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Abstract

Beginning students face significant challenges when they make the transition to undergraduate university study. Understanding and adapting to the requirements of academic writing is central to their successful transition. ‘Intertextual practices’, those practices writers use to create meaning by drawing on source texts (Ivanič, 2004a) are an integral part of academic writing, and one students often find particularly challenging.

This thesis investigates the intertextual practices of a group of Australian first-year undergraduate health sciences students in responding to an authentic written assessment task involving writing from sources. The student writers who participated in the study were enrolled in a core first-year unit of study for both the nursing and physiotherapy degree courses in the Faculty of Health Sciences. These writers represent a diverse cohort, including monolingual and multilingual writers, Australian citizens, permanent residents and students studying on international student visas.

The study comprises two strands. The first is a text-focussed multidimensional mixed methods investigation of the citation practices in students’ written academic texts ($n = 171$) incorporating both quantitative and qualitative data and analysis. The second is a writer-focussed qualitative investigation of a smaller subgroup of these students' ($n = 6$) understandings of their practices. In this second strand, the talk around text method is used, in which the researcher and participant writers engage in conversations about the writer’s life and their experiences with learning and writing, leading to discussions around the texts produced by the participant (Lillis, 2009). These conversations provide insights into issues around writer identity and opportunities to explore how writers are present in their texts and how their identities influence their perceptions and practices.
In the first strand, the quantitative findings of the textual analysis indicate that, in many respects, the student writers who participated in this study employed the broad brushstrokes of intertextual practices in expected ways within their discipline, in what was one of their earliest attempts at producing academic texts within their degrees, and there was consistency across language groups and degree courses. This was borne out by the qualitative textual analysis, in that patterns of strengths were found in the writing of students from all groups, as were weaknesses. These student writers recognised the need to use sources in their academic writing, but they were uncertain about how to employ and cite information from their source texts once they moved beyond the familiar tasks of defining terms and providing facts.

The talk around text strand findings deepen the insights from the textual analysis and ensure that student voices inform the understandings of first-year writing developed in this study. Three stances toward intertextual practices emerged from the talk around text analysis: embracing intertextual practices; resisting intertextual practices; and adapting to intertextual practices.

This thesis aims to shifts the research lens away from the problems and perceived deficits of beginning academic writers, identifying not just the challenges they face but also their capabilities and strengths. This research questions the deficit approach often taken towards beginning writers by those responsible for institutional policy and assessment. An underlying premise of this research is that students bring to university study experiences that inform their intertextual practices. These prior experiences not only influence their ongoing development as writers, but they should also influence the practices of institutions, teachers and academic literacy specialists, facilitating positive engagement with novice students and their texts.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background

This research has grown out of my experience working with students to support the development of their academic language and learning within the context of their university studies. Over more than a decade in my role as an academic literacy specialist, the most interesting and engaging part of my work has involved conversations with students about their learning and writing. Health Sciences is one of the largest faculties at the university where I have worked for several years, and many of the students I have had the pleasure of getting to know were part of this faculty. The research that is the focus of this thesis is a direct result of those conversations with those health sciences students. Student writers are the experts on why they do what they do in their academic writing, and my goal is to let the writers and their texts speak for themselves, to tell us what they have done in their own words. The title reflects that goal; it is a quote from one of the student writers who participated in the interviews that bring their voices into this research.

Over the years, I have often witnessed the uncertainty and anxiety students can experience as they make their first attempts to construct a piece of academic writing that draws on the work of experts in their field of study. Most recognise the important role that writing plays in their studies but worry that their previous experience may not be relevant to the tasks that lie ahead or that they will not be able to translate what they know to this new context. Their concerns are well-founded. New genres and unfamiliar disciplinary practices require first-year students to quickly develop a different, more sophisticated understanding of academic writing and the requirements of their field of study (Lea, 2004).

An important aspect of academic writing students need to master involves incorporating information from sources in the published literature of the discipline into their texts (Lea &
Street, 1998). Many university lecturers tend to place more emphasis on the importance of knowing the literature of the field than students have experienced in previous educational settings, and the extent to which they are expected to incorporate and cite the work of published experts is often surprising even to students with experience in academic writing (Chandrasoma, 2007). How students choose, incorporate, and engage with their source texts impacts upon their ability to create an authorial identity and to be persuasive in their writing. They must learn to blend information from their source texts with their own words, ideas and structure to create a text that is a coherent whole. While doing so, they must make clear which ideas are their own and which are drawn from their source texts. This weaving together of many voices within a piece of writing and the identification of relationships between different texts is a central characteristic of scholarly writing.

Intertextuality is the term that is used in the literature to refer to the interrelated nature of texts (Ivanič, 2004a). Through intertextuality academic knowledge is created, by affirming, refuting or recontextualising knowledge contained in other texts. Intertextuality is the focus of this thesis, which investigates the intertextual practices of undergraduate student writers. This investigation is grounded in Fairclough’s (1992b) work on intertextuality in the context of critical discourse analysis, and Bazerman’s (2004b) in the context of academic writing. Both of these researchers make an important distinction between explicit examples of intertextuality, which make clear, identifiable reference to specific source texts and are overtly signalled by the writer, and the less obvious implicit forms of intertextuality, which draw on common patterns of discourse and genres rather than from specific sources (Ivanič, 2004a). Academic texts are characterised by explicit intertextuality more commonly than those produced by other discourse communities (Scollon, 2004). Consequently, it is appropriate to focus on this form of intertextuality when investigating undergraduate texts. Regardless of whether students are building on existing practices and strategies or mastering
entirely new ones, they face enormous intellectual challenges. As they are developing knowledge of their field, they are also expected to acknowledge relevant sources appropriately and demonstrate an understanding of the literature (Borg, 2000).

In Australia, the kinds of university students who are facing these challenges have rapidly expanded and diversified in recent years. The demand-driven system implemented in 2009 was designed to increase participation from students traditionally under-represented in higher education, and, although the work is not yet complete, Australian universities are more diverse (Briguglio & Watson, 2014; Devlin & McKay, 2018). Many of the students I work with are returning to study after years spent working and/or raising families, and some are the first in their families to attend university. Some coming through vocational pathways may never have completed secondary school, having left after year ten to join the workforce, while others have previously gained a certificate or degree and are returning for qualifications in a different field. They may take a circuitous route through their degree course. It is not uncommon for students to take time away from their studies to manage financial or caring commitments, and many will mix stretches of part-time study with full-time work (and vice versa) before they reach graduation – just as I have done during my own studies. Their language backgrounds are just as varied: “traditional” English-speaking background students; multilingual students whose parents migrated to Australia or who migrated themselves, either as children or adults, with various levels of competence in their heritage language(s); and international students with English as a second, or sometimes third or fourth language.

Deficit discourses around student academic writing have persisted as the student body in higher education has become more diverse (Daddow, 2017; Pang, Garrett, Wrench, & Perrett, 2018). Institutional expectations and conventions are often viewed as “transparently meaningful” when in reality they are complex and rooted in assumptions that are rarely made clear to students (Lillis & Turner, 2001, p. 58). When students struggle to meet those
expectations or recognise conventions, the blame is often placed on them, while the complexity and variety of literacy practices they are attempting to master remains unacknowledged (Lea & Street, 1998). Deficit discourses around academic writing are especially targeted at multilingual students, with second language learners in general and international students in particular problematised (Moore & Harrington, 2016; Murray, 2010). Staff and students alike internalise these discourses.

Throughout my career, I have been associated with universities dedicated to expanding access to higher education; I now work within an institution with a declared mission of social justice and inclusion, and its staff live out this mission in remarkable ways. I have been privileged to work with many academics and professional staff members who are deeply committed to supporting students as they take their first steps into university learning. Even in this supportive environment, however, discussions about how students learn to become academic writers often begin by naming the issue as a problem that rests primarily with the students and seeking to identify and remediate their difficulties. I often hear comments about students who should not be at university; unfortunately, these kinds of viewpoints appear to remain widespread in the sector (Baker, 2017; Hale, 2019). In my experience, many students have also internalised this problematisation of their learning and writing abilities. They seem to believe they should have arrived at university as fully formed writers, and they may hesitate to ask for help, often out of fear they will reveal to their lecturers and tutors that they do not “belong” at university.

A key goal of my research is to respond to these deficit discourses. This thesis is grounded in an academic literacies approach to writing, which is concerned with the social practices associated with written language (Lea & Street, 1998). The term literacies is used in its plural form to highlight the multiple and contested nature of language use and the variety of practices students need to command to succeed in academic settings (Lillis & Scott, 2007).
This model is associated with the New Literacy Studies, a social and ideological approach deeply concerned with issues of power and identity and their impact on learners (Lea & Street, 1998). Research associated with this model focuses on exploring students’ experiences with the constructs, forms and expectations of academic writing, rather than on identifying characteristics or more or less successful texts (Coffin & Donohue, 2012).

The goals of academic literacies research are ambitious. Researchers seek to change the way writing practices are conceptualised within universities to affect teaching and learning practices, acknowledging the resources students bring with them and valuing their identities. From this perspective, many of the difficulties students encounter with academic writing can be explained by a misalignment between the expectations of university teaching staff and how students interpret what will be required of them in their written tasks (Lea & Street, 1998). While recognising that most beginning students will not yet have developed the full complement of skills and abilities required by the academy, an academic literacies approach actively rejects the problematisation of students and their literacy practices and the deficit discourses that can result (Lillis & Tuck, 2016). The focus shifts from ensuring students understand and adapt to university practices toward enabling both students and staff to “understand the literacy practices of the university and the issues that arise from the meanings that literacy has for them” (Coffin & Donohue, 2012, p. 72).

My research takes this stance, and my goal is to develop a deeper understanding of how students engage with source texts in their academic writing and what they understand about the role of intertextuality in academic writing. By investigating what beginning students know and do, rather than prioritising an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of their texts, I hope to shed light on the kinds of expectations we communicate to students (both intentionally and unintentionally) and demonstrate the ways that first-year student writers both conform to and question those expectations.
1.2 Aims and significance of the research

The research that is the focus of this thesis has three main aims. First, it seeks to identify and explore the intertextual practices used by first-year undergraduate health sciences students in an assessment task involving writing from sources. Much of what we know about first-year undergraduate writers is drawn from research on second language learners or comes out of EAP or first-year composition studies. Consequently, this research is significant because it contributes to our knowledge of the intertextual practices of a linguistically and educationally diverse group of beginning first-year writers that incorporates local monolingual students, local multilingual students and multilingual international students, in one of their first assessment tasks in a unit of study that is part of a university degree course.

Second, this research aims to investigate how student writers make choices related to intertextual practices in their writing and how they perceive the role of intertextual practices. The research is significant because it provides insights into how students’ developing identities as writers and learners influence their intertextual practices. Academics and academic literacy specialists who work with first-year students can use these insights to frame intertextuality in positive ways that more closely resonate with their students’ own goals and understandings.

Finally, this research aims to identify differences and commonalities in the intertextual practices between groups of students, specifically monolingual and multilingual students, both local and international, enrolled in degree courses with different entry requirements. Intertextuality presents challenges not only for multilingual or second language writers (Stockall & Cole, 2016), but it is very often investigated through the lens of EAP or ESP research. By revealing not only the differences but also the similarities in patterns of practices between these diverse groups, this thesis provides empirical evidence of the strengths and capabilities of first-year writers, as well as the areas in which university academics and
support staff can focus their efforts to further develop beginning writers’ intertextual practices.

1.3 Research design and research questions

This section provides a brief overview of the research design of this project which will be discussed in detail in Chapter Three. The research described in this thesis is a mixed methods study. The first strand involves an examination of intertextual practices across a variety of dimensions: a statistical analysis of the resulting numerical data, and a qualitative analysis of exemplars from the essay texts. The second strand of the study makes use of the ethnographic method of talk around text interviews to reveal how students’ current practices are influenced by their prior knowledge and experience and how they understand the expectations of their current writing context. By investigating this topic both quantitatively and qualitatively, this study will provide a more complete picture of the intertextual practices of undergraduate writers than has been achieved in previous studies.

The following research questions drive the textual analysis strand of this project:

RQ1a What kinds of intertextual practices are used in the assessment tasks of novice undergraduate writers in health sciences, and what is the frequency of their use?

i. What methods of incorporation and integration do they use?

ii. Where in the structure of their texts are they most likely to use sources?

iii. For what rhetorical purposes do they use sources?

RQ1b Are there any differences in the frequency of specific kinds of intertextual practices between student groups?

i. Course of study
ii. Language background (monolingual/multilingual)

iii. Visa status (local/international)

Descriptive statistics and the findings of the qualitative textual analysis were examined to answer research question 1a, while inferential statistics (ANOVA tests) were used to answer research question 1b.

The second strand of the study uses talk around text interviews with a smaller group of these student writers to explore how they understand the role of intertextuality in academic writing and how their understanding affects the choices they make in their writing.

The following research questions guided the talk around text analysis in the second strand:

RQ2 How do novice undergraduate writers in health sciences understand intertextual practices in academic writing?

RQ3 How do they understand intertextual practices in the specific academic writing task?

To answer these research questions, interview data about students’ general understandings of intertextual practices and their understandings around their use of intertextual practices in the specific academic writing task were examined.

1.4 Key terms

*Intertextuality*

*Intertextuality* is a broad term referring to the interrelated nature of texts. It can be applied to images and works of art, written texts, web pages, spoken communication – any kind of communicative interaction (Ivanič, 2004a). In academic texts, writers signal intertextuality in more explicit ways (direct quotes, paraphrases, and summaries, for example) and less explicit ways (genre, structure, formulaic language) (Bazerman et al., 2005).
Intertextual practices

Intertextual practices refer to what writers do as they interact with other texts (Ivanič, 2004a); for example, how they position themselves in relation to other texts, or how they incorporate ideas or language from other texts.

Primary text

Primary text refers to the student texts being analysed, as they are the “primary data” texts (Ivanič, 2004a, p. 282) for this research project.

Source text

Source texts are those identifiable cited texts student writers draw upon when creating their primary texts (Ivanič, 2004a).

Student writer

I will use the term student writer to refer to the participants in this study who produced the primary texts that are the focus of the analysis.

Author

Following G. Thompson and Ye (1991), I use the term author in this thesis to indicate the writer of a cited source text.

Talk around text

Talk around text is a method of qualitative data collection grounded in an ethnographic approach and involving “talk between the researcher and the writer-participant about a text that the writer is writing or has written” (Lillis, 2009, p. 171).

Multilingual

Multilingual refers to student writers who are able to draw on more than one language as a resource for their communication and their thinking about writing. The use of this term is
aligned with an academic literacies approach that rejects the problematising of students from diverse language backgrounds (Morton, Storch, & Thompson, 2015).

1.5 Organisation of the thesis

This thesis consists of six chapters. Chapter One provides an introduction to the research and an overview of the thesis. Chapter Two positions this study by providing an overview of the literature on intertextuality. The chapter briefly presents the history of the concept of intertextuality from its beginnings in literary theory through to its application in academic writing research. Then, the main types of intertextuality and text-focussed and writer-focussed approaches to intertextuality in the research are outlined, and an overview of the empirical studies into transgressive intertextual practices, citation analysis and talk around text approaches is provided. The chapter concludes with a justification of the theoretical framework of this thesis, which combines a text-focussed and writer-focussed approach.

Chapter Three describes and justifies the methodology used in this research, beginning with a rationale for the research study and a discussion of mixed methods research design and the benefits of this method for academic writing research, as well as an overview of the setting and the participants. A description of the data collection instruments for each strand of the study follows, beginning with the quantitative data collection instruments, then the qualitative. Next, the data collection procedure is outlined, again beginning with the quantitative strand and moving to the qualitative. Finally, the ethical considerations involved in the research are identified and discussed.

The next two chapters present the findings of the study. Chapter Four provides the findings for the textual analysis in the first strand of the study. The quantitative findings for each of the coding dimensions are provided, including the results of the group comparisons,
alongside a qualitative analysis of exemplars for each dimension. Chapter Five discusses the findings of the talk around text analysis for a smaller group of six student writers.

Chapter Six brings together both strands of the study in an overall discussion. It begins with sections providing answers to the research questions and interpreting the specific findings of the two strands: the textual analysis and the talk around text strand of the study. These findings are then brought together in a general discussion. Next, the key contributions of the research, the pedagogical implications and the limitations of the research are presented, before the thesis concludes with a discussion of future directions.
Chapter 2: Theoretical background

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides the theoretical background to the study, including an overview of the literature related to intertextuality and the use of sources in university-level academic writing in sections 2.2-4. Section 2.2 traces the concept of intertextuality from its beginnings in literary theory, explains the differences between two main types of intertextuality – implicit and explicit – and explores text-focussed and writer-focussed approaches to intertextuality. Section 2.3 discusses the specific nature of intertextuality in academic writing and outlines the key concept of intertextual practices, already briefly introduced in Chapter 1. This section concludes by investigating the research into the intertextual practices of writers with different levels to experience and identifying a need for research focussing on the writing of beginning academic writers. Section 2.4 discusses different approaches to intertextuality and academic writing in the literature. The ways that intertextuality and institutional and disciplinary expectations can present difficulties for writers, potentially resulting in transgressive practices, are briefly considered, then two main approaches in the literature are identified: text-focussed and writer-focussed approaches. This section positions the thesis as utilising a framework that combines a text-focussed approach with a writer-focussed approach. Finally, in Section 2.5, the current research is outlined, including the gaps in the research that the study seeks to fill and the research questions.

2.2 Intertextuality

Intertextuality is a broad term that refers to the interrelated nature of texts. It can be applied to images and works of art, written texts, web pages, spoken communication – any kind of communicative interaction (Ivanič, 2004a). With respect to written texts, it is most obvious in the ways that speakers and writers use quotations and paraphrases to incorporate the ideas
and words of others (Porter, 1986). In a broader sense, it sheds light on how writers build a
new piece of communication using the texts, language, ideas and discourse structures that
surround them in what Bazerman (2004b) calls “the sea of language we live in” (p. 83).
Fairclough (1992b) describes intertextuality as the ways that a text “responds to,
reaccentuates, and reworks past texts” (p. 270). Thus, it is much more than quotations and
citations, although these are the most visible aspects of intertextuality in academic texts.

Influential Russian scholar and theorist Mikhail Bakhtin was instrumental in the development
of the concept of intertextuality; he explored the nature of language and meaning-making
through his theory of dialogism, specifically the ways that individuals use language to engage
Dialogism concerns the ways that all words we have to choose from to create our utterances –
Bakhtin’s term for a communicative act where meaning is exchanged (Holquist, 2002) –
carry with them the meanings from their previous use. Our words are infused with these prior
meanings, and they anticipate the use that others may make of them in future; we are
constantly negotiating with these other voices to create our own meanings (Fairclough,
1992b). Intertextuality is a “given” in all language and communication (Lillis, 2003, p. 197);
it is not merely a stylistic feature.

The term intertextuality was first coined by Julia Kristeva, further extending Bakhtin’s
conversation of many voices inside an utterance to “the notion of several texts within a text”
(Kristeva, 2002, p. 88). Her use of the term incorporates the connectedness of texts and the
new relationships between them that readers and writers create together. By incorporating
prior texts, writers bring history into their writing, and insert their writing into history, as
their texts are incorporated by future writers. Bakhtin and Kristeva share this vision of
language as a chain of communication. The dialogic chain, a central concept of Bakhtinian
intertextuality, is important to how new language is acquired through the engagement with
the words and utterances of others; the future use of these words and utterances will be shaped by the prior context (Cazden, 1989). In this way, voice is a central concept in intertextuality, encompassing the ways that speakers and writers acquire language by populating the words of others “with [their] own intention, [their] own accent” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 293).

An important implication of this understanding of language is that the meaning is negotiated, rather than transmitted; the chain is constructed through interaction with previous meanings. Words do not have meaning that can be contained in static definitions; meaning occurs as people engage each other in communication within a specific sociohistorical context (Prior, 2001). Communication is an action, not a product. Bakhtin and Volosinov (1973) put it this way in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*:

I give myself verbal shape from another’s point of view, ultimately, from the point of view of the community to which I belong. A word is a bridge thrown between myself and another. If one end of the bridge depends on me, then the other depends on my addressee. (p. 86)

Writers and readers working together within their shared context produce meaning, rather than the reader extracting meaning from a text produced by an individual (Still & Worton, 1991). Our utterances contribute to a shared cultural experience in which “the social text writes us” (Bazerman, 2004a, p. 54).

2.2.1 Implicit and explicit intertextuality

The literature has consistently recognised that intertextuality can be realised in texts in different ways (Bazerman, 2004b; Fairclough, 1992b; Ivanič, 1998; S. H. Lee, 2010; Pecorari & Petrić, 2014). Implicit forms of intertextuality sit at one end and relate to aspects of the text that are not immediately obvious on the surface; this kind of intertextuality is not clearly attributable to a specific source text or identifiable author and includes generic features and
formulaic language. Implicit intertextuality is the broadest category of intertextuality (S. H. Lee, 2019), referring to the relationships between texts that exist because of a shared context, discipline or form (Fairclough, 1992b). Ivanič (1998) calls this an echo in the new text, not of a specific other text, but of a type of text, or the conventions to which they adhere; Bazerman (2004b) also describes how writers may use phrases or terminology associated with a particular group, or language that “echo[s] certain ways of communication” (p.5). For example, disciplinary communities may use very different genres and have different expectations regarding the kinds of evidence that should be used, and these expectations form part of the social context writers work within. They provide boundaries around the kinds of meanings created within that context, which are most likely to be recognised by more experienced members of the discourse community (Badenhorst, 2017). Fairclough (1992b) uses the term interdiscursivity to refer to the ways texts can differ depending upon the conventions and resources available to the writers who produce them. He links this kind of intertextuality to “orders of discourse associated with particular institutions or domains of social life” (p. 284). While disciplinary conventions may not be explicitly marked in the text, they shape it at a fundamental level. Implicit intertextuality is a feature of all texts, indeed of all language (Ivanič, 1998), and it is also a feature of literacy practices (Ivanič, 2004b).

Explicit intertextuality involves clearly identifiable instances of textual borrowing that point to a recognisable source text. The most visible type of intertextuality occurs when writers explicitly signal the use of the words and ideas from another text. A number of terms have been used to identify this type of intertextuality, including manifest (Fairclough, 1992b), explicit (Bazerman, 2004b) or actual (Ivanič, 1998). Each of these terms points to the visible, identifiable presence of other texts. Invariably, language draws meaning from context, and writers create their own voices by assimilating and reshaping the resources available in their discoursal context (Paxton, 2006). This happens explicitly in academic texts, where writers
actively engage and negotiate with prior texts to create meaning; doing so is how writers seek and attain membership in academic communities as they demonstrate an understanding of the texts in the disciplinary environment (Chatterjee-Padmanabhan, 2014). The texts resulting from these interactions are heteroglossic (Bakhtin, 1981), bringing together many voices in a single text. Writers engage with the ideas, beliefs and perspectives of others, accepting or rejecting them, in a way that Bakhtin (1984) referred to as double-voiced, responding to the voices of others and to our own perceptions of those voices (C. D. Lee, 2004).

An understanding of these two aspects of intertextuality allows researchers and writers to trace relationships between texts more clearly and to recognise the intertextual resources that are available to writers. The current study is most concerned with the more explicit forms of intertextuality because explicit intertextuality is a central feature of academic writing with significant implications for academic writers. However, because these two kinds of intertextuality occur side by side, investigating explicit intertextuality can provide insights into the less explicit forms as well, shedding light on writers’ understandings of the broader relationships between texts, academic genres, and disciplinary expectations.

2.2.2 Texts and writers

Any consideration of intertextuality is necessarily concerned with the relationship between the writer, the text and the context within which the text is produced. Explorations of intertextuality vary depending on whether the focus rests primarily with the writer or the text. These categories are not mutually exclusive, however. Text-focussed approaches may widen the research lens to include writers’ experiences, described as a “text-oriented ethnography” by Coffin and Donohue (2012, p. 71), while writer-focussed approaches may also include elements of textual analysis, which they argued could be considered an “ethnographically informed text analysis”.
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Focus on the text

Text-focused approaches in academic writing research have a lengthy history (Lillis, 2008). Much of the research on intertextuality that focuses on textual analysis is indebted to Fairclough (1992a, 1992b) and his work with Bakhtinian notions of intertextuality in the fields of applied linguistics and critical discourse analysis. He believes intertextual analysis plays a crucial role in “mediat[ing] the connection between language and social context” and “bridg[ing] the gap between texts and contexts” (Fairclough, 1992a, p. 192). Fairclough aimed to operationalise intertextuality to apply it to textual analysis, with the goal of developing an analytical framework to be used in critical discourse analysis.

Charles Bazerman’s influential work in intertextuality shares this goal and is also firmly grounded in a Bakhtinian approach. He is deeply concerned with how writers understand and control multiple voices in their texts, arguing that making this process clear to writers increases their agency, more fully enabling them to create their own meanings in relation to the utterances of others (Bazerman, 2004a). To this end, Bazerman (2004a, 2004b) developed a detailed approach to the analysis of intertextuality within written texts that can be used to investigate how one text is deployed within another. Intertextual analyses grounded in this approach seek to explore the practices involved in the construction of knowledge to reveal the deeper relationships between texts, thus moving beyond the “metrics” (Avila-Reyes, 2017, p. 23) that are often the focus of citation analysis.

Bazerman (2004a) identified key dimensions or aspects of intertextuality in what he calls an “analytic heuristic” (p. 61). In this heuristic, he examined both the texts that are available to serve as resources for the writer and the ways that information from a source text can be integrated into a writer’s text. According to this heuristic, intertextuality related to the “texts that lie behind the … [writer’s] text” (Bazerman, 2004a, p. 63) – those texts that are available to serve as resources for the writer – fall into three groups: firstly, texts within the rhetorical
situation (for example, course materials, assigned readings or textbooks); secondly, texts within the genre (for example, sample essays written by other students); and thirdly, the entire range of relevant texts. These aspects of intertextuality identify the nature of the source texts that have either influenced the writer’s text or been directly incorporated within it. As the current research is focussed on the analysis of student texts, rather than an examination of the source texts, these aspects related to underlying intertextual resources are not within the scope of this thesis.

In terms of the ways that information from a source text can be incorporated into a writer’s text, Bazerman (2004a, 2004b) identified the following dimensions:

- Levels of intertextuality: how completely the source text is incorporated
- Techniques of intertextual representation: how the writer signals the presence of the source text to their readers (e.g., through citations, quotation marks, reporting verbs). Levels of intertextuality are realised through the techniques of intertextual representation.
- Intertextual transformation: how the writer recontextualises the information from the source text, commenting upon or evaluating the information. This aspect is closely related to the concept of a writer’s stance.
- Rhetorical purpose: how the information is used within the writer’s argument
- Intertextual reach: how close or distant the texts are from each other in space, time or history with a single text referring to itself (intratextual) as an example of close reach, while those texts from other disciplines or fields reach further (interdisciplinary reach)

The current research focuses on the aspects of intertextuality most visible and amenable to analysis in student texts (levels of intertextuality, techniques of intertextual representation,
intertextual transformation and rhetorical purpose), as the ability to recognise, understand and deploy the practices they encompass are of such significance to academic writers. Identifying intertextual reach, while an important aspect of intertextuality, would require the analysis of source texts as well as student texts, and so remains outside the scope of this study. Inspired by Bazerman’s heuristic, I have employed an analytical approach that acknowledges the complexity and diversity of intertextual practices and recognises the value of examining the interplay of a number of features of explicit intertextuality within texts.

**Focus on the writer**

Investigations of intertextuality that begin with the writer are often concerned with the broader conceptions of intertextuality and are strongly tied to concepts of voice and identity. In her influential publication *Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing*, Ivanič (1998) drew upon Bakhtinian theories of intertextuality in proposing a three-fold construct of writer identity. The three selves she identifies are:

- **the autobiographical self**: the identity a writer brings with them shaped by their history and roots, for example, where the writer was born, raised and educated. This aspect of identity is concerned with how people’s lives influence the ways that they write, for example, through the discourses they do or do not have access to.

- **the discoursal self**: the identity a writer constructs when they write, tied to the specific social context of the writing. For example, in their written assessments student writers often take on the persona of a professional in their field or play the role of a successful student. This aspect of identity relates to how a writer wants to ‘sound’ to their readers - who they want to be - and why.

- **the self as author**: the writer’s presence in the text, in terms of their stance, voice and authoritativeness, and how they take ownership of their text. For example, writers
position themselves in their text using specific language features, including modality of reporting verbs, tentative or hedging language, and active or passive constructions (Ivanič, 1998, pp. 24-27).

These selves are socially constructed and come into play as writers compose specific texts to achieve their own communicative goals. These aspects of identity are not separate and distinct from each other but instead come together in the act of writing. Ivanič (1998) identified the self as author as particularly significant to considerations of academic writing, as this aspect of identity directly concerns how writers establish an authorial presence in their writing, incorporating both voice and stance. The ways that writers attribute ideas to others, how they insert themselves into the text, and how authoritatively they present themselves are situated within this aspect of writer identity. These aspects of authorial identity are often revealed in instances of explicit intertextuality, where specific instances of source use and the texts they are drawn from are clearly identified.

The self as author is also intertwined with the autobiographical self, as the ideas writers express and the self-worth that underpins a writer’s sense of authority are products of their life experiences. The study that is the focus of this thesis draws upon the concepts of the autobiographical and authorial self in the writer-focused talk around text strand, where students were asked to describe their motivations for taking up university study, their past experiences with academic writing, and their understandings of intertextuality generally and within a specific assessment task. This talk around text analysis provides important insights into these student writers’ understandings and the goals that underlie their intertextual practices.
2.3 Intertextuality in academic writing

Intertextuality provides a valuable lens to examine academic writing, as the production of knowledge in students’ academic texts is built upon responding to the words and ideas of scholars and thinkers. In the context of academic writing, the relationships that individuals forge with prior voices take place within discourses that can be considered authoritative. Authoritative discourses of power are those in which meaning is externally imposed, as opposed to internally persuasive discourses, in which individuals work their own way towards meanings through dialogic engagement (Lillis, 2003). Intertextuality is a feature of the authoritative discourse of higher education, colouring and constraining the relationships that writers have with other voices within their texts. The goal is for students to find internally persuasive ways to work within externally imposed discourses (Gimenez & Thomas, 2015). Successful academic writers do more than pass along ideas when they incorporate information from other texts; they internalise those ideas and make them their own, as they learn to participate in the discourse of a genre or field. This process is often challenging.

Intertextual analysis is most powerful when it situates the student writer within a social context and shifts the focus toward questions about how writers and readers are influenced by their discourse community and the extent to which texts are products of “larger community writing processes” (Porter, 1986, p. 42). For example, institutions of higher education have orders of discourse that serve to create boundaries around the kinds of practices that are accepted and valued. Particular kinds of evidence are valued, and students are strongly encouraged to seek out scholarly publications representative of the knowledge-base of their discipline (C. Thompson, Morton, & Storch, 2013), rather than to rely on personal experience or previously acquired knowledge. A boundary is drawn between students’ prior knowledge
and literacy practices and those that will be required for successful completion of assessment tasks.

Beginning writers may be uncertain of where to place themselves within the conventions that govern academic writing and amongst the writers and thinkers that contribute to the conversation occurring in the literature of their discipline. They may struggle to “take control over meaning-making, by making words one’s own” (Lillis, 2003, p. 199), as do even the most experienced academic writers. The creation of meaning occurs at a “threshold”, an “in-between zone” which is a point of struggle and can be a “melancholic moment of crisis, a loss of voice and meaning” (Kristeva, 2002, p. 99). Negotiating these competing discourses does not require renouncing one for another, however. Bakhtin (1981) described developing internally persuasive discourses as a process in which “one’s own discourse is gradually and slowly wrought out of others’ words”, opening up new possibilities and revealing “ever newer ways to mean” (p.346).

2.3.1 Intertextual practices

‘Practices’ is, at its simplest, a word used to describe what people do: recognisable patterns of behaviour within a cultural context (Tusting, Ivanič, & Wilson, 2000). Practices are shaped by who people see themselves to be and the day-to-day activities of their lives. They are important in the context of literacy, situating the things people do with reading and writing within the social structures that shape and constrain them and underscoring the fact the people use literacy practices to achieve a variety of personal communicative goals. Literacy practices change over a person’s lifetime: informally as the ways they interact with language and texts adjust to changes in their lives, and more formally through education and training (D. Barton & Hamilton, 2000).
Academic writers’ engagement with intertextuality is a very specific kind of literacy practice, one that is typically associated with formal education. Intertextual practices in the context of academic writing refer to what writers do as they interact with other texts (Ivanič, 2004a); for example, how they position themselves in relation to other texts, or how they incorporate ideas or language from other texts. Academic writers are required to engage in intertextual practices more explicitly than writers in other discourse communities (Scollon, 2004), and citation (a specific intertextual practice) is a feature of academic writing across all disciplines (Becher & Trower, 2001; K. Hyland & Jiang, 2019; Lillis, Hewings, Vladimirou, & Curry, 2010). Intertextual practices can be particularly opaque to beginning writers (Mansourizadeh & Ahmad, 2011; Pecorari, 2006), but these practices are key to understanding how knowledge is created and communicated within and across academic disciplines (Bartholomae, 1986).

Understanding why and how students make the choices they do around using sources and layering voices in their academic writing may help academics and language and learning specialists better articulate to student writers the options they have in their writing and how those options relate to the practices students bring with them, opening up new paths of meaning-making that are internally persuasive to them. Investigating intertextuality through a literacy practices lens may identify strategies that can be used to reveal key features of academic texts to student writers. This is important because these features often remain hidden or occluded to students (Hu & Wang, 2014; Mansourizadeh & Ahmad, 2011; Pecorari, 2006).

Much of the research into intertextuality in academic writing is focussed on explicit intertextuality realised through academic citation, a key characteristic of scholarly discourse (Borg, 2009; Scollon, 2004). Referring to the work of others through attribution and citation “links text-users to a network of prior texts and provides a system of options for making
meanings which can be recognised by other text-users” (K. Hyland, 2002b, p. 36), as well as demonstrating the persuasiveness of claims by linking them to the existing “intertextual web” (Bazerman, 1988, p. 324). Writers indicate citations in academic texts using standardised referencing systems codified in published style guides (such as APA or MLA), but successful academic citation clearly involves more than mastering a referencing style. Given the complexity inherent in creating these webs of meaning, it is not surprising that research has shown students may find it difficult to develop competence with this aspect of intertextuality (Howard, Serviss, & Rodrigue, 2010; Keck, 2007; Wette, 2018). Consequently, explicit intertextuality and citation is the focus of much of the research on intertextuality in academic writing (Wang, 2016).

