REFRAMING STUDENT PLAGIARISM: INSIGHT, FAIRNESS, AND INSTRUCTIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

John Sivell*

Brock University

This paper starts from an exploration of two well-established viewpoints on unintended plagiarism by adult or young adult non-native-speaking (NNS) students. The first is the developmental perspective, with its focus on patchwriting as a transitional strategy for writers unfamiliar with the university setting (stemming from Howard, 1993). The second is the cultural perspective, focusing on the cultural underpinnings of perceptions about acceptable or unacceptable use of academic sources (as advanced by Pennycook, 1994, 1996). Both viewpoints are seen to display informative consistencies with postmodern thinking about the intricate interconnections that can be expected to operate among texts. An added layer of complexity is then suggested through consideration of revealing parallels between paraphrasing and two other, demonstrably very difficult skills—translation and simplification—which exemplify the demanding subtlety of language processes that require mastery not only of *usage* but also of *use* (as defined by Widdowson, 1978). To address the inherent difficulty of paraphrasing, which is associated with both its developmental and cultural dimensions, a correspondingly flexible and ambitious pedagogical framework—Universal Design for Instruction (UDI)—is proposed. The paper concludes with illustrations of how three UDI principles can be applied to paraphrasing pedagogy for NNS students.

Keywords: culture, paraphrasing, patchwriting, plagiarism, simplification, translation, Universal Design for Instruction

An informative overview of the literature on non-native-speaking (NNS) student plagiarism by Pecorari and Petrić (2014) depicts a very rich field of study. At the highest level of generality, there is a distinction between two alternative viewpoints on plagiarism: one more punitive, and the other more pedagogical. The pedagogical perspective has special importance for this paper. Focusing on this perspective within the pedagogical perspective on perceived plagiarism, two subdivisions can be discerned: a more developmentally and a more culturally oriented line of thinking. My purpose is to position those two strands of the pedagogical perspective within a schema that has a place not only for the learner but also for the inherent difficulty of the paraphrasing process itself. The issue of intrinsic difficulty deserves consideration because of its especially persuasive justification for responding to perceived plagiarism in pedagogical rather than narrowly ethical terms.

As background, I begin with a review of the developmental and cultural traditions, each of which casts useful light on the phenomenon of unintended plagiarism. Although my key focus is on NNS writers, that treatment includes sources discussing both native-speaking (NS) and NNS students because of evidence that in some respects both groups may confront comparable demands (Pecorari & Petrić, 2014). In addition, I outline ways in which the two traditions have embraced insights based on postmodern questioning of the very possibility that authorship can be so original as to eschew entirely such intertextual echoes as might be mistakenly reproached as plagiarism; I then further examine the complexity, in particular the intrinsic difficulty, of paraphrasing, through consideration of parallels

between paraphrasing and two other activities that are widely recognized as highly exacting—simplification and translation, each of which depends on the writer's ability to command not only linguistic accuracy but also the finely tuned contextual appropriateness that Widdowson (1978) would term communicative *use*. I argue that recognizing the inherently very demanding challenge of the paraphrasing process can shift the pedagogical focus from remedying the perceived deficiencies of individual students toward providing a learning environment that centralizes the difficulty of the task confronting any apprentice academic writer. As such, this broader focus draws attention to the need for a commensurately expansive and adaptable model for teaching this skill, which I believe can be provided by Universal Design for Instruction (UDI), an approach that insofar as possible endeavors to create an opportunity for diverse students to participate in a fair and welcoming educational context where they can choose to approach core tasks in ways that meet their differing individual needs, interests, and aspirations. Finally, the paper describes three examples of classroom routines with an intrinsic-difficulty focus that each illustrate UDI-inspired planning for paraphrasing instruction directed specifically toward an adult or young adult NNS student population.

It is important, however, to begin with a recognition that characterizing the two pedagogically oriented viewpoints as generally *developmental* and *cultural* does not imply that they have nothing at all in common. In fact, I show that both relate at least in part to postmodern philosophical theorizations about intertextuality and resulting limitations on textual originality, thereby probing the degree to which any writing whatsoever can be viewed as entirely "an autonomous individual's expression of his or her original thoughts" (Pecorari & Petrić, 2014, p. 274). Still, in the language-teaching context, the two viewpoints can be distinguished through their emphasis on two different factors that resonate strongly with instructors: developmental processes for writing, and cultural variations. Also, as both propose an alternative to the punitive approach to plagiarism noted at the outset, it is not surprising that they tend toward similar overall values. First, both the developmental and the cultural viewpoints argue that it is unfair to punish unintentionally inappropriate re-uses of source text material as transgressions; second, they endorse the pedagogical rather than the disciplinary approach as simply more practically effective in influencing how students learn to write from academic sources. It remains true, however, that in support of those recommendations, the two views advance quite different rationales—developmental and cultural—which are the themes of the following two sections.

The Developmental Perspective on Student Plagiarism

The developmental perspective underlines the possibility that faulty rewording of sources may sometimes reflect a sincere if inadequate effort to acquire the skill of paraphrasing. As early as 1993, Howard drew attention to what she termed *patchwriting*, as a more reasonable alternative to the resolutely judgmental term *plagiarism* whenever there is no intention to deceive. For Howard, patchwriting refers to the naïve and ineffective—but not dishonest—process of "copying from a source text and then deleting some words, altering grammatical structures, or plugging in one-for-one synonym substitutions" (1993, p. 233). Although yielding an unacceptable product, this kind of error may well signal a good-faith if bungled attempt to deal with unfamiliar content and style.

