Exploring Paraphrase Performances and Strategies of Graduate Student Writing

Hatice Çeşme

Atatürk University, Turkey

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3279-7205

Abstract

This study aims to investigate performances and strategies of EFL graduate students in terms of language proficiency, language background and type of writing task. The participants were 12 graduate students pursuing their doctoral studies in ELT at a Turkish university. A chosen text was used for data collection and the students' paraphrased texts were analyzed employing Keck's (2006) the taxonomy of paraphrase types and 'a paraphrase found form' developed by the researcher in terms of lexical and structural changes. The results of the study revealed that graduate students had challenges in appropriate implementation of paraphrasing in their task. While they generated frequently moderate level of paraphrases, the strategies they often used were synonym substitution as well as copying strings of words from source. Additionally, deviated meaning was designated as a new paraphrase type in the taxonomy of paraphrase. These findings suggest that students need an explicit paraphrasing instruction supported by good and bad paraphrase examples and more practice to learn how to paraphrase appropriately.

Keywords: Paraphrasing, Plagiarism, Textual Borrowing, Academic Writing

Introduction

Paraphrasing is one of the demanding writing types in academic writing for particularly second language students and writers in which writers need to restate the ideas of other authors in their own words appropriately (Chatterjee, 2007; Flowerdew & Li, 2007; Keck, 2006, as cited in Davis, 2013, p.126).

There are several levels at which paraphrases occur as lexical, phrase-level, and sentential or sentence-level. Students, even advanced graduates use generally word-level or lexical paraphrases due to limited cognition of accurate and appropriate paraphrasing although they are rather aware of the close relationship of plagiarism. Because of the lack of paraphrasing knowledge, they often change some words with their synonyms while paraphrasing. This relationship between paraphrasing and the phenomenon of plagiarism, the role of paraphrasing and developing paraphrasing skills draw practitioners' and researchers' attention. (Barry,2006; Pennycook,1996; Thompson & Pennycook,2008). Writing books, articles, and writing websites offer practical information and strategies for paraphrasing. Purdue's Online Writing Lab, for instance, lists six steps to effective paraphrasing. Madhavi (2013) established rubrics in her study for students about how to accurately paraphrase a text. However, instructional materials are argued to be inadequate and limited (Campbell, 1990; Frodesen, 2007) and 'do little to help learners develop their lexical knowledge' (Currie, 1998; Deckert, 1993, as cited in Chang, Huang, Chen & Liou, 2013, p.2). Furthermore, through only these techniques, students may not completely be able to understand the role of paraphrasing and appropriately perform it in academic writing. While dictionaries and thesauri may also be used while paraphrasing,they usually provide single-word inputs with no practical knowledge. Student writers often experience difficulties in choosing the correct word when paraphrasing.

Transition from learning theoretical knowledge of principles of accurate paraphrasing to the actual paraphrasing phase Hirvela & Du, 2013) is also difficult for novice writers. Writing failure may occur even if the student writers follow the relevant instructions or steps when paraphrasing.

Despite being one of the most principal means of textual borrowing strategies, paraphrasing has received relatively little attention in both the pedagogical and English second language writing research literature. According to Hyland, many of the studies about paraphrasing have subsumed within summary writing (as cited in Hirvela & Du, 2013, p. 88) (Chen & Su, 2012; Choy & Lee, 2012; Keck, 2006; 2010; Liao & Tseng, 2010; MacDonogh, Crawford & De Vleeschauwer, 2014) as well as plagiarism (Ansorge, Ansorgeova & Sixsmith, 2021; Kim & Wise, 2009; Marzec-Stawiarska, 2019; Srisongkram, 2011; Wise et al., 2013; Yamwong, 2014), and patchwriting (Abasi & Akbari, 2008; Pecorari, 2003). As both reading and writing skill, 'summarizing requires the writer to express the main points of a text she has read succinctly and in her own words' (Hedgock & Ferris, 2009, p.185, as cited in Hirvela & Du, 2013, p. 88) as in paraphrasing. In fact, paraphrasing is one of the summarizing devices and patch writing is a first attempted paraphrase performance or a necessary stage for appropriate paraphrasing as Pecorari (2003, p.338) stated 'today's patchwriter is tomorrow's competent academic writer, given necessary support to develop'.

Considering relevant research in Turkey context, it is seen that the researchers have mostly focused on plagiarism; particularly views on plagiarism (Bayram & Tıkman, 2022; Kayaoğlu, Erbay, Flitner & Saltaş, 2015; Koçak & Özbek, 2016) and reason of plagiarism (Ersoy & Özden, 2011; Rocha Erkaya, 2009) too. There are also limited number of studies (Ilhan, 2017; Ozdemir, 2006; Yağız; 2019) whose focuses were the instruction of paraphrasing in reading comprehension, paraphrasing perceptions, and performances. These studies were conducted with undergraduates and primary school students. In other words, little is known about the behaviors and strategies of graduate students while generating paraphrase. Therefore, relevant literature has highlighted the need for research on paraphrasing as both an academic writing skill and textual borrowing skill at diverse levels including graduate students in Turkey. Accordingly, this study aims to examine whether graduate students' English writing experience and explicit English academic writing instruction play a significant role in their paraphrase practices. This study is also expected to enrich the understanding of paraphrase strategies employed by L2 graduate students. The research questions of the study are:

1. How do Turkish graduate students paraphrase an English text?
2. What kind of strategies do Turkish graduate students use in their paraphrasing practices?

Literature Review
Types of Paraphrasing

Although there is no consensus on the elements that constitute 'good paraphrase' or 'appropriate paraphrase' and on paraphrase strategies and techniques to follow, there have been several research studies to designate or classify different types of paraphrases and to better explain the strategies and practices that particularly L2 undergraduates, graduates and scholars adopt while writing from other sources (Campbell, 1990; Keck, 2006, 2010, 2014; Shi, 2004; Pecorari, 2003; Roig, 1999; Sun, 2013; Sun & Yang, 2015).