Research into explicit intertextuality focuses on the analysis of visible representations of source use in academic writing, including reporting verbs (Charles, 2006; G. Thompson & Ye, 1991) paraphrasing and textual borrowing (Howard et al., 2010), direct quotation (Petrić, 2012), the integration of citations (Groom, 2000; Swales, 1990, 2014) and their rhetorical purpose (Petrić, 2007), as well as multi-dimensional studies that investigate the interplay between these features of explicit intertextuality within student texts (Ädel & Garretson, 2006; J. J. Lee, Hitchcock, & Casal, 2018; Swales, 2014; Wang, 2016). However, as will be demonstrated in the next section of this chapter, studies of explicit intertextuality in undergraduate texts can be heavily text-focussed, lacking discussions with student writers that allow them to express their understandings of the expectations of the discourses of their disciplines and articulate their writing goals and explanations of their choices.

2.3.2 Intertextual practices and different kinds of writers

Given its central role in the construction of meaning in academic texts, intertextual practices in academic writing have generated a significant amount of research interest, and the number of empirical studies in this area continues to grow (Cumming, Lai, & Cho, 2016; Pecorari,
2016; Tardy & Jwa, 2016). These studies can be usefully categorised according to the kinds of writers that are the focus of the research.

**Experienced academic writers**

The majority of previous studies investigating intertextuality have focussed on relatively proficient writers, such as PhD students and advanced postgraduates (Mansourizadeh & Ahmad, 2011; Pecorari, 2003, 2006; Peng, 2019; Shi, Fazel, & Kowkabi, 2018) and professional academics (Avila-Reyes, 2017; Diana, 2019; Hryniuk, 2016; Hu & Wang, 2014; K. Hyland & Jiang, 2019; Kwan & Chan, 2014), often with the goal of identifying features and practices that can be incorporated into instruction for beginning writers. Studies also compare the writing of experts with that of less experienced or less successful writers to identify differences in source use between their texts (Abasi & Graves, 2008; Buckingham & Nevile, 1997; K. Hyland, 2002a; Mansourizadeh & Ahmad, 2011; Samraj, 2013; P. Thompson & Tribble, 2001). Other researchers have compared academic staff and student perceptions of source use within a text (Crocker & Shaw, 2002; Hu & Lei, 2016; Matsuda & Tardy, 2007).

Numerous studies investigate intertextuality in the texts produced by master’s students, either as theses (Altidor-Brooks, 2014; Borg, 2000; Jalilifar, 2012; McCulloch, 2013; Petrić, 2007, 2012; Rabab’ah & Al-Marshadi, 2013) or assessment tasks in coursework units (Badenhorst, 2018; Davis, 2013; Ivanič & Camps, 2001; Nguyen & Buckingham, 2019; Petrić & Harwood, 2013; Roozen, 2010; Wang, 2016). These studies either focus on L2 students or compare L1 and L2 students to identify features or practices of L2 texts, providing valuable insights into expectations students face around the incorporation of sources into their academic texts and how more experienced (although not always entirely successful) writers meet them. The findings of these studies may assist teachers and support staff in the development of practical pedagogical resources for novice writers. They cannot, however,
help us understand why or how writers at the very beginning of their university studies do what they do when they write, nor can they provide direct information about how beginning writers form their understandings of intertextuality.

_Undergraduate academic writers_

As Petric (2007, 2012) has demonstrated, the academic writing undergraduate students do in the course of their studies is very different from the kinds of writing produced by academics and scholars in research settings. Undergraduate academic writing is also very different from the writing produced by postgraduate students, in purpose, focus and genre. More researchers are turning their attention to what has been an under-investigated area – the intertextual practices of novice undergraduate writers. Of the research that has been carried out, much has taken place in ESL and EAP settings (Du, 2019; Hirvela & Du, 2013; Li, 2013; Luzon, 2015; Neumann, Leu, & McDonough, 2019; Plakans & Gebril, 2012; C. Thompson et al., 2013; Wette, 2010) or has exclusively investigated the work of L2 writers in undergraduate degree courses (Kibler & Hardigree, 2017; Li & Casanave, 2012; Mori, 2014, 2017; Ouellette, 2008; Ramoroka, 2014; Stockall & Cole, 2016; Wette, 2017b). As we have seen in the literature around postgraduate students, research of novice writing sometimes compares L1 and L2 writers’ texts, but generally with the purpose of identifying differences between them in order to identify deficits or problems in L2 writing and to find ways to better support L2 writers (Keck, 2006, 2014; S. H. Lee, 2010; Shi, 2004, 2010). While many of these studies argue for the applicability of their findings outside the arena of L2 writing research and identify the use of sources as challenging for both L1 and L2 writers, their main focus is on the support and development of L2 writers. Thus, there is a need for research that seeks to shed light on the intertextual practices related in the first-year coursework of a diverse group of writers. The current study seeks to fill this gap.
Much of the research focuses on texts produced in EAP or ESL settings with a focus on English-language instruction, or in first-year writing courses, where the goal is writing instruction. More research is needed that examines undergraduate writing using authentic texts produced for assessment purposes (Nesi, Matheson, & Basturkmen, 2017). Relatively recently, the body of work in which researchers explore existing corpora of student academic texts has begun to grow; Ådel and Garretson (2006) described unpublished student writing as “uncharted territory” (p. 271) and claimed that their investigation into source use in the Michigan Corpus of Upper Level Student Papers was a “first foray” into this research space. Several of these corpus-based research projects originate from the US and involve researchers exploring large collections of undergraduate texts, such as the studies produced by the Citation Project (Jamieson, 2016; Jamieson & Howard, 2011), or analyses of texts from the Michigan Corpus of Upper Level Student Papers (Ådel & Garretson, 2006; Swales, 2014). While these studies have provided significant insights into the features of undergraduate texts across a number of academic disciplines (as will be presented in more detail in section 2.4), they have focussed solely on large-scale textual analysis that does not include the voices of the writers who produced these texts. Consequently, they cannot reveal anything about how or why writers engaged in specific intertextual practices.

2.4 Approaches to intertextual practices in academic writing

Much of the research into intertextual practices in academic writing can be categorised within the text- and writer-focussed approaches identified in section 2.2.2. Citation practices research consists of text-focussed studies that seek to identify and classify explicit instances of source use in student academic texts, while writer-focussed studies of intertextual practices grounded in ethnographic approaches investigate the ways student writers understand and experience academic writing and how they engage with their source texts. A significant body of research into intertextual practices is concerned with the ways that student writing fails to
meet institutional and disciplinary expectations (for example, associated with the concepts of transgressive and nontransgressive intertextuality), with studies in this area often deliberately incorporating elements from both text- and writer-focussed approaches.

Research studies into transgressive/nontransgressive intertextual practices have made significant contributions to the understanding of student writers’ intertextual practices, and so this section begins with an overview of the research in this area. It then turns to research taking a text-focussed approach to citation practices and that taking an ethnographically informed approach to examining intertextual practices in terms of the identity of writers. It is the two latter approaches that will receive the greatest attention as together they form the basis of the framework used in this thesis.

Transgressive and non-transgressive intertextuality

Much of the research into intertextual practices in academic writing focusses on the difficulties writers face managing multiple voices in academic writing. These studies operate from a problem-based perspective, identifying where students’ intertextual practices fall short of expectations, often through a close analysis of instances of source use in student texts alongside students’ explanations of their understandings and choices. The term transgressive intertextuality (Borg, 2009; Chandrasoma, Thompson, & Pennycook, 2004) is sometimes used in place of the commonly used notion of plagiarism, which has been characterised as a “shorthand compilation of a rather hefty set of assumptions” (Scollon, 2004, p. 23). In contrast, characterising unsuccessful attempts at employing explicit intertextuality as a non-transgressive misalignment with readers’ expectations, rather than an ethical failing, shifts the pedagogical conversation toward how writers collaborate with texts to create relationships with their readers (England, 2004). Adopting the terminology of non-transgressive intertextuality opens up space “to explore the contextual boundaries that exist in academic practice with as few preconceptions as possible” (Borg, 2009, p. 417).
The intent is to shift the focus from issues of ethics and morality that have traditionally permeated discussions of students’ use of source, toward a deeper consideration of what it is involved in creating and communicating meaning through intertextuality (Eira, 2005). This shift in perspective allows for a distinction to be made between issues of transgressive intertextuality, involving deliberate violations of ethical norms, and nontransgressive intertextuality, which includes the unsuccessful attempts of writers that may not meet expectations of source use in university-level writing (Chandrasoma et al., 2004).

Researchers adopting this approach repeatedly and strenuously advocate moving from a punitive to pedagogical approach at the institutional level (Abasi & Akbari, 2008; Abasi & Graves, 2008; Borg, 2009; Crocker & Shaw, 2002; England, 2004; Hu & Lei, 2012; Pecorari, 2003, 2006; Pecorari & Petrić, 2014; Vardi, 2012). They underscore the importance of working with students to reveal the often-opaque intertextual practices involved in the production of academic texts and the socially and culturally specific expectations of discourse communities within higher education.

Negotiating the intertextual demands of academic writing can be challenging even for very experienced writers, and students recognise that it requires more than just documentary skills, although this is how institutions typically frame intertextuality in their policies and handbooks (Abasi & Graves, 2008; Chandrasoma et al., 2004; Shi, 2006). Research has shown that students draw upon their sources as models and language resources to inform their own writing because they recognise that intertextual practices are valued within the discourse community they are seeking to join. For example, Howard (1995) found that many students use language appropriation as a learning strategy, employing patchwriting strategies, which she defines as “copying from a source text and then deleting some words, altering grammatical structures, or plugging in one-for-one synonym-substitutes” (p. 788). Students use these strategies to help them gain familiarity with and mastery over new academic
vocabulary and language structures. While this kind of behaviour could be defined as plagiarism, she urges educators to recognise the “diversity of definitions and motivations for plagiarism” and encourages institutions to implement a variety of context-sensitive responses, instead of adopting a strictly punitive approach. This non-punitive perspective has been taken up by several researchers interested in source use, particularly regarding L2 university students (Li & Casanave, 2012; Shi, 2004, 2006) with patchwriting identified as a critical learning strategy for beginning L2 writers. Identity also plays a role. An MMR study of plagiarism and L1/L2 undergraduate psychology students’ perceptions of authorial identity (Pittam, Elander, Lusher, Fox, & Payne, 2009) identified specific factors that challenged students’ development of authorial identity, including formulaic writing tasks over which students feel little ownership and the tensions associated with balancing the requirements to demonstrate wide reading, incorporate the ideas of other writers and provide original ideas.

The research into transgressive and nontransgressive intertextual practices described above has made important contributions to the literature on academic writing through researchers’ insistence on the centrality of the student writer’s understandings, goals and practices; the value they place upon approaching student texts in the light of those understandings; and their rejection of a deficit perspective on student academic writing. I share these concerns and values. However, while researchers investigating transgressive/non-transgressive intertextual practices are deliberate in their aim to shift the locus of the problem away from students, they remain focussed on the ways that students’ intertextual practices fail to meet expectations. In contrast, this research seeks to highlight the often-unexpected ways students do meet institutional and disciplinary expectations, even in their earliest attempts at academic writing. The goal of the current research is to provide a more complete picture of first-year undergraduate students’ intertextual practices, highlighting strengths as well as areas for development.
2.4.1 A text-based approach: Citation practices

The first research approach I will examine in detail is that of text-based citation practices research, which focusses on explicit intertextual practices, specifically how academic writers incorporate sources into their writing and signal their presence to readers. Studies of citation practices seek to identify patterns of citation within a group of texts (often a relatively large corpus), commonly presenting a comparative overview of citation behaviours, between disciplines (K. Hyland, 1999; K. Hyland & Jiang, 2019), for example, or amongst writers with different levels of experience (Mansourizadeh & Ahmad, 2011; Samraj, 2013; P. Thompson & Tribble, 2001). In contrast to the transgressive/nontransgressive focus, these researchers seek to describe the lay of the land, so to speak, to illuminate what different groups of writers do in their texts, rather than to explicate how their practices do or do not conform to institutional policies or expectations, or how significantly the text differs from the sources drawn upon in its creation.

There has been considerable text-focussed research into citation practices in academic writing. A number of studies have employed a multi-dimensional approach to investigate explicit intertextuality in academic writing (e.g., Ädel & Garretson, 2006; Badenhorst, 2018; Borg, 2000), with several also incorporating a specifically Bakhtinian perspective (e.g., Hu & Wang, 2014; S. H. Lee, 2010; Mori, 2014, 2017; Swales, 2014; Wang, 2016). Dimensions of citation practices that have been commonly researched are incorporation, integration, and rhetorical purpose. These dimensions form the basis of the analytical framework used in the current study to analyse intertextual practices in student texts; they are described below, and relevant research on each of these aspects is reviewed.

_Incorporation_

A key characteristic of the use of sources in academic texts involves the extent to which the source information is assimilated into the writer’s text. In this thesis, I use the term
incorporation to refer to this aspect of academic texts, and it comprises the commonly
identified categories of quotation and paraphrase, the most explicit of Bazerman’s (2004a,
2004b) levels of intertextuality. Quotation and paraphrasing are more than just methods of
incorporation into writers’ texts; they can also be significant learning strategies. Beginning
writers acquire the discourse of their discipline by practising with others’ words (Abasi &
Akbari, 2008; Li & Casanave, 2012) and this process allows students to create texts that
demonstrate the level to which new knowledge has become their own.

Writers can choose to replicate the original author’s words exactly through direct quotation,
which creates a delineation between the two texts, indicating clearly where the incorporated
information begins and ends. In a quotation, the writer is arguing with another’s words (Hu &
Wang, 2014), and while quotation is often assumed to be a relatively straightforward activity,
it requires writers to use their own words to create links between the quotation and the larger
argument of the text in sophisticated ways. Less experienced or less successful writers tend to
use more direct quotations than more experienced writers, their quotations are more likely to
be poorly integrated into surrounding sentences (Petrić, 2012; Shi, 2004), and they are less
likely to be used as support for the writer’s opinion (Wang, 2016). These studies indicate that
successfully integrating quotations is complex and requires writers to create linguistic and
contextual relationships.

Quotation is replication; when paraphrasing, on the other hand, writers rephrase words and
ideas from other texts, blending them into something new in which more than one voice is
present. Bakhtin (1981) describes this as a process in which “one’s own discourse is
gradually and slowly wrought out of others’ words that have been acknowledged and
assimilated” (p. 345). In this kind of “double-voiced” discourse (p. 341), the writer takes
another’s speech and language and uses it to serve their own authorial purposes, commenting,
evaluating, and positioning themselves in relation to another’s words (Baynham, 1999).
Paraphrases allow writers more freedom to interpret the text they are citing and to determine which ideas and words to emphasise to suit their rhetorical purposes (K. Hyland, 1999). While quotations signal to the reader that another’s words have been introduced as they appeared in another text, a paraphrase cannot be not so straightforwardly deciphered. In a paraphrase, there is ambiguity, and the two voices may not be clearly identified (Mori, 2014).

Even experienced writers can find weaving together two (or more) individuals’ words and intentions to create a single coherent text challenging (Shi et al., 2018); however, it is often presented to students as a straightforward process of simply putting another author’s ideas into the student writer’s own words. Studies of student writers have found particular difficulties in reworking the information from source texts to display the “dialogic orchestration/ interaction/merging/engagement between the writer’s own voice and social voices” (S. H. Lee, 2010, p. 200) that is characteristic of what Bakhtin terms internally persuasive discourse. Instead, less experienced student writers often stay close to the wording and structure of the original text, and may inadvertently alter the meaning when they do attempt changes (Mori, 2014). A common thread in studies on quotation and paraphrase is that less successful texts include quotations and paraphrases that are not well integrated with the writer’s own words and tend to contain longer blocks of text, while more successful writers interweave the words and ideas from their sources into a cohesive heteroglossic text, relying more on paraphrases and brief quotations as they do so (S. H. Lee, 2010; Mori, 2014; Shi & Dong, 2018).

Integration

The conventions of academic writing require writers to identify the source text from which both quotations and paraphrases are drawn; they do so through citation, either naming the author of the source in the text of the sentence (integral) or removing the identification from the grammatical structure and placing it in a parenthetical citation or a footnote (non-integral)
This dimension relates to the aspect of Bazerman’s (2004a) heuristic called techniques of intertextual representation. These typologies for the analysis of citations are based upon the identification of linguistic features in the text, what Petrić (2007) terms formal criteria, and are therefore relatively straightforward to identify in academic texts.

Options for integration allow the writer some measure of control over how the information from the source is presented to the reader, emphasising either the ideas or the source and controlling the extent of the presence of the other voices in the text. A non-integral citation brings the proposition to the fore by focussing the reader’s attention on the words or ideas being brought into the writer’s text. It often highlights the work that was done, rather than the people doing the work (K. Hyland, 1999). Integral citations, on the other hand, draw the reader’s attention to the original author of the cited text, allowing the writer to establish their own position toward the cited information or the person who produced it (Hewings, Lillis, & Vladimirou, 2010). Both non-integral and integral citations can be further examined to identify the presence or absence of a reporting verb (Swales, 2014), with the presence of a reporting verb providing more opportunity for the writer to take a position toward the incorporated information. For non-integral citations, this results in two subcategories: reporting and nonreporting. For integral citations, the subcategories are tied to how the cited author’s name is used within the grammatical structure of the sentence (author as subject, author as agent, author as adjunct, author in noun phrase, and other) (Swales, 2014). I have adopted these subcategories in my qualitative textual analysis, identifying reporting and nonreporting non-integral citations and collapsing the five subcategories of integrated citations into two (author as subject, author in other position).

Writers also make choices regarding dialogic engagement as they interact with source texts, either opening up a space for alternate positions or interpretations of a proposition (expansion) or closing it down (contraction) (Martin & White, 2005). Non-integral citations
can serve to contract the dialogic space by presenting the cited information as an accepted fact, which can limit the opportunities to entertain opposing views; integral citation, however, draws attention to the individual responsible for the cited information, highlighting how people are involved in the construction of knowledge, and creating more space for alternate interpretations (Hu & Wang, 2014).

Source integration can be influenced by academic discipline. Research has consistently shown that non-integral citations are typical in scientific writing (Hu & Wang, 2014; K. Hyland, 1999; Swales, 2014; P. Thompson & Tribble, 2001), reflecting the objective approach to knowledge in the hard sciences that downplays the role of human agency in knowledge construction (Hu & Wang, 2014). However, K. Hyland and Jiang (2019) identified a significant increase over time in the use of non-integral citations in academic publications across a number of disciplines, including those outside of the hard sciences such as applied linguistics and sociology, highlighting a stylistic shift in academic texts toward a decreasing presence of cited authors in the text. While many of the findings about integration in academic writing have come from studies of texts produced by expert writers, most typically the published research article (Hewings et al., 2010; Hryniuk, 2016; Hu & Wang, 2014; K. Hyland, 1999; K. Hyland & Jiang, 2019; Martinez, 2008), a similar tendency toward non-integral citations has been identified in both undergraduate and postgraduate student academic writing across the disciplines (Ädel & Garretson, 2006; Swales, 2014), and in student writing produced in EFL contexts (Jalilifar, 2012; Luzon, 2015).

Differences in integration practices have been identified in the texts produced by more and less successful student writers. Numerous studies have found that less successful writers tend to describe the information drawn from source texts, often presenting the information as fact with little evaluation or comment, and that they have less variety in their integration practices (Badenhorst, 2017, 2018; S. H. Lee, 2010; Mansourizadeh & Ahmad, 2011). Experienced
writers, on the other hand, tend to demonstrate more variety and greater understanding of the 
effect of their choices upon readers (Charles, 2006; Swales, 2014).

**Rhetorical purpose**

Incorporation and integration relate to the ways writers bring the words and ideas of other 
authors into their text; rhetorical purpose considers what writers do with that cited 
information, also represented in Bazerman’s (2004a) analytic heuristic. The typologies used 
to analyse rhetorical purpose are based on the content of the text, rather than the linguistic 
features that distinguish the different types of citation integration. A writer’s intention is more 
difficult to discern. To conduct this kind of analysis, researchers must develop a familiarity 
with the subject matter of the text, and ensure that the typology is reliable through the use of 
double-rating procedures (Petrić, 2007). Given that the typologies for rhetorical purpose are 
often tailored to the content of a particular set of texts, they tend to vary from study to study.

Petrić (2007) adapted Thompson and Tribble’s (2001) typology of citations used to study 
integration, with the specific goal of analysing student texts as the writing required of 
students is fundamentally different to that produced by scholars. Students are citing the work 
of scholars with much more experience and standing in the field or discipline, which may 
result in a reluctance to evaluate or appear critical about the work of those who are in a 
position of relative power. Petric identified nine categories of rhetorical purpose through a 
recursive examination of 16 master’s theses. Her categories grew out of this particular group 
of texts; another group of texts could produce slightly different categories. Once the 
categories were identified, Petric then compared the rhetorical purpose of citations within 
high and low graded master’s theses produced by L2 writers, based upon frequency counts 
and percentages and qualitative descriptions of the texts. While high graded texts had more 
variation in citation function, the most common citation function in both the high and low 
graded texts was related to knowledge display, indicating it was a primary concern for these
students in Petric’s study. The smaller variation in citation function in the low graded texts also indicates a tendency in these writers towards descriptiveness rather than analysis, and towards knowledge-telling rather than knowledge-transformation.

Petrić and Harwood (2013) used a similar process to identify the rhetorical purpose of citations within two texts produced by one high-achieving L2 master’s student (Sophie), to investigate how task requirements might influence citation function. The tendency to knowledge display identified in Petric’s (2007) study was also identified in Sophie’s texts, indicating that this may be an important requirement of student academic writing more generally, but there was also evidence that Sophie varied the functions of her citations in response to task requirements. Mansourizadeh and Ahmad (2011) also applied Petric’s (2007) content-based typology to L2 postgraduate theses, and their findings indicate that even at the postgraduate level, knowledge display seems to be a consistent characteristic of student writing. The pedagogical implications of the findings from these studies focus on the EAP classroom, with a recommendation that the typology can be useful in raising student awareness of the different rhetorical purposes for which students can employ their citations.

Kelly, Bazerman, Shukauskaite, and Prothero (2010) employed a different approach to rhetorical purpose in their study of first-year undergraduate geography student writing. They identified assignment- and subject-specific rhetorical categories to examine students’ academic argument within a generic report structure, which related to ‘epistemic levels’, based on the generality or specificity of the claim. Their quantitative findings indicated that these beginning students had developed a general rhetorical understanding of the genre in which they were writing, as a result of explicit instruction. They were not specifically examining intertextuality, but rather the linguistic and rhetorical features of students’ argument. Their use of assignment- and subject-specific categories to investigate academic texts, however, can be usefully applied to the study of intertextuality as I have done in this
research, to provide insights into students’ understandings of the demands of the particular task and genre within which they are using sources.

2.4.2 A writer-based approach: Talk-around-text

Writer-based approaches to intertextuality sit with ethnographically-informed investigations of academic writing. Through the adoption of the ethnographic method of talk around text, this study aims to expand the research lens beyond the text to incorporate the writers’ insider, emic perceptions of the writing context (Lillis, 2008), to illuminate what “learners need to know and be able to do to join in on the conversations of their disciplines through the means of academic writing” (Paltridge, Starfield, & Tardy, 2016, p. 28).

Building on the work of Ivanič (1998), Lillis (1997, 2001, 2008, 2009) advanced the talk around text approach, an ethnographic method based in discourse-based interviews. This widely adopted approach situates talk between a researcher and participant about authentic texts (or aspects, sections, or features of those texts) alongside broader conversations about the writer’s life and their experiences with learning and writing (Lillis, 2009). These autobiographically focussed discussions, called literacy histories, aim to situate the writer’s practices and understandings within the larger sociocultural context of the writer’s life, while text-focussed conversations allow the participant to establish what is significant and relevant to them in their writing (Coffin & Donohue, 2012). The talk around text method has been widely adopted across a range of areas in academic writing research, including the experiences of international students in English-speaking countries (Arkoudis & Tran, 2007; Tran, 2009); secondary students’ transition to university study (Baker, 2017; Kelly-Laubscher & Van der Merwe, 2014); theses and dissertation writing (Chiu, 2015, 2016; Kaufhold, 2017); and the published writing of academics (Harwood, 2006) and their perceptions of their work with student writers (Tuck, 2016).
Although the text-based interview is a common approach in studies of intertextuality (for example, for example, Harwood, 2009; Li & Casanave, 2012; Pecorari & Shaw, 2012; Wette, 2017b), fewer studies have explicitly adopted Lillis’ talk around text approach. Petric’s (2012) research into L2 students’ textual borrowing is an example of such a study, which investigated intertextuality in the context of writer identity. She examined the quotation and paraphrasing practices of L2 postgraduate writers in the social sciences and argued for the centrality of writers’ perspectives in the development of an understanding of acceptable practices within a discipline and effective pedagogical strategies. In a series of studies on L2 first-year undergraduate writers at an Australian university, C. Thompson (2009, 2011) used an explicitly Bakhtinian approach to investigate the relationship between identity and intertextuality. She advocates persuasively for an approach to intertextual practices that recognises students’ “unstable, contradictory and evolving” (C. Thompson, 2005, p. 99) self-perceptions as academic writers and underscores the significance of the dialogic relationship with their lecturers in their developing sense of identity. Studies linking identity and intertextuality often deal with issues of power and how students can make their voices heard and valued in institutions of higher education, and these studies often advocate for institutional change. Recommendations tend to promote dialogue between students and lecturers to increase situational understanding, rather than prioritising additional instruction or pedagogical strategies designed to address student deficits (Greene, 1995; Ouellette, 2004, 2008; Roozen, 2010; C. Thompson, 2005).

The current study adopts a talk around text approach to explore how beginning students understand intertextual practices in academic writing. A central aim of this study is to create a description of the intertextual practices of these beginning writers, and to avoid negatively framing their experiences as problems to solve. This study is one of the few to explicitly employ talk around text to specifically investigate intertextual practices, and, to my
knowledge, the only one to do so in a mixed methods design that also incorporates a detailed textual analysis.

2.5 The current research

The study presented in this thesis involves a mixed-method examination of the intertextual practices of first-year undergraduate health science students at an Australian university. The study incorporates two strands. The first strand is a text-focussed multidimensional investigation of the citation practices in students’ written academic texts that incorporates both quantitative and qualitative data and analysis. The second strand of the study is a writer-focussed qualitative investigation of students' understandings of their practices. It uses the talk around text method, in which the researcher and participant writers engage in significant conversations about the writer’s life and their experiences with learning and writing, leading to discussions around the texts produced by the participant (Lillis, 2009). These conversations are necessarily concerned with issues of writer identity and provide opportunities to explore how writers are present in their texts and how identity influences writers’ practices.

The current study fills the research gaps identified in this literature review. First, as outlined, much of the research into source use and academic citation has focussed on experienced writers and the texts they produce. Numerous studies exist on academic citation in published research articles and postgraduate theses, and the findings are often presented with the goal of providing models to which beginning writers can aspire. However, while these may have broad disciplinary applicability to undergraduate writing contexts, beginning writers are undertaking fundamentally different genres, for very different purposes, and there are far fewer studies investigating this group of students and their writing. The current study’s focus on novice undergraduate writers’ intertextual practices and the texts they produce in response
to university-level assessment tasks helps fill this gap. The study addresses the need for research in contexts involving novice writers.

Second, the study employs a mixed method design that brings together textual analysis with both quantitative and qualitative components and qualitative interviews using a talk-around text methodology. Numerous previous studies of intertextuality in undergraduate writing have focussed solely on the analysis of texts (Ädel & Garretson, 2006; S. H. Lee, 2008; Swales, 2014) or interview data (Abasi & Akbari, 2008; Hirvela & Du, 2013). Many that do combine qualitative textual analysis with interviews have been situated within EAP, ESL or other first-year writing courses (see S. H. Lee, 2010; Mori, 2017; Wette, 2017b), rather than analysing texts produced within a disciplinary unit of study. These studies have provided valuable insights into the learning and development of student writers within the setting of a writing or language classroom, but they cannot reveal how students engage with written assessment tasks and source use within their disciplinary coursework.

Additionally, the size of the cohort of the current study is significantly larger than most research involving systematic textual analysis or mixed methods approaches, enabling quantitative analysis with sufficient power to detect meaningful differences. Previous larger-scale quantitative studies of citation in student disciplinary academic writing (Ädel & Garretson, 2006; Swales, 2014) or smaller-scale studies with quantitative elements (Wette, 2017b) focussed on writers who are beyond their first year of university study. The current study focuses on actual novice undergraduate writers and the writing they produce in a unit of study within a discipline, and this mixed methods study provides a deeper understanding of these beginning student writers’ practices, informed by an exploration of their experiences and understandings and a thorough investigation of their texts.
Third, this study uses a mixed methods approach to focus on a linguistically diverse group of students in order to find commonalities in the experiences and practices of novice academic writers. Many of the previous studies investigating intertextuality in student academic writing have singled out second language writers and the difficulties they face, either linguistically or culturally, and often deal with the issues of plagiarism and transgressive intertextuality. When L1 writers were included, many of these studies adopted a comparative approach, seeking to identify differences in the practices and texts of L1 and L2 writers, with the goal of better supporting L2 writers or better informing pedagogical practices in L2 writing instruction. The research presented in this thesis avoids the L1/L2 dichotomy, instead investigating the experiences of monolingual and local and international multilingual student writers, representing the diversity present in many modern university classrooms. With the exception of Wette’s (2018) mixed method study of undergraduate nursing students and their writing, most studies of linguistically diverse groups of novice undergraduate writers lack a mixed methods approach.

This thesis aims to shift the lens away from the problems and perceived deficits of novice writers. The research presented in this thesis aims to identify not just the challenges faced by novice writers but also their capabilities and strengths. It challenges the deficit approach often taken towards novice writers by those responsible for institutional policy and assessment. This does not mean, however, that there is no value in identifying the challenges and difficulties beginning writers encounter, or in acknowledging the effects they have on the texts these writers produce. Examining the full spectrum of the practices in which these writers are engaged produces an accurate representation of where they are in their process of development. An underlying premise of this research is that students bring to university study experiences that inform their intertextual practices; these prior experiences not only influence their ongoing development as writers, but they should also influence the practice of teachers.
and academic literacy specialists, facilitating positive engagement with novice students and their texts.

As was presented in the introduction chapter, this study comprises four research questions, associated with the two strands of the study. The research questions for the textual analysis strand are as follows:

RQ1a What kinds of intertextual practices are used in the assessment tasks of novice undergraduate writers in health sciences, and what is the frequency of their use?

i. What methods of incorporation and integration do they use?
ii. Where in the structure of their texts are they most likely to use sources?
iii. For what rhetorical purposes do they use sources?

RQ1b Are there any differences in the frequency of specific kinds of intertextual practices between student groups?

i. Course of study
ii. Language background (monolingual/multilingual)
iii. Visa status (local/international)

The research questions informing the talk around text strand of the study are as follows:

RQ2 How do novice undergraduate writers in health sciences understand intertextual practices in academic writing?

RQ3 How do they understand intertextual practices in the specific academic writing task?
2.6 Summary

This chapter began with an introduction of the concept of intertextuality, which is the foundation of the research presented in this thesis. The two main types of intertextuality were explored, and explicit intertextuality was identified as the key focus of the current research, because of the central role it plays in the construction of academic texts. The chapter investigated text- and writer-focussed approaches to the investigation of intertextuality and positioned the current research within both these approaches. Intertextuality was considered within the context of academic writing, with a specific focus on the concept of intertextual practices, and an argument was made for the necessity of research into the intertextual practices of beginning academic writers. The following chapter will provide detailed information about the methodology used in this thesis.
Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the methodology used to conduct the research study. Section 3.2 begins with a rationale for the methodology and then provides an overview of the setting and the participants in Section 3.3. Section 3.4 outlines how the data was collected, with a description of the writing task and student interviews, and describes the procedures involved in the data collection. This is followed by a detailed description of the data analyses for both strands of the study in Section 3.5. Chapter 3 concludes with a discussion of the ethical considerations involved in this research project (Section 3.6), and a summary for the chapter (Section 3.7).

3.2 Rationale

3.2.1 Mixed methods research

In this study, I have employed a mixed methods research (MMR) approach. Mixed methods research brings together the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative methods, and this combination can allow for the most complete examination of complex research problems (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). MMR studies draw upon both quantitative and qualitative data and employ analysis drawn from both methodologies to generate answers to research questions (Riazi, 2017). MMR is an approach to theory and practice that values a diversity of viewpoints and positions, drawing on both qualitative and quantitative approaches with the goal of deeper understanding (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007). The number of studies employing this research method continues to grow, increasing its visibility and credibility (Bergman, 2008; Mayoh & Onwuegbuzie, 2014; Onwuegbuzie, Johnson, & Collins, 2009; Riazi, 2017) and expanding the potential audience for MMR (Dornyei, 2007). Indeed, MMR has been described as a third research paradigm, alongside qualitative and
quantitative research (Ivankova & Greer, 2015; Riazi & Candlin, 2014; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2008).

Mixed methods research is most commonly grounded in the philosophical approach of pragmatism, which advocates for the use of the combination of ideas and methods that best allows researchers to identify, investigate and respond to their research questions (Ivankova & Greer, 2015; Johnson et al., 2007), and it explicitly rejects the notion that research must be an either/or proposition. Studies that draw upon pragmatism as a justification for the mixing of qualitative and quantitative approaches can be described as adopting the approach of MMR as method, rather than methodology. The researchers do not engage in theoretical debates about the ontological and epistemological foundations of the methods they employ. Rather, their interest is on the practical matters of bringing together the most appropriate and useful research methods to develop a multidimensional understanding of the phenomena that is the focus of study (Riazi, 2017).

There are several purposes for mixed methods research, three of which are most directly relevant to this study. First, mixed methods research is used to develop complementary perspectives about the same phenomenon, with research questions for all strands investigating related aspects of the same phenomenon (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2008). Quantitative methods can provide findings on the scope and frequency of phenomena, while qualitative methods can help the researcher determine their meaning (Ivankova & Greer, 2015). In this research study, the related aspects of intertextual practices are the ‘what’ and ‘how’ provided by the textual analysis and the ‘why’ and ‘for what purpose’ provided by the talk around text analysis. Mixed methods research can also bring together etic (researcher) and emic (student) perspectives in the investigation of a research problem, and this is a fundamental goal of my research project. Etic perspectives are tied to the quantitative methods in a mixed methods study (Riazi, 2017); they are often characterised as objective
and represent the viewpoint of the outsider looking in (Zhou & Hall, 2016). Emic perspectives are more closely aligned with qualitative methods (Riazi, 2017); they represent a more subjective, insider point of view (Onwuegbuzie et al., 2009).