Howard has developed her viewpoint on patchwriting over two decades of publications (including Adler-Kassner, Anson, & Howard, 2008; Howard, 1993, 1995, 1999, 2000a, 2000b, & 2002; Howard, Serviss, & Rodrigue, 2010; and Howard & Watson, 2010). She has consistently stressed the special challenge posed by paraphrasing for poorly prepared writers who sometimes lack the reading or composing resources to produce a fully independent version in their own words. Such students may feel compelled to process the source text sentence by individual sentence and, even if well aware of the need to paraphrase rather than copy, they risk paraphrasing so superficially that they fall into the trap of patchwriting, which can be misconstrued as deliberate plagiarism (Howard, Serviss, & Rodrigue, 2010).

At present, Howard is taking part in an ambitious new empirical project to investigate how students

use academic sources (Howard, Serviss, & Rodrigue, 2010, p. 189). Moreover, her influence on other scholars remains considerable. Robillard (2007) notes that Howard's writing "has generated a wealth of scholarship" (p. 15), and Eisener and Vicinus (2008) refer admiringly to her "groundbreaking work" (p. 2). Certainly, the influence of her pioneering emphasis on patchwriting can be traced, for instance, in Abilock (2014), Anson (2011), & Brooke (2007), or Pecorari and Petrić (2014), to name just a few relatively recent references. Not surprisingly, however, there has also been resistance. For example, Bertram-Gallant (2008) questions the tendency of Howard's developmentally oriented view to downplay a more ethically centered perspective on plagiarism; Hatcher (2011) points out that, while novice patchwriting may be excused as only accidentally inappropriate, authors must recognize the real-world possibility of legal sanctions for breaching copyright; and Chace (2012) denounces Howard for seemingly undermining all efforts to lead students toward conscientious reporting of sources.

Nevertheless, the basic concept of patchwriting as a potentially innocent although unsuccessful effort to paraphrase appropriately remains very influential. Power (2009) evocatively identifies even faulty paraphrasing as beginning students' "membership application . . . to become part of the university community" (p. 660). In somewhat more moderate terms, Pecorari and Petrić (2014) assert that "while patchwriting is not an effective use of sources, it is a useful transitional stage that helps students develop both in terms of raising their rhetorical awareness and in terms of their writing practices" (p. 277). Nevertheless, they also concede that, despite being endorsed by many researchers, this perception "is still not widely accepted by practitioners" (p. 277).

The Culturally Oriented Perspective on Student Plagiarism

The cultural perspective explores the possibility that students' conception of the appropriate use of academic sources may vary cross-culturally, a view that largely reflects the logic of a seminal *TESOL Quarterly* article by Pennycook (1996). There, Pennycook drew on his belief, already expressed two years earlier, that apparent plagiarism by non-Western students is very complicated to analyze because "Western academic practices" are in fact "cultural practices" with a range of implications for authority, cross-cultural understanding, inclusion or exclusion, and task-specific demands, rather than straightforward, factual truths that might be considered immune to critical assessment (1994, p. 279). The article went on to foreground the possibility that NNS students from abroad might stray over the line from paraphrasing to copying through a genuine lack of experience with the culture-specific academic referencing conventions that typically hold sway at Western educational institutions. Pennycook carefully delineates the relationship between two finely balanced responsibilities. On the one hand, he notes, "of course we . . . need to leave space open to criticize unacceptable borrowing practices," but on the other hand he sees the issues as so intricate that heavy-handed allegations of plagiarism could risk being "inadequate and arrogant" (1996, p. 226).

Pennycook's point is that much Western thinking about plagiarism stems from a quite specific concept of textual ownership that, even in the West, has varied significantly over time (noted as well by Howard, 1995). Thus, it may be expected that international students could find themselves working in a "particular cultural and educational context" so familiar to their instructors that they take it for granted (Pennycook, 1996, p. 203), but may impose expectations that are unfairly puzzling for outsiders. This overall principle is of course now generally accepted. Still, it seems not always to be put into practice, in part because of an affective obstacle that Pennycook described in his 1996 article: the influence of unequal "power relationships" between academically proven and secure instructors and their lower ranking students or research assistants (p. 213).

Postmodern Thinking as Reflected in the Culturally Oriented Perspective

In a later work, Chandrasoma, Thompson, and Pennycook (2004) focused more centrally on the postmodern insight that all writers—from whatever cultural background—tend to compose in ways that

involve various forms of the "pervasive social practice" of "intertextual borrowing," with or without explicit attribution (p. 181). In this connection, they credit Howard's theory of patchwriting with casting light on "important questions about how writers write" (p. 176)—reasonable because Howard (1995) herself quite early pointed out the implausibility of the "fiction of the autonomous author" as promoted by many anti-plagiarism policies (p. 797), and has continued to assert that "writing is always intertextual" in the sense of embodying echoes and influences from other texts (Adler-Kassner et al., 2008, p. 243). In the view of Chandrasoma, Thompson, and Pennycook (2004), intertextual echoes that might potentially be viewed as plagiarism may simply be "a form of patchwriting at a particular level of a student's developing ability to handle academic discourse" (p. 189). This recognition, however, does not diminish the difficulty of determining which instances of such borrowing are acceptable.