Campbell (1990) carried out an early study on textual borrowing habits of more and less proficient native speakers of English and ESL students. She analyzed students' multi paragraph compositions and classified 7 types of written units and defined them as quotation, exact copy, near copy, paraphrase, summary, original explanation, or marooned term (p.14). The results of the analysis indicated that ESL students provided more directly copied material in their paraphrases than native speakers did. In another study with undergraduates, Roig (1999) defined superficial paraphrasing as copying more than five words of strings from the original excerpt. Accordingly, Oshima and Hogue (1999) introduced unacceptable paraphrasing as employing the same grammatical and lexical structure of source text.

Shi (2004) investigated differences between English L1 and English L2 students' paraphrase and found that English L1 students less frequently copied

strings of words that were identical to the source text and borrowed a quarter of original text. In this study, Shi (2004) proposed a systematic and simplified categorization for paraphrasing strategies as exactly copied, slightly modified, and closely paraphrased.

In her study, Keck (2006) further revised and elaborated paraphrasing types by comparing L1 and L2 students' paraphrasing strategies in their summary tasks. Keck used a "taxonomy of paraphrase types" (p.268) to analyze the words which were borrowed and the amount of material the L1 and L2 students copied directly from the original texts and to calculate how much unique links and general links were used by the participants. She defined unique link as individual word or strings of words exactly copied in the summary that appeared only once in the original excerpt (p.266) and general link as lexical words used in the paraphrase that occurred in the original text and also occurred elsewhere in the original text(p.267). Keck also classified the students' each attempted paraphrase in four categories hinging on rate of unique and general links: near copies, minimal revision, moderate revision, and substantial revision (p.268). The results of the study indicated that L2 writers depended more on minimal modification and direct copying of words and structures from source text than L1 writers. Keck also suggested that linguistic competence may affect students' paraphrasing strategies.

In her another paraphrasing study whose focus was on examining the main grammatical strategies that L1 and L2 English students used while paraphrasing source text, Keck (2010) found that the students commonly preferred to delete and substitute original words with their synonyms. She suggested ongoing research on student paraphrasing to provide better insight of linguistic strategies.

Previous studies show that the strategies used by the participating students have a significant role in the researchers' classification of paraphrase types. However, the definitions and classifications of what constitutes appropriate or effective paraphrasing are still changeable substantially in terms of what extent to borrow lexical and syntactical structures from the original texts in spite of many attempted studies (Shi, 2012).

Language Proficiency and Paraphrase Performance

A close relationship between language proficiency and paraphrasing performance has been found in novice writers' inappropriate use of source texts. For example, based on interviews, case studies, and personal observations, researchers and classroom teachers have noted that 'many L2 written products of university students are patchwriting, interwoven with sentences or phrases copied from original sources' (e.g., Currie,1998; Myers, 1998; LoCastro & Masuko, 1997; Pennycook, 1996; Matelena, 1985, as cited in Shi, 2004 p.173). This tendency to copy might stem from the nature of tasks that demand an advanced sense of language and the ability to paraphrase (Shi, 2004). Furthermore, text readability and familiarity with the sentence structures and words that appear in source texts also affect paraphrasing performance (Liao & Tseng, 2010, p.188). In other words, students can have difficulties in understanding how to paraphrase due to the lack of academic literacy skill which requires advanced language content knowledge, the disciplinary nature of citation practices, and the rhetorical purposes of using citations in a specific context of disciplinary writing. 'Establishing main ideas, using synonyms, changing active to passive voice, knowing when to quote or keep certain expressions, and re-ordering sentence structure demand a high lexical proficiency, advanced reading comprehension, as well as syntactical sophistication' (Barks & Watts, 2001, as cited in Mclnnis, 2009, p.6). Therefore, the more research focuses on finding out the causes of student writers' poor paraphrasing attempts the more benefit can be gained regarding the relationship between language proficiency and 'acceptable' paraphrasing.

Method

This study aims to examine to what extent Turkish graduate students accurately paraphrase. To that end, textual analysis to gather information about how graduate students perform in a particular setting was conducted in the study. Mckee (2003) defines textual analysis as a methodology and a data gathering process. 'The aim of textual analysis is not altogether to analyze merely the structure of the text but to get some concrete meaning or message out of it (Arya,

2020, p.174). Thereby, researchers find this type of analysis useful in understanding methods or ways the participants use and in obtaining a rich conclusion.

Setting and Participants

The study was carried out in a Turkish state university which provides students with many undergraduate and graduate level of higher education for many years .Drawing upon on a qualitative methodology, the study was conducted with 12 Turkish EFL students, 5 male and 7 female, who were pursuing their graduate degrees in English language teaching. The reasons why graduate students were chosen for the study were that paraphrase has not been studied with graduate students in the Turkish context and that graduates are commonly assumed to have advanced knowledge and ability (more than undergraduate students) in scholarly writing. Therefore, a purposive sampling was employed to sample students who participated in the study. With this sampling, researchers should select the participants on the basis of their knowledge of the population to provide the best information to address the purpose of the research (McMillian & Schumacher, 2014, p.152). Therefore, the participants were chosen considering their experiences in academic writing regarding instruction on academic writing or writing experiences or both (e.g., MA Thesis or articles). Nine of them had only MA thesis writing experience while only two participants experienced in writing both writing MA thesis and articles and one had only proposals and article writing experience. Out of the 12 participants, only one participant did not take explicit academic writing instruction.

Data Collection Instrument and Procedure

Considering the opinions of an academic writing expert, a text was chosen: "EAP: Issues and Directions" (Hyland & Hamp- Lyons,2002). It was approximately one-page long and it was appropriate for the participants regarding their proficiency level as well as having familiar topic. The text which required to be paraphrased were sent to the participants via e-mail and they were asked to focus on and to read the whole text thoroughly and to paraphrase the text in two weeks. The purpose of sending the text to the participants was to provide an atmosphere within which they would feel comfortable when paraphrasing. After completing the task, the participants were asked to send back their writing products.