Secondly, another purpose of MMR is completeness: mixed methods research can be used to produce a complete picture of a phenomenon that is more meaningful than that which could be obtained by either of the components separately (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2008). Many researchers in applied linguistics generally (Brown, 2014; Dornyei, 2007) and in academic writing specifically (Hartley & Chesworth, 2000; Tardy, 2016; Wingate & Tribble, 2012) have recognised how combining methods contributes to a more complete understanding and have called for more research in these areas to be conducted using mixed methods. A key aim of the current research project is to investigate both the experiences of student writers and the texts they produce within a single study, to generate a more complete and richer picture of the intertextual practices of these beginning writers.

Thirdly, the enhanced understanding produced by using both qualitative and quantitative methods can serve as triangulation. In this study, a different data set was analysed in each strand (descriptive and inferential statistics and the essay corpus in Strand 1; interview data and specific essay excerpts in Strand 2), allowing for triangulation of data sources. The act of mixing different methods to answer related research questions can allow researchers to corroborate and cross-validate findings across the research strands (Riazi, 2017). In this study, the findings of the textual analysis were deepened and confirmed by the findings produced by the analysis of the students’ talk around text interviews.
3.2.2 Research design

This cross-sectional research study uses a concurrent mixed methods design comprised of two main strands: a textual analysis with quantitative and qualitative stages (Strand 1), and a qualitative talk around text analysis (Strand 2). The research questions for Strand 1 relate to identifying, quantifying and describing the intertextual practices the students in this study engaged in, while Strand 2 explores students’ perceptions and understandings of those practices (see Table 1).

Table 1: Relationships between strands of the study, research questions and data analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strand</th>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRAND 1: Textual analysis</td>
<td><strong>RQ1a</strong> What kinds of intertextual practices are used in the assessment tasks of novice undergraduate writers in health sciences, and what is the frequency of their use?</td>
<td>Textual analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. What methods of incorporation and integration do they use?</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Where in the structure of their texts are they most likely to use sources?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. For what rhetorical purposes do they use sources?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RQ1b</strong> Are there any differences in the frequency of specific kinds of intertextual practices between student groups?</td>
<td>Inferential statistics:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Course of study</td>
<td>• Two-way independent ANOVAs for course and language background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Language background (monolingual/multilingual)</td>
<td>• One-way independent ANOVAs for multilingual groups (local and international)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Visa status (local/international)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRAND 2: Talk around text analysis

**RQ2** How do the novice undergraduate writers in health sciences understand intertextual practices in academic writing?

- Biographical and literacy history interview data

**RQ3** How do they understand intertextual practices in a specific academic writing task?

- Sections of the text identified by students for discussion

The overall research design is ([QUAN→QUAL] + QUAL). While the quantitative data provide key information about the kinds of practices these students engaged in, the study as a whole is more heavily weighted toward the qualitative. Mixed methods research designs are, by their nature, typically complex, and visual representations can be a useful tool for readers. Ivankova and Greer (2015) provide an overview of a notation system for conceptual diagrams of mixed method research designs, which I have used to develop an overview of the design for this study, presented in Figure 1. The initial data collection informs both strands of the study: a demographic survey was used to collect background information about participants that allowed for the groupings of the student cohort, and the corpus of student essays provided textual data for both the larger textual analysis ($n = 171$) and the subsample used in the talk around text analysis ($n = 6$).
The textual analysis strand of this research project focusses on a close examination of intertextual features within student essays, using both quantitative and qualitative methods. While a stated purpose of my research is to ensure the centrality of the student perspective, a quantitative approach to the textual analysis is appropriate and addresses two commonly identified issues in academic writing research. First, many studies in this area tend to deal with relatively small numbers of students who represent “non-traditional” groups, for example students from a non-English speaking background or those who enter higher education through alternate pathways (rather than directly from high school), and the difficulties students may experience with academic writing have tended to be portrayed as problems specific to these groups (Wingate & Tribble, 2012). By including an analysis of a relatively large number of texts from the entire cohort of students enrolled in a unit of study, this research aims to provide a picture that represents the broader student experience, and to identify common practices within the group which are then explored in greater depth in the qualitative aspects of the study.
Second, another identified issue of academic writing research addressed by the large number of texts analysed in Strand 1 relates to the role of the text in academic writing research. Many studies into academic writing, particularly those from an Academic Literacies approach, have prioritised students’ experiences and understandings as the focus and in doing so have moved away from the text as an object of study (or removed it entirely) (Lillis & Scott, 2007). This study seeks to situate a textual analysis alongside an investigation of the students’ understanding of their practices, ensuring that student experiences are valued and represented while keeping their texts in the research frame. The quantitative analysis is built upon coding dimensions drawn from my etic perspective as a researcher, drawn from similar conceptual studies of citation analysis and investigations into source use, contributing to the language of description of the student experiences and making the findings relatable outside of this particular research context (Kell, 2009).

The talk around text strand of this study uses an ethnographically-oriented research technique, specifically semi-structured talk around text interview. Street (2010) describes an ethnographic perspective as an epistemology, rather than a research method or specific techniques, a way of “framing of self/other and of what counts as cultural knowledge” (p.203). In educational research, this involves beginning with the learner and identifying where they are and working to develop a “language of description” for their experiences and understandings, presenting them in ways that make sense to those outside the participant group, or as Street calls them “the people back home”, while not problematising the learner or “slipping into deficit talk” (p. 210). A central aim of this study is to create such a description of the intertextual practices of these beginning writers, and to avoid negatively framing their experiences as problems to solve. The insider/emic perspectives from the talk around text data “guides the exploration and understanding of the phenomena under scrutiny” (Coffin & Donohue, 2012, p. 69) – intertextual practices – while the etic perspective provides
the analytical framework (the language of description described above) for the exploration of the textual data in Strand 1. This language of description developed in Strand 1, alongside the students’ own explanations of their experiences and practices, informed my own understandings of their intertextuality in the excerpts chosen for discussion by the student writers in the subsample (depicted by the arrow between the two strands in Figure 1).

It must be noted that while this study employs the ethnographic method of talk around text, it cannot be considered an ethnographic study. Lillis (2008, p. 355) outlines three levels at which ethnography can inform research into academic writing:

- ethnography as method: use of talk around text methods to direct attention beyond the text towards the writers’ perspectives
- ethnography as methodology: use of multiple data sources and “sustained” involvement in the writing situation to explore meanings and practices
- ethnography as deep theorising: the development of new analytic tools designed to narrow the gap between text and context in academic writing

Considered from this perspective, the current research that is the focus of this thesis makes use of the ethnographic method of talk around text interviews representing the writer-emic perspective. However, it lacks the sustained involvement in the writing situation and the development of new analytic tools that would move it beyond ethnography as method into methodology or deep theorising.
3.3 Context of the research

3.3.1 Setting

This section provides an overview of the setting where the research study was conducted (the university, the degree course and the unit of study), and it provides a description of the writing task students were asked to complete, including the support resources provided.

This research was conducted at a mid-sized public multi-campus Australian university. The university’s degrees are concentrated in education and health sciences, and it has one of the largest nursing degree programs in Australia. The campuses are spread across several states and territories, with campuses located in both regional and metropolitan areas; this study was conducted at a metropolitan campus of about 4000 students. The university is a relatively young institution, formed in the 1990s when a group of geographically dispersed predecessor colleges specialising in applied disciplines including education and health care came together to form a single university.

The student population of the university, and the campus where the study was conducted in particular, is diverse, with a significant cohort of international, mature aged and multilingual students. The university is committed to broadening access to higher education and so admits students through several pathways, resulting in a significant number of “non-traditional” students and students who are not entering directly from high school. I have been employed in the central learning support unit of the university for several years and consider myself to be a part of the community investigated in the study. I chose to collect my data at this university in part because of the convenience of the accessibility of these students due to my proximity, but I was also inspired to begin this research study because of my ongoing interactions with this diverse group of learners.
The data for this study was collected through a unit of study in the Faculty of Health Sciences. The unit of study, an interdisciplinary unit focused on psychology for health care professionals, was a required subject for all first-year health sciences students (which comprised nursing and physiotherapy students in this cohort), and it was a prerequisite for other units of study in these degree courses. I chose this unit of study for my research for several reasons: firstly, for many of these students, this was one of the first units of study in their degree, and the writing task would have been one of their first university assessments. This setting presented an opportunity to gather information about the experiences and understandings of tertiary learners in the very earliest stages of their development as academic writers at university. Secondly, the unit of study had a large enrolment of beginning students from a wide variety of educational and language backgrounds, ensuring a diversity of experiences and expectations. The cohort included distinct groups in the two different degree courses, with quite different entry requirements: Bachelor of Nursing and Bachelor of Physiotherapy. Admission to most Australian university degree courses is based upon students’ Australian Tertiary Admission Rank (ATAR), a number which ranks students’ academic performance against each other at the state level. In New South Wales, where this research was conducted, ATAR is calculated by the Universities Admissions Centre (UAC); This calculation is an aggregation of a student’s scaled marks across ten units completed in years 11 and 12 (Universities Admissions Centre, 2019). The minimum ATAR entry score for nursing in the semester I collected data was in the high 50s (out of 100 points), in contrast to physiotherapy’s entry score in the high 90s. The median ATAR for admission in NSW for the academic year was 69.25 (Universities Admissions Centre, 2012). While a student’s ATAR score may not necessarily reflect their capacity to succeed at university study, it does provide a measure of their previous academic achievement (Blyth, 2012), and students entering with low ATAR scores have been identified as being less prepared for university
study (Baik, Naylor, & Arkoudis, 2015). While very capable, prepared students enrolled in both degree courses, the variation in the entry scores provided a useful point of comparison for this study. Finally, the enrolment numbers in this unit were large enough to provide a sample size conducive to quantitative analysis.

3.3.2 Participants

The target population for this research study was first-year undergraduate academic writers. The students who participated were enrolled in a core unit of study in the school of Health Science. As described in the previous section, the unit was located in the first year of the Bachelor of Nursing and Bachelor of Physiotherapy degrees, with an enrolment of 485 first-year undergraduate health sciences students. All enrolled students were invited to participate in the study and were instructed that they could choose the level of participation they were comfortable with (i.e., they could choose to submit their essay only for textual analysis, or they could additionally choose to participate in an interview).

Textual analysis

Of these students, 174 volunteered to submit their essays for the textual analysis (a participation rate of 36%). Three submitted essays without any citations in the texts and were excluded from the study; therefore, the total number of students in the participant group for the textual analysis is 171. This represents a nonprobabilistic sampling strategy, which involves selecting participants who are available to be studied without necessarily being representative of a population (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). While I deliberately selected a unit that met the necessary criteria to conduct the study, students within the unit self-selected into the study.

All participants completed a demographic survey (see Appendix 3). For the analysis, the information collected in the survey was used to place students into course, language
background and visa status groups. As presented in Table 2, participants enrolled in the Bachelor of Nursing outnumber those in the Bachelor of Physiotherapy, and, even though there are more students classified as multilingual within the nursing group, students from monolingual backgrounds outnumber those from multilingual backgrounds across the entire cohort.

Table 2: Participant course and language background groupings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All participants</th>
<th>Monolingual</th>
<th>Multilingual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapy</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the survey, participants were asked two questions regarding their language background: first, “What is the main language you speak with your family?” and second, “Is this the only language you speak with your family?”. Students were included in the monolingual language background group if the answer to the first question was English, and the answer to the second question was yes (indicating that English was the only language spoken with their family). Students were classified as multilingual either when they indicated that English was one of the languages used in their home, or if they identified a language other than English with their families. The multilingual group was further broken into two sub-groups: those...
students with Australian citizenship or permanent residency (local multilingual), and those with student visas (international multilingual).

Interview group

A nested sampling design was used, in which a subset of participants from the sample of one strand of a mixed method study are chosen from participants of the other strand (Hashemi & Babaii, 2013), thereby allowing credible comparisons to be made (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2007). Of the 171 student participants in the textual analysis strand, 141 agreed to participate in the interviews. Judgement sampling was used to identify a smaller participant group for the talk around text strand; this involves the researcher identifying the variables that are meaningful for a study (in this case, course enrolment, language background and multilingual group) and then systematically selecting participants to ensure that those variables are represented in the sample (Buchstaller & Khattab, 2013). To ensure a relatively large pool of potential interview participants, I selected forty-two students to proportionally represent each of the language background and degree groups in the larger sample and contacted the forty-two students with a request for an interview. I arranged and conducted interviews with 16 of them; the remaining students either did not reply to my invitation to become an interview participant, did not identify a time they were available for an interview or did not attend their scheduled interview.

As a practical matter, Dornyei (2007) recommends a sample size of six to ten participants as manageable for interview-based qualitative research conducted by a single researcher. I selected six of the 16 interviews and the students’ associated essay texts for detailed qualitative analysis, to allow for the creation of profiles for a small group of students that examined their experiences and understandings in greater detail than would have been feasible for the whole group. Again using judgement sampling, six students were chosen to represent a range of language backgrounds (two students from a monolingual background,
two local multilingual students and two non-English dominant multilingual students) and levels of attainment on the task (two low-scoring essays, two essays near the median mark, and two high scoring essays), as well as course enrolment (three nursing students and three physiotherapy students) (see Table 3).

Table 3: Overview of the interview group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language background</th>
<th>Physiotherapy</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Katrijn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilingual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepali dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visa status</th>
<th>Physiotherapy</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Katrijn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International student visa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Data collection

This section provides an overview of the main data collection instruments and a detailed description of the processes involved in data collection.

3.4.1 The writing task

The task that is the focus of the study was the final of three assessment tasks, submitted in week ten of a twelve-week semester; the other assessment items in the unit of study comprised a series of online quizzes throughout the semester and a final written exam. Thus, it was the only essay-style assessment task in the unit of study.
Students were asked to submit a 1000-word essay in response to the following prompt:

*Using the precontemplation and contemplation stages of the transtheoretical model of behaviour change, discuss how to facilitate change in a person who has an addictive health risk behaviour.*

*Provide an outline of the issues in the precontemplation and contemplation stages, and discuss strategies you (as the health professional) would use to implement the model.*

*You need to find and evaluate appropriate literature to support your discussion.*

*The written essay task was worth 35% of the total mark for the unit of study.*

The students were provided with marking criteria in the Unit Outline (see Appendix 7 for the Unit Outline document containing the complete marking criteria). This document was made available to all students in the first week of the course via the unit of study’s page in the university’s online learning environment. In the marking criteria, levels of achievement are designated in five bands (High Distinction, Distinction, Credit, Pass, Fail), with band descriptors provided for each criterion.
There were seven categories in the marking criteria; each is briefly described in Table 4.

**Table 4: Overview of the marking criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Brief description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction and focus or position statement</td>
<td>• Presence/quality of the position statement and essay outline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence and examples</td>
<td>• How the model stages are identified, described and applied in the essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Quality/relevance of the strategies provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Whether a rational/evidence for their choice is provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequencing</td>
<td>• Order of arguments and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing paragraph</td>
<td>• Overall quality of concluding statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presence of restatement of essay purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources and referencing</td>
<td>• Credibility of sources chosen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accuracy of APA referencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence and paragraph structure</td>
<td>• Quality of sentence structure and variety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organisation of paragraphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presence of topic statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics (grammar, spelling and punctuation)</td>
<td>• Number of grammatical errors present in the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Whether errors impede meaning and obstruct the flow of the text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four of the seven categories (i.e., introduction and focus or position statement; sequencing; closing paragraph; and sentence and paragraph structure) deal mainly with structure and make no reference to evidence or use of sources. Two categories specifically address academic citation and referencing: the sources and referencing category deals with APA formatting of in-text citations and the referencing list and the credibility of sources used; the evidence and examples category evaluates how students identified the stages of the model.
and their use of evidence (descriptors in the high distinction band include “current”, “relevant” and “appropriate”). Finally, the sequencing category refers generally to “support”, which could be interpreted to mean evidence from sources, although this is not explicitly stated. The marking guide appears to prioritise accuracy of formatting and the quality of sources chosen.

In addition to the task description and marking criteria, the lecturer in charge of the unit of study also provided an essay-writing guide (see Appendix 8), which included recommendations on how to approach the task presented as several pages of bullet points. These recommendations, as summarised in Table 5, were concerned primarily with structure, academic writing style, and the mechanics of spelling, grammar, and referencing, as well as how students could identify credible sources.
### Table 5: Overview of the advice in the essay writing guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Recommendations for student writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus of assignment and structure</td>
<td>• Use an introduction-body-conclusion structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>• Provide an argument, not just facts or “assertion[s] without evidence”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style and clarity</td>
<td>• Avoid words like always and never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoid sources from “spin doctors”; instead choose “academic sources using considered argument”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Do not submit early drafts with repetitive content, “ill-formed ideas” and mistakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling and grammar</td>
<td>• Use the spell- and grammar-check in Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use online information provided by the learning support unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referencing and use of sources</td>
<td>• Provide a bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Do not use Wikipedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use the referencing guide from the learning support unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use more paraphrases than quotations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Older sources are acceptable for this assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Identify the relevant literature, find opinions that agree with you and use them to illustrate and convey your position.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lecturer in charge explained that, because this was one of the first essays many of these students would have submitted at university, he saw this task as an opportunity for students to practice the basic skills required for university-level academic writing (for example, essay structure, referencing and academic writing style), and he deliberately provided them with explicit information about his expectations. He intended the essay writing guide to be an overview of academic writing conventions that students could apply broadly in their assessments across their units of study.
To support the students’ understanding and development of academic writing skills, a staff member from the university’s learning support unit gave a lecture, developed in collaboration with the unit of study’s lecturer in charge and delivered during class time in the first weeks of semester. The lecture provided an overview of the processes of university essay writing, including structure and referencing, and helped students analyse the assessment task instructions and assessment criteria. Table 6 provides an overview of topic areas covered in this lecture, which had a clear focus on understanding the task requirements and essay structure.

*Table 6: Overview of the support lecture topics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Subtopics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The “what” of assignment writing</td>
<td>• Analysing the task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understanding assessment criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The “how” of assignment writing</td>
<td>• Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Essay structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No specific information on how to use sources or the role evidence plays in academic writing was covered in the support lecture.

3.4.2 Interviews

The data for the second strand of the study was generated through an analysis of student talk around text interviews. Lillis (2009) provides a straightforward definition of this method as “talk between the researcher and the writer-participant about a text that the writer is writing or has written” (p. 171). She provides two important characteristics of these kinds of interviews. First, the talk must be focused on authentic texts that are a product of a genuine learning activity on the part of the writer, rather than a task designed for a research study. Second, text-focused discussions must sit alongside conversations about the writer-
participants’ life more generally, as well as their experiences related to literacy (their literacy histories). The semi-structured interviews in this study were designed accordingly.

The interviews in this study were conducted in two parts: the first part focused on students’ family histories and their experiences with education, including why they chose to engage in university study and how they were taught the skills involved in academic writing. The second part consisted of text-focused conversations, with questions that directed students’ attention to their use of sources in their writing (see Table 7).

Table 7: Sample interview questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal and family history</td>
<td>• Why did you choose to come to university?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Did either of your parents attend university?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What language do you usually use at home with your family?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does anyone in your family speak a language other than English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous experience with academic writing</td>
<td>• What kind of experience with academic writing did you have before you began your university studies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Were you ever specifically taught how to write an essay?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What do you think makes an essay successful?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Why do you think students are asked to include the words and ideas of other writers in their written work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What have you been taught about bringing the words and ideas of other writers into your written work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text-focused conversations</td>
<td>• Why did you choose this section of your essay for us to talk about?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What are you doing with your sources in this section?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Why did you choose to use this information here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Do you feel confident about the way you used sources in this section?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why or why not?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first part of the interviews focusing on students’ biographies and their prior experiences with academic writing tended to be more structured, and all the students were asked the same questions in roughly the same order, although follow up questions and prompts were tailored to suit the direction of the conversation. While I did not curtail any digressions from the interview schedule and encouraged students to express themselves in their own time and in their own way, I did ensure that I collected the same basic pieces of information from each student, in order to create comparable biographies and literacy histories for the student profiles.

In the text-focused conversations, students were asked to choose at least two parts of their work for us to discuss, specifically where they had incorporated information from outside sources. This section of the interviews was quite fluid and loosely structured. Students were encouraged to comment on any aspect of their text or their writing processes that they saw as significant or relevant, although they were aware that the research was concerned with students’ use of sources in academic writing and they were encouraged to identify source use in their texts. This is another important characteristic of talk around text interviews, that the researcher and the student participant work together to establish what will be the focus of the conversation, to ensure the researcher and the participants are “see[ing] the world using the same terms of reference” (Coffin & Donohue, 2012, p. 71). The text-focused interview questions include a combination of ‘what’ and ‘why’ questions; Arkoudis and Tran (2007) identify these as useful question types for text-focussed interviews, because the ‘what’ questions allow the researcher to investigate aspects of the students’ aims and goals that inform their writing, and the ‘why’ questions illuminate the processes behind the choices they are making in their writing.
3.4.3 Procedure

Lecture visits

Those students who agreed to participate completed a brief demographic survey at the end of the tutorial in the week the assessment task was submitted; students were informed they were free to leave the classroom before the distribution of the survey, to avoid any appearance of coercion. These lecture visits were the only part of the data collection that took place during scheduled class meetings. In the survey, students were asked to provide information about their gender, age, visa status, home country, and language background. See Appendix 3 for the complete survey.

Essay collection

Students enrolled in the unit of study submitted their essays as hard copies to the teaching team at the end of the tutorial session in week ten. After the essays were marked at the end of the semester, the lecturer in charge provided me access to all the marked assignments from the unit of study. I identified the tasks submitted by students who agreed to have their essays collected and scanned their texts to create a corpus of digital essay texts form, which was used in both the textual analysis and talk around text strands of the study.

Interviews

The interviews that informed the talk around text analysis were conducted in the first week of the semester immediately following their completion of the unit of study. I conducted the interviews in my office in the university’s learning support unit. The office was a quiet, private room centrally located on the campus.

For most students, the two parts of the interviews were conducted consecutively on the same day, with a break between. For some, however, the two parts of the interviews were scheduled on separate days. This was determined by the students’ schedules and availability.
The duration of the interviews varied greatly, guided by the students’ level of willingness to engage in extended conversations and the amount of time they were able to share with me at a busy point in the semester. Some were quite brief (45 minutes), while others went for significantly longer, with the longest interview stretching over three interview sessions of an hour each.

Like Lillis (2001), I was then (and remain now) a participant in the community within which the research was conducted. Some students were familiar with me in my role as an academic literacy specialist from workshops and my visits to lectures in other units of study, although none had attended individual consultations with me prior to the research study. Students often approached the interviews as an opportunity to seek feedback and advice around situations and writing events that were not the focus of this study; indeed, as a result of this study, I developed ongoing relationships with several students that continued throughout their studies and beyond, a positive outcome I value highly. On occasion, however, it was challenging to move our talk beyond the typical teacher-student space into genuine conversations about the students’ writing practices and their understandings of them, particularly as I was keen not to impose constraints on our conversations, and I believe those opportunities to seek information from a “knowledgeable insider” (Lillis, 2001) were valuable to the students. My conversations with students were guided by their interests, priorities, and how much of their time they were able to share with me, balanced against my priorities as a researcher.

The interviews were recorded digitally on a smartphone. I made initial notes during and immediately following our conversations, to capture the feel of the conversation. I transcribed the recordings of the interviews in the months following the interviews. These transcriptions were not intended to inform a detailed formal discourse analysis, and so they did not include conversations extraneous to the research questions (for example, small talk at the beginning
and end of the interview) and aspects of the conversation including pauses and fillers (e.g., like, um, you know).

3.5 Data analysis

3.5.1 Textual analysis

The data produced in my textual analysis responds to the first research question and its associated subquestions; these are presented in Table 8.

*Table 8: Research questions driving the textual analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1a What kinds of intertextual practices are used in the assessment tasks of the</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>novice undergraduate writers in health sciences, and what is the frequency of</td>
<td>Qualitative analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their use?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. What methods of incorporation and integration do they use?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Where in the structure of their texts are they most likely to use sources?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. For what rhetorical purposes do they use sources?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ1b Are there any differences in the frequency of specific kinds of intertextual</td>
<td>Inferential statistics:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practices between student groups?</td>
<td>- Two-way independent ANOVAs for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Course of study</td>
<td>course and language background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Language background (monolingual/multilingual)</td>
<td>One-way independent ANOVAs for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Visa status (local/international)</td>
<td>multilingual visa status (local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and international)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The textual analysis consisted of two parts: a quantitative analysis of the data involving the coding dimensions and a qualitative analysis of representative excerpts from each of the dimensions.

To begin the analysis, I broke the essays into analytical units. T-units are a common analytical unit for the analysis of written and verbal data; a t-unit can be defined as a main clause and any other dependent clauses attached to it (Foster, Tonkyn, & Wigglesworth, 2000). For this study, I used c-units as the analytical unit, which are similar to t-units but include isolated phrases not accompanied by a verb (Crookes, 1990; Foster et al., 2000). In this analysis, c-units included:

- t-units (i.e., main clauses and dependent clauses)
- headings and subheadings
- the introductory phrase of a list or series
- single items in bulleted or numbered lists
- phrases punctuated as sentences

The c-units within the essay texts were then converted to tables and imported into SPSS for manual coding and statistical analysis. This process resulted in an essay corpus containing 171 texts; the average word count was 1056, with an average c-unit count of 48 (see Table 9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average per text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word count</td>
<td>176317</td>
<td>1056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-unit count</td>
<td>8088</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 9: Overview of the essay corpus, n = 171*
Presentation of textual data

In this thesis, I have followed Ivanič’s (1998) conventions for presenting textual data, which uses a different font to identify essay text. Extracts from the essays are numbered consecutively throughout the chapter and presented in an italicised san serif font. When the excerpt consists of more than one c-unit, I have provided a count preceding each c-unit in square brackets, allowing me to pinpoint features within the excerpt more easily: this differs slightly from Ivanič’s approach of providing line numbers that can be used to locate the excerpt within the essay text. Where I have referred to words drawn from the excerpt in my analysis, they are also presented in the italicised san serif font.

I have made every attempt to present the student writers’ words as they appeared in the original text, making no modifications to the spelling, grammar or sentence structure in the excerpts. The essay extracts are followed by an identification of the student writer’s course group, language background and visa status for the multilingual group, and mark on the task.

Therefore, an essay excerpt will appear as follows:

4.6) [1] The aim of dramatic relief is to use emotional arousal, such as fear, guilt and hope to educate the person about their current behaviour and the relief that can transpire from making a change in their lifestyle. [2] By using techniques such as role playing, psychodrama, and grieving losses, the health care professional can aid the patient into moving onto the contemplation stage (Ries, Miller, Fiellin & Saitz, 2009).

Nursing, monolingual, 27

This is the sixth excerpt in chapter four, consisting of two c-units, written by a student writer:

- enrolled in the Bachelor of Nursing degree;
identified as being from a monolingual English background (and thus an Australian citizen or permanent resident, as were all the monolingual students);

awarded a mark of 27 on this essay task.

Coding dimensions

The data analysed in the first strand of the study were generated through the application of a coding scheme designed to identify specific aspects of students’ intertextual practices; the coding scheme consists of the following dimensions:

- Attribution and citation
- Essay structure
- Incorporation
- Integration
- Rhetorical purpose

All c-units were coded for attribution and essay structure, as demonstrated in Figure 2. Those c-units that were identified as attributed and cited were then coded for integration, method of incorporation, and how attribution was allocated across the categories of rhetorical purpose.
The following subsections present specific descriptions of each of the coding dimensions and examples drawn from student texts where necessary to provide clarification.

**Attribution and citation**

The dimensions of attribution and citation are based upon the concept of manifest (explicit) intertextuality, which refers to the overt inclusion of specific words and ideas from sources, clearly signalled in the text with visible cues, such as quotation marks and reporting verbs (Fairclough, 1992b; Scollon, 2004). This form of intertextuality is commonly associated with academic and scholarly texts (D. Barton, 2007; Scollon, 2004) and is the focus of this study.

Attribution occurs when the student writer indicates that information contained in a c-unit has been drawn from an outside source, whether or not that source is identified. When a source is not identified, attribution can be indicated through a general statement (e.g., “research has shown”), as in Excerpt 3.1:
3.1) *Research by the creators proved that motivational interviewing was essential movement between the first two stages in the TTM.*

Physiotherapy, multilingual English dominant, local, 31

In contrast, citation occurs when the writer specifically identifies the source of the information, usually with an in-text citation as required by the style manual specified for the unit of study by the lecturer in charge (APA), as demonstrated in Excerpts 3.2a and b:

3.2a) *According to Barkway (2009), there are several factors which influence deal alcohol abuse;*

Nursing, monolingual, 18

3.2b) *As per the transtheoretical model, the person would need to progress the contemplation stage, in order to recognise their need to change (Barkway & Kenny, 2009).*

Physiotherapy, monolingual, 27

Each c-unit in the essay received an attribution code. While 174 students agreed to participate in the study, only 171 of those essays included attributed statements; those without attribution were excluded from the participant group; therefore, \( n = 171 \).

Secondary citations and multiple sources within a single citation were counted once, as the purpose was to identify how much of the text was attributed/cited (as a percentage of the total number of c-units), not how many sources were cited in the essay. It was assumed that in the case of a sentence with a single citation, that citation incorporated all c-units included within the sentence unless the writer clearly indicated otherwise (e.g., separate citations for different c-units included in the sentence), as in Excerpt 3.3.

3.3) *Smoking is the cause if many fatal diseases, for example, respiratory diseases such as asthma and emphysema, heart disease and lung cancer (Health Insite, 2011), which account for a large percentage of Australia’s mortality rates, placing*
burdens on individuals, communities and families (Australian Institute of Health and Wellbeing, 2005).

Physiotherapy, multilingual English dominant, local, 26

Not all attributed c-units were cited, and there were four essays with no cited attribution anywhere in the text. In these texts, attribution was indicated through a general reference to “research” or “the literature”. These four essays were included in the group used to calculate the overall mark for the participant group and the rate of attribution but were excluded from analysis for the remaining coding dimensions (n = 167).

Essay structure

This dimension identifies how the writer incorporated the information from their source texts into the generic structure of their assignment. The student writers who participated in this study were instructed to employ a typical essay structure of introduction-body-conclusion, and these were the structural sections that were used in this coding dimension.

Two aspects were considered in the application of this dimension: the presence (or absence) of each of the structural elements (introduction, body and conclusion) in the essay, and how the attributed c-units were distributed throughout the essay structure. A preliminary analysis identified that many of the essays were missing at least one of these elements (see Table 10).

Table 10: Frequency and percentage of elements in the essay structure, n = 167

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion of elements</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All elements present</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing introduction only</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing conclusion only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing both introduction and conclusion</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only those essays with attribution that had all elements of the essay structure present were included in the analysis for this dimension \((n = 91)\).

**Incorporation**

Incorporation refers to how the student writers brought the words and ideas of their cited authors into their texts. There are two categories:

1. **Quotation**: the student writer exactly duplicated the words of another writer;
2. **Paraphrase**: the student writer attempted to explain the ideas using their own words when they brought information from an outside source into the essay.

I did not attempt to judge whether students had successfully paraphrased their sources or accurately represented their direct quotations. My goal was not to identify whether or how students had plagiarised or misused sources, but rather to explore how they engaged with intertextual practices. This goal is consistent with the stance taken throughout this thesis that the analysis of student texts presents an opportunity to explore practices, rather than an investigation of the ‘problem’ of bad student writing waiting to be solved (Lillis, 2009). The focus of this study is on identifying what students believed the expectations were for source use within their academic writing, and how they attempted to meet those expectations.

All essays that included cited attributed c-units were included in the analysis for this dimension \((n = 167)\). When the attributed information was contained within quotation marks and an in-text citation was provided, as in Excerpt 3.4, I interpreted that to mean the student was signalling the cited information was incorporated as a direct quotation.
3.4) *In this stage, the health professionals need consider to provide further more educations such as “the effects of smoking, positive aspects of not smoking, improved health, a more positive self image and economic savings.”*(Mallin2002)

Nursing, multilingual Mandarin dominant, local, 19

Attributed c-units were categorised as a paraphrase when the student used an in-text citation without quotation marks to signal attribution, as demonstrated in Excerpts 3.5a and b:

3.5a) *Consciousness raising, dramatic relief and environmental relief and environmental re-evaluation are principal strategies for the health professionals to follow (Norcross, Krebs & Prochaska 2010).*

Nursing, multilingual Mandarin dominant, local, 19

3.5b) *Motivational interviewing, developed by Miller and Rollnick (2002) is a cognitive behavioural based intervention therapy designed to get the client to initiate a review of thought towards a change in behaviour.*

Nursing, multilingual Vietnamese dominant, international student, 21

*Integration*

The integration dimension deals with how students integrated the information from outside sources into the grammatical structure of their sentences, using Swales’ (2014) categorisation. The categories in this coding dimension are integral and non-integral.
Once again, all essays with cited attribution were included in the analysis for this dimension \((n = 167)\). When the information about the source was separate from the grammatical structure of the sentence, that c-unit received a code of non-integral, as demonstrated in Excerpt 3.6:

3.6) "During this stage the individual is still smoking but considering quitting within the next six months" (Woody, DeCristofaro & Carlton, 2008, p.409).

Nursing, monolingual, 23

When information about the source was integrated into the grammatical structure of the sentence, it received a code of integral (see Excerpt 3.7).

3.7) According to Fava, Norman, Redding, Procaska and Velicar (1998), the most important thing to consider at this phase is to motivate and encourage people for a positive change in their behaviour.

Nursing, multilingual Nepali dominant, international student visa, 18

**Rhetorical purpose**

Rhetorical purpose refers to how students used sources to achieve their writing goals within the context of their assigned writing task. The task instructions required students to identify the model and its stages, as well as a specific health risk behaviour, but to answer the question successfully, they should have applied the model to the behaviour and demonstrated how the health care provider could use the model with a patient to change behaviour. All essays with cited attribution \((n = 167)\) were examined to identify how students typically responded to these different task requirements, and more specifically, how they distributed their attribution amongst the rhetorical structure of the essay.
Following Petric’s (2007) process for developing a content-based typology of citations, I engaged in a recursive examination of the essay texts to generate several categories. I began working with the nine categories she identified in postgraduate theses, but I found that the categories did not necessarily translate to the context of an undergraduate essay. For example, one of the categories in Petric’s typology relates to comparing one’s own findings to those in the literature. The first-year student writers in my study were not reporting the findings of their own research, and so this category was not relevant to my corpus. Many of the categories were based on the presumption that the writer is positioning their work in some way against other writer’s in their field, which is rarely the purpose of first-year undergraduate academic writing. These writers were instead applying a theoretical model to a context of their own choosing (i.e., a specific health risk behaviour), and so I adapted Petric’s typology to their writing situation in an approach similar to Kelly et al. (2010) in their identification of assignment- and subject-specific rhetorical categories (see Figure 3).