Rather than a blanket rule, Chandrasoma et al. (2004) argue that the appropriateness of intertextuality in students' writing is context-dependent. For example, the "academic writing conventions" propounded by a particular institution or course will determine what is considered "transgressive" or "nontransgressive intertextuality" (pp. 173, 171)—in other words, unacceptable or acceptable use of source material. In this connection, student writers' intentions will also play a role alongside their developmental progress. A key culturally oriented implication advanced by Chandrasoma, et al. is the necessity to "understand where our students are coming from" as a step toward avoiding the oversimplified assumption that all international students will—if they are competent and honest—immediately and unquestioningly accept the requirement to "play by . . . [the] rules" set out in their new educational setting (pp. 189, 190). Thus, as in the developmentally oriented tradition, we are advised: "Rather than a punitive approach to intertextuality, we would advocate a more complex, more time-consuming, consultative and exploratory process" (p. 190).

Current Influence of the Culturally Oriented Perspective

As I demonstrated earlier with respect to Howard and the developmentally oriented tradition, Pennycook and the culturally oriented perspective have been and remain widely influential. Pennycook's key theme of the often subtle impact of cultural diversity continues to be explored in studies that refer to his work. For instance, Youmans' (2001) demonstration of the minimal deterrent effect of advising students about the use of plagiarism-detection software takes into account the possibility that "threats of detection and punishment alone" cannot reduce plagiarism rates (p. 750, explicitly based on an insight from Pennycook, 1996). Similarly, Heather (2010) warns against overreliance on such software in part because "the boundaries between plagiarism and the normal learning process are not always clear-cut" (p. 648, in reference to an observation by Pennycook (1996); also, Mott-Smith (2013) bases her analysis of the risk of negatively and ignorantly stereotyping NNS students on principles advanced, among others, by both Pennycook (1996) and Chandrasoma, Thompson, and Pennycook (2004).

Associations Between the Two Perspectives

The two lines of thought—developmental and cultural—are often constructively associated. This connection was first suggested by Howard herself, who began by looking mainly at NS students but who soon reported the parallel circumstances of NNS (Howard, 1995). Moreover, as noted above, Chandrasoma, Thompson, and Pennycook (2004) also made this association. Turning to examples from other scholars, Ellery (2008) refers to both Howard and Pennycook in her argument for an instructional rather than a punitive approach to student plagiarism. In addition, Lyon (2009) makes use of work by both authors in a thought-provoking discussion of how complex cultural forces affect international students' speaking and writing. And Buranen (2009) as well draws on both traditions, using references to both Howard and Pennycook as a foundation for her advice that simply "'going over MLA' isn't enough" to prepare students for effective paraphrasing (p. 26).

The Inherent Difficulty of the Paraphrasing Task

As the previous sections attest, much has been learned about paraphrasing and unintentional plagiarism through consideration of learners as developmentally and culturally diverse individuals. I believe, however, that it is very important to complement such understanding by adding insights derived from a different viewpoint: paraphrasing itself seems to be an intrinsically difficult skill for all writers. For example, Howard's own initial insight stemmed from her surprise that, even as late as their first year at a university, many NS students appeared unable to produce the kind of "mature summary" that correlates with fluently effective paraphrasing (1993, p. 23), and more recently Howard, Serviss, and Rodrigue (2010) have adduced additional evidence that thoroughgoing mastery of all forms of source reference in every relevant case may not be achieved before graduate school. Thus, acquiring this skill appears to require far more than a brief course or even an entire year of study; instead, the process seems to be virtually open-ended: "[T]he more advanced a student's education, the more he or she is likely to apply the generalization rule for summarizing," which is a strategy for interpreting specific source-text details that Howard, Serviss, and Rodrigue associate with critically independent paraphrasing (p. 178). Moreover, I suggest that inferences from such other linguistic endeavors as simplification and translation can cast additional light on the intrinsic difficulty of paraphrasing and on the basic fairness of realizing that a lengthy apprenticeship will be necessary to gain a reliable grasp of this skill.

Paraphrasing, Translation, and Simplification

A good starting point is an article by Jakobson (1959), in which he envisages three versions of translation: "interlingual translation, or *translation proper*," of course; but also "intersemiotic translation," or "*transmutation* [into] signs of nonverbal sign systems"; and—ultimately of greatest relevance here— "intralingual translation, or *rewording*," which is very similar to paraphrasing (p. 233; in each case, emphasis in original). The possibility that translation might be viewed as a category of rewording broad enough to include even paraphrasing opens the way to some interesting reflections. Perhaps most modestly, it calls to mind an *intra*lingual [emphasis mine] translation process that is familiar to most language teachers—simplification; I would suggest, in fact, that there is evidence that skillful simplification is difficult in a way that echoes the challenge of paraphrasing. The reason for this is neatly captured in Widdowson's (1978) distinction between a "simplified version" as opposed to a "simple account" (pp. 88–89). His point is that a simple account, which is the preferred model, requires faithfulness not primarily to the language but to the information content of the original source, to create a new "genuine instance of discourse" that will be readily comprehensible by a different reader with lesser language competence (p. 89). This emphasis on working from overall meaning rather than from the structure of specific sentences is likewise emphasized in Honeyfield's (1977) discussion of the simplification process. Both scholars stress that any form of simplification that merely tinkers with the language of the original will fall prey to interference from over-close allegiance to the initial wording, with two negative consequences: the result will be awkward and unenjoyable to read, and offer a poor representation of the tone and message of the original text.

Consequently, weak simplification appears to resemble unsatisfactory paraphrasing: one might almost say that both are patchwritten. As Howard, Serviss, and Rodrigue (2010) explain, effective paraphrasing differs from patchwriting by being anchored to a full understanding of "sources" rather than just individual "sentences," which explains how good paraphrasing escapes the trap of being "too close to the language of the original" (p. 187). Given this revealing similarity, and in light of the difficulty of creating fluent, simple accounts for pedagogical applications, I would argue that we can infer that the broadly comparable task of paraphrasing is also very demanding.