Textual Analysis

The analysis and classification of the texts generated by the participants were carried out in two stages. In the first stage, the researcher analyzed the texts with Keck's (2006) the Taxonomy of Paraphrase Types in terms of lexical level analysis. The words and words of strings of the original text were classified into unique links and general links. Keck (2006) defined unique link as 'individual word or strings of words exactly copied in the summary that appeared only once in the original excerpt' (p.266) and general link as 'lexical words used in the paraphrase that occurred in the original text and also occurred elsewhere in the original text' (p.267). Following table displays Keck's taxonomy of paraphrase types.

Table 1 The Taxonomy of Paraphrase Types (Adapted from Keck, 2006)

In the second stage, the researcher developed a paraphrase form consisting of specific codes such as phrases and clause types to describe the changes. She compared the paraphrased texts with the original text and coded the changes the participants made. Besides, semantic equivalents were examined between the original source and paraphrased text. After completing the analysis of lexical, structural, and semantic changes, the researcher classified each paraphrased sentence into one taxonomy category (Keck,2006). To ensure coder reliability, the paraphrase classifications created as a result of the analyses were checked by a writing expert whose

main research interest is academic writing. They reached a consensus by discussing on incompatible codes and classifications.

Results

Distribution of the Paraphrases across the Taxonomy Each paraphrase identified in the task that the participants produced was classified into Taxonomy category created by Keck (2006, p.268). While categorizing the sentences, the researcher and the other rater compared semantic equivalences between paraphrased sentences written by the writers and the original sentences as well as lexical changes and grammatical changes. One new category, Deviated Meaning, was added into the four Paraphrase Type categories. It includes attempted paraphrases in different meaning from the original. It may have unique and general links as the other categories do. Table 3.1 shows the number of paraphrases categorized under each Paraphrase Type and for each writer.

Table 3.1 The Number of Identified Paraphrases Across the Paraphrase Types

Paraphrase Types	The Number of Sentences
Near Copy	11
Minimal Revision	7
Moderate Revision	60
Substantial Revision	27
Deviated Meaning*	12
Total	**117**

Note: 'Deviated meaning' includes the number of paraphrase sentences which could not be classified into Keck's Taxonomy of Paraphrase Types (2006)

As seen in Table 3.1, the writers produced a total of 117 attempted paraphrases in their task. The most attempted paraphrase type (60/117) identified within the written texts is Moderate Revision while the less attempted paraphrase type (7/117) is Minimal Revision. The identified paraphrases in Near Copy and Deviated Meaning are roughly evenly distributed across the two paraphrase types. The following sections provide the examples of major linguistic strategies that the participants used for each paraphrase type.

Near Copy

Near Copy, the first paraphrase type, is defined as paraphrase which makes up 50 % or more words within unique links. Long or short strings of words are copied. 11 of the 117 paraphrases were categorized as Near Copies. The paraphrased sentences in Near Copy type shared almost the same lexical features. The writers of the sentences into Near Copy preferred to use long unique words and general words in the original excerpt. Table 3.2 shows the number of unique links and general links into 11 Near Copy sentences that the writers produced.

Table 3.2 The Number of Unique and General Links into each paraphrase type

Paraphrase Types	The Number of Unique Links	The Number of General Links
Near copy (n=11)	48	14
Minimal Revision (n=7)	18	14
Moderate Revision (n=60)	108	59
Substantial Revision (n=27)	-	38
Deviated Meaning (n=12)	16	9
Total	**190**	**134**

As Table 3.2 shows, 11 Near Copy sentences were composed of 48 unique strings of words and 14 general links. The participants producing near copies commonly preferred to use large copied unique links in their paraphrase practices as well as combining two consecutive sentences with unique and general links. Besides, some near copiers also used the synonyms of some unique links and general links while saving some of them and the sentence structure. The example below shows a sentence of Near Copy from the students' performances (Unique links are in bold, general links are in italic.).

Original
This rapid expansion in the number of learners of English for Academic Purposes has led to a similar expansion in the number of EAP teachers. And This means that many-probably most- of the teachers of EAP around the world are not native speakers of English (Hyland & Hamp-Lyons,2002).

Near Copy
As a result of **this rapid** *increase* in the number of learners of EAP, the number of EAP *teachers* have increased, which the **means most of** *the EAP* teachers **around the world** are *non-native* **speakers of English.**

In the grammatical analysis of the paraphrased text, it was seen that the sentences classified into Near Copy type included deletion,substitution, and addition strategies. The writers borrowed at least two consecutive words or phrases from the original text, and changed them with their synonyms, added additional words, or deleted some words from the borrowed sentences. Near Copy sentences were also composed of form changes such as transforming the active or passive form of a verb into the original, combining two sentences into one sentence, and separating one original excerpt into two sentences. However, substitution is the most frequently observed strategy in the graduate students' attempted paraphrase sentences. The following examples demonstrate the strategies of deletion, substitution, and addition. (Borrowed chunks of words are bolded, substitutions are in italics, additions are in the bracket, and deletions are shown with an ↓.)

Original
This rapid expansion in the number of learners of English for Academic Purposes has led to a similar expansion in the number of EAP teachers (Hyland & Hamp-Lyons,2002).

Near Copy
[The increases] **in the number of EAP teachers** *is based on* [the fact that] ↓ *abrupt pervasion* **in the number of learners** [who need to learn] **English for Academic Purposes**.
Deletion: "this"; *Substitution:* "rapid expansion" → "abrupt pervasion", "has led to" →"is based on" ; *Addition:* "who need to learn", "the increases", "the fact that"

Taking all Near Copy sentences that the participants produced into consideration, it can be clearly mentioned that they commonly copied strings of words or phrases from the original excerpt. Their paraphrased sentences included a number of unique and general links that they copied directly. They most frequently substituted some words with their synonyms. Some words or phrases were deleted while new ones were added. Furthermore, the structures of sentences were not completely changed even if the writers of Near Copy changed sentence voice; active↔ passive and they transformed simple sentence into complex or compound sentence or vice versa. However, the most crucial reason why to classify their sentences in Near Copy type was the unique and general words or phrases copied from the original excerpt.