All c-units in the corpus received a code for rhetorical purpose; consequently, these codes were applied to both integral and non-integral citations. For the statistical analysis, these categories were collapsed down into two main categories, to capture the distinction between display and application of knowledge, and rates were calculated based upon cited c-units. (See Figure 3 for an overview of the two resulting main analytical categories and the original categories of which they are comprised.) Each c-unit received a single code; if a c-unit had more than one purpose, application was prioritised over description.
Inter-rater reliability

Inter-rater reliability was calculated to determine whether the dimensions of the coding scheme were reliably identified in the student texts. An academic in the Education Faculty at a major metropolitan university agreed to serve as a second coder to assist me in assessing the reliability of the coding scheme, and this second coder was trained in the application of the coding scheme over several sessions. In the training sessions, I provided explanations of each dimension, a detailed written explanation of the coding scheme, and a demonstration of the coding process. Then, over two sessions both coders engaged in a practice attempt at coding eight randomly selected student texts and compared their results. Once the second coder felt she had developed enough familiarity with the coding scheme to practice coding, I randomly selected ten student essays to which the second coder independently applied the coding scheme. Differences between coders were discussed and reconciled.

Cohen’s kappa was used to measure inter-rater reliability for each coding dimension. This statistic is commonly used to measure levels of interrater reliability between two coders in
applied linguistics research; it is considered more useful than a simple percentage calculation because it controls for random agreement (Riazi, 2016).

Table 11 shows that Cohen’s kappa was well above .80 for all coding dimensions, indicating acceptable levels of agreement between the coders (Phakiti, 2015; Riazi, 2016).

Table 11: Findings on inter-rater reliability for the coding dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Cohen’s kappa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essay structure</td>
<td>.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical purpose</td>
<td>.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td>.89*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of incorporation</td>
<td>.91*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>.87*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .01

Quantitative analysis

The quantitative analysis involved several stages. First, because raw frequency counts are not directly comparable between texts of different lengths (Biber, Conrad, & Reppen, 1998), rates expressed as percentages of attributed c-units for each of the coding dimensions were calculated. Frequency counts are often normed by word count (for example, the number of occurrences of a feature per 100 or 1000 words of text) (Biber & Conrad, 2009). I express attribution rates expressed as percentages; however, because my primary interest is not how many citations or features are present in the text. Rather, I am interested in uncovering how students allocate their attribution across the categories in the coding dimensions. Dimensions dealing with identifying attribution and its distribution throughout the structure of the essay are expressed as percentages of the total number of c-units in an essay, while dimensions that focus on the analysis of citations are expressed as a percentage of the number of cited c-units in an essay. This approach ensured that rates for all categories within a coding dimension total of 100 per cent.
As background analysis, descriptive statistics were calculated to identify how the students performed overall on the task (their mark) and the amount of attribution they used in their essays. Then, to answer the RQ1a (which concerned identifying, quantifying and describing the intertextual practices the students in this study engaged in), descriptive statistics for each coding dimension (including frequency counts and means) were examined to identify patterns in the participant groups’ intertextual practices. (See Table 8 for an overview of the research questions driving the textual analysis in the first strand of the study.)

Inferential statistics were used to answer RQ1b (which sought to identify commonalities and differences in intertextual practices between groups in the student cohort). Two-way between groups ANOVA tests were used to compare the rates in each coding dimension (including the rate of attribution and overall mark), with planned comparisons by course (nursing/physiotherapy) and language background (monolingual/local multilingual/international multilingual), rather than post-hoc analysis. Planned comparisons are appropriate when the goal is to test for differences between groups, with the groups identified before analysing the data (Pallant, 2013), as mine were. There were no significant interaction effects or violations of the assumption for homogeneity of variance for any of these comparisons, except for the mark on the task. However, mark on the task is a background variable, and as such, it is not directly related to intertextual practices.

One-way ANOVA tests were conducted to further compare rates of local and international multilingual students. Cohen’s criterion was used to calculate effect size (small - .01; med - .06; large - .138) (Pallant, 2013), and significance was set at \( p < .05 \). None of the data for the coding dimensions was normally distributed, which is fairly common in research in the social sciences. With sample sizes that are sufficiently large (over 30), the violation of the assumption of normality is not generally considered to be problematic, as ANOVA tests are robust to violations of this assumption (Pallant, 2013; Schmider, Ziegler, Danay, Beyer, &
Buhner, 2010). The use of ANOVA tests is preferable to nonparametric tests due to their greater power (Woodrow, 2014).

**Qualitative analysis**

A qualitative analysis of exemplars from each coding dimension was also conducted. I began by examining several c-units in the corpus from each dimension and viewing them in the context of the original essay texts. I identified what I considered to be a typical example representative of each dimension, and then compared coded c-units within the dimension from essays with the highest marks to those with the lowest marks to identify points of difference. A recursive examination of the coded c-units revealed patterns of citation practices within the c-units, which enabled me to identify exemplars that were then extracted and examined for linguistic features and commonalities.

3.5.2 Talk around text interviews

The talk around text interviews were analysed to answer the final two research questions. To answer RQ2, I drew on the students’ discussions of their family and educational history, including their language background and prior experiences with academic writing, while RQ3 was answered using the analysis of the text-focussed discussions of specific essay passages, as demonstrated in Table 12.
Table 12: Research questions driving the talk around text analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ2</strong> How do novice undergraduate writers in health sciences understand intertextual practices in academic writing?</td>
<td>• Biographical and literacy history interview data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ3</strong> How do they understand intertextual practices in a specific academic writing task?</td>
<td>• Talk around text interview data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sections of the text identified by students for discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I began my analysis with the data related to student writers’ biographies and literacy histories, reading generally at first to get a sense of the students as a group and then more specifically to identify details about their family histories, language backgrounds, prior education experiences and current goals and motivations. I used this information in the construction of profiles of each of the six participants. To answer RQ2, I returned to this data and recursively categorised participants’ responses, relating comments to specific sets of questions in the interview schedule around topics such as ‘previous writing experience’, ‘motivation for university study’, and ‘perceptions of university writing requirements’. This process allowed me to begin to see general patterns of students’ intertextual practices and understandings, both within a single participant’s interview data and across the group. The transcripts were then colour-coded within broad categories. I proceeded to look for patterns within the broader categories, and I also discovered new patterns. For example, many students consistently expressed uncertainty and concern when asked to explain their understanding of the writing requirements at university, specifically around the concept of what is considered common knowledge and what is not. Once I identified this pattern in one
student’s comments, I re-examined all the transcripts to identify instances of this issue and found other uncertainties about what kind of information required citation.

For the talk around text analysis, the sections of the interviews dedicated to each students’ discussion of their essay texts were identified in the transcripts. Then, I drew upon a strategy described by Lillis (2001) in which a distinction is made between the talk that could be classified as occurring within a student/teacher conversation space (talk about assessment) and the talk more closely related to the students’ understanding and emotions as they engaged in the process of writing their essays and bringing in information from their sources (talk about writing). Within these types of talk, the focus shifts from the researcher’s expertise to the students’ perceptions, as demonstrated in Table 13.

Table 13: Categories of talk within the talk around text interviews (based on Lillis, 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Talk about assessment</th>
<th>Talk about writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Product of the text</td>
<td>Process of the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draws upon the researcher’s experience with academic writing conventions</td>
<td>Draws upon the student writers’ experiences creating the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features</td>
<td>Evaluative language (well done, good job)</td>
<td>Questions about future actions (Would you use this strategy again?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directives (I’d like us to, you could have)</td>
<td>Exploratory questions (Do you feel confident? Do you feel you understand this?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Lillis, these categories informed the direction of ongoing conversations with student writers as they engaged in the process of drafting and completing a piece of academic writing. In contrast, my talk around text conversations occurred after the students had
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submitted their assignment for assessment and focussed on their marked draft. Nonetheless, I found these categories analytically useful when coding the transcripts, to identify those sections that most clearly indicated the students’ perceptions and emotions about their writing.

Next, the two passages identified by the student writers in the interviews were located in the essay texts. No other passages of the essays were included in the qualitative textual analysis for this strand of the study. Each passage selected by the student was examined to identify how it fitted within the larger essay, and I prepared a summary of the passage’s meaning and purpose within the essay. Then, I returned to the talk around text section in the interview transcript related to that part of the essay to uncover what the student considered to be of primary importance in relation to their writing processes, their use of sources, their understanding of the writing context, or any other aspect they viewed as relevant to their purpose, to create a picture of the students’ emic understandings of their writing and intertextual practices. Finally, I went back to the essay text to look for patterns of intertextual practices within the attributed c-units, informed by the dimensions that informed the quantitative analysis, to interpret the practices demonstrated in each section, expressed as my etic perspective.

3.6 Ethical considerations

Before receiving ethics approval, I conducted initial meetings with the lecturer in charge of the unit of study to familiarise him with the project and to seek his permission to collect data from students enrolled in his unit of study. He gave his permission and was supportive of the project throughout.

Ethics approval was obtained from the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) at the university in which the participating students were enrolled (an NHMRC-registered ethics
committee that acted as the responsible ethics review body). The ethics approval was accepted by representatives of the Sydney University HREC. All data collection activities occurred at the university that granted ethics approval (see Appendix 9 for approval letter).

After ethics approval was granted, I visited a lecture for the unit of study in which I planned to collect data. At the end of the lecture, I provided students with a verbal description of the research project, requested their participation, and distributed participant information letters that contained a written overview of the research project. In the letter, students who agreed to participate were asked to return a signed consent form to one of two locked collection boxes, located at campus reception and within the Library. In the consent form, students were asked to indicate which aspects of the study they were willing to participate in: some students agreed to provide their essay for analysis and participate in interviews; others chose only to provide their essay. See Appendix 1 for the participant information letter and Appendix 2 for the consent form. The request to participate was presented to students at the end of the timetabled lecture for the unit of study, so students felt free to leave if they chose and did not feel coerced into participating. Consent forms were collected in locked boxes in available in public spaces on campus, rather than in the classroom, to reduce the likelihood that students felt pressured to participate by either the teaching team or the researcher and to remove any association between the research project and the assessment of student work within the unit of study.

Students were informed that their participation or lack thereof in the project would have no bearing on the mark they would receive for their essay task, nor on their overall mark for the unit of study. Their ability to access the support services provided by the learning support unit was similarly unaffected by their decision. At the time of the data collection, I was employed in the learning support unit of the university. To avoid any conflict of interest, students who agreed to participate in the research project were referred to another adviser for
the duration of the data collection, and processes were put in place to ensure that students’
timely access to the service was not be affected by this referral. Additionally, I was not
involved in the provision of embedded support activities for the unit of study from which data
was collected for this research project.

Student confidentiality was ensured by removing identifiers and replacing them with a
numerical code, and by creating pseudonyms for students who participated in the interviews.

3.7 Summary

This chapter has presented an overview of the methodology used to conduct this research. I
began with a justification for the mixed methods research approach. I then described the
context of the research, including an overview of the university where the project was
conducted, and the study’s participants were identified, with information provided about the
participant groups for the different strands of the study. This was followed by a description
the data collection, beginning with a description of the writing task and the interview
schedule, followed by a detailed explanation of the data collection procedure, including a
description of my visits to lectures, and how I collected the student texts and interview data.
Next, I explained how the data were analysed for both the quantitative and qualitative aspects
of the textual analysis of the students’ essays and the qualitative analysis of the talk around
text interview data. Finally, I presented a discussion of the ethical considerations for the
project, including the importance of limiting the possibility of coercion when recruiting
participants and techniques used to ensure the participants’ confidentiality.
Chapter 4: Results: Textual analysis

4.1 Introduction

This chapter provides the findings of the first strand of the study, consisting of a textual analysis to answer the first two-part research question. Research question 1a focusses on identifying the character and frequency of the intertextual practices demonstrated by the students in their essays. This research question was answered by examining descriptive statistics and conducting a qualitative analysis of excerpts from the student texts. Research question 1b investigates whether the intertextual practices were influenced by specific factors: the degree course in which the students were enrolled and their language background (monolingual or multilingual) and visa status (international or local). This research question was answered through a quantitative analysis involving two-way ANOVAs (for course and language background) and one-way ANOVAs (for visa status).

The chapter begins by presenting background statistics related to students’ performance on the essay task and their rates of attribution (Section 4.2). The next two sections are structured according to the coding taxonomy. Section 4.3 focuses on how students incorporated the words and ideas of other authors into their sentences (incorporation and integration). Section 4.4 presents findings for the use of sources within the structure of the essays and the rhetorical purpose of citations within the stages students went through as they responded to the task. Each section begins with the presentation of the descriptive statistics for the coding dimension and the results of the ANOVA tests comparing the different groups. Qualitative analyses of essay excerpts drawn from the essay corpus follow the quantitative findings for each coding dimension. Finally, the chapter concludes with a summary of the findings from this first strand of the study.
4.2 Background

This section presents findings related to how the students performed on the task and the amount of attribution they included in their texts. It first examines the participant group as a whole, and then compares the different participant groupings:

- Course: Bachelor of Physiotherapy/Bachelor of Nursing
- Language background: monolingual/multilingual
- Visa status: local/international

4.2.1 Mark

The maximum score possible for the task was 35. Table 14 shows that for the entire participant group, the mean mark on the task was 21 ($SD = 3.79$), which is equivalent to 60% of the available marks, which equals a Pass.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14: Descriptive statistics for mark on the task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The marking system used for this unit included five bands, ranging from Fail to High Distinction. Table 15 provides a breakdown of this marking system, which was used for all units of study at the university where this research was conducted. This system is typical for higher education in Australia. It is worth noting that in Australian tertiary education, relatively fewer High Distinction marks are awarded, and a Credit is considered a respectable
A Pass indicates that the student has met the minimum requirements for the marking criteria, but it would be considered a relatively low mark. Consequently, the average mark awarded for this task could be interpreted as being relatively low.

Table 15: Marking system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Range of marks (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High distinction</td>
<td>HD</td>
<td>85-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td>75-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>65-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>50-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td>0-49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, despite being relatively low, the mean mark for students who agreed to participate in this study ($M = 21$, $SD = 3.77$) was consistent with the mean for all students who submitted an essay for assessment in the unit ($n = 375$, $M = 21$, $SD = 3.62$). In terms of grades, Table 16 shows that the distribution of grades across both the cohorts was also very similar, although, as a percentage, there were slightly more of the higher grades and fewer of the lower grades in the participant cohort.

Table 16: Distribution of grades for the whole cohort and participant group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Perc</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Perc</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole cohort $n = 375$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant cohort $n = 171$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A two-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to examine the impact of the degree course and language background on the mark. Within the participant cohort, the mean mark for physiotherapy students \((M = 23, \, SD = 3.62)\) was higher than that of the nursing students \((M = 20, \, SD = 3.64)\), and the difference was significant, \(F(1,169) = 13.93, \, p = .013;\) however, the effect size was small (partial eta squared = .036). The average mark for physiotherapy students was 63% of the available marks, a ‘high’ pass two marks short of a credit, while nursing students achieved 57% of the available marks, a mid-range pass.

There was no significant difference in scores between monolingual students \((M = 22, \, SD = 3.76)\), a pass at 60% of available marks, and multilingual students \((M = 20, \, SD = 3.71)\), also a pass with 57% of available marks. However, there was a violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance (as indicated by a significant result for Levene’s test, \(p = .009\)), as well as a statistically significant interaction effect between course and language background group \((p = .013)\): in nursing, monolingual writers scored higher than the multilingual writers, while in physiotherapy, this pattern was reversed. Consequently, these findings must be interpreted with caution. However, these results appear to indicate that even though the physiotherapy students, who met much higher entry requirements for their course, did score better than the nursing students, by achieving on average a pass mark they are also still only just meeting the minimum expectations for the task.

The one-way between-groups analysis of variance within the multilingual group did not result in a significant difference between local students \((M = 21, \, SD = 3.88)\), a pass with 57% of available marks, and international students \((M = 20, \, SD = 3.07)\), 56% of available marks, also a pass.
4.2.2 Attribution and citation

The rate of attribution refers to how many c-units in the essay, as a percentage of the entire number of c-units, contained information the student writer indicated was drawn from another author’s work. Source attribution can occur either through formal citation, coded as cited attribution, or by a broader reference to another author or speaker, publication, or general research, without providing the typical author/date bibliographic information, coded as uncited attribution. I did not consider a c-unit as cited attribution if the student writer only mentioned the name of a theory or a researcher without providing a date of publication or indicating through quotation marks or their wording that they were referring to a specific text.

The rate of attribution was calculated for all attributed c-units, both cited and uncited.

Quantitative findings

Table 17 shows that the mean rate of overall attribution was .29 (SD = .17), indicating that about 30% of the c-units in these essays were attributed to an outside source in some way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Language background</th>
<th>Multilingual visa status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Physio</td>
<td>Mono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>n = 129</td>
<td>n = 42</td>
<td>n = 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not all the attributed c-units were formally cited according to the prescribed referencing system, however, with about 10% of attribution uncited in the corpus, as demonstrated in Table 18.
Table 18: Citation rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Language background</th>
<th>Multilingual visa status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Physio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 171</td>
<td>n = 129</td>
<td>n = 42</td>
<td>n = 93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attributed, not cited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attributed, cited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A two-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of the degree course and language background on the overall rate of attribution. There was no statistically significant difference in attribution between course groups (nursing students, $M = .30$, $SD = .17$; physiotherapy students, $M = .27$, $SD = .16$) or language background groups (monolingual, $M = .28$, $SD = .15$; multilingual, $M = .30$, $SD = .18$), with no interaction effects or violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance.

However, a one-way between-groups analysis of variance indicated that international multilingual students ($M = .37$, $SD = .20$) had more attribution in their essays than did the local multilingual students ($M = .28$, $SD = .17$); the difference was marginally significant $F(1,76) = 3.75$, $p = .057$ and the effect size was moderate (eta squared = .05). Although a number of outliers in this category with much higher rates of attribution ($n = 6$) were identified in a scatterplot, the results were unchanged when they were removed from the data set, indicating this is a consistent pattern.
As explained above, students did not always provide a citation for c-units that were attributed to an outside source. Table 18 shows that roughly 10% of the attributed c-units in these essays did not include any kind of citation that would allow a reader to identify the source of the information ($M = .10, SD = .20$). There were no statistically significant differences between course groups (nursing students, $M = .09, SD = .21$; physiotherapy students, $M = .12, SD = .18$), language background groups (monolingual, $M = .12, SD = .23$; multilingual, $M = .07, SD = .16$), or between local multilingual ($M = .08, SD = .17$) and international multilingual students ($M = .06, SD = .13$).

The above findings indicate that across the groups, students tended to have fairly similar amounts of attribution in their texts, with the exception of the international multilingual students, who tended to include more attributed c-units in their texts than the local multilingual students. Student writers across all groups did not include citations for a number of their attributed statements. Four essays in the corpus had no cited attribution at all; these student writers used very little attribution in their texts (cited or uncited), and those few statements were attributed in the general way demonstrated in Excerpts 4.1 and 4.2 below. Consequently, those essays were not included in the analysis of the remaining dimensions related to citation.

Qualitative findings

In the essays, the uncited attributed statements usually identified ‘the literature’ or ‘studies’ as the source of information, but no specific publication or study was identified. In Excerpt 4.1, the student writer claims that research has named a particular strategy, Motivational Interviewing, to be effective:
4.1) Motivational Interviewing is greatly supported by research, indicating its effectiveness as an intervention strategy.

Physiotherapy, monolingual, 28

For the effectiveness of this strategy to be greatly supported, one would assume several studies must have been conducted. However, no sources have been cited, making it impossible to determine if the student writer’s interpretation of the research is sound. Interestingly, the writer is showing early attempts at developing a stance in this excerpt, positively evaluating the health care strategy (indicating its effectiveness), rather than remaining neutral as might be expected from a novice academic writer.

In Excerpt 4.2, the student writer has made a claim about individuals’ behaviour and attributed it to external sources, but no specific publication details were provided:

4.2) However, the literatures inform that as individuals became more conscious of themselves and the nature of their problems, they are more likely to re-evaluate their values, problems, and themselves both affectively and cognitively.

Nursing, multilingual Thai dominant, international, 26

The specific nature of the information in the paraphrase included in Excerpt 4.2 seems more likely to have come from a single publication, but the information has been attributed to the literatures. More experienced writers might follow these general references to the literature or research with specific examples drawn from named sources, but neither of the student writers of Excerpts 4.1 or 4.2 did so in their essays. However, this kind of uncited attribution may not represent a misunderstanding of the principles of citation but may serve a rhetorical purpose, helping writers set the stage for their discussion of a topic or justify it as worthy of discussion.
In contrast, cited attributed statements included information about the source of the information incorporated into the student writer’s text, usually in the form of an in-text citation, as required by the APA referencing system. C-units that contained a clear reference to a specific publication were also included in this category, even if the citation did not entirely conform to APA citation practices. Sections 4.3 and 4.4 of this chapter present examples and analyses of cited attributed statements drawn from the corpus.

Citations of secondary sources were a type of attribution that occurred regularly throughout the corpus. In this type of attribution, the student writer cited another author’s ideas about a publication that the student writer had not accessed themselves. Because the textbook for the course was a frequently used source for this assignment, students often provided the overview of theories and concepts presented there, rather than accessing the original, primary source. For example, the student writer who produced Excerpt 4.3 presents Crossley’s critique of the transtheoretical model, as found in the required text:

4.3) Crossley (as cited in Barkway, 2009) shows it’s a narrow and limited approach to understanding the human behaviour.

Nursing, multilingual Vietnamese dominant, local, 19

The primary author is appropriately credited with the idea within the text of the sentence, while the secondary author is named in the parenthetical citation. There were several examples of student writers in this study successfully adopting this relatively sophisticated citation practice, demonstrating detailed attention to the referencing requirements and a genuine attempt to meet them. Once again, this writer is moving towards a critical stance; although the position taken is attributed to a (secondary) cited source, he is attempting to move beyond merely describing the characteristics of the model.

However, accurately citing secondary sources was sometimes an area of confusion for these student writers; in some instances, the mechanics of the citation created a stumbling block:
4.4) [1] Hea 1998, Canning 1999 as cited in Hussein 2010 states that "one in six people attending accident and emergency department for treatment have alcohol-related injuries or problems, rising to eight out of ten at peak times, [2] and one in seven acute hospital admissions are misusing alcohol" (p4).

The cited information in Excerpt 4.4 is a summary of research findings attributed to two separate publications, one from Hea and another from Canning, but presented in a single quotation presumably drawn from Hussein. The level of detail of the findings make it unlikely that they were generated in separate studies, and the sentence structure makes it difficult to determine with any certainty who is making the statement.

Teasing out who should receive credit for concepts and ideas and tracing the development of a concept through numerous publications presented challenges for these student writers. In Excerpt 4.5, four separate publications are included across three citations in this densely cited excerpt, making it challenging for the reader to unpack the attribution:

4.5) The Biopsychosocial model, (Mental Illness Fellowship Australia. 2008) theorised by George L. Engel in 1977 (Smith, 2002), maintains the philosophy that health and illness result from a complex interchange between biological, psychological and social factors (Barkway, 2009).

The Mental Illness Fellowship Australia, Smith and Barkway are all included in the students’ reference list. One possible interpretation could be that the student found a mention of the biopsychosocial model in a publication by the Mental Illness Fellowship Australia, while Smith (a secondary source) described Engel’s role in its development, and Barkway provided the details of the working of the model. This student seems keen to maximise the use of sources in a limited word count; it may also have been an attempt to minimise the likelihood
of accusations of plagiarism, a very real concern for beginning writers, particularly when secondary sources are involved.

The use of secondary sources by these writers may indicate that while many of these students are genuinely attempting to engage with the referencing conventions of their discipline, the details of practical implementation within a sentence often elude them. Secondary sources are a complex form of heteroglossia, with the writer bringing in the voices of not one but two authors, and these students often struggled to trace the path of an idea through the cited publications.

4.3 Citing the words and ideas of other authors

This section presents the findings related to RQ1a(i), which is concerned with how students incorporate the words and ideas of others into their sentences. Table 19 presents the descriptive statistics for the coding categories related to RQ1a(i), namely the method of incorporation and integration. For both these categories, all cited c-units were examined to determine the rate, and these rates were calculated as a percentage of the total number of cited c-units (out of 100%). Essays that did not contain cited attribution were removed from the dataset for this analysis; therefore, \( n = 167 \).
Table 19: Descriptive statistics, method of incorporation and integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>Physio</th>
<th>Language background</th>
<th>Multilingual visa status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 167</td>
<td>n = 125</td>
<td>n = 42</td>
<td>n = 90</td>
<td>n = 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-integral</td>
<td>M .75</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD .27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integral</td>
<td>M .25</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD .27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of incorporation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>M .76</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD .29</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>M .24</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD .29</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1 Integration

Integration refers to how students incorporated their attribution into their sentences. Two categories of integration, using Swales’ (2014) typology, were identified in the corpus: integral citations are those which are incorporated in the grammatical structure of the sentence, while non-integral citations are placed outside the grammatical structure, with the citation information appearing in brackets (as required by APA style, the referencing style specified for the unit of study). By choosing one over the other, the writer directs the readers’ focus toward the author who is the source of the cited content (either to highlight their authority or to position them against another author, for example) or toward the cited content itself (K. Hyland, 2000; P. Thompson, 2005).
Quantitative findings

As can be seen in Table 19, students in all groups relied heavily on citations that were not integral ($M = .75$, $SD = .27$). This means that 75% of the attributed c-units in the students’ essays were cited in a way that did not integrate the citation information into the grammatical structure of their sentences, which is consistent with previous studies of academic writers (Ädel & Garretson, 2006; Mansourizadeh & Ahmad, 2011; Swales, 2014). Citations were integrated into the structure of the sentence much less frequently ($M = .25$, $SD = .27$). Note that as the two rates (i.e., integral and non-integral) are dependent on each other, statistical testing was only conducted for non-integral citations. For non-integral citations, a two-way between groups analysis of variance indicated there were no significant differences between course (nursing, $M = .74$, $SD = .27$; physiotherapy, $M = .77$, $SD = .29$) or language background groups (monolingual, $M = .78$, $SD = .27$; multilingual, $M = .71$, $SD = .28$), with no interaction effect or violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance; a one-way between groups analysis of variance did not identify a significant difference between local multilingual ($M = .72$, $SD = .27$) and international multilingual students ($M = .68$, $SD = .30$).

Qualitative findings

Swales (2014) identified finer distinctions within the two main integration categories for citations in an author/date referencing system such as APA (presented in Table 20). I use these subcategories to explore the students’ citation practices in greater qualitative detail.
Both non-integral and integral citations can be grouped by the presence or absence of a reporting verb; when a reporting verb is present, the writer has more opportunity to characterise the author’s position. When using integral citations, the author’s name becomes part of the grammatical structure of the sentence, and these kinds of citations can be further described by the grammatical positioning of the author.

**Non-integral citations, nonreporting**

Because no mention of the author or publication is made in the text, the writer’s focus is on the ideas being incorporated in nonreporting citations. Excerpt 4.6 presents a typical example of this type of citation pattern; the student writer uses a standard APA author/date in-text citation at the end of the sentence to identify the source of the information, which is incorporated as a paraphrase:

4.6)  

[1] The aim of dramatic relief is to use emotional arousal, such as fear, guilt and hope to educate the person about their current behaviour and the relief that can transpire from making a change in their lifestyle. [2] By using techniques such as role playing, psychodrama, and grieving losses, the health care professional can aid the patient into moving onto the contemplation stage (Ries, Miller, Fiellin & Saitz, 2009).

Nursing, monolingual, 27
The two c-units that comprise this excerpt are positioned at the end of second body paragraph; the student writer is focussed on the health care professional (in the subject position of the cited c-unit) and the techniques available in the stage (in the introductory phrase). The non-integral citation presents the use of these techniques as an accepted and viable strategy for the health care provider, and the reader can conclude that the authors of the source identified these techniques as a useful way to help patients move from one stage to the next. The paraphrase is clearly stated, and the citation works well in the context of the paragraph.

However, nonreporting non-integral citations sometimes created ambiguity, particularly when a student writer was suggesting a course of action, which students needed to do to be successful in this assignment. For example, a recommendation is made in Excerpt 4.7 below:

4.7) [1] Elimination of persons developing addictive health risk behaviour should be implemented from a young age, to address the issues and so they quickly learn the harmful effects. [2] This is why all schools must involve drug education in their curriculum, as a strategy of eliminating health risk behaviour’s. (Department Of Education, Training and Youth, 1999).

Nursing, monolingual, 18

This excerpt consists of two c-units, with information from a source text incorporated in the second c-unit in the form of a paraphrase. A lengthy noun clause in the subject position of the first c-unit and a vague pronoun references confuse the relationship between the two c-units. The absence of a clear reporting structure makes it difficult to determine which voice is responsible for the recommendation – that of the student writer or the cited author. The student writer could be making a judgement that a strategy described by the Department of Education, Training and Youth is valuable, and presenting her own recommendation that it should be widely implemented. Alternatively, she may be paraphrasing a recommendation
made by the Department of Education, Training and Youth. What is clear is that she presented the wide-ranging recommendation in very strong terms, presenting the intervention she recommended not as one option among many, but as a requirement for all schools. This could represent another early effort at taking a critical stance, a relatively sophisticated practice for a developing writer to attempt.

In Excerpt 4.8, the student writer names and describes the Agenda Setting Chart, a tool that can be used by the health care provider to assist the client in setting personal goals:

4.8) An effective tool to clarify and establish strategies is the use of the Agenda Setting Chart, where questions such as “What would be the good result of changing and what are the barriers to changing are examined”? (Zimmerman et al., 2000, p.7).

Nursing, monolingual, 25

The student writer could be evaluating the tool as effective, and the examples of the types of questions have come from Zimmerman et al., with the accurately cited direct quote including the full extent of the ideas coming from the source text. However, it is also possible that the student writer is presenting Zimmerman et al.’s opinion of the value of the tool for the specified purpose, as well as their suggested wording for questions to be used. Determining the student writer’s intent here is very difficult, and the punctuation of the quotation does not provide much clarification. Presenting questions that the health care provider could use with a patient, punctuating them as quotations and attributing them to a source was a common practice in these texts. However, it was often not possible to ascertain if the question was created by the student writer as an example of a useful cited strategy for the health care provider, or if the questions had been collected by the cited author in the source text and reported by the student writer.
Non-integral citations, reporting

Reporting non-integral citations incorporate a reporting verb and often make a broad general reference to the external source of the incorporated information within the c-unit, attributing the information to ‘research’, ‘studies’ or ‘literature’, with reporting verbs such as ‘suggest’ or ‘show’, without naming the specific author(s). In Excerpt 4.9, the student writer describes how research links an aspect of patient behaviour (reasons) to stages of the model:

4.9) Research suggests that these reasons can be viewed in stages, with the first three being similar to the first steps of the transtheoretical model, precontemplation, contemplation and preparation (Scollon & Winstanley, 2008; Erol & Erdogan; 2008).)

Nursing, monolingual, 23

In this excerpt, more than one source has been included in the in-text citation. While the punctuation of the in-text citation is not consistent with APA guidelines and the sentence structure is somewhat awkward, the student writer does successfully indicate that the authors of both sources have presented a similar viewpoint, and these two publications make up the research being referred to here. The use of a paraphrase also supports the interpretation that the student writer is bringing together information from both sources in one statement to create a synthesis. Student writers may attribute a proposition to more than one source in this way to increase the proposition’s believability and to stay within the word count, as an efficient way to work more sources into the reference list.

In Excerpt 4.10, however, the student writer’s intent is less clear:

4.10) Literature suggests that many people think that parental supervision of drinking is the solution to reducing alcohol problems in young people (Gorman & Odette, 2005).

Nursing, multilingual Vietnamese dominant, international, 22
The student writer attributes a proposition about what many people think to literature; this in itself is difficult to interpret. A single source is cited at the end of the c-unit, further complicating the meaning, as the literature is usually presumed to consist of more than one publication. A reader could therefore interpret this c-unit to mean that the idea pulled out of Gorman and Odette’s 2005 publication is representative of the literature, or it could also mean that Gorman and Odette themselves summarised the literature in this way.

In Excerpt 4.11, the use of a direct quote further complicates the student writer’s intent:

4.11) *Studies have shown that an "empathetic therapist style was predictive of decreased drinking while a confrontational style predicted increased drinking" G, Zimmerman. C, Olsen and M, Bosworth (2000).*

Nursing, monolingual, 31

The quotation is ambiguously attributed to studies in the plural form, while only a single source is cited (in a manner inconsistent with APA formatting guidelines); however, a single direct quotation cannot sensibly come from more than one study, so it should follow that Zimmerman, Olsen and Bosworth have provided this summary of other studies. On several levels, integrating the ideas into the structure of the sentence have proven challenging for this student writer.

These broad references to the literature may represent the incorporation of formulaic language, with students borrowing a common rhetorical device in academic writing to lend authority to the claims they have drawn from their sources. It also seems likely that the student writers were attempting to broaden their repertoire of citation techniques and perhaps draw attention to their use of published, credible studies that are part of the literature of their field. General references to the literature or studies often clouded the meaning of the citation, however, making it difficult for the reader to determine if the student writer intended to
indicate that the author in the brackets is the source of the information, or if the cited author summarised other research studies, making these in effect secondary citations.

In *Integral citations, author as subject* With integral citations, the student writer incorporates some or all the required information about the author within the grammatical structure of the sentence. The author information was often presented in the author position, which is consistent with Swales’ (2014) findings. In Excerpt 4.12, the student writer uses this citation structure to define the transtheoretical model:

4.12) Prochaska and Velicer (1997) define the transtheoretical model of behaviour change (TTM) as a six stage process of change in behaviour, including the precontemplation, contemplation, preparation, action, maintenance, and termination stages of behavioural change.

Physiotherapy, monolingual, 23

In this excerpt, like many in the corpus, a neutral reporting verb is used to present a description of the model and its stages as factual and commonly accepted; information is provided objectively, without interpretation or an indication of the student writer’s position. These kinds of neutral reporting verbs (e.g., ‘defines’, ‘states’, ‘names’) were quite common in the corpus.

This same structure was used with both paraphrases, as in Excerpt 4.12, and direct quotations, seen in Excerpt 4.13:

4.13) Apodaca and Longabaugh (2009) defined motivational interviewing as "a client-centred and directive method for enhancing intrinsic motivation to change by exploring and resolving ambivalence" (p.3).

Nursing, multilingual Igbo dominant, permanent resident, 26
In these kinds of definitions, the method of incorporation has very little effect, with paraphrases and quotations serving the same purpose: to provide a neutral, objective definition of a term or concept.