Moreover, from simplification it is a short step to translation itself, which is even more widely

recognized as an extremely demanding skill. We readily accept that translation students must enroll in multiple courses over a period of years: for instance, at the University of Ottawa, preparation as a translator ideally requires a minimum of a four-year B.A. program (University of Ottawa, n.d.). This time frame differs enormously from that of a first-year writing course, yet I will argue that there is a strong parallel between paraphrasing and translating.

Theories of translation vary, but in this context I believe it is informative to consider that of Seleskovitch (1973/1978), who describes a progression through three stages: (a) subtle reading and understanding of the language and concepts of the initial text; (b) identifying the meaning; and (c) re-expressing that meaning in the target language of the translated version. The similarity with paraphrasing (and simplification) seems especially apparent at the second stage, which hinges on "deverbalization"[1] of the meaning (p. 93). Seleskovitch stresses that, for a fluent and comprehensible product, the translator must "work from the idea [itself], stripped of its language" (p. 92). Likewise, her colleague and co-author Lederer states that "in translation, it is necessary to step back from linguistic analysis and strive to provide a re-expression of the meaning in the other language," so that there will be no "resemblance to the original language forms" (pp. 25, 33). Plainly, this requires that the translator develop considerable linguistic and intellectual finesse; I infer that the writer of an effective paraphrase, which avoids problems caused by too-close echoes of the original source, will also require sufficient linguistic and scholarly agility to manage what Seleskovitch terms the intermediary "non-verbal meaning" (p. 75).

Paraphrasing as an Operation Dependent on *Use* Rather Than *Usage*

I stress that these parallels with simplification and translation can be understood to imply that paraphrasing is much more than a linguistic operation in the narrow sense. While it may be true that restricted basic language ability can lead some students toward inadequate paraphrasing (e.g., Keck, 2006), full success will depend on subtle control over what Widdowson—when discussing the production of a simple account—terms "use rather than usage" (1978, p. 89). For Widdowson, *usage* involves only formally accurate manipulation of code-related language features such as syntax, vocabulary, or morphology. In contrast, *use* evokes the far more creative process of employing language to craft an appropriate message that conveys a specific meaning in a particular context.

My suggestion is that the Seleskovitch model of translation can also be understood to underline the importance of *use*, a focus that Hatim and Mason (1990) emphasize explicitly in their own discussion of this skill, in which they argue that effective translation must get beyond a "preoccupation . . . with . . . usage rather than use" (p. 33). Moreover, this perspective on a use-oriented process links with paraphrasing via Seidlhofer's (1990) parallel between Widdowson's simple account and her own proposal of a "brief account," which she describes as a summarizing activity—a kind of extended paraphrase—that promotes language development by emphasizing not "linguistic elements" but "a reformulation of propositional and illocutionary development" (p. 418).

Overall, in my view the analogy between paraphrasing and translation or simplification not only helps identify paraphrasing as a highly demanding skill in general, but also more particularly points toward ways in which this difficulty underlies the very aspects of effective paraphrasing instructors especially value: reading the source material perceptively, selecting key details and themes astutely, and working toward the creation of a meaningful and coherent new text. Moreover, I propose that addressing this multifarious learning task effectively requires a correspondingly broad and flexible conceptualization of the study environment. For that reason, I complete this discussion with a brief introduction to such a model— Universal Design for Instruction—leading into an illustration of how that educational framework can be adopted for instruction in writing from sources.

---

[1]Original text in French; translations here and elsewhere by the author.

Universal Design for Instruction and its Origins in Universal Design

Prior to its application in the realm of education, the universal design (UD) movement began in the field of architectural and streetscape planning with the goal of introducing creative design features to meet the accessibility needs of a diverse population (Institute for Human Centered Design, 2014). By making the design process proactive instead of reactive, UD aimed to foster a welcoming climate for as wide a range of users as possible. Thinking beyond what might be imagined as the needs of a "typical" or "average" person, planners discovered that resourceful design characteristics originally envisaged to cater to one particular group could prove very helpful for many others as well. For example, mechanized door openers of various kinds have long been recognized as "a perfect example of universal design" (Steinfeld & Danford, 1993, n.p.). Initially promoted as beneficial for people with disabilities, this innovation is in fact also appreciated by others, such as anyone carrying a large parcel. Moreover, installation of a push-button opener in tandem with a regular door handle serves to reduce doorway barriers in a flexible way that people can employ as they choose, with little if any sense of special accommodation. Over time, UD has been expanded from buildings to a wide range of products used in daily life, with the constant goal of being "usable by all people, to the greatest extent possible, without the need for adaptation or specialized design" (Mace, 2008, p. 1).