Minimal Revision

The second paraphrased type is Minimal Revision that was captured in paraphrases of the student participants. It composes of 20-49 % words within unique and the general links of the original excerpt.

The researcher categorized only 7 of 117 sentences into Minimal Revision Type. When compared with the other paraphrase types, the number of sentences into Minimal Revision is less. Table 3.2 shows the number of unique links and general links into 7 Minimal Revision sentences that the participants produced.

The paraphrased sentences in Minimal Revision type shared almost the same lexical features with Near Copy but the writers of the sentences into Minimal Revision preferred to use shorter unique words and general words in the original excerpt. Since they used elaborative words and phrases, this decreased the number of unique and general links in their texts. As Table 3.2 displayed, 7 Minimal Revision sentences were defined in the writers' texts, and they included in 18 unique links and 14 general links. The following example shows this use of copied unique and general links. (The unique links are in bold and general links are in italics)

Original
Equally, for countries that are trying to lift themselves into economic prominence, or to remain major players on the world economic stage, producing an annual crop of graduates who can function in employment through English is a major issue (Hyland & Hamp-Lyons,2002).

Minimal Revision
At the same time, **for countries**, that have more *major economic* objectives than others, graduating a pre-determined level of *students* the dominating the **employment through English** is a crucial importance.

The writers producing Minimal Revision sentences mostly employed substitution and addition strategies. However, they most frequently used substitution strategy identified in all Minimal Revisions. Of these Minimal Revision substitutions, adjective phrase (ADJP) and noun phrase (NP) substitution were mostly observed. But they substituted half of the phrase while changing with their synonyms, and they replaced an original word with another word or phrase that was nearly the same length or shorter. They avoided copying long strings of words. While substituting, they added conjunctions, noun phrases (NP), and verb phrases (VP).

In addition, the strategies of the Minimal Revision sentences analyzed in the paraphrase were also form change, as one the most frequent strategies, active-passive sentences, changing a compound sentence to a simple two sentences. However, subjects and objects of the original excerpt were commonly same. That is, the subject referred to same thing within

both the original excerpt and paraphrased clause. While converting sentences from active to passive, the writers of Minimal Revisions did not use the same verb in the original excerpt, and they added a new verb to the sentences. In some Minimal Revision sentences, form change was used in combination with substitution and addition strategies. Following examples illustrate these strategies:

> *Original*
> The needs of these nonnative teachers are different from those of native speakers, and this recognition has led to new developments in EAP materials and teacher training courses (Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002).
>
> *Minimal Revision*
> These nonnative teachers' needs are not [the same with]^Substitution:ADJP/Antonym the native speakers'. [Thus]^Addition:Conjuction, new [improvements]^Substitution:ADJP in EAP materials and teacher training courses [has been observed.]^Active-Passive

To summarize all the strategies of the Minimal Revision sentences, it is seen that the strategies used were almost the same with those in Near Copy sentences. Unique and general links were commonly copied from the original excerpt. Compared with Near Copy, shorter links were frequently preferred. Nevertheless, copying directly unique links and general links became the main reason for classification as Minimal Revision. Besides, substitution and addition were strategies that the writers preferred to use most commonly. In Minimal Revision, form changes of the sentences were also made. For example, an original excerpt was split into two sentences, or two original sentences were combined into one However, the changes in both words and forms were seen as insufficient to classify them as suitable paraphrase examples.

Moderate Revision

Moderate Revision is the third paraphrase type which includes borrowing one or three words unique and general links. A total of 60 paraphrases were classified into Moderate Revision Type. In contrast to the first two paraphrase types, the number of Moderate Revision sentences in the text the writers produced was higher.

Within Moderate Revision, the unique links and general links were identified as in the first two paraphrase strategies. Considering the number of sentences in Minimal Revision, the ones in Moderate Revision included in a smaller number of unique and general links. As Table 3.2 displays, 60 Moderate Revision sentences were composed of 108 unique strings of words and 59 general links, and they were commonly individual words or 2-word phrases borrowed from the original sentence. Some of the writers also used the synonyms of some unique links and general links. The following example displays this use of unique links and general links. It can be seen that they were commonly individual words or word phrases borrowed from the original sentence. (The unique link is in bold).

> *Original*
> The response of the language teaching profession to these demands has been the development over the past 25 years of a new field in the teaching of English as a Second/ Foreign Language in universities and other academic settings: the field of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) (Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002).
>
> *Moderate Revision*
> To meet these needs, the field of language teaching has created a young- ESP field-namely **English for Academic Purposes (EAP)** which now has a history of more than two decades -in many academic institutions including **universities.**

Substitution, addition, and deletion strategies were marked in all of the Moderate Revisions included in the grammatical analysis. As in Near Copies and Minimal Revisions, substitution was the most frequently observed strategy in Moderate Revision sentences. The relevant strategy is composed of noun phrases, verb phrases and adjective phrases replacements. These substitutions appeared in combination with many other addition and deletion strategies.

Additionally, within the Moderate Revision, structural change was one of the most frequently used strategies and various structural changes were observed. The writers used form changes to alter simple sentence with compound or complex sentence or compound sentence with complex sentence, and to change sentence active form to passive form or vice versa, and to divide one sentence into two sentences or to combine two or more sentences into one in the combination with substitution, deletion, and addition strategies as in the examples below:

> *Original*
> The growth of English as the leading language for the dissemination of academic knowledge has had a major impact around the world, binding the careers of thousands of scholars to their competence in a foreign language and elevating this competence to a professional imperative (Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002).
>
> *Moderate Revision*
> The [need for]^Substitution:PP a [pioneer]^Substitution:ADJP language [to]^Substitution:Func:for→to [expand]^Substitution:NP→VP academic knowledge has [made obligatory]^Addition:VP [for]^Addition:Func the scholars to prove their [proficiency]^Substitution:NP in foreign language. [Form change: Phrase →Clause] [Thus]^Addition:Conj. [this]^Substitution:ADJ:the growth of English as the leading language for the dissemination of academic knowledge→this:subject has [led to]^Substitution:VP [influence]^Substitution:NP [↓]^Deletion:ADVP:around the world on advancing this [proficiency]^Substitution to a professional [requisite.]^Substitution:NP

Within the Moderate Revision, it was frequently seen that time expression- phrases were commonly used in various types, and occasionally misused and copied directly as in the following examples.