When students did make use of less neutral reporting verbs, they tended to prefer those indicating a positive stance, with ‘recommend’ one of the most common, as in Excerpt 4.15:

4.14)  

Fiore, Jaen and Baker (2009) also recommend mentioning short-term health impacts such as shortness of breath and increased risk of respiratory infections.

Physiotherapy, monolingual, 27

Another common practice involved the use of positive reporting verbs with evaluative statements to report the original author’s value position, as in Excerpt 4.15:

4.15)  

Janet Oakes (2005) notes that providing education to individuals can be extremely helpful at this stage rather that forcing them straight into action as that may be "destructive, driving the person away and discouraging them from seeking future treatment".

Nursing, multilingual English dominant, local, 20

The student writer paraphrased the cited author’s positive evaluation of the strategy (extremely helpful) and presented the author’s strong negative position toward the alternative strategy in the author’s own words (destructive, driving away, discouraging), using what G. Thompson and Ye (1991) would classify as a generally positive reporting verb (Janet Oakes notes...). Rather than staking out a position themselves, these student writers used integral citations with the author in the subject position, and accompanied occasionally by positive evaluation, to borrow the ideas and the positions of the authors of their cited sources and align themselves with experts in their field. (We will see more examples of this in the qualitative analysis of the body sections of these essays.) This could be viewed as a reasonable practice for these first-year students, as the task required them to imagine
themselves to be experienced health care providers, a challenging requirement for beginners with a limited professional context.

**Integral citations, author in other position**

Placing the author in another grammatical position within the sentence removes the reporting structure and opens up other possibilities. Within the corpus, the author’s name was often included as part of a noun clause, allowing student writers to give credit to researchers and theorists who originated key concepts, tools or health care provider strategies. Excerpt 4.16 provides a student writer’s description of the transtheoretical model that was the focus of the assignment:

4.16) _The transtheoretical model of behaviour change developed by Prochaska and DiClemente (1984) has been the basis of developing effective interventions to promote health behaviour change._

Nursing, monolingual, 25

This citation is the opening sentence of the essay and echoes the wording used in the essay prompt; the student writer effectively adopts the positive evaluation of the model that is implicit in the essay task while identifying the researchers responsible for the model.

Placing the author information within a noun clause could also be used to draw the reader’s attention to the type of source being cited. Excerpt 4.17 demonstrates a student writer using published scholarly research to outline the scope of the health risk behaviour:

4.17) _For example in an article written by DiClemente, Carlo C; Nidecker, Melissa; Bellack, Alan S titled Motivation and the stages of change among individuals with severe mental illness and substance abuse disorders which refers to when a persons has a co-morbidities of a mental illness and a drug addiction._

Nursing, monolingual, 20

It appears the student writer intended to emphasise the use of a research article (as opposed to a website, perhaps, or other less credible source type). The full names of the authors and the
entire title of the research article were provided, pushing the idea being cited to the very end of the sentence (and not conforming to APA formatting guidelines). The student writer prioritised identifying the publication over pulling out relevant ideas and lost grammatical control of the sentence. The title of the article runs into the concept being incorporated, making it difficult for the reader to discern where the title ends and the concept begins, and difficulties with clause structure and agreement further obscure the student writer’s meaning.

A similar difficulty is encountered in Excerpt 4.18, in which the student writer identifies the article itself as an example of a community network, as opposed to a publication containing an example of this kind of network:

4.18)  
A recent article by McCarty, Gustafson, Capoccia & Cotter (2009) is one example of a community network that can be established that uses learning sessions, web pages, coaching and interest circles to educate addiction treatment programs to greater enhance their effectiveness of care to the individual.

Physiotherapy, monolingual, 25

The concept is again pushed to the back of the c-unit to give the use of the article and its currency the emphasis, obscuring the concepts being presented as evidence in a complicated sentence structure. Excerpts 4.17 and 4.18 demonstrate the structural and grammatical challenges integral citations posed for the student writers in this study. The use of scholarly sources was an explicit part of the criteria against which the lecturer evaluated the essay tasks, and in interviews students consistently identified the use of credible sources as a characteristic of successful academic writing. By identifying within the text of the sentence that they were using published research articles as sources in their essays, these student writers may have used integral citations as one way to demonstrate they were meeting that aspect of the marking criteria and to fulfil commonly understood expectations of academic writers.
Another structure frequently used by these student writers involved placing the author name within a prepositional phrase; many writers relied heavily on the phrase ‘according to’. In this context, this practice is likely to be the student writer drawing the reader’s attention to a credible author. It may also have been a subtler way of highlighting the presence of specific author or type of source than naming the type of publication alongside the author name in the sentence as was done in the two previous excerpts.

In Excerpt 4.19, located in an introductory paragraph, the student writer cites the author of the required textbook for the subject to identify the stages of the transtheoretical model:

4.19) According to Barkway (2009), the model itself is broken into five stages; precontemplation, contemplation, preparation, action, and maintenance or termination.

Nursing, multilingual English dominant, local, 19

The straightforward sentence structure and citation pattern indicate where the cited idea originated and highlights the student writer’s use of the required text.

In Excerpt 4.20, background information about a health risk behaviour is attributed to an organisation:

4.20) [1] According to the National Health and Medical Research Council (2009), alcohol consumption has been associated with a range of effects both physically and mentally [2] therefore such addictive behaviours need to be changed as soon as possible with the assistance of professional health care practitioners.

Nursing, multilingual Chinese dominant, local, 19

The National Health and Medical Research Council is the key funding body for health and medical research in Australia, and as such is a credible source for information on alcohol consumption. In both 4.19 and 4.20, the student writers prominently placed the name of a credible author at the beginning of the sentence and credited them with the content, effectively endorsing the proposition. For this analysis, a citation is assumed to extend to
include c-units punctuated as a single sentence. Excerpt 4.20, however, underscores the
difficulties of identifying a writers’ intent in citing attributed information; it is not always
clear if the writer intends to attribute all the information in the sentence to the cited source.

This citation could be interpreted to mean that the NHMRC made the associations between
the behaviour and the negative consequences, and the student writer drew the conclusion
about treatment presented in the second half of the sentence within the context of the
assessment task. Conversely, the NHMRC may categorise alcohol consumption as an
addictive behaviour requiring the intervention of a health care practitioner. Identifying the
author within the citation does not always result in clearer attribution. It does appear,
however, that many students used this citation structure to highlight the authoritative nature
and credibility of their cited source texts.

4.3.2 Incorporation

Incorporation is the second category related to RQ1a(i), identifying whether student writers
attempted to reproduce the words of other authors in their texts (quotation) or to explain or
rephrase them (paraphrase).

Quantitative findings

Table 19 shows that students across all groups indicated far more paraphrases \((M = .76, SD = .29)\) than quotations \((M = .24, SD = .29)\), with 76% of the total cited c-units in the texts
incorporating source information as paraphrases. The two-way between-groups analysis of
variance found no significant differences between course (nursing, \(M = .73, SD = .30\);
physiotherapy, \(M = .84, SD = .24\)), language background groups (monolingual, \(M = .77, SD = .29\);
multilingual, \(M = .75, SD = .29\)) in the rate of paraphrasing, with no interaction effects or
violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance. Similarly, the one-way between-
groups analysis of variance found no significant difference between local multilingual (\(M = .74, SD = .29\)) and international multilingual students (\(M = .78, SD = .32\)).

Neither are there significant differences between these groups regarding the rate of quotation, as these rates mirror each other – that is, because they are dichotomous variables, the rates are dependent on each other. These findings show that the students who participated in this study signalled more paraphrases than they did direct quotes, and this usage was consistent regardless of course enrolment, language background or group. The essay writing guide provided by the lecturer of the unit and the information provided in the support lecture encouraged students to paraphrase rather than to quote, so these findings may indicate these students were attempting to meet explicitly presented expectations around this aspect of intertextuality.

**Qualitative findings**

**Quotations**

Quotations within the corpus tended to vary greatly in length, from single words or phrases, to complete sentences and even larger chunks of text comprising entire paragraphs. Shorter quotations of a few words or a single phrase tended to be better integrated with the student writers’ own words. In Excerpt 4.21, the student writer is using a direct quote to link strategies for the health care provider and stages in the transtheoretical model:

4.21) *This change in the patient depends on “doing the right things (strategies/processes) at the right time (stages)” (Prochaska, 1992 p1110).*

Physiotherapy, monolingual, 20

This quotation sits comfortably within the sentence, as the sentence does within the paragraph. The student writer used the quotation to explain the relationship between strategies and stages and introduces it with a phrase containing a pronoun linking back to the idea of behaviour change presented in the previous sentences, creating a relationship for the
reader between the quote and the preceding ideas. The non-integral, nonreporting citation allows the student writer to keep the sentence structure simple, which has distinct benefits in communicating meaning.

Larger sections of quoted text tended to be more difficult for these student writers to manage. A quotation might take the form of a complete sentence, as in Excerpt 4.22:

4.22) [1] Antismoking advertising appears on every packet of cigarettes, with advertising on billboards and on transport [2] e.g.: busses also have a most in your face advertising culture – aimed at smokers within the community. [3] “Most education programs that aim to increase knowledge do indeed achieve this, with most participants knowing more about drugs after the program than before”. (Ryder, Walker & Salmon. 2006 p102).

Nursing, monolingual, 19

This excerpt contains three c-units, the last of which is an entire sentence accurately cited as a direct quotation (although some punctuation problems are evident within the citation). The first two c-units describe antismoking advertising campaigns, while the direct quote provides a claim that education programs are successful at achieving their goals. The student writer links the ideas by their proximity in the paragraph but does not use any of their own words to make a connection for the reader, leaving the student writer’s understanding of the relationship between the ideas unstated. The use of a non-integral concept-focussed citation serves to further disconnect the quotation from the surrounding sentences. Swales (2014, p. 135) refers to this as “parenthetical plonking”, where a citation is dropped into a paragraph with a non-integral citation, without discussion or contextualisation.
Quotations might also incorporate much larger sections of text than a single sentence. In Excerpt 4.23, four sentences in their entirety are reproduced as a direct quote:

4.23) [1] Education is another vital component that can facilitate change in a person who has an addictive health risk behaviour, in this case smoking. [2] As quoted by the Australian Government’s Department of Health (2011), “tobacco smoking is the single largest preventable cause of premature death and disease in Australia. [3] It is responsible for the greatest disease burden and accounts for approximately 15,500 deaths per annum. [4] Quitting at age 50 halves your risk of smoking-related death, [5] but quitting by age 30 avoids almost all of the excess risk. [6] Stopping at age 60, 50, 40 or 30 can result in gains, respectively, of about three, six, nine, or 10 years of life expectancy”.

Nursing, multilingual English dominant, local, 23

These sentences occur toward the beginning of the third body paragraph, and the topic sentence indicates that the focus will be on educational programs. However, the quotation relates to the health risk behaviour, describing its impact and prevalence before providing statistics about the benefits of quitting, none of which relates directly to educational programs. This information is perhaps provided to justify the importance of education as a health care provider strategy, given the severity of the behaviour’s consequences, but that argument is not directly made. Once again, proximity is the only technique the student writer used to link ideas. The awkward reporting structure as quoted by foregrounds the method of incorporation and the use of a lengthy direct quote that is not well-contextualised further separates the cited information from the purpose the author identified in the topic sentence.

Paraphrases

Most of the attributed c-units were cited as paraphrases, rather than direct quotations. It is important to note that I did not attempt to determine the similarities or differences between the student writer’s paraphrase and the original author’s text, as it is not my goal to evaluate
how well student paraphrased or to determine whether they may have plagiarised their source material. However, similar paraphrases occurred repeatedly throughout the corpus, indicating that it is likely in these cases that these student writers were relying heavily on the required text for the course, as in Excerpts 4.24 and 4.25.

Excerpt 4.24 provides a definition of the first stage of the model the students were asked to apply:

(4.24a) The precontemplation stage is the stage where the person does not intend to change or recognise that the behaviour poses health risks and therefore does not perceive a need to change (Barkway, 2009).

Nursing, monolingual, 25

(4.24b) The Precontemplation stage describes how the individual does not recognise that the behaviour poses health risks and therefore does not perceive a need to change, (Barkway, p, 2009)

Nursing, monolingual, 14

(4.24c) In the first stage of precontemplation the client is unaware that their behaviour poses health risks, therefore not perceiving a need to change (Barkway, 2009).

Physiotherapy, multilingual Chinese dominant, local, 22

The excerpts included in Excerpt 4.25 explain why individuals may remain stuck in the first stage:

(4.25a) This is because they may have a lack of knowledge about the health risks or the person may be in denial. (Barkway, 2009).

Nursing, monolingual, 18

(4.25b) This may be due to lack of knowledge or information about the health problem or they are using denial (Barkway 2009).

Nursing, multilingual English dominant, local, 23

(4.25c) This may be due to a lack of knowledge, or the person may be using denial
Each of these excerpts is formatted as non-integral nonreporting paraphrases, with no quotation marks, yet very little in the way of structure or vocabulary has changed from one student writer to another. These students seem reluctant to make substantial changes to the wording they encountered in their textbook, and understandably so. They are in a difficult situation; they need to demonstrate they understand a model they most likely would never have used themselves or seen in practice. This stage of the model would have been discussed in detail in the lectures and tutorials, in language very similar to that presented in their textbook, and most of these students would have been entirely dependent on these sources of information for their knowledge of the model.

As we saw in the sections on direct quotations, there was a strong tendency to incorporate large sections of the source text, with little contextualisation. For example, a common practice of the student writers in this study was to reproduce the steps of a health care provider strategy as a numbered or bulleted list (often providing the same in-text citation for each item in the list), without the quotation marks and page numbers that would identify a direct quotation. The lengthy excerpt presented in Excerpt 4.26 demonstrates the parenthetical plonking (Swales, 2014) that also characterised much of the quotations described in the previous section. In this excerpt, the student writer is describing a strategy known as Motivational Interviewing:

(4.26) **1. Express Empathy:**

*Develops a collaborative relationship between individual and health practitioner allowing gaining trust. Patients are encouraged to express concerns, identify goals, and debate advantages and disadvantages of treatments. Reflective listening is developed through active listening; the health practitioner listens without*
judgements, providing the patient with a comfortable non-judgmental atmosphere enhancing individuals self esteem (Arkowitz, Westra, Miller, Rollnick, 2008).

2. Develop Discrepancy:
Individuals own personal goals and values are identified and the good and bad things about change (pros and cons). This allows health care professionals to gain insights into where the patient wants to be in comparison to where they are now, and setting of realistic goals (Arkowitz, Westra, Miller, Rollnick, 2008).

3. Avoid argumentation:
Confrontations can develop through resistance to change. As a health care professional arguments should be avoided, if needed new strategies should be developed, always maintain a persons self recognition of the problem (Arkowitz, Westra, Miller, Rollnick, 2008).

4. Roll with resistance:
Ambivalence or indecision are recognised as a part of the change progression and not opposed. Health care practitioners can use this to avoid patient confrontation and resistance (Arkowitz, Westra, Miller, Rollnick, 2008).

4. Support self-efficacy:
Allows patient awareness that they are responsible for identifying and carrying out behavioral change, their beliefs that change is possible is an important motivator, as a health care practitioner we should acknowledge and praise positive behaviors and support self efficacy (Arkowitz, Westra, Miller, Rollnick, 2008). Techniques of motivational interviewing intend to resolve ambivalence by developing a therapeutic relationship where the health professional develops client motivation whilst maintaining the persons sense of self control, personal power and contributions to their own recover process (Arkowitz, Westra, Miller, Rollnick, 2008).
This excerpt represents almost one-quarter of the total word count for the essay, all drawn from one source. Information about each step of the health care provider strategy is grouped, with an in-text citation to the same publication provided at the end of the description of the first four steps, and two citations incorporated into the final (misnumbered) step. There is little indication of the student writer’s understanding of these concepts or her position in relation to them; her heavy reliance on the source text means her voice is almost entirely absent. Extensive lists of characteristics or steps that were formatted as paraphrases and minimally incorporated into the surrounding text were particularly common in the lower marked tasks. It should be noted, however, that the writer of Excerpt 4.26 received a relatively high mark for their essay even though the excerpt is representative of the essay as a whole, which contained several numbered lists and provided little contextualisation of source use. It appears that the marker has not recognised the inappropriate source use, underscoring the difficulties lecturers often face identifying copied text when marking large numbers of tasks in units of study with large enrolments.

Students also created paragraphs by juxtaposing information drawn from different sources:

(4.27) [1] In contemplation stages individuals getting awareness about the behaviour about the health risk that it can cause but still having struggle for costs and benefits of changing by presenting ambivalence (Patterson, Wolf, 2010). [2] It is due to some negative factors distracting their motivations, knowledge or mental state [3] therefore individual needs to be aware, educated and persuaded to apply adequate course of actions (Miller, Rollnick, 2002). [4] The changing process in contemplation stage occurs when there is consciousness about pros and cons of the results, [5] the process of passing through this stage can recognize by the individual's knowledge (Patterson, Wolf, 2010).
While there are some basic grammatical issues with agreement and sentence structure in Excerpt 4.27, the multilingual international student writer crafted a logical progression through the concepts expressed in the paraphrases. Each of the sentences in this excerpt is attributed to a source, and the student writer begins with an overview of the stage, then presents a description of patient behaviour while in the stage drawn from a different source than the surrounding sentences and finishes with a statement on how to progress through the stage. However, she has not used her own words to link the sources or to tie this information specifically to the health risk behaviour she has chosen to address, and while she has attempted to paraphrase information from her sources, she is struggling to express the underlying meaning. She has positioned the ideas brought in from her sources to express her main points, cobbling together a paragraph from two published articles, in what could be potentially be an example of patchwriting (although this cannot be determined without an examination of the source text). While her voice is missing, we can see her trying to create a heteroglossic text from more than one source, in a way the writer of the previous excerpt did not.

4.4 Using sources within the structure of the text

This section focuses on how students allocated their source use within the overall sections of their essays (the introduction, body and conclusion) and within the rhetorical structure of the text.

4.4.1 Essay structure

To discover where in the essay structure students used their sources, it was first necessary to identify the presence or absence of the structural elements in their essays. This preliminary analysis identified that many of the essays with attribution were missing at least one of these elements and that the introduction was the element most commonly omitted (see Table 10).
Quantitative findings

The first coding category investigated in RQ1a(ii) relates to this overall essay structure. For the entire group of essays with attribution ($n = 167$), most attribution for all groups was found in the body of the essay ($M = .89$, $SD = .13$). However, many of the essays did not include all three elements of the essay structure, which could have inflated the amount of attribution within the elements that were present. Consequently, a subset of the essays containing all three elements of the essay structure ($n = 91$) was analysed, and these results appear in Table 21. Within this subset, the body was again the section where most attribution was located ($M = .84$, $SD = .14$).

Table 21: Rate of attribution within the essay structure for the subset of essays with all structural elements, $n = 91$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Language background</th>
<th>Multilingual visa status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 91$</td>
<td>$n = 70$</td>
<td>$n = 21$</td>
<td>$n = 41$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two-way between-groups analysis of variance indicated no statistically significant differences in the rate of attribution in the introduction for either course (nursing, $M = .13$, $SD = .15$; physiotherapy, $M = .14$, $SD = .09$) or language background groups (monolingual, $M = .13$, $SD = .17$; multilingual, $M = .13$, $SD = .11$). There were no interaction effects or violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance for any of the two-way between groups analyses presented in this section. One-way between-groups analysis of variance also
did not identify any significant difference between multilingual local \( (M = .13, SD = .11) \) or multilingual students \( (M = .15, SD = .13) \). Similarly, there were no statistically significant differences in the rate of attribution in the body for either course (nursing, \( M = .84, SD = .16 \); physiotherapy, \( M = .83, SD = .10 \)) or language background groups (monolingual, \( M = .84, SD = .17 \); multilingual, \( M = .84, SD = .12 \)), or between multilingual local \( (M = .84, SD = .12) \) or international students \( (M = .83, SD = .14) \). Students were least likely to include attributed c-units in the conclusion of the essay. There were no statistically significant differences in the rate of attribution in the conclusion for either course (nursing, \( M = .02, SD = .04 \); physiotherapy, \( M = .02, SD = .04 \)) or language background groups (monolingual, \( M = .02, SD = .04 \); multilingual, \( M = .02, SD = .04 \)), or between multilingual local \( (M = .02, SD = .04) \) or international students \( (M = .02, SD = .06) \). Within each data set in this dimension, some few extreme outliers were identified with much higher rates of attribution in the essay sections; removing them from the data set did not change the findings.

Students were directed to use a typical introduction-body-conclusion structure by their lecturer in the essay writing guide provided in the unit outline, and this guidance was repeated in the support lecture provided by the learning support adviser, at the lecturer’s request. Four of the seven items in the marking criteria were explicitly linked to structure (introduction and focus statement; closing paragraph; sequencing; and sentence and paragraph structure), and the writing guide provided by the lecturer specifically directed students to use an introduction-body-conclusion structure and provided information about the purpose of each section within the essay structure. Even so, a sizeable number of students struggled to meet this criterion, with 31% of the essays lacking an identifiable introductory paragraph (see Table 10). While many students demonstrated difficulties mastering the typical essay structure, they were concentrating their source use within the body paragraphs,
as might be expected, and most were attempting to use the typical structure as they had been
instructed to do, which will become evident in the interview results presented in Chapter 5.

Qualitative findings

Introduction

Typically, students who used sources in the introduction were focussed on providing
definitions. In Excerpt 4.28, the student writer is defining a general term used in the task
description, using an accurately cited direct quotation (integral citation, author as adjunct in
prepositional phrase):

4.28) According to Bundy (2004), “behaviour is the result of the interaction between what
we believe and how we feel” (p. 43).

Nursing, multilingual Filipino dominant, local, 18

These definitions were also used to identify the model that they were directed to use in the
assignment, as in Excerpt 4.29 (paraphrase, non-integral nonreporting citation):

4.29) The transtheoretical model uses stages of change to integrate processes and
principles of change across major theories of intervention (Australian Government,
2010).

Nursing, monolingual, 27

Students also frequently used attribution in the introduction to identify the originator of a
model or theory (Excerpt 4.30, paraphrase, non-integral nonreporting citation):

4.30) The transtheoretical model of behaviour change was developed by Prochaska and
DiClemente (Barkway, 2009).

Physiotherapy, multilingual Hindi dominant, local, 31

Finally, attribution contained in the introductions was also characterised by facts and
statistics. In Excerpt 4.31 (paraphrase, non-integral nonreporting citation), the student writer
is indicating the scope of the health risk behaviour he has chosen as the focus of his assignment:

4.31) *Tobacco smoking in Australia is the leading cause of preventable death, making it one of the country's most widespread health risk behaviours (Cancer Council, 2010).*

Physiotherapy, monolingual, 31

In each of these excerpts, there are no reporting verbs or modality which the writer could use to indicate a position, and the reporting structures serve to present the cited information as unarguable propositions. From these examples, we can see that students were using attribution in the introduction to identify and define key concepts, establish the scope of the discussion by identifying a specific behaviour and providing context in ways that are consistent with what an introduction needs to achieve in a piece of academic writing. They tended to do so in ways that did not create opportunities to explore other positions or viewpoints.

*Body*

Definitions and lists of characteristics were also the main purposes of attribution in the body paragraphs, and the structure and method of integration did not appear to be markedly different in the body than in any of the other essay sections. However, students were more likely to use attribution to provide an explanation in the body than they were in the introduction or conclusion.

For example, in Excerpt 4.32 (paraphrase, non-integral nonreporting citation), the student writer is using cited information to explain patient behaviour:

4.32) *They may be of the belief that they are immune to these health issues, and that they will deal with these issues if or when, they begin to affect them [2] or they have
tried unsuccessfully so many times to quit that they have simply given up

(Zimmerman, Olsen & Bosworth, 2000).

Physiotherapy, monolingual, 19

The language choices in this paraphrase are more dialogically expansive than the excerpts from the introductions presented in the previous section, with modal verbs (they may be of the belief) and more hedging (if or when). While these may represent the original author’s language, students were more likely to select these kinds of explanatory statements for inclusion in the body paragraphs than they were in the introductions.

Students also tended to incorporate evaluation in their use of attribution in the body paragraphs. As we saw in section 4.3.1, most of these student writers did not typically take an evaluative stance themselves but were more likely to present the evaluative positions of experts in their field. Much of the evaluation related to the model itself, and its usefulness or likelihood of success, as in Excerpt 4.33 (paraphrase, non-integral reporting citation):

4.33) The transtheoretical model has been shown to be successful as it suggests strategies to work with unmotivated people, which includes social support and working at whatever stage the person is at (Barkway 2009, p.127).

Nursing, multilingual English dominant, 25

In this excerpt, the student writer presented a positive evaluation of the model with a strong reporting verb (has been shown) and a non-integral citation. It is unclear, however, whether the cited author, Barkway, has demonstrated the success of the model, or if Barkway is reporting that others have shown it to be successful, an example of the ambiguity that Swales (2014) calls a hanging citation.

Students also used evaluative language to juxtapose opposing viewpoints, and while this infrequently occurred, it was most likely in the body paragraphs. Excerpt 4.34 is drawn from the end of the first body paragraph of this student’s essay:
4.34) [1] The precontemplation stage recognised by Prochaska, J.O. & Verlicor, W.F., 1997, West (2005) that it needs to change as it give the individual soft outcomes with in the first two stages of the transtheoretical model. [2] The authors both believe that it is not founded on evidence and can be damaging to progress. [3] However according to Glanz, Rimmer & Viswanath (2008) it enables the individual constant reassurance [4] and it naturally occurs in people who want to facilitate change. [5] Overall the precontemplation stage has been adapted to suit many addictive health risk behaviours [6] and Glanz, Rimmer & Viswanath (2008) present strong argument within their writings.

Nursing, monolingual, 18

This student writer is comparing conflicting opinions on the value of a theoretical model and staking a position on one side. She presents a critique of the model, based upon information from two authors who are sceptical of its benefits in the first and second c-units of the excerpt. The negative critique of the model (is not founded and can be damaging) is preceded by a positive reporting verb attaching the proposition to the authors’ beliefs, rather than demonstrated facts (the authors both believe), perhaps hinting at the student writer’s disagreement with their critique. This critique is followed by a statement from another source refuting the critique in the third and fourth c-units, and then by the student writer’s positive evaluation of the refuting author’s arguments in the fifth and sixth c-units. The verbs become more direct (it enables, it naturally occurs) and while the student herself does not directly criticise either the model or the positions presented within her sources, by characterising the arguments of the refuting author as strong she is in effect borrowing their conclusions.

The unclear pronoun references throughout the excerpt obscure the student writer’s meaning somewhat, and she is struggling to draw a distinction between the characteristics of the model and its stages and how the health care practitioner works within them. However, we can see
this student taking steps toward the creation of a heteroglossic text, and her voice is beginning to emerge. As we will see in the interview data, most students said they preferred to avoid engaging with sources that present conflicting viewpoints, and this was borne out by the limited number of examples in the corpus. The student writer of Excerpt 4.34 is extending herself beyond what most students felt comfortable attempting in this task, and while these first attempts are not always entirely successful, they should be acknowledged as a positive development.

The excerpts in this section have shown that while students are still using a significant proportion of their attribution to define terms in their body paragraphs, they are also making a shift toward evaluation and explanation in this section, more so than in the introduction. While they are not staking out positions for themselves, for the most part, they are using their sources in ways that make sense within the structure of the essay. Some are beginning to experiment with citation structures that support their authorial voice, and this kind of engagement with the sources is most likely to occur in the body paragraphs.

**Conclusion**

Evaluation was the most common purpose of attribution in the conclusions. In Excerpt 4.35, the student writer provides a summary of the health care provider strategies identified throughout the essay, and justifies them as more likely to be successful than traditional approaches:

4.35) *In conclusion, the process of facilitating change using planned strategies, realistic goals, motivational interviewing, evaluation and therapeutic communication techniques at the precontemplative and contemplative stages often result in more positive outcomes compared to the traditional approach of advice giving* (Britt, Hudson, & Blampied, 2004).

Nursing, monolingual, 25
Once again, the student writer allows their source to make the judgement, but the reader could reasonably assume that the student writer shares the position taken in the cited source. This kind of summative evaluation is entirely appropriate at this stage of the essay, and the reliance on sources to express evaluations or judgments is consistent with citation practices demonstrated by these student writers in the other sections of their essays.

The student writer in Excerpt 4.36 identifies a key goal of the healthcare provider as worthwhile and supports that evaluation by referring to a source:

4.36)  *Moving an individual from one stage to another is proposed to be a worthwhile goal because it will increase the likelihood that this person will subsequently achieve the termination stage (West, 2005).*

Physiotherapy, monolingual, 24

This student is evaluating not individual health care provider strategies but the overall aims of the implementation of the model. The passive construction of the sentence makes it unclear who is proposing the action to be *a worthwhile goal,* highlighting a challenge students faced with non-integral reporting citations, passive constructions and evaluative language. Even so, the kinds of evaluation demonstrated in Excerpt 4.35 and 4.36 seem to indicate an awareness of the purpose of a conclusion in an academic text and reflect appropriate use of sources to achieve that purpose.

These definitions look very similar to those located in other sections, except for the summary phrase tacked onto the beginning. In Excerpt 4.37, the student writer returns to defining key terms from the task description:

4.37)  *In conclusion, as stated by Engs (2003), an addictive health risk behaviour is classified as “any activity, substance, object or behaviour that has become the major focus of a person’s life to the exclusion of other activities, or that has begun to harm the individual or others physically, mentally, or socially is considered an*
Some students also redefined the model to open their concluding paragraph, as in Excerpt 4.38:

4.38) *In summary, the TTM identifies the stages an individual goes through when making health behaviour changes.* (Barkway, 2009)

The student writers of Excerpts 4.37 and 4.38 are recycling familiar citation practices first employed in their introductory paragraphs and using information from their sources to remind their readers of the context of the discussion, prioritising the defining of terms and concepts above their application even in the final stages of their writing. In Excerpts 4.37 and 4.38, the evaluative language of Excerpts 4.35 and 4.36 is absent; these student writers seem to approach the conclusion as an introduction that happens at the end, using their sources to re-establish key concepts rather than to affirm main points.

4.4.2 Rhetorical purpose

Rhetorical purpose relates to where students focussed their attribution in relation to the stages of the essay. Within the overall structure, students moved through a number of rhetorical stages as they responded to the task. Students needed to describe the Transtheoretical Model of Behaviour change and identify their chosen health risk behaviour; however, to answer the question successfully, students needed to apply the model, rather than just describe it. This section identifies where students chose to dedicate their source use within the rhetorical structure of their essays – to defining the model and behaviours or applying the model through identifying health care provider strategies.
Quantitative findings

Table 22 shows that 56% of the attributed c-units in the corpus were used to describe the model or risk behaviours ($M = .56, SD = .23$) and 44% of the c-units were used to apply the model ($M = .44, SD = .23$).

Table 22: Rate of attribution according to rhetorical purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Language background</th>
<th>Multilingual visa status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 167$</td>
<td>$n = 125$</td>
<td>$n = 90$</td>
<td>$n = 77$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describing the model and risk behaviour</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying the model</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no statistically significant differences in the rate of attribution allocated to describing the model and risk behaviour in either course group (nursing, $M = .58, SD = .22$; physiotherapy, $M = .50, SD = .24$), language background group (monolingual, $M = .55, SD = .24$; multilingual, $M = .57, SD = .21$), or between multilingual local ($M = .57, SD = .23$) and international students ($M = .57, SD = .15$). As these two are dichotomous variables and the rates are dependent on each other, the attribution rate for applying the model did not need to be statistically tested.

These findings indicate that the beginning student writers who participated in this study typically used a little more attribution to describe the model and the risk behaviours in this task than they did to apply the model. The primary goal was for students to demonstrate they understood how a health care practitioner could implement the model to facilitate a change in patient behaviour, but students were a little less likely to use sources to achieve this goal.
Some students’ use of sources highlights a possible misinterpretation of the purpose of the task; they seem to approach describing the model and the risk behaviour and applying the model to practice as equally important goals in this task. The learning outcomes for the unit that apply to this task, however, ask students to discuss and think critically, not describe or define. This approach to the task appears to be consistent across course groups, language background, and multilingual visa status groupings, indicating that it is not primarily related to either course or English language competence.

Qualitative findings

Describing the model and risk behaviour

A common practice amongst the stronger writers in this study was to interweave their attributed statements dedicated to describing the model with their discussion of its application, instead of separating the two into different sections. In Excerpt 4.39, the opening statements of the second body paragraph began with a description of the stage:

4.39)  [1] Individuals in this stage have recognised needs to change and are starting to think of possible ways to achieve this (Walker, Payne, Smith & Jarrett, 2007). [2] Change is intended sometime in the future, usually defined as between 1 to 6 months (Bridle et al, 2005). [3] Procrastination and lack of self efficacy may result in delays to initiate change and could potentially lead to reverting to previous stage. [4] Individuals in the contemplation stages are more likely to profit from cognitive approaches to increase their motivation for engaging in behaviour change. [5] This can comprise discussing the benefits of changing behaviour and providing written materials illustrating the steps necessary to instigate the change process (Elder, Ayala & Harris 1999).

Once the context of the stage was established in the first two c-units of the excerpt, the student writer quickly moved to describe some barriers to change within the stage in the third
uncited c-unit, and then provided an attributed statement that named a specific strategy the health care provider can use with the patient within the stage in the final c-unit. By drawing on a number of source texts, this student writer has begun to move toward a more heteroglossic approach to her writing. Although there is some evidence of parenthetical plonking (Swales, 2014), she weaves together different voices and does so in a way that moves from description of the model through to application. Moving from large sections of text incorporated from a single source to more a more heteroglossic weaving of voices from several authors may represent a logical progression in the development of beginning writers, finally resulting in the development of the ability to include their own voice in the mix.

In contrast, many students provided lengthy descriptions of the model or its stages that were not connected to information about health care provider strategies or application, as in Excerpt 4.40:

4.40) [1] The precontemplation stage is when the person knows what the effects of smoking to their healths are, but still do not have an intention to quit (Barkway, 2009). [2] In this stage the person is denial, [3] do not understand that the behaviour is dangerous [4] and they only see the positive side of it. [5] Aside from that, they do not want to accept the disadvantages that they may get from the habit of smoking. [6] Queensland Government (2007) stated that this kind of people have not encountered any negative results of their behaviour, [7] they are unaware or have not been well informed about the consequences of the addiction that has been made because the group tends to avoid any information. [8] In this case, a person with smoking addiction does not want to leave smoking, does not want to understand its side effects which is basically denial.