The underlying insight, which over time has been expanded to include education, is that well-thought-out design will commonly have value beyond service to any specific group whose needs or preferences initially prompted it. This is the spirit infusing Universal Design for Instruction (UDI, aka Universal Design *of* Instruction, Burgstahler, 2008b, p. 24). Burgstahler (2012) purposely echoes Mace's statement about UD when she identifies the key objective of UDI as the creation of fair and welcoming environments, materials, and activities that proactively accommodate "all students, to the greatest extent possible, without the need for adaptation or specialized design" (p. 2). Because UD itself did not initially include education, there has been a need for a principled adaptation. It is worth noting that this may be achieved through inventive reliance on technological resources (as in the Universal Design for Learning [UDL] model; see CAST, 2013), or through carefully rethinking more conventional foundations for effective teaching (UDI), as I recommend here. Either way, however, the resulting innovations will imply potentially controversial alterations in how teachers and institutions approach educational planning—as a "formidable task" (Pliner & Johnson, 2004, p. 105) that may meet with resistance and will certainly call for appropriate professional training (Dallas, Sprong, & Upton, 2014). Nevertheless, we should realistically recall that this type of difficulty has likewise been an issue for some time in the context of paraphrasing instruction and responses to perceived plagiarism. For instance, Pennycook concluded his 1996 article by noting that recognition of students as individuals struggling to come to terms in their own ways with the demands of writing from sources would "challenge the ways in which academic systems operate" (p. 227), and I have already noted Chandrasoma et al.'s (2004) emphasis on the "time-consuming" demands that instructors would face in exploring students' diverse understandings of the appropriate use of sources (p. 190). Similarly, Adler-Kassner et al (2008) more recently conclude a detailed discussion of writing instruction and responses to patchwriting or plagiarism with the warning that their recommendations will entail "real change" (p. 244). Fortunately, however, moving toward UDI seems likely to be worth the effort.

Principles of UDI

Generally, UDI's recognition and acceptance of individual differences is consistent with the postmodern questioning of practices or preferences that favor one constituency at the expense of others, a key theme in the debate about fairness in responding to instances of perceived plagiarism. UDI is widely commended for its "potential to produce better learning outcomes for all students" (Izzo, Murray, & Novak, 2008, p. 69; see also Burgstahler, 2012b; Chodock & Dolinger, 2009; Ouellett, 2004; Ralabate, 2011;

Roberts, Park, Brown, & Cook, 2011; Rose, Harbour, Johnston, Daley, & Abarbanell, 2006; Scott, McGuire, & Shaw, 2003; Shaw, 2011). More particularly, ESL instructors will be encouraged by the fact that most of those same sources also explicitly identify NNS and international or otherwise culturally different students among the broadly diverse population of learners liable to benefit from UDI (Chodock & Dolinger, 2009; Izzo et al., 2008; Ouellett, 2004; Ralabate, 2011; Roberts et al., 2011; Rose et al., 2006; Scott et al., 2003; Shaw, 2011).

The particular model of UDI proposed by Scott et al. (2003) encompasses nine principles:

1. *Equitable use,* which refers to teaching that is "designed to be useful to and accessible by people with diverse abilities."
2. *Flexibility in use,* which calls for teaching that is "designed to accommodate a wide range of individual abilities."
3. *Simple and intuitive*, meaning "straightforward and predictable" instruction, "regardless of the student's experience, knowledge, language skills, or current concentration level."
4. *Perceptible information,* which highlights materials that are easy to process "regardless of ambient conditions or the student's sensory abilities."
5. *Tolerance for error,* which caters to diverse "individual student learning pace and prerequisite skills."
6. *Low physical effort,* to "minimize nonessential physical effort in order to allow maximum attention to learning."
7. *Size and space for approach and use,* which can facilitate "approach, reach, manipulations, and use regardless of a student's body size, posture, mobility, and communication needs."
8. *The community of learners*, in which "interaction and communication among students and between students and faculty" are promoted.
9. *Instructional climate,* which calls for teaching that is "designed to be welcoming and inclusive," but in which "high expectations are espoused for all students" (pp. 375–376).

For illustrative purposes with respect to instruction in writing from sources, I have selected principles 3, 5, and 9 as especially informative.

Teaching Paraphrasing Skills under the Aegis of UDI

The selected three principles are especially appealing because of their evocation of aspects of the advice on writing from sources given in the Council of Writing Program Administrators' online document, *Defining and Avoiding Plagiarism* (2003). In the following tabular display, action-oriented rewordings of each of the three selected UDI principles are aligned with significant references to recommendations from the Council of Writing Program Administrators, along with applications in the right-most column to the specific demands of a twelve-week, largely pre-master's course for NNS students in which writing from sources is a key part of what I teach. This adjustment to a particular setting is in keeping with the view that UD itself is a flexible, context-specific "process" rather than a fixed "goal" (Burgstahler, 2008a. p. 12). As Scott et al. (2003) explain, "[T] he principles of UDI are intended to be a framework . . . rather than a rigid procedure or prescription for instruction" (p. 374). Following the table, I explore the potential of each of the illustrative UDI principles to promote practical classroom activities that will each time be associated with projected outcomes as well.

Table 1 *Application of Three Selected UDI Principles*

UDI Principles as Understood in My Context	Advice from the CWPA Statement (2003)	Special Considerations in My Particular Context
3—Assure that your expectations are comprehensible, no matter what experience, knowledge, or language skills each student has.	Provide written "policies and expectations for document- ting sources and avoiding plagiarism." (p. 3)	Learning must be made as manageable and transparent as possible because paraphrasing will present difficulties for all students in the group, despite differences in their profiles.
5—Anticipate variations in the individual pace of learning and in background skills.	Avoid "playing an adversarial role as 'plagiarism police' instead of a coaching role as educators." (p. 3)	Expect to work flexibly because learners develop over time; also, each year cultural, linguistic, and other forms of diversity tend to vary unpredictably.
9—Provide welcoming and inclusive instruction that facilitates each learner's achievement of the highest possible outcomes.	Provide "support for researched writing (such as the analysis of models, individual/group conferences, or peer review)." (p. 3)	Patchwriting can be recognized as a teachable moment, and seen as a step on the way to mastering a style of source use that is accep- table to students and instructor alike.