The strategies used were almost similar to those in Minimal Revision sentences. Less number of unique and general links were copied from the original excerpt than Minimal Revision,but shorter ones were preferred. Substitution and addition were strategies the participants most commonly preferred to use. They particularly used substitution and addition of noun phrases and verb phrases. In addition, while the original and general links were used less, the form changes were made more in the sentences. For example, an original excerpt was split into two sentences, or two original ones were combined by transforming complex sentences into compound or simple sentences or vice versa. Clauses were used as phrases or phrases were used as clauses.

Substantial Revision

The fourth paraphrase type is Substantial Revision which uses no unique links but may include few general links. A total of 27 paraphrases were classified into Substantial Revision. This type of paraphrase sentences contained no unique links from the original excerpt in addition to including few general links. As indicated in Table 3.1, 27 Substantial Revision sentences were composed of only 38 general links. Many substantial sentences contained only one or two general links from the original excerpt, as shown below.

When contrasted with the first three paraphrase types, few substitution, addition, and deletion strategies were used in Substantial Revision sentences.

However, short word chunks were combined to form change and clause revision strategies. Besides, clause creations were also identified as well as form changes in some of Substantial Revisions. The following examples present the graduate students' paraphrase relevant attempts classified in Substantial Revision.

As in both Minimal Revision and Moderate Revision, combining two clauses into one clause was the strategy. Additionally, it was identified that clauses were converted into phrases and noun clauses into verb clauses in Substantial Revisions that form change was used. In the examples below, these types of form change are shown.

To summarize the paraphrase strategies in the sentences classified in this category, it can be stated that the sentences included few numbers of general links whereas no unique links were used. The writers of Substantial Revisions also used substitution, deletion, and addition strategies but they generally preferred to use substitution. In contrast with Minimal Revision and Moderate Revision, the usage of substitution was less in Substantial Revision. Clause revision and thus, form change was made in all Substantial Revision sentences. Some of the form change strategies used were the same as in previous paraphrase types such as condensing phrase into clause or vice versa, making active form passive form, and combining or dividing sentences. However, clause creation was first and last used in this paraphrase type.

Deviated Meaning

The Paraphrase Taxonomy that Keck (2006) constructed does not include deviated meaning paraphrase type. It has been added into the Taxonomy as a new paraphrase type or element in the results of the analysis the researcher made. Although it has some similar lexical and grammatical characteristics to Minimal Revision and Substantial Revision, Deviated Meaning differs from them in terms of implementing these strategies. Since the differences in the implementation of the strategies caused semantic disturbances in the original idea the sentences were classified in this paraphrase type.

Deviated Meaning sentences contained both unique links and general links from the original excerpt. As indicated in Table 3.2, there are 16 unique links and 9 general links in 12 Deviated Meaning sentences the writers produced. Moreover, it is clear in the related table that the number of the sentences classified in Deviated Meaning is higher than in Near Copy and Minimal Revision. When compared with them, Deviated Meaning includes a smaller number of unique links and general links. As within the first four paraphrase types, substitution, addition, and deletion strategies were also used in Deviated Meaning. The following examples display this usage of unique links and general links, semantic differences between the paraphrased sentence and the original excerpt as well as form changes and substitution, and addition strategies.

Original
The appearance of a journal devoted to the issues and directions of EAP seems almost inevitable given the developments in English language teaching in the last decade (Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002).

Deviated Meaning
[According to]$^{Addition:Conj}$ [a journal]$^{General link}$ [dedicated to]$^{Subsitution:VP}$ the [issue]$^{Unique link}$ and directed by EAP, it has been [nearly]$^{Substitution:ADVP}$ [inextricable]$^{Substitution:ADJP}$ to improve on English language teaching [lately.]$^{Substitution:ADVP}$

Original
But EAP is not only a commercial endeavor: for college and university students in many countries, mastering enough English, and the right English, to succeed in learning their subjects through the medium of English in textbooks, lectures, study groups, and so on, is a matter of great urgency (Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002).

Deviated Meaning
[Though]$^{Substitution:Conj}$, considering EAP from the aspect of a [commercial]$^{Unique Link}$ [enterprise]$^{Substitution:NP}$ [will not be]$^{Clause revision:Form Change:Future Form}$ [acceptable and meaningful]$^{Addition:ADJP}$ [particularly]$^{Addition:ADVP}$ [for those who are to have a competence in]$^{Addition:Phrase}$ English such as [university]$^{Unique Link}$ [students]$^{General Link}$ in many [countries,]$^{Unique Link}$ and [for those who need to be]$^{Addition:Phrase}$ mastered in English to be able to produce [content-true materials,]$^{Substitution:NP}$ and [lectures.]$^{Unique Link}$

The analyses of sentences classified into Deviated Meaning showed that the writers used similar strategies in the first four paraphrase types. They copied some unique links and general links from the original excerpt, substituted some words with their equivalents, and occasionally added words and phrases into their paraphrases. They also made structural changes in original sentences. However, their paraphrases were not found successful and appropriate in spite of these all-various strategies they implemented. Although saving the meaning of the original excerpt is crucial in paraphrasing,the graduate students did not save it while changing words and structures. Even if sentences into Deviated Meaning included in few copied strings of words, their meaning was different from the original. These results indicated that changing structures, revising sentences, and substituting or adding words or phrases were inadequate to create appropriate paraphrase.

The researcher also examined the sequence in which writers selected sentences from the original text while coding each paraphrase's original excerpt. She found that almost all of writers (10/12) followed the sequence of sentences in the source text exactly when paraphrasing or copying. They preferred to paraphrase sentence by sentence in the original text.