In this excerpt, the student writer focusses the attribution on describing the stage and the patient’s behaviour within the stage, and the references to the risk behaviour are so general
that they could apply to almost anyone. In the sentences following this excerpt, the student writer briefly identifies very general health care provider strategies and then proceeds to provide another lengthy description of the second stage of the model. This student writer is also drawing on more than one source to present the same basic idea, keeping his focus clearly on description. It was common for the student writers in this study to allocate cited statements toward describing the risk behaviours that they had chosen to focus on in their essay.

Some students approached the task as though thoroughly defining their choice of risk behaviour were their primary goal. The student writer of Excerpt 4.41 dedicates a lengthy passage of her essay to a very clinical discussion of the health risk behaviour:

4.41) [1] Smoking is a risky behaviour as it affects health and death, [2] but even if it is dangerous for health there are still many people who apply this behaviour as part of their hobby. [3] Through the use of tobacco, smoking, has been shown to be one of the most addictive habits in the generation today. [4] Tobacco contains a lot of nicotine which is very dangerous to the health of every individual. [5] “Tobacco smoke is a toxic mix of more than 7,000 chemicals and compounds. [6] These chemicals and compounds reach a person’s lungs quickly every time the person inhales. [7] The blood then carries the toxicants to every organ in the body” (Benjamin, 2011, p.158). [8] In addition, if the person uses tobacco every single day their body and mind will get used to it and makes it harder to quit. [9] Cancer Research UK (2009) reported that the possible reasons why people smokes are that it copes stress and give relaxation to the body, to be able to have friends, to be confident, relief loneliness or just bored and or influence from family and friend. [10] As what is stated above smoking is a very risky behaviour. [11] To be able to help those people who are in precontemplation and contemplation stage of change that have addictive behaviour strategies will be the focused to help them
The writer’s focus here is squarely on the behaviour, with minimal information about the model. Her choices here seem to indicate her belief in the importance of thoroughly describing the clinical implications of the health risk behaviour, which is a misinterpretation of the task and her lecturer’s requirements. It is important to note that this particular unit was quite different from the other subjects students would have been studying in the first semester of their degree. The subject content of psychological approaches to health and wellbeing, including developmental theories and frameworks, would have been very different from what students encountered in other units on the fundamentals of nursing, which dealt more with clinical practice and human biological sciences. The student’s choices in the excerpt may also reflect a lack of experience with the role of a health care provider. Her focus was on pathologies and clinical descriptions of behaviour, rather than on the facilitation of behaviour change described in the task description.

While their focus was on the risk behaviour, students often brought in findings of published research but seemed to get somewhat lost in the findings. The student writer who produced Excerpt 4.42 included quite detailed information about the participants of the study:

4.42) [1] Example: "These 794 subject were smoking and seriously considering quitting within the next 6 months: [2] however they were not considering quitting the next 30 days, had not make an quit attempt of 24 hr in the past year, or both, [3] They represented 54.2% of the total sample smoker, were 66% female and averaged 41 years of age. [4] these contemplation © subject averaged 29 per day, began smoking at the age of 17, and had smoked for about 23 years" (Prochaska, James O, 1991)
These statistics about the participant sample are dropped into the paragraph, unexplained, before the student writer moves on in the next paragraph to list general health care provider strategies associated with the transtheoretical model. Those strategies were not tied to how many attempts the smoker had made to quit, or how recently, nor were they related to the age or gender of the smoker. This student writer tried to engage with research that was relevant to her topic, but she was unable to identify which aspects of the research would have been most useful to her in this task. Students appeared to be aware that they needed to choose credible sources for this assignment, and published research articles had been identified in lectures and tutorials as being highly credible. They attempted to summarise those findings but demonstrated a lack of awareness of how to apply them in the context of the assignment. They tended to either select information from the articles that was not relevant in the specific context (as the detailed description of the participant sample in 4.42) or chose to use the findings to achieve the writing goal that was most familiar to them: defining and describing, most frequently the health risk behaviour. Very rarely were research findings used to justify the choice of a particular health care provider strategy or method for implementing the model.

These student writers demonstrated their understanding of what should be prioritised in the task through the allocation of their attribution. The students who received lower marks often dedicated lengthy passages and a significant amount of their attribution to descriptions of the behaviour (as in Excerpts 4.39-41), while students who received the highest marks on this task tended to have very few or no attributed statements about the risk behaviour. In informal conversations with me, the lecturer in charge described the selection of the risk behaviour as of secondary importance to him and his understanding of the task; it was included in the task almost as a case study element, to help students focus their efforts to apply the model and
avoid a general description. However, this was not explicitly stated in the unit outline, the essay writing guide provided to students or the support lecture.

**Applying the model**

The students in this study also used their sources to satisfy the main requirement of this task: to apply the specified model to a health risk behaviour and demonstrate how it could be used in practice. As we saw in the previous section, the student writers who were more successful in this task tended to link their discussion of health care provider strategies to a particular stage or the characteristics a patient might display in that stage, and they allocated their sources accordingly.

In Excerpt 4.43, the student writer, who was relatively more successful in this task, focussed on the first stage of the model:

4.43)  

[1] If the patient is in the pre-contemplation stage due to denial it is important to establish trust with the patient so that the health care professional can effectively explore the reasons why the patient was brought in for treatment. [2] The intervention strategy used at this stage is motivational interviewing. [3] Motivational interviewing assists patients in identifying a reason to change. [4] This involves techniques such as expressing empathy, rolling with resistance, developing discrepancies and promoting self efficacy (W, Miller & S, Rollnick 2002). [5] Expressing empathy with the patient through reflective listening will let the patient know that the health care professional understands what they are saying and feeling. [6] Studies have shown that an "empathetic therapist style was predictive of decreased drinking while a confrontational style predicted increased drinking" G, Zimmerman. C, Olsen and M, Bosworth (2000).

Nursing, monolingual, 31
In this excerpt, the student writer linked the strategy to the health care provider’s goals within the stage. The excerpt contains two cited c-units, both of which relate to applying the model, but in different ways. The cited information from Miller and Rollnick in c-unit four provides supporting information about the health care provider strategy, while the quotation from Zimmerman, Olsen and Bosworth in c-unit six uses research findings to justify specific techniques. The information drawn from the sources is quite brief and integrated into the structure of the paragraph and is used to identify and justify health care provider strategies (studies have shown), not merely to describe them.

The student writer of Excerpt 4.44 also achieved a high mark on the task and wove together a paragraph of her own words and information from her sources:

4.44) [1] The main goal of intervention strategies in Precontemplation therefore involves facilitating the movement of individuals into the Contemplation stage. [2] To achieve this, recognition of the fact that a problem exists is necessary. [3] As suggested by Eastwood et al (2004), such recognition may be achieved through the implementation of “cognitive, affective and evaluative strategies”; reflective of the Processes of Change recommended for Precontemplation. [4] Consciousness raising is the first of these processes, referring to the introduction of the client to the extent of their behaviour. [5] Simple, confronting statements such as, “You are an alcoholic” may be all that is required to expose the client to their behaviour. [6] However, research demonstrates that techniques such as ‘Normative Feedback’ are more effective in achieving this goal. [7] Normative Feedback involves the comparison of the client’s behaviour pattern with the normative range for the majority population. [8] For example, the client’s perceived drinking rate could be contrasted with that recorded by the health professional, or alternatively with the average drinking rate of peers. [9] Bosari and Carey (2000) found a single, brief Normative Feedback session resulted in a significant reduction in the consumption of alcoholic drinks per week among college students, highlighting its effectiveness as an intervention strategy.

Physiotherapy, monolingual, 28
The excerpt begins with the student writer establishing a goal for the health care provider in the first two uncited c-units; she then drew upon a source to suggest a category of strategies that could be used to achieve the goal in the third c-unit. The specific technique that could be used to implement such a health care provider strategy was not cited, and the technique was evaluated as less effective than her next suggestion. The discussion of the second technique (Normative Feedback) begins with a claim that research demonstrates its effectiveness, in the sixth c-unit, followed by a definition of the technique and a report of research findings as supporting evidence in c-units seven and eight. The first general reference to research in c-unit six may serve as the beginning of a kind of frame around the information incorporated from Bosari and Carey’s article, with the final citation providing the next boundary. This writer clearly understood the task and created a well-structured heteroglossic text that is dialogically expansive in its incorporation of alternative health care provider strategies drawn from different sources.

It was relatively common for students to identify specific health care provider strategies without providing supporting citations; more than three-quarters of the c-units that were identified as related to strategies did not include attribution. While the attribution in the corpus was relatively evenly distributed across the two coding categories (describing the model and applying the model), many student writers may have been more engaged with the task’s requirements to apply the model than the statistical findings appear to indicate. They just may not always have been consistent in citing their sources as they did so, and they may have developed their own strategies based on what they learned throughout the unit of study. Uncited strategies also occurred in the texts of students who were less successful on the task, such as the student writer who produced Excerpt 4.45:
Once the patient's goals are created by the patient with guidance from the health professional, the patient's current incentive can once again be questioned. The patient can use alternative forms of tobacco, such as low tar or nicotine cigarettes.

Also several other products such as nicotine patches and gum can be used. Coping strategies such as emotion-focused strategies can also be instituted. This allows the smoker to not be confronted with temptations to smoke by carrying out various activities as a substitute to smoking. (Barkway 2009)

As a health professional you may suggest activities which the patient may enjoy, such as exercise or simply choosing to go to smoke-free restaurants. It is important that as the health professional you advise the patient to surround him or herself with a healthy environment.

Physiotherapy, multilingual English dominant, local, 18

In this excerpt, the student writer presents four different strategies the health care provider could use with the patient who wants to stop smoking; a brief explanation for the third strategy (emotion-focused strategies) includes a citation in c-unit five, but there is little practical information about how this might be implemented. The excerpt consists of a list of potential strategies, most of which are uncited, unconnected to patient needs or the characteristics demonstrated in the stage.

Student writers who were less successful in the task also tended to provide lengthy descriptions of publications or examples of existing programs, as in Excerpt 4.46:

There are many Government campaigns, which are aimed at individuals in the Contemplation stage, and one, which is highly regarded by many people who have succeeded in quitting smoking, is this radio recording. “The day you stop smoking, your body starts to repair itself. In eight hours, excess carbon monoxide is out of your bloodstream in five days, most nicotine has left your body in three months, your lung function begins to improve. In a year, your
risk of a heart attack has halved and your risk of lung cancer is falling too. [8] Every cigarette you don’t smoke is doing you good. [9] Stop smoking today.” (Australian Government Canberra 2010). [10] This radio recording gives individuals direct and correct information about the benefits of quitting [11] and this is what people in the Contemplation stage of quitting need.

Nursing, monolingual, 18

This student writer focussed on describing a resource that could be used by a health care provider strategy within the Contemplation stage. However, a government campaign is not a strategy that would be implemented by a health care provider. Neither does the student writer indicate how this kind of resource could be useful within a patient/caregiver interaction, although she does attempt to link to patient needs within the stage. The citation is a lengthy direct quote from a single source presenting information from the broadcast left in the form of a direct address to a listener. The student writer has made little attempt to incorporate the quotation into the paragraph, a challenge many students experienced when attempting to incorporate quotations, as we saw in section 4.3.2 of this chapter.

When students provided information about how to apply the model, the weaker writers tended to segment their ideas into much larger chunks, separating the health care provider strategies from the stages of the model, while the writers who were more successful on the task wove together different aspects they were required to address in their paragraphs. Both more and less successful writers were inconsistent in their citing practices, and much of the content of the essays that dealt with strategies went uncited.

4.5 Summary

In this chapter, I have provided the findings for the first strand of the study, the textual analysis, which has a two-part research question. RQ1a is concerned with identifying the kinds of intertextual practices that are characteristic of the writing of first-year
undergraduates in an academic writing task, and the frequency of their use. The quantitative results associated with the RQ1a indicate that these students used more paraphrases than direct quotes in their writing; they used non-integral citations far more frequently than integral citations; and they concentrated their source use within the body paragraphs of their essays.

The qualitative findings related to RQ1a seemed to indicate that these students were attempting to demonstrate their understanding of expectations and compliance with task requirements through their citation practices. However, there was what appeared to be an understandable tendency to rely heavily on the wording used in the required text for the unit of study, particularly when describing the specific stages of the model that were the focus of the task. The authors of the required texts were regularly named in integral citations throughout the corpus. There were numerous examples of lengthy quotations and paraphrases from one source, often comprising entire sections of an essay, with minimal interpretation or contextualisation of the source information.

Some students, on the other hand, demonstrated the ability to weave together information from their sources, carefully selecting words and phrases to quote or paraphrase and combining passages from several sources into a coherent paragraph. Some of these writers also moved logically from one rhetorical purpose to another, using cited statements to identify characteristics of the model and its stages and connecting that information to cited statements identifying relevant health care provider strategies. Even these writers appeared to rely heavily on the words and phrases taken from their source texts, however, and many demonstrated what appeared to be patchwriting practices that emphasised the voices of their cited authors, pushing their own voices into the background of the texts and providing little contextualisation of the source content. Through the analysis, I developed an extensive familiarity with the corpus. Passages from particular sources (especially those that were
required texts for the course) appeared repeatedly and were often phrased in similar (and in some cases identical) ways across a number of the essays produced by these student writers. Without a systematic comparison of the student texts with their cited sources, however, I cannot with entire certainty identify these practices as patchwriting, although I do believe these writers were engaging in patchwriting behaviour.

Another finding relates to the choices students made about when to cite their sources. The quantitative findings show that these student writers tended to focus slightly more of their cited statements on descriptions of the model and the health risk behaviour than they did on suggesting health care provider strategies for implementing the model or discussing the role of the health care provider. On the other hand, these student writers tended to accompany factual information (like definitions or statistics) with a citation. Together, the quantitative and the qualitative results of the textual analysis seem to indicate that while these student writers recognised the need to use sources in their academic writing, they were uncertain about how to employ and cite information from their source texts once they moved beyond the familiar tasks of defining terms and providing facts.

RQ1b focussed on three specific factors that may have influenced the students’ intertextual practices: course of study, language background and visa status. These factors were the focus of the quantitative analysis for RQ1b, and ANOVA tests were used to answer this research question. The findings showed consistency across the language groups and degree courses, perhaps surprisingly. The intertextual practices of the physiotherapy students, who had met a much higher entry threshold, were not markedly different from those of the nursing students. Neither were there statistically significant differences between students from monolingual English backgrounds and those from multilingual backgrounds.
Students from diverse language backgrounds and with a variety of prior learning experiences were all in the process of learning the new language of academic citation. This was borne out by the qualitative textual analysis, in that examples of challenges were found in the writing of students from all groups, as were strengths. This is not to discount the very real challenges faced by students who are learning and writing in what is not their native language, but the findings of this study appear to show that there are some important commonalities amongst beginning student writers from diverse language backgrounds and educational experiences in their approaches to intertextuality and academic citation.

In the following chapter, I will present the findings of the talk around text strand of the study, which will focus on a much smaller group of six students. As I investigate their interview data and examine specific passages of their written texts, I will draw on the dimensions of the coding scheme presented in this chapter, to consider these dimensions within the context of the students’ articulation of their understandings of intertextuality and their own intertextual practices.
Chapter 5: Results: Talk around text analysis

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the talk around text analysis by examining six novice writers’ understandings of intertextual practices in general (research question 2) and their understandings of their own intertextual practices for a specific writing task (research question 3). The written tasks that appear in this chapter are from the same essay corpus explored in Chapter 4. The current chapter is organised around individual profiles of the six novice writers in the interview group. Each profile includes a brief introduction to the writer and an overview of previous writing experiences and intertextual practices, drawing on the concept of the autobiographical self (Ivanič, 1998, 2005). This is followed by an analysis of the data produced during our text-based discussions, focusing on the writers’ discoursal and authorial selves (Ivanič, 1998, 2005).

Each student chose two excerpts from their essay to discuss; these could be places where they were satisfied with their use of sources or where they were uncertain or concerned. The analysis of each excerpt is presented as follows:

- the text of the essay excerpt (typically a single paragraph), with a brief overview of its positioning and function within the essay
- an emic perspective on the excerpt, including the student’s reflections on their text-specific intertextual practices, in their own words
- an etic analysis of the text and the students’ reflections, providing my own response to the students’ texts and reflections

5.1.1 Overview of the interview group

The overview of the interview group presented in Table 23 provides demographic information about the student writers whose texts were included in the talk around text
analysis. These students were chosen to ensure representation in the interview group across the degree course, gender, language background, visa status, and level of attainment in the task. (The methodology chapter contains a more detailed explanation of the sample selection process.) The profiles in the following sections are presented in the same order as they appear in Table 23.

Table 23: Overview of the interview group, student-reported demographic information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physiotherapy</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katrijn</td>
<td>Ana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language background</th>
<th>Physiotherapy</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multilingual</td>
<td>Multilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multilingual</td>
<td>Multilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multilingual</td>
<td>Multilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multilingual</td>
<td>Multilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>English dominant, Dutch heritage language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>English dominant, Croatian heritage language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>English dominant, Nepali dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>English dominant, Nepali dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>English dominant, Nepali dominant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visa status</th>
<th>Physiotherapy</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Ana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Laurent</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent resident</td>
<td>Bibek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International student visa</td>
<td>Ana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Physiotherapy</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Katrijn</td>
<td>Ana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Laurent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Bibek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Physiotherapy</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;19</td>
<td>Katrijn</td>
<td>Ana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>Laurent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Bibek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;19</td>
<td>Ana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Physiotherapy</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High distinction</td>
<td>Katrijn</td>
<td>Ana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>Laurent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>Bibek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Ana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Profile 1: Katrijn

Katrijn, a female Australian citizen from a multilingual background, was in her late teens at the time of our interview. Katrijn’s family immigrated to Australia from Holland when she was two years old. At home, her family spoke Dutch (her parents’ native language), as well as English: “It’s not exactly straight Dutch because we’ve been away for so long. We don’t
exactly know what anymore!” She characterised herself as English dominant, describing her reading and writing abilities in Dutch as that of a five-year-old. She was more confident in her ability to communicate verbally but did not describe herself as fluent. Katrijn is an example of a generation of Australian university students, often labelled Generation 1.5, who emigrated as children with their parents. Her parents did not have English as their first language, and Katrijn is not monolingual, but neither is she fully literate in the other language used in her home.

Katrijn was keen to begin university, and she went straight from high school into the physiotherapy course, which satisfied her fascination with health and the human body. Her decision to attend university was strongly influenced by her family, and their association with higher education was a key aspect of Katrijn’s autobiographical self. Both her parents have PhDs, and her father was the first in his family (which she described as poor) to attend university. She clearly stated that education “is foremost and comes before absolutely everything else” in her family, a belief she shares:

    Education, that’s what you need to … get a good life, so I always assumed that no matter what I would always go to uni.

5.2.1 Academic and intertextual practices

Katrijn had significant support for her university learning at home. She and her mother, a published writer, often discussed the characteristics of academic texts, specifically the importance of structure, and this provided her with an academic perspective she built upon in her university studies. These discussions helped give Katrijn the confidence to determine what she needed to do in her university writing, having been exposed to it “her whole life”. The family also had a large library at home, so she felt comfortable making sense of complex texts. When asked how she judged whether sources were credible, Katrijn replied: “By
reading through them. I read a lot so it’s not exactly a big deal for me.” Katrijn received one of the highest marks in the class for her essay, one of the few high distinctions awarded.

Katrijn’s textual and intertextual practices were also strongly influenced by her prior educational experiences. Much of what she knew about academic writing she learned from her high school history teacher, who provided her with regular, weekly opportunities to practice her writing and a significant amount of ongoing feedback, particularly about how to structure an argument. This same teacher also helped Katrijn develop an understanding of the kinds of texts that are valued as sources in academic writing. Through a cyclical process of drafting and feedback, she and her history teacher engaged in personal discussions over time that helped Katrijn understand how to identify and “properly use a source”. The focus of these conversations was not on citation or referencing, but on how to select specific sections of a source text to use as evidence, and how to incorporate information into the sentence (“not just fling them in, and only use the most specific parts”).

Katrijn stressed the importance of the quality of her sources and the depth of her reading when describing her approach to academic writing, mentioning Medline and other databases by name. Her family library at home was the starting point for much of her research and reading, and she described enjoying reading academic texts, particularly case studies. She sought diverse opinions and deliberately incorporated different points of view to provide balance in her writing. Katrijn said she had never specifically been taught how to paraphrase, but “I was already alright at that, so I didn’t exactly need help”.

5.2.2 Text-specific intertextual practices

Katrijn described making a deliberate choice to approach her writing for this assignment from the perspective of a health care provider (as she understood it) and described taking on this role to inform her library research and reading, deliberately shaping her discoursal self. She
expressed some dissatisfaction with this unit of study, because “psychology, it’s all so
different [from the other units in her degree] and really, really subjective”. Consequently, she
sought help with this task from other students who were studying psychology and borrowed
books from them to inform her reading. Katrijn used our conversation as an opportunity to
ask some detailed questions about her choices related to source use and the APA referencing
system. Her questions seemed to highlight an underlying uncertainty about her intertextual
practices that lingered beneath the confidence she portrayed.

*Translating previous practices to a new context*

Katrijn selected her opening paragraph as an example of where she believed she had used her
sources well. This paragraph, presented in Excerpt 5.1, is the introduction to her assignment:

5.1)

[1] In Australia smoking is the largest cause of premature death. [2] The
extensiveness and expense behind this poor health habit have led to the need
for behaviour change. [3] Prochaska et al. (1983) devised the transtheoretical
model [TTM], a behaviour change theory containing: five stages of change, the
pros and cons of change, self efficacy versus temptation and ten processes of
change. [4] Despite the excellent attempt to describe behaviour change "no
single theory can account for all the complexities of behaviour change. [5] A
more comprehensive model is likely to emerge from integration across major
theories" (J. Glanz et al. 2008). [6] This becomes apparent in a close study of
the first two stages: pre-contemplation, not intending to change within the next
six months and contemplation: planning to make a change within six months.

In this excerpt, Katrijn defined the model and identified the stages she would focus on in her
essay, and she introduced what she called her main argument with a direct quotation. Her
argument, which was woven throughout her body paragraphs, is a critique of the model in
that she points out how the model is insufficient on its own, an example of her confident
discoursal self. Katrijn presented the TTM as a useful tool for practitioners when strengthened with complementary theories.

*Emic perspective*

Katrijn chose the quotation to include in this paragraph because she said:

I agreed with [it] quite a lot … I based a lot of my argument about that no single theory can account for all the complexities of behaviour change.

Katrijn described making a conscious decision about the direction her argument would take and articulating her argument early in the text in the introduction, although she was not entirely certain if this was a practice she should use in her university assignments. She described feeling unsure about stating her argument so clearly in her opening paragraph:

I’ve had mixed opinions about that. My English teacher said it wasn’t a good idea when I was at school, then another English teacher said she liked having points in the opening paragraph.

Although she was uncertain if this practice was useful to her in her university writing, having received what appeared to her to be contradictory advice about how to incorporate information in an introductory paragraph, in the end, Katrijn followed her gut instinct and did what she felt would help her create a strong argument in her assignment.

*Etic analysis*

Although Katrijn’s introduction reflects what she wanted to achieve in her essay rhetorically, providing a complete snapshot of her essay, her intertextual practices are arguably less successful, perhaps reflecting her attempts to reconcile her understandings of academic writing developed in her previous high school experiences with the instructions and advice she encountered within the unit of study.
Following a citation in c-unit three that outlined the components of the model she had been directed to use, Katrijn included a direct quotation from her textbook (c-units four and five) to present the controlling argument for her assignment: the necessity of drawing on additional theories to complement the model in order to successfully facilitate behaviour change. Although her high school experiences caused her to feel uncertain about taking such a strong stance in the introduction, this writing strategy is consistent with the essay writing guide provided by the lecturer: students were directed to “identify the relevant literature, find opinions that agree with you and use them to illustrate and convey your position” (see Appendix 8). Katrijn described using the quotation in c-units four and five for exactly this purpose. However, the point Katrijn seeks to make through her source use here is not entirely clear. The relationship she identifies between theories and model remains obscure, and it seems that she may be arguing for the necessity of another model altogether. Concluding the quote after c-unit four (identifying that no single model is sufficient) and then moving to c-unit six with its focus on the stages of the model may have resulted in a clearer statement of her argument and clearer representation of her authorial self. Although incorporating information as a direct quote may seem to be an easier practice to master for beginning writers, this excerpt demonstrates how challenging it can be to identify and incorporate the most relevant and useful sections of a source text.

Katrijn demonstrates other textual practices that appear to respond to requirements of the task as they are presented throughout the course materials. The assignment instructions (see Appendix 6) state that students “need to find and evaluate appropriate literature” (emphasis mine). Katrijn provided her qualified evaluation of the cited author’s presentation of the model (an excellent attempt to describe behaviour change), as she attempts to establish an authorial identity in her opening paragraph. The essay writing guide further states that “essays should follow an ‘argument’ not just present a collection of facts or rely on assertion
without evidence…”. The high distinction band descriptor for Sequencing in the marking criteria (Appendix 7) further states that “Arguments and support are provided in a logical order…”. Thus, in the course materials, the idea of constructing an argument in this assignment is linked to the use of sources as evidence and support in the task. Katrijn’s comments and her text indicate that she did intend to craft an argument throughout her assignment (representing a confident discoursal self), supported through her intertextual practices (linked to her authorial self).

The question remains, however, as to whether this writing task is an argumentative task; students were directed to use a specific model and to apply it within a particular context. They were not required to demonstrate that the model was appropriate, or to provide opposing viewpoints. This mismatch between the nature of the task and the general advice provided about academic writing may also have contributed to the relative clumsiness of Katrijn’s intertextual practices in this opening paragraph.

**The ownership of knowledge and citation practices**

The next paragraph Katrijn chose was her first body paragraph, presented in Excerpt 5.2, which immediately followed the introductory paragraph discussed above. She chose this paragraph because she felt uncertain about her citation practices.

5.2) **[1] Prochaska’s TTM is one of the most renowned methods of behaviour change.**

**[2] However it is limited, particularly in the first transition: between pre-contemplation and contemplation.** [3] **Thus treatment is made more effective through a collaboration of models and theories to create a more "comprehensive model".** [4] **Of the ten processes of change only three are relatable to the first transition: conscious raising, dramatic relief and environmental re-evaluation.**

**[5] A health professional would use conscious raising by informing the smoker of**
the statistics and risks: [6] nineteen thousand Australians die per-annum from smoking-related illnesses (ABS 2002). [7] The treatment would also incorporate dramatic relief, creating fear, guilt and grief within the patient through exposure to the negative consequences of smoking. [8] The final relevant process of change is environmental re-evaluation. [9] The adverse affects smoking has on the environment and the community, such as illness caused to others through passive smoking. [10] The aim of the health professional during this first transition is to change the cognition of the smoker so that the pros of cessation out-weight the cons. [11] Many of the suggestions for the first transition are readily available through education and government advertisement, [12] yet still individual's smoke. [13] This observation suggests that smokers require more than just the TTM to change behaviour. [14] In fact research (Glynn et al. 1992) shows there is little health professionals can do to change behaviour while following the TTM. [15] Furthermore computer programs were more effective in initiating change as the individual felt that they did not need ongoing personal support. [16] Rosen (2000) further criticised dependence on the TTM: “a one-size-fits-all blueprint for interventions are likely to be disappointed”, [17] rather a more personalised approach was needed with a combination of therapies suited to the individual. [18] The TTM alone provides a structure for behaviour change [19] however successful treatment needs to include various therapies.

In this quite lengthy and dense paragraph, Katrijn continued to build the argument she put forward in the introduction, continuing her critique of the Transtheoretical Model. She did so by focussing on the transition between the first two stages of the model, bringing in another theory introduced in the course (the processes of change) to supplement the TTM, and providing statistics related to the health risk behaviour.
**Emic perspective**

Katrijn chose this paragraph for us to discuss because she had specific questions about her citation practices:

The ideas that 19,000 Australians die per annum from smoking-related illnesses. I don’t know how to reference statistics… I said it’s from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, which is in the brackets, but I’m not exactly sure what I’m supposed to do.

We had a detailed discussion on in-text citations in the APA referencing system. This most visible aspect of manifest intertextuality was a prominent concern with this group of student writers. Katrijn felt that this statistic was well placed within her paragraph and that it provided a useful example of the kind of information that might motivate a smoker to change. She chose to use a statistic not merely to provide background information or context, but as a part of a strategy for the health care provider. Katrijn was not particularly concerned about her content; rather, she worried that she had not yet mastered the details of referencing different types of sources in APA.

In this paragraph, the statistics from ABS are accurately cited in c-unit six, while information about goals of the health care professional and the specific strategies that could be employed in this stage (provided in c-unit seven, ten and eleven) are not cited. Katrijn followed this same pattern consistently throughout her essay, and when asked why her recommended strategies for the health care provider were uncited, she said: “I made that up. I wrote that from what I’ve read so I pretty much collected various ideas and made my own.” In her mind, these were sentences she felt she had ownership of in a way she did not with statistics and research findings that were the product of someone else’s effort.

**Etic analysis**

Katrijn’s use of sources in this excerpt highlights the difficulties beginning students may experience identifying which information requires citation in their academic writing. In this
excerpt, there is a clear distinction between the practices related to factual information (i.e.,
statistics) and those related to practical knowledge acquired in classroom discussions and
self-directed library research and reading around the topic. Specifically, Katrijn carefully
cited data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics in c-unit six, but the processes of change
referred to in c-unit four (which were attributed to the textbook for the unit in other essays in
the corpus) are not cited here. While Katrijn may have “made up” the specific connection
between the strategy of consciousness-raising and the ABS statistic she chose to use, she did
not make up the strategy of consciousness-raising itself. However, Katrijn’s comments seem
to indicate that those sentences express knowledge that she gained from her reading,
knowledge that she felt she had ownership of, rendering citation unnecessary.

Katrijn’s success in the task can perhaps be explained by her determined attempt to create a
sustained argument that integrated what she learned in class with information from her wide
reading. She attempted to write a persuasive, heteroglossic text with a clear line of argument
throughout, a feature of her confident discoursal self. Although the paragraph as a whole is
very dense and overly long, Katrijn’s voice as a writer came through clearly, and she did not
shy away from making evaluations and judgements in the service of her argument. Her
determination to produce an argument helped her move beyond a basic description of the
model, and she was more focussed on strategies for the health care provider in the model and
the implementation of these than most students in the cohort. Problematically, the authors
referred to in the in-text citations in c-units six, fourteen, and sixteen are not included in her
list of sources at the end of the assignment. This practice continued throughout the essay, and
her in-text citations had little in common with the list of sources at the end of the essay. She
also received comments on errors in the formatting of her reference list but did not appear to
be penalised for them. In this case, Katrijn’s confident sense of ownership in her new
knowledge may have obscured potentially transgressive citation practices that could cause difficulties for her in future assignments.

5.3 Profile 2: Michael

Michael, a male student in his late twenties, comes from a multilingual family, although he is monolingual himself. Michael’s father speaks “a few languages”, and his grandparents are proficient speakers of Dutch and English. However, the immediate family spoke English at home when Michael was growing up, and Michael does not read, write or speak any language other than English. He completed a Technical and Further Education (TAFE) diploma in architecture after completing secondary school and worked for three years in the industry before returning to study. (In Australia, TAFE institutes are part of the vocational education and training (VET) sector, providing post-secondary education focussed on qualifications for employment (Australian Skills Quality Authority, n.d.).) Additionally, Michael studied for a year at another university in a general health sciences degree to develop an academic track record which helped him gain entry to the competitive physiotherapy degree program, transferring to his current course after successfully meeting the entry requirements.

Michael’s family is highly academic. He described his father, a teacher, as having “about four degrees”. Although his mother did not attend university, both of his siblings did. Michael returned to university study because he did not enjoy working in front of a computer and the lack of variety in the work he had been doing in architecture; he wanted to “use his brain” in a different way and have more contact with people, and to help them. He saw his university study as a deliberate effort to change direction in his life:

I started to get a concept of the future and thought, ok, this is not where I want to be. What do I need to do to change that?
Michael did not feel challenged in his previous educational experiences at secondary school or TAFE and described not taking his studies seriously, an aspect of his autobiographical self that featured prominently in our conversations about his learning. He attributed the low results he received on his final high school examinations to his lack of effort, rather than his abilities. He seemed engaged and positively challenged by his university studies and came across as a confident learner.

5.3.1 Academic and intertextual practices

Michael’s practices around managing his studies indicated that he was adjusting well to university. He articulated well-developed help-seeking practices. He was surrounded by a supportive network of friends and family members with experience of university study, and he sought support adjusting to the demands of university study from the university’s learning support services. He appeared comfortable with his overall approach toward his studies and clearly articulated his judgements about his strengths and weaknesses as a writer.

Michael used his academic writing to deepen his knowledge and hone his thinking around a topic. He was conscious of writing for an audience and described a successful essay as one that keeps the reader in mind, demonstrating an emerging awareness of how he could shape the representation of his discoursal self. The underlying science in the physiotherapy degree appealed to Michael; he enjoyed learning about anatomy and biology, partly because he felt that there are “right and wrong” answers in these disciplines. He described the subjective nature of knowledge and theory in the discipline of psychology as frustrating to him and specifically sought assistance with this assessment task from a friend studying psychology at another university.
Michael identified his abilities in searching for sources and evaluating their credibility as strengths. These were developed while he completed a unit of study at another university focused on preparing students for university-level writing:

there’s such an overload of information out there now. … [I]f you’re going to be looking for really specific things, you need to be able to know how to search properly.

This previous unit also included an introduction to the concept of levels of evidence, a commonly used framework in the health sciences for evaluating empirical research studies, developed by the National Health and Medical Research Council [NHMRC] (National Health and Medical Research Council, 2009). Michael encountered this same framework in his current degree, which he used to interpret and evaluate the research studies he used as evidence in his assignments. Michael’s developing identity as a practitioner in his chosen field (a feature of his discoursal self) can be seen in his recognition of the importance of this framework to writing in the health sciences as well as his ability to transfer this understanding from one learning environment to another.

5.3.2 Text-specific intertextual practices

While Michael came across as a confident writer, and he received a grade of distinction on the task, the two excerpts he identified for our conversations focussed on aspects of his source use with which he was dissatisfied.

**Practices of compliance**

Michael identified his first body paragraph, presented in Excerpt 5.3, as a place in his writing where his use of sources was descriptive, an issue he felt persisted throughout his assignment. This paragraph immediately follows the introduction of the essay:

5.3) **[1] During the precontemplation stage an individual may not be aware that their smoking behaviour is damaging to their health, [2] or they may underestimate**
the health risks involved. [3] A lack of knowledge or information about the health risks associated with smoking may contribute to this lack of awareness (Barkway & Kenny, 2009; Morrison et al., 2008). [4] Individuals who smoke can also be in denial about the negative consequences of smoking, and may lack self-efficacy, [5] that is, they lack belief in their own ability to be able to manage the process of change (Barkway & Kenny, 2009; Morrison et al., 2008). [6] Smokers may also experience other barriers to change, such as psychological and physiological dependence, and the unpleasant withdrawal symptoms associated with this dependence, such as anxiety, irritability and restlessness (Morrison et al., 2008; Jarvis, 2004). [7] As per the transtheoretical model, the person would need to progress the contemplation stage, in order to recognise their need to change (Barkway & Kenny, 2009).