These applications can be described more precisely as follows:

Adapted from principle 3: *Learning must be made as manageable and transparent as possible because paraphrasing will present difficulties for all students in the group, despite differences in their profiles.* My institution's Academic Integrity Policy (Brock University, 2013) is at once promising and yet somewhat ambiguous. For example, it usefully distinguishes culpable from unintentional plagiarism, but requires instructors to report all suspected instances of either type and leaves the final classification to an administrator. Moreover, although unintentional misconduct entails a positive-looking educational follow-up (not a penalty), the policy also stipulates that proven cases in either category will lead to an at least temporary record in the student's file, which reintroduces an arguably punitive dimension even when no deliberate misconduct is alleged. It is therefore crucial for me and my students to be as clear as possible on how we mutually understand the distinction between suspected plagiarism (which requires reporting) and merely bad writing (which does not), so as to minimize uncertainty regarding an issue that is not infrequently in doubt: "what counts as plagiarism" (Williams, 2001, p. 226). This goal has led me to take a number of instructional steps, which include:

- Referring to the policy often, with a stress on its identity as a document that can be illustrated or actually tested by concrete examples from drafts of my students' own work (as a class discussion, in group work, or in individual consultations);
- Assigning reading and/or writing tasks where students work with (and reference) WWW sources that attempt to define plagiarism;
- Inviting my students to join me in creating a class-specific list, fresh each year, of our own best practices for writing from sources.

Above all, these initiatives are designed to involve learners in the postmodern exercise of questioning

the status quo. Such critical examination of the policy responds to Buranen's (2009) advice, noted above, that merely teaching the requirements of a given policy document will be of little use. At the same time, such activities encourage classmates to reflect on and share the particular uncertainties that concern them individually, thus allowing them to focus their study as they choose. Furthermore, it validates the role of patchwriting as a transitional stage on the way to writing effectively from sources. Overall, students not only gain insight into institutional expectations, but also typically express surprise, enthusiasm, and increased engagement in response to the suggestion that their own judgments and self-identified needs can be part of a serious discussion about matters that previously seemed mysterious and even frightening.

Adapted from principle 5: *Expect to work flexibly, because learners develop over time; also, each year cultural, linguistic, and other forms of diversity tend to vary unpredictably*. As Chickering and Gamson (1987)—part of the inspiration behind UDI (Scott et al., 2003, p. 374)—wrote, "There are many roads to learning. People bring different talents and styles of learning to college" (p. 6). With respect to writing from sources, the generally very demanding task of paraphrasing can exhibit different specific features depending on developmental or cultural differences among students. This calls for instructional strategies posing questions and problems in a way that elicits answers and proposed solutions, but that also leaves room for the expression of resistance. Thus, the plagiarism vigilante, concerned primarily with detecting missteps, should be replaced by the curious mentor, who genuinely wishes to discover what and how students think about their own writing. To this end, I find it valuable to employ strategies that permit me to be a constructive listener, consciously demonstrating respect for what my students bring to the process, for instance by:

- Exploring specific instances of source use (and their justification) from my students' own writing through—as appropriate—class discussion, group activities, or individual conferences on a given piece of work;
- Explicitly organizing the sequence of instruction around emergent issues, not just pages in a textbook.

Once again, it is apparent that this student-focused architecture enacts the UDI principle of inviting individual students to home in on areas of academic growth that are of special relevance for them. Moreover, for me as the instructor, vastly improved insight into the needs, interests, and strengths of individual learners is made possible by the explicit move away from a more conventional, syllabus-based progression in class after class. As such, these initiatives have proven themselves as excellent hands-on steps to combat the kind of standardized cultural generalizations about writing conventions critiqued by the Pennycook tradition.

Adapted from principle 9: *Patchwriting can be recognized as a teachable moment, and seen as a step on the way to mastering a style of source use that is acceptable to students and instructor alike*. Hirvela and Du (2013) warn that students may perceive paraphrasing as little more than a pointlessly mechanical "antidote to plagiarism" unless academic sources are energetically represented as valuable supports for the line of reasoning chosen by the writer (p. 96). Of course, achieving this goal entails understanding and respecting the argument and the style that the student actually wishes to express. My earlier analogy with simplification and translation foregrounded the use-oriented aspect of paraphrasing; I suggest that the instructional challenge of making paraphrasing vividly relevant offers an ideal context in which to apply that insight. If instruction does no more than guide the revision of patchwritten passages in the direction of introducing more frequent verbal-level substitutions, learners will produce work that may marginally satisfy their teacher's obligation to the institutional policy but that will provide little if any intellectual excitement for themselves. Instead, I find it effective to:

- Invite my students to discuss the actual value of individual paraphrased/patchwritten passages one by one, in terms of their meaning for the essay and for the writer himself or herself, and to reflect on whether a different rendition or indeed a decision to refer to an entirely different point in the source text would be preferable;

- Draw my students' attention to diverse source-referencing options—ranging from broad summary to narrower paraphrase to exact quotation—to remind them of their freedom to select the most satisfactory form for each reference;
- Prepare myself, in view of the growing awareness of gray areas in judgments about intertextuality, to endorse (after suitable debate) a version that may not be exactly "my" individual style, but that is within the bounds of the academically acceptable and, just as important, is personally and culturally agreeable to the student.