The writers began to create their text by paraphrasing first excerpt of the first paragraph and continued to exactly follow the line of sentences until they reached the final sentence of the last paragraph. They paraphrased sentence by sentence and they occasionally combined two or more clauses into one clause or split out one clause into two clauses. However, they still produced the same length of text and sentences in nearly the same number. Only two papers included the fewer number of sentences from the source text because they combined both ideas and clauses and they created shorter texts. However, they followed a similar sequence strategy in their paraphrasing.

Discussion

This study explored the role of English proficiency, English writing experience,and explicit academic writing course experience on Turkish EFL graduate students' paraphrasing performances and strategies. The results of the study reveal some important points to be evaluated. Considering all paraphrase types and strategies, it was concluded that all the ways of paraphrasing in the sentences examined were almost similar. The participants used several common strategies including substation,

addition, deletion as well as copying general and unique links from the original excerpt.

When the writers felt that some words or chunks of words such as English for Academic Purposes, language teaching, and academic knowledge were more suitable to directly copy and there were no appropriate equivalents of such words, they preferred to use them as in the original excerpt. Either there might be a lack of confidence in choosing appropriate synonyms or they might consider these words asa term and tend to use them directly. According to Keck (2006), the first three paraphrase types included unique links and general links and the number of these words was an important and first criteria criterion in classifying clauses in paraphrase taxonomy. Correspondingly, the participants' paraphrases included a total of 190 unique links and a total of 134 general links from the original excerpts. Additionally, the most frequent type of paraphrase identified was moderate revision (n=60) followed by substantial revision (n=27) and deviated meaning (n=12). Similarly, Mariani et. al., (2021)also identified the sentences produced by undergraduate students by using Keck's (2006) taxonomy and the number of moderate revisions was higher than the other types of paraphrases.

Directly copying many strings of words from the original text was one of the main paraphrasing strategies in the participants' writing practice. As in line with this finding of the study, several studies conducted with graduates and scholars found similar results regarding copying or using more words verbatim from the original excerpts (Lestari, 2021; Liao & Tseng (2010); Milicevic & Tsedryk, 2011; Pecorari, 2003; Pinjaorenpan & Danvivath, 2017; Shi, 2012; Sun, 2013).However, high textual reliance on the vocabulary of the source text caused a wide range of patchwriting examples. These previous studies showed that their participants commonly copied from the original texts, which subsequently resulted in a low level of paraphrasing or textual transformation. Unlike some previous studies mentioning that lower proficient English students frequently tend to copy (Hirvela & Du, 2013; Hu & Lei, 2016; Yağız, 2019),the graduate students as participants of this study, who were thought to have higher language proficiency, could

not avoid copying words strings of words from the original text. The participants might have chosen to copy to avoid changing the meaning of the text or because they could not choose the right synonyms conveying the exact meaning of the original. Further, Shi et al. (2018) mentioned in their study that the advanced graduate participants might not share their near copied paraphrases as examples of their paraphrase practice because of plagiarism. However, it is possible that advanced graduates also might copy from the original text. Thereby, the language proficiency and limited paraphrasing skills of L2 writers cannot always be associated with their use of near copying and minimal revision of original texts (Keck, 2014).

Besides directly copying words or chunks of words, substitution strategies were identified within all paraphrase types. The participants changed the words of the original excerpt with their synonyms. This finding of the current study confirms the results of previous research clearing out that substituting word with their synonyms was a popular paraphrasing strategy among their participants and they frequently relied on only using synonyms in their paraphrasing (Angelil-Carter, 2000; Keck, 2010, 2014; Khaurinnisa et al., 2014; Liao & Tseng, 2010; Na & Mai, 2017; Sun &Yang, 2015). However, each word substituted might not have the same meaning as the original word and this affected the meaning of the idea. Thus, replacement of original words is inadequate to produce a good paraphrase. Besides, it was found that the writers had difficulties in the substitution of time expressions of the source text and their choices, at times, caused changes in the original meaning even if they could correctly change the sentence structure.

Deletion and addition were the other strategies mostly used by the writers. They deleted some words or phrases and added new ones. This result is in agreement with the findings of studies by Ji (2012), Keck, 2010, Shi (2004), Shi et al., 2018 and Sun (2009).While Ji (2012) evaluated 'deleting and replacing vocabulary' as unsophisticated or minimal modification in his study that investigated the types of paraphrases, Shi (2004) found that addition and deletion were mostly used strategies that the participants preferred to use while constructing

their summary. Sun (2009) also identified deletion and addition as frequently used paraphrasing strategies. Further more, both Shi (2004) and Sun (2009) mentioned that these strategies were more implemented than structural changes as the participants did in the present study. However, such drastic changes commonly resulted in insufficient changes for appropriate paraphrasing. Shi et al. (2018) also discovered that their advanced graduate participants recontextualized the source text by 'omitting' as well as 'adding ideas and interpreting'. As in line with the findings of this study, Sun and Yang (2015)also found 'copying verbatim and substitution' as the most common in various types of paraphrasing strategies they identified in their study.

As well as replacements of words, structural changes were also identified as a paraphrasing strategy. The writers condensed phrase into clause or clause into phrase, transformed compound clauses into simple ones, combined two sentences into one sentence, or split out one sentence into two or more sentences. More successful structural changes were identified in the Substantial Revision type. However, in some sentences, it was noticed that structural changes either caused ambiguity in the original meaning or changed the main idea of the original excerpt. Furthermore, clause creation was also found in both Substantial Revision sentences and Deviated Meaning sentences. Within Substantial Revision, the writers created clauses related to the original excerpts with the aim of attribution. However, some clauses classified in Deviated Meaning type were not related to the original excerpt or with the general meaning in the source text. This showed that mechanical changes in words and forms in the original text were inadequate to create suitable paraphrases. In parallel with the results of this study, Lestari (2021) and Pinjaroenpan and Danvivath (2017) indicated that the students did not substantially preserve the exact meaning of the original text although they implemented various paraphrasing techniques or strategies such as lexical and structural changes.

