classes, the development of academic writing and the contribution of feedback to such development.

Correspondence: neomys@unimelb.edu.au