While opportunities for such use-oriented instructional discussion often arise in the course of workshopping preliminary drafts of an assignment, they can present themselves during the review of a phrase-matching report on a near-final version as well. Approached this way, even output from such familiar software as Turnitin can—if used pedagogically rather than as a deterrent (in keeping with the warning given by Youmans, 2001)—turn up patchwritten sections with welcome potential to inspire fruitful teacher-student exchanges of views and suggestions about core issues for evolving writers—the very purpose of relying on academic sources, the available forms that such reliance may take, the merits of alternative or additional sources to buttress a given argument, and search techniques to identify material that student writers will now be motivated to locate, not merely to show, that they are "using sources" in a way that avoids charges of plagiarism, but above all to satisfy their own interest in their chosen topic.

Conclusion

In this discussion I first described the developmentally and the culturally oriented approaches to plagiarism, patchwriting, and paraphrasing. Then, I explored parallels between paraphrasing, simplification, and translation as a basis for arguing that paraphrasing is a very difficult skill in itself. My purpose was to position the inherent difficulty of paraphrasing for all students as a key point of contact between the developmentally and culturally oriented viewpoints in the sense that, even though each learner will approach this writing challenge in his or her own way, attention to intrinsic difficulty can, I believe, serve as a meaningful starting point of instruction for most if not all students. In that connection, I introduced the adaptable and inclusive principles of UDI and outlined three scenarios to illustrate how reliance on advice from UDI could be used to promote welcoming and flexible teaching strategies in the specific setting of one of my own courses, embodying both developmental and cultural factors and permitting the high level of individualization required for learning a very difficult skill.

Nevertheless, it is necessary to concede that thinking through this process even just for one particular class is very definitely "no small undertaking" in itself (Scott et al., 2003, p. 377), and there will be limits on the generalizability of specific examples across different settings. For instance, my own planning even in the one course described above cannot be carried forward from year to year without ongoing adjustment, achieved not by a single advance-planning exercise but through a constant process of immediate, in-class reflection in practice, along with reflection on practice before and after each class (Schön, 1983). It would, therefore, be impossible for me simply to transfer strategies from one course to another, even within my own teaching load, without very prudent revision. More notably, it would be misleading to expect that other teachers at different educational institutions could adopt the specific strategies outlined above without potentially substantial reconfiguration for appropriateness in their own context.

Still, I suggest that the examples do provide reason for optimism that all instructors of writing from sources for NNS students could create an equally (or more) effective foundation for inclusive education through their own context-appropriate adaptation of UDI principles that facilitate recognition of diverse manifestations of the inherent difficulty of the paraphrasing skill. To that end, I believe that the intrinsic-difficulty element of the overall paraphrasing process deserves central attention as a unifying nexus for fair and constructive accommodation of developmental and cultural diversity in the broadest sense.

References

Abilock, D. (2014). Adding friction: How to design deliberate thinking into the research process. *Library Media Connection* (August/September), 46–47.

Adler-Kassner, L., Anson. C., & Howard, R. M. (2008). Framing plagiarism. In C. Eisner & M. Vicinus (Eds.), *Originality. imitation, and plagiarism* (pp. 231–246). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Anson, C. (2011). Fraudulent practices: Academic misrepresentations of plagiarism in the name of good pedagogy. *Composition Studies, 39*(2), 29–43.

Bertram-Gallant, T. (2008). *Academic integrity in the twenty-first century*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Periodicals.

Brock University. (2013, June 10). *Academic integrity policy*. Retrieved from https://www.brocku.ca/webfm_send/28409

Brooke, C. (2007). Joseph Janangelo and the analogics of new media. *College Composition and Communication, 59*(2), 288–298.

Buranen, L. (2009). A safe place: The role of librarians and writing centers in addressing citation practices and plagiarism. *Knowledge Quest, 37*(3), 24–33.

Burgstahler, S. (2008a). Universal design in higher education. In S. Burgstahler & R. Cory (Eds.), *Universal design in higher education: From principles to practice* (pp. 3–20). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Burgstahler, S. (2008b). Universal design of instruction: From principles to practice. In S. Burgstahler & R. Cory (Eds.), *Universal design in higher education: From principles to practice* (pp. 23–43). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Burgstahler, S. (2012, March 28). *Universal design of instruction (UDI): Definition, principles, guidelines, and examples*. Seattle, WA: DO-IT, University of Washington, n. p. Retrieved from http://www.washington.edu/doit/Brochures/PDF/instruction.pdf

CAST (Center for Applied Special Technology). (2013). *About UDL*. Retrieved from http://www.cast.org/udl/

Chace, W. (2012). A question of honor: Cheating on campus undermines the reputation of our universities and the value of their degrees. *The American Scholar, 81*(2), 20–32.

Chandrasoma, R., Thompson, C., & Pennycook, A. (2004). Beyond plagiarism: Transgressive and nontransgressive intertextuality. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education, 3*(3), 171–193.

Chickering, A., & Gamson, Z. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education, *AAHE Bulletin* (March), 3–7. Retrieved from ERIC Document Reproduction Service (No. ED 282 491), http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED282491.pdf

Chodock, T., & Dolinger, E. (2009). Applying universal design to information literacy. *Reference & User Services Quarterly, 49*(1), 24–32.

Council of Writing Program Administrators. (2003, January). *Defining and avoiding plagiarism: The WPA statement on best practices*. Retrieved from http://wpacouncil.org/files/wpa-plagiarism-statement.pdf

Dallas, B., Sprong, E., & Upton, D. (2014). Post-secondary faculty attitudes toward inclusive teaching strategies. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 80*(2), 21–20.