So far, as Ji (2012) stated, many studies have showed that as the level of L2 competence increases, paraphrasing performances will be better. There has been found a correlation between language competence and paraphrasing ability. However, the

findings also showed that although L2 proficiency was higher and they were experienced in academic writing and all of them had explicit academic writing instructions, their paraphrased sentences were mostly classified in moderate level. In addition, the strategies they employed were limited to paraphrased texts. Besides, the nature of the source text and their familiarity with it were the reasons for their moderate level of paraphrasing. It is possible that their limited linguistic competence, the demanding nature of paraphrasing, and the source text caused the participants to complete their paraphrasing task in a long time, but they displayed moderate performance on paraphrasing.

There are possible reasons that may influence their direct copy or paraphrasing preference. Initially, either graduate students might be reluctant to substantially paraphrase, or their lack of linguistic competence and paraphrasing ability might cause challenges in restructuring sentences and changing sophisticatedly the text by saving the original meaning. Additionally, the nature of the source text and their familiarity with it might be the other reasons for minimal or moderate modifications they made. Furthermore, the idea that changing terms or specific expressions may always not be appropriate because the meaning may change, and the original idea may not be conveyed is based on their insufficient self-confidence in their own paraphrasing performance. Moreover, their common tendency to use direct copying and revise minimally may be because they are less time-consuming and easier than paraphrasing for novice writers.

Conclusion

The findings of the study revealed that Turkish graduate students showed similar tendencies when using the source text even if they generated paraphrases at different levels. They commonly preferred to use substitution, addition, deletion and direct copy as paraphrasing strategies. Among the sentences classified according to taxonomy, moderate level paraphrases were more frequently produced (n=60). However,in each type of paraphrase, including deviated meaning, the participating students appeared to frequently employ the same strategies such as substituting, deleting, and adding

as well as copying unique and general links from the source.

As a conclusion, the findings of the study offer some pedagogical implications for curriculum developers and writing teachers. Explicit paraphrase instruction can be provided and the importance of textual borrowing, particularly paraphrase, could be emphasized. Plagiarism awareness should be also strengthened among students. To facilitate learning, writing teachers should present paraphrasing strategies and also guide their students to apply these strategies in their tasks. Additionally, the samples for appropriate paraphrase can be shown. Finally, more practice and appropriate feedback might contribute to achieving the paraphrasing quality.

Acknowledgment

References

Abasi, Ali R., and Nahal Akbari. "Are We encouraging Patchwriting? Reconsidering the Role of the Pedagogical Context in ESL Student Writers' Transgressive Intertextuality." *English for Specific Purposes*, vol. 27, no. 3, 2008, pp. 267-84.

Angelil-Carter, Shelley. *Stolen Language?: Plagiarism in Writing*. Longman, 2000.

Ansorge, Libor, et al. "Plagiarism through Paraphrasing Tools - The Story of One Plagiarized Text." *Publications*, vol. 9, 2021.

Arya, Aneri. "An Overview of Textual Analysis as a Research Method for Cultural Studies." *International Journal for Innovative Research in Multidisciplinary Field*, vol. 6, no. 3, 2020, pp.173-77.

Barry, Elaine S. "Can Paraphrasing Practice Help Students define Plagiarism?." *College Student Journal*, vol. 40, no. 2, 2006, pp. 377-84.

Bayram, Huseyin, and Fatih Tıkman. "Determining Student Teachers' Rates of Plagiarism during the Distance Education and Investigating Possible Reasons for Plagiarism." *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, vol. 23, no. 1, 2022, pp. 210-36.

Campbell, Cherry. "Writing with Others' Words: Using Background Reading Text in Academic Compositions." *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom*, edited by Kroll, Barbara, Cambridge University Press, 1990, pp. 211-30.

Chen, M.H., et al. "Developing a Corpus-based Paraphrase Tool to Improve EFL Learners' Writing Skills." *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, vol. 28, no. 1, 2013, pp. 22-40.

Chen, Yuan-Shan, and Shao-Wen Su. "A Genre-based Approach to Teaching Efl Summary Writing." *ELT Journal*, vol. 66, no. 2, 2012, pp. 184-92.

Choy, S. Chee, and Mun Yee Lee. "Effects of Teaching Paraphrasing Skills to Students Learning Summary Writing in ESL." *Journal of Teaching and Learning*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2012, pp. 77-89.

Davis, Mary. "The Development of Source use by International Postgraduate Students." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2013, pp. 125-35.

Ersoy, Ali, and Muhammet Ozden. "The Views of Teacher Candidates regarding the role of Instructor in Plagiarizing from Internet in their Assignments." *Elementary Education Online*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2011, pp. 608-19.

Hyland, Ken, and Liz Hamp-Lyons. "EAP: Issues and Directions." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2002.

Hirvela, Alan, and Qian Du. "Why am I Paraphrasing?: Undergraduate ESL Writers' Engagement with Source-Based Academic Writing and Reading." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2013, pp. 87-98.

Hu, Guangwei, and Jun Lei. "Plagiarism in English Academic Writing: A Comparison of Chinese University Teachers' and Students' Understandings and Stances." *System*, vol. 56, 2016, pp. 107-18.

Iter, Ilhan. "Improving the Reading Comprehension of Primary-School Students at Frustration-Level Reading through the Paraphrasing Strategy Training: A Multiple-Probe Design Study." *International Electronic Journal of*

Elementary Education, vol. 10, no. 1, 2017, pp. 147-61.

Ji, NanYoung. "Modes of Paraphrasing Attempted by Korean L2 Writers." *English Teaching*, vol. 67, no. 4, 2012, pp. 131-48.

Kayaoglu, Mustafa Naci, et al. "Examining Students' Perceptions of Plagiarism: A Cross-Cultural Study at Tertiary Level." *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, vol. 40, no. 5, 2015, pp. 682-705.

Keck, Casey. "The Use of Paraphrase in Summary Writing: A Comparison of L1 and L2 Writers." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 15, 2006, pp. 261-78.

Keck, Casey. "How do University Students attempt to Avoid Plagiarism? A Grammatical Analysis of Undergraduate Paraphrasing Strategies." *Writing & Pedagogy*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2010, pp. 193-222.