This section focuses on defining the precontemplation stage of the model, relating it to the concept of denial, a key characteristic of the stage.

Emic perspective

Michael’s dissatisfaction with his writing in this excerpt mirrored his general frustration with the assessment task itself. In the task instructions, the students were directed to focus on the first two stages of the transtheoretical model:

You’ve got these two stages, one where a person doesn’t know they’ve got a problem, where they wouldn’t seek advice from a health practitioner in the first place, so I kind of found that difficult, what they wanted from us.

Michael felt stymied by this requirement; his writing options were limited for reasons that were not apparent to him, restricting his ability to explore more interesting aspects of the topic. Consequently, there is little in this paragraph that could be said to represent Michael’s own voice:
This is mostly stuff I just regurgitated from the textbooks. … That’s the first stage which I didn’t think was too terribly useful, so I just kind of came up with what I could from the textbook and paraphrased it.

Because Michael did not feel engaged with the task, he fell back on what he believed to be a descriptive approach in his use of sources, a significant effect on the representation of his authorial self. Almost every sentence in the paragraph is attributed to an outside source. The citations in c-units three, five, and six refer to more than one publication, and the information from multiple sources is synthesised. Michael indicated that this was a deliberate practice he employed to stay within the parameters of the task:

I was a fair bit over on the word count, and I had to do a lot of cutting down so wherever I could I tried to combine points. If two different authors were saying the same thing I would cite them both, or if I just wrote a sentence that incorporated two points, I would cite them. I don’t know if that’s the right way to do it.

He was also attempting to reconcile to feedback he had received on other assignments:

I’ve written an essay where basically after every sentence where I haven’t had a citation, they’ve put ‘question mark citation’ and others say that you’ve got too many citations, too many brackets going on there. I don’t really know the right way. I guess it depends on the marker.

Although Michael had received previous feedback on incorporating sources into his writing, he found it to be contradictory and confusing, leaving him uncertain about which practices were the “right way”. The requirements around source use in his assessment tasks across all his units of study appeared arbitrary to him, and he reported relying heavily on the sources provided by the teaching team in his assignments, to help him give them what he thought they wanted.
Etic analysis

Michael’s intertextual practices in this excerpt demonstrate how task requirements affect the intertextual choices student writers make. The academic writing of beginning students occurs within a constrained environment; the tasks they respond to and associated requirements are set by the lecturer, which limits students’ writing choices. Michael projected the discoursal identity of a student meeting his lecturer’s expectations, relying heavily on information from his textbooks to address stages he found less interesting and relevant to his role as a health care provider than the later stages of the model. He reluctantly complied with the requirements of the task to focus on the early stages. While doing so, he employed a relatively sophisticated intertextual practice, synthesising information from several sources throughout the paragraph to create a heteroglossic text, as opposed to summarising each source separately (see c-unit two). This kind of intertextual practice has been identified as characteristic of the writing of more experienced academic writers. Interestingly, Michael adopted this practice, however, not to achieve his own writing goals but to stay within the prescribed word limit for the task. Even though he did not like the writing task, or the kind of writing he felt compelled to produce to respond to the task, many of his practices are very sound.

Practices of resistance

The second excerpt Michael identified, presented in Excerpt 5.4, is another example of where he was not confident with his use of sources. The excerpt occurs in a paragraph from the body of the essay that follows the previous excerpt:

5.4) [1] There are a couple of issues, however, that have not been addressed. [2] this essay suggests methods for changing the conceptions of the client from a pre contemplative to contemplative outlook, but does so without addressing why the
client has sought counsel in the first place. [3] A person in the precontemplation stage, by definition, would see no need to seek help for their addiction. [4] Furthermore in reference to the methodology itself, there is some suggestion that factors such as self efficacy and motivation are not improved through the interventions described above but are improved as a result of having taken action. [5] This is not the only criticism of the model, [6] it is also suggested that simply relying on an intention to change is not a valid predictor of future behaviours. [7] A better predictor of behaviour is actions taken in the past (Morrison et al., 2008). [8] This however leaves a grim prognosis for the smoker, [9] and therefore it seems that a proactive approach to behaviour change is better than none at all.

After several body paragraphs describing the early stages of the model and strategies for the health care provider relevant to those stages, Michael critiques the Transtheoretical Model in this paragraph. Additionally, in the first c-units of the paragraph, the health care provider strategies presented earlier in the essay are explicitly criticised.

Emic perspective

In our discussion, Michael indicated that he did not originally intend to include this paragraph in his essay. He added it only after seeking feedback on his draft from an academic literacy specialist in the university’s learning support unit:

I don’t think it was one of my best essays … because I had difficulty with the question, actually. I’d written the entire essay and I had done my referencing and everything and I was completely ready to hand in when I saw [the academic literacy specialist], which was probably a mistake. (laughs) … I felt like it was a bit patchy after that, because I didn’t want to change it too much.
During the consultation, the specialist highlighted the need for an essay to move beyond
description toward discussion. Michael described leaving the consultation unsure of what he
needed to do. Reluctant to make changes to his writing at this point, he sought a second
opinion:

I had a long conversation with a guy who had just finished up a psychology degree …
and he kind of guided me. He told me that if you say something, you’ve got to find
something that looks at the other side of it.

Michael interpreted this to mean that he needed to include a critique of the model and drafted
the paragraph presented in Excerpt 5.4 as a result. He found bringing in theoretical
information from his sources to discuss what he saw as a practical problem frustrating:

It’s a very practical thing, quitting smoking, and … I just find talking about all this
theory not very helpful.

Etic analysis

This excerpt is especially revealing because it highlights the ambivalence beginning students
often feel towards the context and requirements of university academic writing tasks.

Michael’s resistance to the practices he was advised to adopt appears to have influenced his
textual and intertextual practices in Excerpt 5.4, impacting the representation of his authorial
self in this text. In this paragraph, Michael is critiquing the model, the writing task and his
own response to the task at the same time, using his sources to do so. As a result, his points
are not always easy to follow.

From the beginning, Michael was unconvinced by the need to apply theory to what he saw as
a practical problem. He was also frustrated by the task’s requirement to focus on the first two
stages of the model. We can see this in e-unit four, where he incorrectly uses the term
‘methodology’ in his critique of the Transtheoretical Model as he draws his reader’s attention
to the limited role played by the health care practitioner in these early stages. While Michael
sought feedback on his writing and acted on the advice he received, he remained unconvinced about the practices he felt obligated to take up in response to that advice. Michael was one of the few writers in the cohort to include a critique of the model in his essay, and he did so because of the advice he received to include opposing viewpoints. It is unclear if the critique is Michael’s own or drawn from Morrison (explicitly cited in c-unit seven, but likely the source for c-units five-six as well). His engagement with his source text here is limited and ambiguous. The passive voice, tentative language, and non-integral citation appear to echo Michael’s ambivalence about both the subjective, theoretical nature of the behavioural model and his source use, distancing him from the propositions.

Michael’s motivations for taking up university study, rooted in aspects of his autobiographical self, included cultivating opportunities to “use his brain” in new ways and to exert greater control over the direction he took in life. In this writing context, however, Michael was encouraged to take up an authorial position that was unpersuasive to him, in a task that he perceived as constraining. Consequently, he appeared to resist the authorial identities that he believed were available to him, and his intertextual practices may reflect his disengagement from his writing in this task.

5.4 Profile 3: Laurent

Laurent is a male student from a French-Canadian background. He had been living in Australia as a permanent resident for about five years at the time of our interview and was in his late twenties. Laurent is multilingual; French is his dominant language (the language he “uses to think”), in which he can speak, read and write. Laurent described finding it difficult to express himself as well as he wished in written English, although he learned spoken English as a young child.
Laurent returned to university study as part of a career change. After completing a degree in film studies at a Canadian university, he worked as a video producer for several years, and this association with creative professional pursuits was an important aspect of his autobiographical self. While he appreciated the creative aspects of his work as a producer, the corporate nature of many of his projects held little interest for him. In pursuing a degree in physiotherapy, he was seeking more job satisfaction and a better lifestyle that would leave room for his creative pursuits in film.

Laurent’s decision to pursue a university degree was “just the natural thing to do”, and he had a positive approach to higher education. His first degree in fine arts was an intense experience and his studies there among “the best years of my life”. He described his family as “high[ly] educated” and “carers”: his mother, stepmother and father all have university degrees and were involved in education, working as teachers, with his father specialising in special education. He presented his interest in physiotherapy as a continuation of his family’s values.

5.4.1 Academic and intertextual practices

Laurent was a practical student, studying full-time while continuing to work in the film industry. He regularly mentioned how he carefully allocated his study time and effort to those tasks and topics that were most useful or interesting to him.

Laurent’s first formal instruction in English occurred during an exchange program within Canada before his university studies, and his university classes in Quebec were conducted in English. At Laurent’s university, students are given a choice to submit written assessment tasks in either French or English; Laurent chose to submit his in French, “to make things easier”. Consequently, his spoken English developed during his studies, but writing remained a challenge. He described his written English as basic and lacking creativity, a significant criticism from him, given how highly he valued the creative expression of ideas. Laurent
expected he would encounter fewer written assessments in his physiotherapy course than other degree choices, which was part of the attraction; he did not believe he had the right “attitude” for extensive academic writing.

Laurent believed that health sciences students were required to use sources in their academic writing to demonstrate their research skills and knowledge of a topic. Otherwise, people would just write a lot of crap into their essay. They want you to get involved with what you’re writing and also get sources that are appropriate and extend from those ideas.

He believed sources were used differently in the academic writing he had done for his film studies. In his assessment tasks for physiotherapy he was required to draw more extensively upon sources “to expand and show how you understand the content”, while in film studies it was “a lot about me and a bit less about the sources, just a lot of personal ideas”. This perception of the requirements of academic writing in the health sciences impacted the development of his discoursal self. He described himself as not especially invested in the writing he did for this unit of study, and found it restrictive, with little opportunity for him to make choices in his writing:

Whether you like it or not, that’s what you’re gonna talk about, that’s the way we want it. It’s very mechanical work.

5.4.2 Text-specific intertextual practices

Laurent received a credit grade for this essay, which was his first university-level task written in English; this grade was above the mean for the student writers who participated in the study. Like Michael and Katrijn, he found it challenging to relate the content of this psychology unit to the more science and health focussed units of his degree course, although because he had participated in several psychology units in his previous study, he was more comfortable with the theoretical content.
Documenting sources as an intertextual practice

When asked to identify a section of his essay where he had used sources that we could discuss, Laurent focussed on where he had lost points according to the marking rubric. He placed great importance upon the marks he received, as this was the main way he judged whether his writing was successful:

I’m not a writer, so my only time judging if it’s going well is with my grade. And that’s it. As long as my grade was fine, I was happy.

Consequently, he chose his reference list (presented in Excerpt 5.5) as the section of the text related to his source use that he wanted to discuss.

5.5)

REFERENCES


I have presented this excerpt as it appears in the original text. The marker’s comments that appear in the excerpt represent the only feedback specific to Laurent’s source use and referencing in the entire essay. The referencing comments he received here related to detailed formatting conventions in APA, specifically the requirement to provide a Digital Object Identifier (doi) for electronic publications, rather than a URL, and the italicisation of titles in APA style.

*Emic perspective*

Laurent made a deliberate effort to seek out appropriate and credible sources to establish the key concepts of his essay, an effort he felt was not recognised by his marker. Losing significant marks for his reference list frustrated Laurent, and he found the requirement to distinguish between electronic and print publications needlessly detailed:

What does it matter? Because if the journal actually exists in hard copy, why does it matter to say retrieved from the internet? There needs to be a way within a university … that’s simple.

Given the absence of other comments on his referencing or source use, it appeared to him that his marker penalised him heavily for a missing doi and an unitalicized title and that other intertextual practices, which received no comment, were overlooked. Additionally, the focus on the details of APA formatting in the marker’s comments reinforced Laurent’s stated belief that the primary purpose of the task was for students to demonstrate skills rather than to develop knowledge and that the content was of secondary importance.

*Etic analysis*

The explicit intertextual relationships writers form with their cited authors are established in the text; the documentation of that intertextuality, a mandatory practice in university academic writing, occurs within the reference list. This documentation and the attention it
may receive from markers can be a source of frustration and confusion to beginning students. The focus of the feedback on the mechanics of referencing made it difficult for Laurent to see beyond the superficial formatting that is an unavoidable part of the intertextual practices of university-level academic writing to engage with the deeper ways writers engage with their source texts.

**Disciplinary differences and writer identity**

The only section of the text dealing with his use of sources that Laurent identified himself for us to discuss was the reference list. I steered our conversation back to the text of the essay and suggested we look at a paragraph (Excerpt 5.6) that presented examples and strategies for the health care provider but did not include citations.

5.6) [1] In the contemplation stage even though the person is aware of the problem and is open to change in the future: [2] there is still ambivalence. [3] Identifying barriers and misconceptions is a very important part in helping someone through this stage. [4] Since 'cons' of changing outweigh 'pros', it is important to understand what exactly is keeping the person from changing. [5] For example, an alcohol abuser might be spending ever afternoon at the pub with friends watching sports. [6] In this case, to stop drinking would mean loosing the social appeal of drinking and would then become a major demotivator to the patient. [7] An example of a misconception might be the idea that 'alcohol relax me at night' while in fact it is also the main reason he is not able to achieve sleep effectively. [8] Understanding and breaking down those barriers might eventually help the patient to go forward. [9] The practitioner should propose alternative solutions such as meeting friends in an alcohol free environment or other means that do not involve or encourage drinking alcohol such as reading, exercise (hobbies) taking a bath etc.
This is the third of four body paragraphs, and Laurent has moved to the second stage of the model that students had been directed to focus on in this task. He employed a paragraph structure that addressed each of the elements of the task: he begins with a description of a stage (c-units one and two), then outlined a goal for the health care provider (c-unit three, four and eight), and concluded the paragraph with a specific strategy to meet the goal (c-unit nine). The remainder of the paragraph consists of examples of patient behaviour (c-units five to seven). There are no cited c-units in this paragraph.

Emic perspective
Laurent described how he chose the health care provider strategies in c-units five and six to include in this paragraph based upon classroom discussions, rather than his research:

I think that’s from a tute … it was just something that we discussed and I can’t see why I couldn’t use that. … It’s just part of the course actually, so I just used one of the examples.

He deliberately chose to include explanations of behaviour in c-unit seven as a way of demonstrating his understanding:

I thought it would be appropriate to say because it’s an explanation, so if you can show that you understand that strategy by showing example. It’s not from a source.

Laurent brought the creative and critical skills gained in his fine arts degree to his physiotherapy course. He saw his role as a learner as active:

…You actually have to make up your own mind with it, create a story about what you read. … I thought … you can use your own brain to give example…. I don’t need the text to tell me how you can take something, as long as you have the stages from sources, that’s what you’re trying to show, then the rest of the example, you can try to make it up yourself, how you would use it. But it might not be the way it should have been done, but that’s the way I did it.
Demonstrating how to use sources in a piece of writing was one of the skills Laurent believed his lecturer was expecting him to display in this task, and he shaped the representation of his discoursal self accordingly. In his opinion, he was required to provide credible sources for his descriptions of the stages of the model. He did not use sources in this excerpt because he believed the strategies a health care provider could use to implement the model were the product of his creative thinking, based upon the knowledge he acquired through his participation in classroom activities and his reading.

_Etic analysis_

Laurent’s lack of citations in this paragraph underscores how challenging it can be for any academic writer to tease apart their own knowledge and understanding from the ideas that originate in their source texts. Although Laurent indicated in his interview that he believed it was important to acknowledge the general information about the stages he drew from his textbooks and readings, his descriptions of the key concepts related to the contemplation stage in c-units one to four (which were presented in the required texts and cited in other essays in the corpus) went uncited in this excerpt. The specific strategies he provided in c-units eight and nine appeared worded very similarly in other essays in the corpus, indicating that they too may have been drawn from a common source, course materials or in-class discussions. It is unlikely that the information presented in these c-units represent ideas originated by Laurent; rather, they were more likely the result of his participation in classroom activities and his self-directed reading. This situation is a useful example of how Bakhtin’s (1981) concept of dialogism comes into play for student writers; they are in constant negotiation with prior voices to create their own meanings, and those voices may not always take the form of clearly citable publications. However, students are regularly advised to cite any ideas that are not clearly their own original thoughts. It may be counterproductive in some instances to become overly invested in teasing out the exact source of every
utterance students use to shape their learning, which may negate feelings of ownership of new knowledge.

Laurent’s intertextual practices were directly influenced by the identity he had formed during his previous film studies and his professional career. He interpreted his role as a writer through his commitment to innovation, creativity and self-expression he valued in his work in the fine arts. These aspects of his autobiographical self carried into the discoursal self he constructed in this text. He avoided providing citations for his recommendations, preferring instead to convey the impression of a confident, independent thinker to his reader. He seemed to consider the incorporation of information from source texts almost as a crutch, negating his responsibility to present his ideas as the products of his learning and to think critically and creatively. I suspect that this proactive attitude did contribute to Laurent’s achievements in this task: he projected a confident discoursal self by demonstrating an understanding of the model and providing specific health care provider strategies that were appropriate to the stages that were the focus of the assignment. The marker’s limited feedback is difficult to interpret but would seem to endorse his writing strategies. The only marker comment on this paragraph is a tick in the margin, and it does not appear that the lack of citations in this paragraph cost Laurent marks. Laurent’s situation provides a useful example of the impact of disciplinary differences on the development of students’ intertextual practices and the reasons behind the decisions to take up or reject identities and practices in their writing.

5.5 Profile 4: Bibek

Bibek, a Nepali-dominant multilingual student, was in his late forties when we met. He was studying in Australia on an international student visa and had been living in Australia with his wife and children for three years at the time of our interview. Nepali is Bibek’s first language, and he began learning English in year two at a local mission school. He indicated
that most of his formal education took place in an English-speaking context in Nepal. He came from a well-educated family that placed a priority on university study, and both his parents completed undergraduate degrees at a Nepalese university.

Bibek earned a bachelor's degree in English and psychology and a coursework master's in sociology in his home country, where teaching and learning activities were conducted primarily in English. He came to study in Australia to gain further professional qualifications after working in the health promotion sector for eight years in Nepal, where he was affiliated with United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and involved with community health programs (important aspects of his autobiographical self). Before commencing his nursing degree, Bibek completed a course in nursing at an Australian TAFE, a common entry pathway to the bachelor's degree course for international students with practical experience in the healthcare profession. Bibek came across as a competent professional committed to expanding his knowledge base and further developing his qualifications.

5.5.1 Academic and intertextual practices

Despite his extensive post-secondary educational experience, Bibek said he was not a confident writer. He drew a distinction between general and academic English and felt more comfortable with general spoken English than he did with written English of either form. Much of his previous assessment was by examination, and the writing in his master’s by coursework in sociology, which he completed in Nepal, had largely involved filling in questionnaires based upon interviews he conducted during fieldwork. Nor did Bibek believe his TAFE experience prepared him for university-level writing, as the writing tasks were simpler than those in his current degree. Some of his assignments at TAFE had required him to reference, so the concept was not entirely new to him, but he had not been required to cite his sources as extensively as was required at university.
The essay we discussed in our interview was his first in his Australian university studies. He felt uncertain about the practices he had developed through what he called a trial and error method, based largely on information he located on university websites. He described “making some guesses” and evaluated their success based on his marks. Managing the reading load associated with his university coursework was quite challenging for Bibek, but he persisted, spending a great deal of his study time working through his source texts. Each required multiple readings before he understood them well enough to begin attempting paraphrases. He judged this to be a useful investment of his time, as his reading provided important insights into the nursing profession in Australia.

5.5.2 Intertextual practices in this task

From Bibek’s perspective, the primary purpose of this essay was to help students learn a concept that would be useful to them both personally and professionally. He related the task to his previous work in community health and indicated that assessing risk behaviours was an important skill in that context. Unlike many of the other writers in this interview group, the practical and professional skills were Bibek’s primary focus in his interpretation of the assignment. To be successful, he described how students needed to demonstrate a practical understanding of the model, and he went about developing that understanding through careful research and reading.

*Internally-directed intertextual practices*

The first section Bibek identified for our discussion, presented in Excerpt 5.7, was chosen because he believed this paragraph provided an example of where he had used his sources well within his essay.

5.7)  

[1] According to the transtheoretical model, there are five stages: precontemplation, contemplation, preparation, action and maintenance to
achieve successful maintenance of a new behavior. [2] An individual may move from one stage to another in a sequential manner or backwards and forwards between the stages before maintenance is established (Barkway, 2009, p.138).

This brief paragraph, consisting of just two cited sentences, immediately followed his introduction. The formatting of his introduction was idiosyncratic, consisting of three brief segments of text separated by white space; as a whole, the introduction focussed on why health risk behaviours were difficult to change and provided an overview of the essay. Bibek then turned his attention in the paragraph presented in this excerpt to the theoretical model with a paraphrase from the required textbook.

Emic perspective

Because the term behaviour change was used in the assignment question, Bibek described how he wanted to “give background about the steps of behaviour change” before he moved into the main discussion of the first stage in the next paragraph, and he believed this citation helped him do that. Throughout our interview, he repeatedly referred to the importance of background information, both for the writer and the reader, and his use of background information in this way represented a significant practice for his learning as well as his writing. After the general information on health risk behaviours provided in the introduction, Bibek indicated that this background information on the TTM provided him with a “sense of the right model, and what to elaborate”, selected from a source that had helped him to “become more knowledgeable about the subject”.

Etic analysis

While intertextuality certainly facilitates a dialogic relationship between the writer and his reader, it can also be directed inward, toward the writer’s own internal dialogue. Bibek’s primary motivation for his source use in this paragraph appears to be managing his writing
and learning processes. In the interview, Bibek described how his writing process involved bringing in information from his source about the stages of the model to focus his attention on the patient’s movement through those stages, and to help him avoid drifting into lengthy descriptions of the stages themselves. He also chose to include information from the sources that he believed had been most useful to him as he worked to build a knowledge base about his topic. It does appear that Bibek may be struggling to master the structure and format of an essay introduction. However, while his paragraphing may not be sophisticated, his description of providing background information is often a function of citations within an introduction. Bibek’s comments also indicate that he engaged in an ongoing dialogue with his sources which served to guide his writing processes, a relatively sophisticated practice for a novice academic writer.

The impact of professional experiences on writer identity and intertextual practices

This second lengthier paragraph presented in Excerpt 5.8 immediately follows the previous excerpt. Bibek identified this paragraph as a source of concern.

5.8) [1] The first stage is pre-contemplation in which the person does not recognize that the behavior has health risk and does not perceive the need to change (Barkway, 2009, p. 125). [2] According to Hobbis and Sutton (2005), in this stage, the person does not consider need of any change, is reluctant to consequences and does not recognize the problem. [3] In smoking cessation, the smoker is unaware that his/her behavior constitutes a problem and has no intention to quit. [4] This is the “denial phase” where the person may not have adequate information [5] so the health personnel should have effective skills for reflective listening and reinforcing messages. [6] The strategy is to educate them about the risk of their habit and benefits of related outcomes after the change. [7] Some studies assert that denial is a
normal grief response which can be adaptive as well as pathological. [8] Since individual utilize denial to protect themselves from psychic pain, the substance abuser needs to be given new tools for coping with that pain. Hobbis and Sutton (2005). [9] Health professionals should acknowledge this phase very critically by offering hope and reassurance to get the individual motivated into the next phase.

The paragraph begins with a description of the pre-contemplation stage of the model drawn from sources before moving to the concept of denial in the fifth c-unit. Bibek then provides information from “studies” linking denial to the grief process in c-units seven and eight, a concept not directly relevant to the theories of behaviour change that are the topic of this assignment, before concluding the paragraph with a statement that bridges to the next stage of the model.

Emic perspective

Bibek focussed on the concept of denial at this stage in the model because of its importance in classroom discussions:

[The lecturer] focussed on denial. He said it was a very important component of behaviour change.

The lecturer’s requirements were foremost in his mind in this paragraph, and his goal was to respond to clear instructions that students focus on providing strategies for the health care provider, rather than defining behaviour change:

[The lecturer] said he doesn’t want to know what the behaviour change is, he wants to know how we can do it. Even the question says how. How can a health practitioner, or me, facilitate behaviour change in a patient.

Upon rereading the paragraph, however, he expressed concern that the information he selected from his source did not create the connections he intended:
I think it doesn’t make sense. … It was for the denial that I used this resource. It doesn’t exactly [relate to] that point I tried to refer [to].

Bibek realised that scholarly publications were a valuable source of information for practitioners, and he sought to draw on them as he moved beyond the definitions and descriptions of the textbook toward a deeper explanation of a key characteristic of the stage: denial. He was uncertain that the source he chose was entirely relevant to his topic, however.

_Etic analysis_

A lecturer’s stated positions and requirements are a significant motivator for student writers as they engage with their source texts, often shaping the representations of their discoursal selves in their written texts. As we saw in the textual analysis as well as in the excerpts presented in this chapter, numerous essays in the corpus included the same (or substantially similar) statements from the required text on the concept of denial. It seems likely that many of these students, like Bibek, responded directly to the lecturer’s emphasis as articulated in lectures and classroom discussions. Bibek, however, did not incorporate the textbook’s definition of denial. Instead, he turned to a recently published peer-reviewed journal article on the related topic of cognitive behaviour therapy, in an attempt to create links between this defining characteristic of patient behaviour within this stage and actions the health care practitioner could make in response. Although Bibek was not confident in his choice, this was a sophisticated academic approach.

Aspects of students’ autobiographical selves may also influence their intertextual choices. Bibek’s choice of source text, and his desire to move beyond the textbook in a meaningful way, may also reflect the practical approach associated with the professional identity he brought with him to his university studies. Although his clear focus was on the how (as he described it), he was unable to make the final connection, and he ended the paragraph with
general recommendations to provide hope and reassurance instead of specifically identifying “new tools” cognitive behaviour therapy might enable the health care provider to suggest to the patient. While Bibek’s relative inexperience with university-level academic English may have contributed to his difficulties in making that final leap from theoretical explanations to practical applications, his prior professional experiences enabled him to employ several sophisticated intertextual practices in his first university-level writing task. He successfully completed the task, achieving a credit grade, above the mean for this group.

5.6 Profile 5: Ana

Ana, a female student in her late teens, is an Australian citizen from an English-dominant multilingual background. Her mother is Australian from a Croatian family, and her father emigrated from Croatia when he was 12 years old. Ana was born in Australia, and her parents taught her Croatian at home. She uses a mix of Croatian and English with her extended family here in Australia, but she finds it difficult to respond in Croatian when spoken to and could neither read nor write in that language.

Ana came directly to university after completing secondary school. It was important to her parents that she was not just “sitting around because I came from a family of hard workers”, and this aspect of her autobiographical self seemed important to her. Neither of Ana’s parents completed university: her mother trained as a secretary because “that was required of girls”; her father studied engineering at university and left to take up employment before completing his degree. Ana decided to study nursing after reading promotional material from the university that caught her interest. She contacted the university and found the academic staff in the School of Nursing to be friendly and approachable. She believed they would be helpful and supportive, which was an important consideration in her decision about where to study.
5.6.1 Academic and intertextual practices

Ana was an enthusiastic participant in the interview process and appeared keen to use our conversation as an opportunity to develop her writing skills. Academic writing was challenging to her, and she was not confident in her abilities. When asked about how she used sources in her writing, Ana’s first response was “This is really hard!” followed by “Honestly, I don’t know how to answer that.” Throughout Ana’s interview, she regularly used words like “dumb” to refer to herself, and “confusing” about expectations around academic writing. Ana was “afraid” to separate ideas into paragraphs in her essays because the reader might not see the connections between ideas if she did so; she believed this often resulted in lengthy paragraphs without a clear main idea, which she identified as one of her main weaknesses as a writer.

Although she was not confident, Ana believed her academic writing in high school (especially in her science classes) had prepared her well for her nursing assignments. She recalled specific instruction on essay structure which helped her develop a writing process she felt comfortable with, and she decided to “just stick to what [she] was familiar with” in her university assignments. She learned the Harvard referencing system for her high school assessments. The main emphasis had been placed on providing a reference list, and in-text citations were not consistently required.

Ana felt that the use of sources allowed her to communicate important things about herself to her marker:

   When I do my essays I want my professors to know this is what [Ana] knows. But I would back it up with a source or two, because I like to put in what I know, I like to put in the hard work. So what I know after reading those sources, put in my own words.
According to Ana, it is important for students to avoid the wrong kinds of sources (like Wikipedia or popular newspapers) because they did not “steer you in the right direction, to get the right mark, or to actually answer that question”. Ana often relied on sources provided by the lecturer in the unit outline, particularly her textbooks, because she believed her teacher had evaluated them, ensuring their credibility. She framed her approach to paraphrasing in terms of avoiding plagiarism and focussed on making changes at the level of individual words, to ensure they were sufficiently different from the original to stay safe.

5.6.2 Text-specific intertextual practices

Ana believed the primary purpose of this assessment task was for students to show that they knew “how to answer the topic question”. When asked why the lecturer might want her to answer a question about this topic, she replied “Well, it was in the unit outline. It was part of the syllabus for the unit.” Ana was not entirely certain what was expected of her in this assignment, but she did not ask questions in her lecture or tutorial because she wanted to project the identity of a competent and knowledgeable student:

You just want to make it seem like you know everything, and … I had no idea what I was answering. I think the reason why I didn’t do very well was I didn’t ask for help.

She understood that the question related to concepts that nurses would use in their professional practice, but her focus was on responding to the question because her lecturer had required her to do so. This writing approach appeared to affect her final mark, as she received only a pass grade for her essay.

The diligent student

Ana identified the first body paragraph of her assignment, presented in Excerpt 5.9, as a place where she was pleased with her use of sources.
According to Barkway (2009), the first two out of the five stages that compose of the trans theoretical model of behavioural change is the pre contemplative stage and the contemplative stage. It is in these first two stages that both internal and external factors regarding the individual’s behaviour can be addressed, and therefore appropriate reasoning and changes can be made for counteracting addictions and other behaviours that pose certain health risks. In the pre contemplative stage, the individual does not recognise that their behaviour poses health risks and therefore does not perceive a need to change. In simpler terms, this stage can be described as the "denial" stage, and the patient even feeling somewhat "immune" to the health problems (AAFP, 2000). In the second stage of the trans theoretical model of behaviour change, the contemplation stage, the person becomes aware of the fact that their behaviour can potentially cause health problems, but is inconclusive about making a commitment to change their behaviour. The AAFP (2000) believes that it is in the contemplation stage where factors, whether external or internal (e.g. loosing a loved one or developing an illness) factors, force patients to assess their behaviours and barriers. When these two stages are achieved, appropriate strategies can be implemented to successfully assist the patient in overcoming their addictive behaviours.

In this paragraph, Ana introduced the first two stages of the model that were the focus of the assignment. She included three citations to two sources in this paragraph, pulling together information from a required textbook (Barkway) and a practical guide for practitioners published online (AAFP). The purpose of the paragraph, and both citations within it, was to define the stages of the model she intended to focus on in the essay. Indeed, throughout her essay, most of Ana’s attributed c-units described the model or defined terms.
Emic perspective

Ana described making deliberate choices about how and where she placed her citations in the structure of her paragraph. She preferred to begin and end her paragraphs with information from her sources and to provide sources that represented the same viewpoint, which she believed strengthens the credibility of her evidence and helped to keep her “on track”. Leaving certain keywords as they appeared in the original text and changing the structure of the sentences around them allowed her to construct what she believed were strong paraphrases that differed sufficiently from the original text to avoid problems with plagiarism. By doing so, she believed she would “gain marks”:

I explain it in my own words, but then this other source says this. So what I’m saying must be right.

Ana deliberately chose to use integral citations in her writing:

I go, ‘according to’ someone … and that’s how I like to start my paragraphs because I feel like it’s a strong introduction, I go straight into the question.

Beginning with ideas expressed by her cited authors in credible sources demonstrated her understanding and established a solid foundation for her own points.

Etic analysis

Ana consciously used her sources to create the discoursal identity of a diligent student whose answer to the question was informed by the required reading. She tended to use integral citations when referring to the required textbooks and readings for the unit, highlighting their presence in the text and demonstrating her use of credible sources. This was a practice she shared with many students in the study. ‘According to’ was one of the most frequently used integral citation structures in the essay corpus, as it was in Ana’s essay, and the purpose of the construction appeared to be attribution of the proposition to an authoritative source, rather than the creation of space for alternative viewpoints or distance from the proposition, as more
experienced writers might do. She intended to highlight the credibility of her sources with non-integral citations, demonstrating her understanding of the model as the first step in answering the question. Students rightly recognise undergraduate essays as a pedagogical genre, which has important implications for their source use and consequently for the identities they choose to assume in their writing.

Feedback and developing practices

Ana also chose her fifth and final body paragraph, presented in Excerpt 5.10; while she was relatively confident in her intertextual practices, she had concerns about her marker’s feedback.

5.10) [1] Samet (1998) also strongly believes that the contemplation stage may last for a long period of time, [2] so it is the intervenor's priority to try and resolve the patient's ambivalence. [3] This includes exploring the positives and negatives of both changing behavioural and cognitive reasoning of the patient; including assisting the patient to see discrepancies between their addictive behaviour and values (CAMH, n.d.). [4] Cognitive reasoning of the patient becomes a challenge; [5] as in the contemplation stage the patient is still ambivalent about changing. [6] Battaglia (2009) firmly believes that for the patient, they can start to acknowledge the benefits of changing their addictive behaviour; [7] however the high levels of temptation and dependancy on the patient's addictive behaviour during the pre contemplation stage challenges the individual's reason for changing. [8] It is during this contemplation stage where the individual needs to start confronting perceived barriers to treatment and recovery including fear, expense, time and other such factors that the patient has been reluctant to confront. [9] To help facilitate change in the individual, it is the intervenor's role to assist the patient with any fears or
worries about changing their addictive behaviour (that is, to reduce alcohol consumption and become less dependent on alcohol). Battaglia (2009) states that it is the interventor's role to ask questions such as "Why do you [the patient] want to change?", "Is there anything preventing you from changing?" and "What are some things that can help you change?".