Eisener, C., & Vicinus, M. (2008). *Originality, imitation, and plagiarism* (231–246). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Ellery, K. (2008). Undergraduate plagiarism: a pedagogical perspective. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(5), 507–516.

Hatcher, T. (2011). Becoming an ethical scholarly writer. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing, 42*(2), 142–159.

Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the translator*. Harlow, UK: Longman.

Heather, J. (2010). Turnitoff: Identifying and fixing a hole in current plagiarism detection software. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 35*(6), 647–660.

Hirvela, A., & Du, Q. (2013). Why am I paraphrasing?: Undergraduate ESL writers' engagement with source-based academic writing and reading. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 12,* 87–98.

Honeyfield, J. (1977). Simplification. *TESOL Quarterly, 11*(4), 431–440.

Howard, R. M. (1993). A plagiarism pentimento. *Journal of Teaching Writing, 11*(2), 233–245.

Howard, R. M. (1995). Plagiarisms, authorships, and the academic death penalty. *College English 57*(7), 788–806.

Howard, R. M. (1999). *Standing in the shadow of giants: Plagiarists, authors, collaborators*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Howard, R. M. (2000a). Sexuality, textuality: The cultural work of plagiarism. *College English, 62* (March), 37–55

Howard, R. M. (2000b). The ethics of plagiarism. In M. Pemberton (Ed.), *The ethics of writing instruction*: *Issues in theory and practice* (79–90). Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Howard, R. M. (2002). Don't police plagiarism: Just TEACH! *Education Digest, 67*(5), 46–49.

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

Howard, R. M., & Watson, M. (2010). The scholarship of plagiarism: Where we've been, where we are, what's needed next. *WPA: Writing Program Administration, 33*(3), 116–124.

Institute for Human Centered Design. (2014). *History of universal design*. Retrieved from http://www.humancentereddesign.org/print/1426

Izzo, M., Murray, A., & Novak, J. (2008). The faculty perspective on universal design for learning. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 21*(2), 60–72.

Jakobson, R. (1959). On linguistic aspects of translation. In R. Brower (Ed.), *On translation.* (pp. 232-239). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

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.

Lederer, M. (1973/1984). Transcoder ou réexprimer? In D. Seleskovitch & M. Lederer (1984). *Interpréter pour traduire* (pp. 15–36). Paris, France: Didier.

Lyon, A. (2009). "You fail": Plagiarism, the ownership of writing, and transnational conflicts. *College Composition and Communication, 61*(2), 222–239.

Mace, R. (2008). *About UD*. Center for Universal Design, North Carolina State University. Retrieved from http://www.ncsu.edu/ncsu/design/cud/about_ud/about_ud.htm

Mott-Smith, J. (2013). Viewing student behavior through the lenses of culture and globalization: Two narratives from a US college writing class. *Teaching in Higher Education, 18*(3), 249–259.

Ouellett, M. (2004). Faculty development and universal instructional design. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 37*(2), 135–144.

Pecorari, D., & Petrić, B. (2014). Plagiarism in second-language writing. *Language Teaching, 47*(3), 269–302.

Pennycook, A. (1994). The complex contexts of plagiarism: A reply to Decker. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 3*(3), 277–284.

Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(2), 201–30.

Pliner, S., & Johnson, J. (2004). Historical, theoretical, and foundational principles of universal instructional design in higher education. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 37*(2), 105–113.

Power, L. (2009). University students' perception of plagiarism. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(6), 643–662.

Ralabate, P. (2011, August 30). Universal Design for Learning: Meeting the needs of all students. *The ASHA Leader, 16.* Retrieved from http://www.asha.org/Publications/leader/2011/110830/Universal-Design-for-Learning—Meeting-the-Needs-of-All-Students.htm

Roberts, K., Park, H., Brown, S., & Cook, B. (2011). Universal design for instruction in postsecondary education: A systematic review of empirically based articles. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 24*(1), 515.

Robillard, A. (2007). We won't get fooled again: On the absence of angry responses to plagiarism in composition studies. *College English, 70*(1), 10–31.

Rose, D., Harbour, S., Johnston, S., Daley, G., & Abarbanell, L. (2006). Universal design for learning in postsecondary education: Reflections on principles and their application. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 19*(2), 135–151.

Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Scott, S., McGuire, J., & Shaw, S. (2003). Universal design for instruction: A new paradigm for adult instruction in postsecondary education. *Remedial and Special Education, 24*(6), 369–79.

Seidlhofer, B. (1990). Summary judgements: Perspectives on reading and writing. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 6*(2), 413–424.

Seleskovitch, C. (1976/1984). De l'expérience aux concepts. In D. Seleskovitch & M. Lederer (1984). *Interpréter pour traduire* (pp. 72–103). Paris, France: Didier.

Shaw, R. (2011). Employing universal design for instruction. *New Directions for Student Services, 134* (Summer), 21–33.

Steinfeld, E., & Danford, G. (1993, October 25). *Automated doors: Towards universal design*. Retrieved from http://idea.ap.buffalo.edu//publications/automateddoors.htm

University of Ottawa. (n.d.). *School of translation and interpretation: Undergraduate programs*. Retrieved from http://arts.uottawa.ca/translation/programs

Widdowson, H. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Williams, S. (2001) How do I know if they're cheating? Teacher strategies in an information age. *The Curriculum Journal, 12*(2), 225–239.

Youmans, R. (2001). Does the adoption of plagiarism-detection software in higher education reduce plagiarism? *Studies in Higher Education, 36*(7), 749–761.

_____
*Corresponding author: jsivell@brocku.ca