Keck, Casey. "Copying, Paraphrasing, and Academic Writing Development: A re-examination of L1 and L2 Summarization Practices." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 25, 2014, pp. 4-22.

Kocak, Funda, and Oguz Ozbek. "Views of Postgraduate Students regarding Research Ethics in Turkey." *Journal of Human Sciences*, vol. 13, no. 2, 2016, pp. 3560-70.

Kim, A., and J.M. Wise. "Measuring College Students' Perceptions and Attitudes toward Anti-Plagiarism Detection Tools and Their Behaviors, Beliefs, and Moral Judgment regarding Plagiarism." *Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology*, 2009.

Khairunnisa, Wahyuni, et al. "Students' Problems in Paraphrasing." *Journal of Equatorial Education and Learning*, vol. 3, no. 11, 2014.

Lestari, Nurul Dwi. *An Analysis of Students' Abilities in Paraphrasing English Text*. State Institute for Islamic Studies, 2021.

Liao, Ming-Tzu, and Chiung-Ying Tseng. "Students' Behaviors and Views of Paraphrasing and Inappropriate Textual Borrowing in an EFL Academic Setting." *Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2010, pp. 187-211.

Mariani, et al. "Paraphrasing Strategies in Higher Education." *Proceedings International Conference on Education of Suryakancana 2021*, 2021, pp. 418-28.

Marzec-Stawarska, Malgorzata. "A Search for Paraphrasing and Plagiarism Avoidance Strategies in the Context of Writing from Sources in a Foreign Language." *Rethinking Directions in Language Learning and Teaching at University Level*, edited by Loranc-Paszylk, B., 2019, pp. 115-35.

Madhavi, Kesari. "Paraphrasing Techniques to develop Academic Writing in an ESL Context - An Experimental Study." *Research Journal of English Language and Literature*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2013, pp. 77-82.

McDonough, Kim, et al. "Summary Writing in a Thai EFL University Context." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 2, 2014, pp. 20-32.

Mclnnis, Lara. *Analyzing English L1 and L2 paraphrasing strategies through Concurrent Verbal Reports and Stimulated Recall Protocols*. University of Toronto, 2009.

McKee, Alan. *Textual Analysis: A Beginner's Guide*. SAGE Publications, 2003.

McMillian, James, and Sally Schumacher. *Research in Education: Evidence-based Inquiry*. Pearson, 2014.

Milicevic, Jasmina, and Alexandra Tsedryk. "Assessing and Improving Paraphrasing Competence in FSL." *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Meaning-Text Theory*, 2011, pp. 176-85.

Na, Chi Do, and Nguyen Xuan Nhat Chi Mai. "Paraphrasing in Academic Writing: A Case Study of Vietnamese Learners of English." *Language Education in Asia*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2017, pp. 9-25.

Oshima, Alice, and Ann Hogue. *Writing Academic English*. Longman, 1999.

Ozdemir, Ihsan. *The Effect of the Paraphrasing Strategy Instruction in Reading Skills I Course in an ELT Department in Turkey on Students' Reading Comprehension Skills*. Abant Izzet Baysal University, 2006.

Pecorari, Diane. "Good and Original: Plagiarism and Patchwriting in Academic Second-Language Writing." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 12, no. 4, 2003, pp. 317-45.

Pennycook, Alastair. "Borrowing Others' Words: Text, Ownership, Memory, and Plagiarism." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 30, no. 2, 1996, pp. 201-30.

Pinjaorenpan, Buaboun, and Uthaivan Danvivath. "Paraphrasing in English Academic Writing by Thai Graduate Students." *Global Journal of business and Social Science Review*, vol. 5, no. 4, 2017, pp. 47-53.

Rocha Erkaya, Odilea. "Plagiarism by Turkish students: Causes and solutions." *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, vol. 11, no. 2, 2009, pp. 86-103.

Roig, Miguel. "When College Students' Attempts at Paraphrasing become Instances of Potential Plagiarism." *Psychological Reports*, vol. 84, no. 3, 1999, pp. 973-82.

Shi, L. "Textual Borrowing in Second-Language Writing." *Written Communication*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2004, pp. 171-200.

Shi, Ling. "Rewriting and Paraphrasing Source Texts in Second Language Writing." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2012, pp. 134-148.

Shi, Ling, et al. "Paraphrasing to Transform Knowledge in Advanced Graduate Student Writing." *English for Specific Purposes*, vol. 51, 2018, pp. 31-44.

Srisongkram, Wilaiwan. *Development of Plagiarism Understanding of Undergraduate Students based on Survey Research and Documentary Analysis Results*. Chulalongkorn University, 2011.

Sun, Yu-Chih. "Do Journal Authors Plagiarize? Using Plagiarism Detection Software to Uncover Matching Text Across Disciplines." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, vol. 12, no. 4, 2013, pp. 264-72.

Sun, Yu-Chih, and Fang-Ying Yang. "Uncovering Published Authors' Text-Borrowing Practices: Paraphrasing Strategies, Sources, and Self-plagiarism." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, vol. 20, 2015, pp. 224-36.

Thompson, Celia, and Alastair Pennycook. "A Question of Dialogues: Authorship, Authority, Plagiarism." *Education Canada*, vol. 48, no. 3, 2008, pp. 20-23.

Wise, Jean-Marc, et al. "International Plagiarism: Comparing Thai, Taiwanese, and American University Students' Knowledge, Behaviors, and Attitudes towards Academic Integrity." *AECT Annual Convention Proceedings 2013*, 2013, pp. 239-47.

Yağız, Oktay. "Exploring Paraphrasing among L2 Academic Writers." *Kafkas University Journal of the Institute of Social Sciences*, no. 24, 2019, pp. 561-78.

Yamwong, Nonthanan. *Perception and Attitudes toward Plagiarism among Graduate Students of Srinakharinwirot University*. Srinakharinwirot University, 2014.

Author Details

Hatice Çeşme, *Atatürk University, Turkey, **Email ID:** h.cesme@atauni.edu.tr*