In this paragraph, Ana considers the contemplation stage of the model, identifying key characteristics of the stage and the practitioner's role within it. She repeats the basic pattern we saw in the previous excerpt, opening and closing the paragraph with integral citations with the author in the subject position. In c-units one and six, Ana paraphrased her sources and returned to the reporting verb believes with the boosters strongly and firmly. Boosters are used by writers to indicate the level commitment to the proposition and are often characteristic of a confident writing style (K. Hyland, 2012), but Ana uses them here to indicate her cited author’s stance, rather than her own. In c-units ten to thirteen, she provided examples of the kinds of things a practitioner might say to a patient, which she punctuated as reported speech.

*Emic perspective*

Our conversation focussed on the marker's comments. There was a tick in the margin next her citation in c-unit three, which Ana interpreted as positive feedback on her source use:

My references, my sourcing within the body is quite good, so I'll keep that strategy. Whenever I do my paragraphs, I’ll start off with a good source and back that up with another one. … And I should show I’m trying to relate what I know back to the question.

In the margin next to the paragraph’s c-unit one and two, the marker wrote “How? Give details?” and this same comment appeared after the ninth c-unit. Ana concluded the marker’s questions were caused by difficulties she had putting ideas from her sources into her own
words in a way that responded to the assignment question. She felt that her marker’s comments indicated she had “drifted off” from her topic, but the tick was positive feedback indicating her intertextual practices related to the choice and placement of sources were fundamentally sound. Although Ana expressed concern about her writing abilities, she used her marker’s feedback to help her identify both strengths and weaknesses in her essay, and she interpreted the feedback in ways that reinforced practices reflecting her autobiographical self – those she brought with her from high school.

_Etic analysis_

Although dialogue between a student writer and her primary reader (the marker) is crucial to her development as a writer, feedback on student writing is notoriously fraught. I would argue that in this instance, the marker’s comments may not have been intended to indicate that Ana’s points did not answer the question, but rather that she did not provide enough specific information about how positives and negatives might be explored or why the questions she provided were useful at that point in the stage. The lessons students learn from feedback may not always be the ones the marker hoped to communicate through their comments, and, students are often trying to make sense of them on their own. Ana was one of the few students in the interview group who picked up her marked assignment and reviewed her feedback before our interview, but she had not spoken with the lecture to clarify the feedback and had no intention to do so. Any clarification she could have obtained would have come well after the unit had finished for the semester because this task was submitted in the final teaching week. This feedback gap is a common dilemma for both students and markers, one that seriously restricts the ability for the writer and her primary reader to engage in the kind of dialogic interaction that is the basis of a fundamentally pedagogical genre such as an undergraduate essay.
5.7 Profile 6: Elizabeth

Elizabeth is an Australian citizen who was in her early twenties at the time of our interview. Her father emigrated to Australia from Holland as an adult and speaks Dutch as his first language; her mother was born in Australia and comes from an English-speaking background. Elizabeth understood enough Dutch to read simple texts but did not speak or write the language. Because Elizabeth’s demographic survey indicated that she did not use any language other than English at home, she was classified as an English monolingual writer. Neither of Elizabeth’s parents attended university; her mother was a hospital-trained nurse and her father a TAFE-trained builder.

After completing her higher school certificate, Elizabeth held jobs in several different settings, including a veterinary clinic, a riding school and an IT company: “I just didn’t know what I wanted to do, so I did a bit of everything.” After hearing about her mother and her mother’s friends’ positive experiences in the nursing profession, she decided to study nursing, a decision supported by her parents. She described finding it challenging “to get back into the swing of studying” after the years away but was enjoying her first semester, especially the science subjects. She spoke positively about her university studies and felt things were getting easier as she gained experience, but she often used words like “difficult” and “stressful” to describe academic work in her first semester.

5.7.1 Academic and intertextual practices

Elizabeth’s previous experience with academic writing occurred in the context of her work toward her final high school examinations. These experiences included writing reports, reviews and essays. When asked about her specific writing habits or approaches, she often responded first with “I don’t really know” and described academic writing at university as
“really hard”. Knowing where to situate her evidence within a paragraph was a particular challenge:

I never know … where the evidence should go. I don’t know if there’s a place where it should go or whether it just goes after the point or whatever. I just sort of put it in wherever … it fits best.

Elizabeth did not recall being taught how to paraphrase; her secondary school teachers helped her understand how to identify important points in her reading that she could use as evidence, but “not how to put it in” the essay. She described “Googling it a bit” to find examples of academic writing that she could use as models for her assignments. From there, she would “just do what seems right and then … hope that it is right!”

Elizabeth expressed a belief that students are expected to use sources in their academic writing because, as beginners, they do not yet have enough experience to be credible or persuasive. Students need to “use other peoples’ ideas … [as] a base for [their] own ideas”. Elizabeth indicated that she was not comfortable criticising the ideas of other authors:

Obviously they’ve put a lot of work into it, studying and stuff, and I sort of come in … and I’ve read a little bit about it, but don’t know much, and then to sort of say to them, well, no, you’re totally wrong, feels a bit [off].

While she was keen to develop her knowledge and skills as a nurse, Elizabeth saw herself as a beginner in her field with no credibility of her own, highlighting a key challenge students often face in shaping their discoursal identity. Until she developed sufficient knowledge and expertise, her responsibility was to defer to the words and ideas of published experts in her field.
5.7.2 Intertextual practices in this task

Elizabeth believed the primary purpose of this task was for students to acquire and demonstrate skills, and that her lecturer’s main reason for assigning this task was to help students learn to research and write an essay. Academic writing was important because researching, reading and writing allowed students to learn more than they could in lectures and tutorials:

Looking at the different models of behaviour, I think it’s something you can’t necessarily learn totally in the classroom. You need to go out and research different behaviours yourself, and come to your own conclusions. Because I think you can’t necessarily just sit in the classroom, or in a tute, and be told this is what we do, this is the format you follow. You sort of need to figure it out yourself.

Elizabeth accepted the responsibility to be an independent learner and recognised the role that her reading and research would play in her learning. She valued the learning that took place outside of the classroom, and she seemed to enjoy trying out what she was learning for herself.

Assumed knowledge(s)

Elizabeth chose her introductory paragraph, presented in Excerpt 5.11, as a section of her assignment about which she had concerns.

5.11) [1] The facilitation of change in a person who has an addiction can be brought about using the Transtheoretical model of behaviour change, [2] "The Transtheoretical model of behaviour change utilises both behavioural and cognitive strategies." (Barkway, 2009). [3] This model helps facilitate change by identifying which stage of behaviour change the person with the addiction is at, providing the best strategy for beating the addiction. [4] This essay will focus on the uses of the precontemplation and contemplation stages within this behaviour
model and using these models will discuss the best ways to facilitate change in a person whose addiction is placing their health at risk. [5] If we consider health behaviour as being "any activity undertaken by a person believing himself to be healthy for the purpose of preventing disease or detecting it at an asymptomatic stage" (Martinelli, Palmer, Wilson, Newton, 2008), health risk behaviour can therefore be identified as an activity undertaken by a person that jeopardises their health and wellbeing. [6] The extreme end of negative health behaviour can be seen in the study of addictions such as smoking, obesity, alcohol and drugs. [7] The essay will discuss the issues and strategies that are associated with both the precontemplation and contemplation stages of the Transtheoretical model when facilitating change in a person whose addiction is causing severe negative health effects. [8] The writer will also discuss the goals and strategies that can be used by health professionals and others to help addicted people break the addiction.

In this introduction, Elizabeth defined the Transtheoretical model and identified the stages of the model to be the focus of the essay; she then defined the term health risk behaviour, identifying the general behaviour of “addiction” as the focus of her assignment. She incorporated information from her source texts as direct quotations, as were most of her citations throughout her essay. Although the use of quotations often pushes the writer into the background, Elizabeth’s authorial self is evident here through the use of the first person plural to introduce the second quotation in c-unit five (“If we consider…”) and self-reference in c-unit eight (“The writer will also discuss…”); this kind of presence was uncommon in the corpus.

Emic perspective

Elizabeth chose this paragraph because she was concerned about how she had included information from her sources in c-unit five:
I’m not sure I needed such a long quote to explain … a term that is probably assumed knowledge. …

She chose to define the term ‘health risk behaviour’ at length because it was included in the task description:

I picked the main points out of the question and then defined them. And sometimes it’s hard to know what’s more assumed knowledge. … I think I end up defining … things that don’t need to be defined.

The task description was an important source of information for her as she was deciding where to place her focus, but she did not believe that she had enough experience with the topic area to know which concepts were established knowledge. She was also uncertain of her use of quotations, an issue that will re-emerge in the next excerpt. Elizabeth continued to dedicate most of her attention (and her source use) to describing the model and discussing health risk behaviours. She expressed concern about this approach in terms of her ability to recognise “assumed knowledge”.

Etic analysis

Elizabeth focussed her source use in the introduction on identifying the characteristics of the model and defining key terms, which are reasonable choices at this point in her essay. While it is indeed difficult for many beginning students to know which of the many concepts covered in lectures and tutorials are well-established, accepted knowledge, and which are contested or still developing, an equally important distinction is between those concepts that are central or peripheral in terms of the assignment. Although her introduction indicates the essay will focus mainly on issues, goals and strategies associated with changing negative behaviours, the essay itself focussed mainly on the risk behaviour. Elizabeth was rightly concerned about her choice to direct her source use to the general concept of health risk behaviour because it was not the central concept of the task. Perhaps the “assumed
knowledge” Elizabeth lacked here was not necessarily related to disciplinary content, but to the assumptions about how students will interpret the instructions for an assessment task.

*Developing credibility*

Elizabeth chose the next section, presented in Excerpt 5.12 because she believed she had used her sources well in this paragraph. It is the second of three body paragraphs and follows a relatively lengthy paragraph describing addictive behaviours and their negative health consequences.

5.12) [1] "The first stage of the Transtheoretical model of behaviour change is the precontemplation stage, [2] within this stage the person does not recognise the health risks posed by their behaviour, [3] this means they do not perceive the need for change." (Barkway, 2009) [4] This lack of recognition of the dangers of their addiction may be caused by a lack of information which can be remedied by increasing access to and quality of available information. [5] The person may also be in denial about the effects their behaviour will have on their health, [6] "oftentimes persons believe they do not conform to the norms for a group they belong to (e.g. smokers often state that they are at less risk of death from smoking than the modal smoker)" (Hughes, 2009). [7] In this case the addicted person will not want to be helped or seek help because they do not believe or realise there is anything wrong with their behaviour. [8] The precontemplation stage places a focus on supplying information with the intent to bring about an understanding over the negative effects of health risk behaviour, [9] once the addicted person gains a level of understanding about the consequences of their behaviour they move on to the contemplation stage.

This paragraph introduces the first stage of the TTM. The information from sources in this paragraph is incorporated in two lengthy non-integral quotations drawn from separate sources; the first attributed information in the paragraph (c-units one to three) is a
straightforward definition of the precontemplation stage. The second quotation, in c-unit six, explains why patients may be in denial about the effects of their behaviour.

_Emic perspective_

Elizabeth chose the quote from Hughes in c-unit six because she appreciated how information about the stage was followed by specific information about patient behaviour. She believed the example provided in the quotation helped her create a relatable context for her reader:

> It just helps … [to] put … this whole big idea into a more specific thing. Because lots of people know a smoker who says, oh, I’ll never get lung cancer. Or someone who drinks a lot and says, oh, I’m never going to get [sick]… So I guess it just helps more humanise it for them, and make it more understandable.

Although she chose this section because she was happier with her use of sources in c-unit six, she also indicated uncertainty about whether her practices overall were appropriate:

> But then I’m never sure about quotes, whether they’re actually fitting in right. So [this quote] was a lot about what that first stage of the model was about, was people just believing that they’re not the same as everyone else in that group, but then … it might not be necessary to stick another quote in there.

Elizabeth’s positive assessment of her source use in this instance was based on her ability to locate useful information in her source that related the model to specific behaviour and provided more of a context for her reader. She questioned, however, whether focusing her source use on the stages of the model in c-unit one was the best approach.

_Etic analysis_

In this excerpt, Elizabeth demonstrates positive development of some appropriate writing practices. She recognised the need to provide explanations and examples from her sources in her essay, and she chose relevant sources of good quality to do so. Her comments about her
source use in this excerpt indicate an awareness of and consideration for her reader (in her attempts to “humanise” the behaviour). However, she continued the pattern established in her introduction of directing her source use towards the health risk behaviour and characteristics of the model, rather than its application. In the final c-units of Excerpt 5.12, strategies associated with the stage were mentioned, but in a general way with no reference to the health care provider or support from her sources.

Elizabeth’s key challenge may lie in her perceptions around her credibility as a writer. In her earlier comments, Elizabeth articulated a belief that beginning students must use sources in their assessment tasks because of their lack of experience in their discipline. She did not understand academic citation as a practice within her discourse community shared by writers at all levels of experience. The uncertainty demonstrated in the previous excerpt regarding her ability to identify and address the central concept of the task persisted and shaped her discoursal and authorial selves within the text. Assuming the identity of a beginner without credibility may have led her to hesitate to make recommendations regarding the role of the health care provider and take on a discoursal identity of a professional in her field, consequently limiting her ability to respond to the central requirement of the task to recommend practical strategies.

5.8 Summary

This chapter presented the findings of the talk around text strand of this study, placing the students’ voices at the centre of the analysis and allowing them to identify the issues that were meaningful to them in their writing. RQ2 investigated students’ prior experiences with academic writing and source use, drawing upon discussions about their personal and educational backgrounds related to their autobiographical selves. RQ3 focussed on how students articulated their intertextual practices within a specific writing task, providing
insights into their discoursal and authorial selves. The findings for this research question were informed by the sections of the interviews that focussed on students’ descriptions of their choices and writing goals for their essay task. These two research questions were considered together throughout the chapter, as the concurrence of conversations about students’ backgrounds and prior educational experiences and text-focussed discussions is an important feature of the talk around text method (Lillis, 2008).

The findings of the talk around text analysis uncovered several important aspects of these students’ developing intertextual practices. The first confirms the findings coming out of the textual analysis: these beginning student writers demonstrated some surprisingly sophisticated textual and intertextual practices in their first university-level written assessment task. The interview data and analysis of essay excerpts revealed synthesis across a number of sources, evaluative language, critical thinking and attempts to formulate arguments, and deliberate choices to move beyond textbooks into scholarly publications on the parts of these writers.

A second finding revealed in the talk around text analysis indicates that prior experiences had a profound effect on these student writers’ current practices and the writer identities they were forming. Professional experiences contributed to Laurent’s decisions around where and when to cite (or not cite) his sources, while Bibek’s expertise in the field of public health led him to engage with scholarly publications in practical ways. Prior educational experiences were more significant for Katrijn, who attempted to reconcile conflicting advice from high school instructors with her current writing context, and for Ana, who carried the identity of a diligent student with her from high school to university.

A third finding is that these student writers did not always find the intertextual practices they perceived in the university writing context to be internally persuasive: Michael outwardly
acceded to the requirements of a task he found frustrating and constraining while also pushing back against those requirements in interesting ways; Laurent perceived the necessity to cite sources as a crutch that compromised his creativity and critical thinking; Elizabeth saw the requirements to cite sources as a reflection on her lack of experience and status as a beginner in her field.

A fourth finding is that many of these student writers did internalise new knowledge acquired through classroom discussions, self-directed reading and writing and found it challenging to recognise which aspects of this knowledge required citation when incorporated into their academic writing tasks. Recognising assumed knowledge and identifying which concepts were most significant in the context of the assessment tasks were also identified as difficulties for many of these students.

Chapters 4 and 5 have presented the findings of both strands of the research. In the final chapter of the thesis, Chapter 6, I will bring the findings of these strands together in a discussion and bring the thesis to a close.
Chapter 6: Discussion

6.1 Introduction

There has been relatively little empirical research into the disciplinary writing of novice undergraduate students (Wette, 2018) or their citation practices (J. J. Lee et al., 2018), which may at least in part account for the persistence of negative assumptions around first-year students’ capabilities, understandings and motivations in their academic writing. An important goal of the current study has been to address this gap.

This chapter provides answers to the research questions and provides a deeper examination and interpretation of the findings from the textual and talk around text strands of the study. Section 6.2 discusses the findings from the textual analysis, and section 6.3 focuses on the talk around text analysis. Section 6.4 brings the findings of both strands together in a general discussion. The key contributions of the study are discussed in section 6.5, followed by the pedagogical implications (section 6.6) and limitations of the study (section 6.7). Finally, in section 6.8, the chapter and the thesis comes to a close with a discussion of future directions and some concluding comments.

6.2 Textual analysis

The textual analysis adopted a multi-dimensional analytical framework to examine intertextual practices in a relatively large corpus of authentic, first-year undergraduate academic writing produced as part of the assessment schedule for a credit-bearing unit of study. The analysis involved both a quantitative investigation of patterns within the corpus and a qualitative examination of exemplars from each of the coding categories. This strand of the study responded to research questions 1a and 1b. Research question 1a focussed on identifying the character and frequency of the intertextual practices demonstrated by the students in their essays; the findings that respond to this research question are
discussed in section 6.2.1. Research question 1b examined whether these students’
intertextual practices were influenced by specific factors, which were the degree course in
which the students were enrolled and their language background; the findings that respond to
this question are discussed in section 6.2.2. Finally, section 6.2.3 considers together the
findings from both parts of the first research question in the first strand of the study,
exploring in more depth the practices highlighted by the textual analysis and the strengths and
challenges they revealed.

6.2.1 Character of intertextual practices

In response to research question 1a, the quantitative findings of the textual analysis indicated
that, in many respects, the student writers who participated in this study employed the broad
brushstrokes of intertextual practices in expected ways within their discipline, in what was
one of their earliest attempts at producing academic texts within their degrees. These student
writers formatted their source use as paraphrases far more frequently than direct quotations in
their essays, which echoes findings of other studies into undergraduate writing in the health
sciences (Ådel & Garretson, 2006; Swales, 2014; Wette, 2017b) and is consistent with the
patterns in published research articles (K. Hyland, 1999). The student writers also adopted the
typical structure required for a university essay, even if their implementation was not
sophisticated. Their source use was concentrated in the body paragraphs, with the fewest
citations occurring in the conclusion, as was also the case in Wette’s (2017b) study of
undergraduate academic writing. With regard to integration, these student writers relied
heavily on non-integral citations, which is consistent with previous studies of undergraduate
writing in similar or related disciplinary areas (Ådel & Garretson, 2006; Mori, 2014; Nesi,
2014; Swales, 2014; Wette, 2017b).

Previous studies of citation practices in student academic writing focussed on more
experienced student writers, either undergraduates in the later years of their degree (Mori,
2014; Wette, 2017b) or large corpus studies containing senior-level undergraduate and postgraduate coursework texts (Ädel & Garretson, 2006; Nesi, 2014; Swales, 2014). The current study’s findings highlight that these beginning writers’ intertextual practices broadly followed patterns similar to those of more experienced writers, indicating an awareness (if not mastery) of many of the expectations associated with university-level academic writing.

The students in the current study appeared to make the clearest attempts to meet expectations when these were specifically highlighted within the context of the unit of study (i.e., in the course materials or the support lecture). Some aspects of explicit intertextuality were made visible to students. For example, the student writers in this study received specific directives in the essay writing guide and the support lecture delivered by the academic literacy specialist that paraphrases were the preferred method to incorporate the words and ideas of other writers into their writing, a common requirement in undergraduate courses (Mori, 2014; Wette, 2017b). As explained above, paraphrases were the strongly preferred method of incorporation in the corpus.

Another aspect of academic writing that was heavily emphasised within the course materials and support information was the structure of the essay, and the qualitative findings of the textual analysis appear to indicate that students were aware of this structure and had a basic understanding of how to employ intertextuality within it. Although it is unlikely that they received any direct instruction about varying citation purposes throughout the sections of the essay, they were able to take the information about essay structure in the writing guide provided by their lecturer and begin to vary their citation purposes accordingly. They often used citations to provide background information in their introductions; their body paragraphs tended to use citations for explanations, although they did continue to define terms and concepts. While these student writers rarely referred to source texts in the conclusion of the essays, a few student writers used citations to provide a final positive
evaluation of the model. Even though these student writers’ incorporation of information from their sources and their citation practices related to essay structure in this early academic writing task were not always sophisticated, the rhetorical purposes within the essay structure were generally appropriate. Therefore, it is important to acknowledge that these student writers were attempting to respond to explicit expectations in ways that were visible in their texts.

However, the textual analysis indicates that rhetorical purposes of citation coming out of the specific writing task seemed to be less apparent to these student writers. The quantitative findings revealed that the majority of the source use in this corpus was allocated to rhetorical purposes that were descriptive: 56% of cited c-units described key concepts and terms related to the model the students had been directed to use or the risk behaviour they identified, while 44% of cited c-units focussed on applying the model to that behaviour. While this gap may not seem especially large, the qualitative textual analysis also revealed that when these student writers did refer to sources regarding the application of the model, they were more often making broad statements about the general goals of the health care practitioner within a stage, instead of providing evidence for the effectiveness of specific strategies. They seemed to prioritise documenting the sources of their definitions and other kinds of factual information, or making broad general statements, rather than justifying specific professional practices. This finding is supported by the talk around text analysis, as we will see in section 6.3.

Rhetorical issues relevant to the writing task were not directly addressed within the task instructions or the support resources made available to students within the unit of study, nor did students report any discussions or instructions around this aspect of intertextuality. However, the necessity to cite “facts and statistics” was directly included in the marking criteria (see Appendix 7). Consequently, these student writers may have been less aware of
the significance of the rhetorical purposes of citation as related to the specific writing task and instead focussed on providing citations for factual information and definitions. This finding may reveal just as much about the effects task instructions and support resources can have on beginning students’ approach to assessment tasks as it does about their intertextual practices.

6.2.2 Influence of factors on intertextual practices

In response to research question 1b, the findings of the textual analysis indicated that the factors, language grouping, visa status and degree course had little influence on intertextual practices. In important ways, it seems that these beginning students shared many of the same practices and challenges in their writing. No statistically significant differences were identified between student groups for these factors with regard to the analytical categories. The broad patterns evident in the quantitative findings were consistent across all the student groupings; different groups of students employed the quantifiable features of citation in similar ways, and they allocated their cited information consistently with regard to rhetorical purpose.

Institutional discourses specifically around multilingual writers (often referred to as L2 or second language writers) are often based on a deficit perspective (Campbell, 1990), working from the assumption that these writers bring particular problems that must be addressed through additional instruction (often remedial) or add-on support services. However, several recent studies have argued that both monolingual and multilingual novice writers share many concerns and challenges when they begin employing intertextual practices in university academic writing tasks (Keck, 2014; Mori, 2017; Shi, 2010, 2011; Wette, 2018). This study provides empirical evidence to support these claims. The challenges undoubtedly experienced by many multilingual writers may be broadly relevant to the many diverse groups now entering Australian higher education, including non-recent school leavers and others entering
through non-traditional pathways. As the student population in Australian universities becomes increasingly diverse, the insights generated from a strong tradition of ESL, EFL and EAP research into the practices of multilingual writers reveal themselves to be applicable to a broad range of students; they have relevance beyond language support and tertiary pathways programs and can be usefully applied within disciplinary teaching and support.

Although there were no statistically significant differences between the writers for the analytical categories, there were statistically significant differences for two background variables (overall rate of attribution and mark on task). For the overall rate of attribution, international multilingual students included significantly more attribution than did the local multilingual students. Other studies have also found that multilingual writers producing academic texts as international students enrolled in Western universities (Gilbert, 2004; T. A. Hyland, 2009) or in English language courses in their home country (Shi, 2004) tend to incorporate more information from source texts than English language background writers, with this tendency attributed to linguistic challenges associated with writing at the university level in a second language. I am not aware of previous research specifically comparing the patterns of citation practices of local and international multilingual writers enrolled in a university degree course, however, as the current study has done. In my experience working with multilingual international students, I have often found that they experience considerable anxiety due to the punitive nature of academic honesty policies and regulations they encounter in the culturally unfamiliar writing context of Australian higher education. Their tendency to include more attribution in their academic writing might be at least partly related to this anxiety. However, it should be stressed that there were no other significant differences between the citation practices of local and international students. The allocation of attribution across the generic and rhetorical structure of multilingual international student writers’ texts
and their incorporation of the words and ideas of others and the kinds of citation types they used were not significantly different from local multilingual or monolingual English students.

The other statistically significant difference between the groups was identified around the mark on the task, where the mean mark for physiotherapy students was higher than that of the nursing students. There were no significant differences between language backgrounds or visa status. The entrance to the physiotherapy degree was highly competitive, and a much higher entry score was required to gain admittance to the physiotherapy course (in the 90s) than nursing (in the 50s). While a higher entrance score is but one potential indicator of future success, it could explain at least some of the disparity between the two groups. It is important to be aware that many factors can impact the final quality of a student’s academic writing, not just their use of sources. The higher mark within the physiotherapy group may also have been attributed to aspects of their texts that were not directly related to their intertextual practices. While the marking criteria for the task did include a general item related to source use focussed on the correct citation of credible sources using APA style (“Sources and referencing” – see Appendix 7), it is not possible to know whether or to what extent the final overall mark was related to source use. The physiotherapy students generally presented their points more confidently in their writing, in ways that more closely matched academic expectations. They tended to be awarded higher marks even when their intertextual practices were in many ways comparable to those of the nursing students.

6.2.3 Exploring intertextual practices revealed by the textual analysis

Overall, the findings presented above in response to research questions 1a and 1b highlight the shared practices across this diverse group of student writers, revealing areas of strength as well as challenges.
Given that the texts collected in the corpus for the current study represent first-year students’ earliest attempts at university-level academic writing, the textual analysis provided some evidence of unexpectedly sophisticated citation practices. For example, throughout the corpus, numerous instances of accurate citation of secondary sources were encountered, as well as instances where the presence of a secondary source has been signalled, although the details of citation formatting may not have been precisely followed. Additionally, generalisations, where the writer synthesises ideas from two or more sources within a single citation (K. Hyland, 1999), were not uncommon in the corpus. In previous studies of undergraduate writing, this kind of citation has been found extremely infrequently (J. J. Lee et al., 2018) or not at all (Borg, 2000). The appearance of secondary citation and generalisations in the corpus for the current study indicates that many of these student writers across all the student groups were developing their referencing skills and mastering more advanced citation practices.

The corpus also provided evidence of these student writers’ early efforts to develop a stance toward the evidence they drew from their source texts, another unexpectedly sophisticated practice for novice writers. Several attempted to project an authorial stance toward their cited sources. Most of the writers relied heavily on a neutral stance toward their cited statements, which is consistent with previous studies of undergraduates (Howard et al., 2010; J. J. Lee et al., 2018; Plakans & Gebril, 2012; Shi, 2010; Wette, 2018). However, the qualitative textual analysis did reveal numerous examples of students across all groups using evaluative language to project a stance toward their cited statements. Most often this took the form of an endorsement of the transtheoretical model that was the focus of the assessment task, but there were several instances of students expressing a more nuanced stance (not always entirely successfully), pointing out potentially problematic aspects of the generally useful model or juxtaposing contrasting viewpoints and identifying the one they found more persuasive.
The task instructions themselves did not specifically require students to take a critical approach to the transtheoretical model, provide alternative viewpoints or develop an argument for or against its use. Rather, they directed students to “discuss the goals and strategies you (as the health care professional) would use to implement the model”, to “provide an outline of the issues in the precontemplation and contemplation stages”, and to “find and evaluate appropriate literature to support your discussion”. Somewhat confusingly, this final instruction could be interpreted to mean that a critical approach toward the literature itself may be required, instead of toward the model or suggested strategies. It is unclear how a first-year health sciences student would have enough familiarity with the variety of professional publications on a topic related to behavioural psychology to attempt to evaluate the literature.

Argumentation in academic writing is often presented as an alternative to description or the listing of facts (Prosser & Webb, 1994; Read, Francis, & Robson, 2001). In contrast to the task instructions themselves, throughout the essay writing guide students were given general advice about the need to include an argument in their academic writing, for example: “Essays should follow an ‘argument’ not just present a collection of facts or rely on assertion without evidence for put a number of arguments that collectively were incoherent.” The examples of evaluative language in the corpus used to construct a stance may represent students’ attempts to respond to this expectation in their texts, demonstrating that many student writers were attuned to general academic requirements of the writing context and shaping their citation practices accordingly. In this assignment, students responded to an assessment task that required them to analyse and apply a model, but not necessarily to construct an argument in which the model itself was critiqued or to present alternatives. The issue was a mismatch between the task instructions and the generic essay writing advice students received; not all
essay tasks are necessarily argumentative, and there was little information that would have helped students understand how the general advice applied to their specific writing situation.

Not surprisingly, these student writers also experienced significant challenges related to their intertextual practices in this writing task. One challenge faced by these student writers involved ambiguity created in their texts as a result of their citation practices. This ambiguity manifested in two key ways. First, students appeared to borrow the language from research articles to refer to ideas from their source texts, but they used that language in ways that made it difficult for the reader to determine who was ultimately responsible for the idea. For example, there are numerous instances of students making broad statements attributed to ‘the literature’ or ‘research studies’ with only a single source included in the citation. Were these students presenting the cited author’s summary of the field, or assuming that providing the viewpoint of one credible author is sufficient to represent the field? Conversely, there were also many examples of quite specific research findings (including quantitative results or detailed descriptions of participants) included in a generalisation, with several sources identified in a single citation, where it would have been extremely unlikely that several studies produced identical findings. This type of ambiguity in identifying sources may be the result of inexperienced student writers attempting to mirror typical citation practices they encounter in published academic texts, without a clear understanding of their purpose or implementation.

The findings of the textual analysis also revealed instances of ambiguity of voice (Mori, 2014), where the cited author’s incorporated ideas and style become inextricably enmeshed in the student writer’s sentences, making it impossible for the reader to identify what is being attributed to the source text. In the current study, this was particularly common in paraphrases where the student writer attempted to incorporate evaluative statements. Although some students took a stance (usually positive) toward information from their sources, there was a
strong tendency across the groups of writers to present the stance in an attributed statement, often in ways that obscured whether the position presented belonged to the student writer or the cited author. For example, in Excerpt 6.1 a monolingual English background physiotherapy student positively evaluated a course of action in the following way:

6.1) Moving an individual from one stage to another is proposed to be a worthwhile goal because it will increase the likelihood that this person will subsequently achieve the termination stage (West, 2005).

It is unclear here whether the student writer is proposing this goal as worthwhile, or if the evaluation is West’s. This tendency for novice writers to “borrow” the stance of their cited authors has been noted in previous studies (J. J. Lee et al., 2018; Swales, 2014) and may represent an inexperienced writer’s deferral to the authority of published experts.

Another challenge these writers encountered stems from the pedagogical nature of university essays, where students are expected to demonstrate not just mastery of content but also the skills associated with academic writing. The textual analysis showed patterns indicating that many of these student writers engaged in a kind of citation practice where references to source texts were used to draw the reader’s attention to particular aspects of the cited sources, particularly in their integral citations. This practice is demonstrated in Excerpt 6.2, drawn from an essay written by a monolingual English background physiotherapy student highlighting her use of a current journal article:

6.2) A recent article by McCarty, Gustafson, Capoccia & Cotter (2009) is one example of a community network that can be established that uses learning sessions, web pages, coaching and interest circles to educate addiction treatment programs to greater enhance their effectiveness of care to the individual.
The qualitative textual analysis showed that when integral citations were used, students tended to give prominence to author names of key texts, often from the unit’s reading list or sources that appeared to be valued by the lecturer. This prominence was achieved by placing authors’ names in the subject position within the sentence, thus focussing the sentence on the cited author and highlighting the student writer’s incorporation of relevant information from credible sources. Additionally, there are numerous examples in the corpus of student writers naming not only the author(s) of cited works but also highlighting the type of publication, most often research articles. This over-emphasis on the author and/or publication information of the source text often disrupted the effective integration of the ideas into the grammatical structure of the sentence and resulted in confusing sentences.

Even though this study’s quantitative analysis identified far fewer integral than non-integral citations in the corpus, there was a significant difference between this study of beginner undergraduate students and previous studies that analysed the texts of more experienced postgraduate (Samraj, 2013) or professional (K. Hyland, 1999) writers. The current study found that integral citations were significantly more common in these beginners’ writing (75:25) than in the other previous studies. However, it is possible that the use of an author/date referencing system may also contribute to more frequent integral citations (Ädel & Garretson, 2006; Charles, 2006; Swales, 2014).

Another challenge student writers faced integrating ideas from their sources into a heteroglossic text related to their practices related to paraphrasing and quotation. The findings from the textual analysis showed that student writers relied heavily on the original wording of their cited sources; in the interviews, students described struggling to incorporate ideas from these sources into their paragraphs. Some students were able to weave information from more than one source into their paragraphs but often did not use their own words to create connections between the ideas from different sources, relying on proximity to link one
idea to the next. This kind of patchwriting (Howard, 1993) has been frequently identified as a feature of the writing of novice academic writers, and a natural step in a writer’s development (Flowerdew & Wang, 2015; Gu & Brooks, 2008; Howard et al., 2010; Li & Casanave, 2012; Pecorari, 2003; Stockall & Cole, 2016; C. Thompson, 2005, 2006; Wette, 2017a). It may be an especially common practice when writers first engage with an unfamiliar topic (Li & Casanave, 2012), as most of these writers were doing. These were beginning writers and novice practitioners, meeting new challenges by borrowing the words and ideas of more experienced writers and established experts in their field.

Additionally, this task required students to identify issues associated with each stage, a descriptive requirement; even experienced writers can find it challenging to paraphrase descriptive text. There were many examples of student writers incorporating relatively large chunks from their source texts (entire sentences or more), resulting in lengthy passages drawn from a single source, often describing a health risk behaviour or a stage of the model. The larger the chunk, the more likely it was to be disconnected from the surrounding text, dropped in with little explanation or links to the surrounding ideas, a practice that has been called “parenthetical plonking” (Swales, 2014) or “dumping” (Stockall & Cole, 2016). Both of these challenges, patchwriting and parenthetical plonking, left the concepts incorporated from sources disconnected from the surrounding text and inhibited the student writers’ ability to connect those concepts to the issues of professional practice they were attempting to address in their writing.

6.3 Talk around text

The talk around text strand of the study provided insights into how these students saw themselves as learners and writers, and how these perceptions influenced their intertextual practices. These findings deepen the insights from the textual analysis and ensure that student
voices inform the understandings of first-year writing developed in this study. Research questions 2 and 3 were addressed by this strand of the study. These questions investigated the students’ understandings of intertextual practices generally and their own practices within this writing task; these findings were presented in Chapter 5. As these two research questions are closely intertwined, they will be discussed together.

Research question 2, which focussed on students’ general understandings of intertextuality based upon their prior personal and educational experiences, can be seen as relating primarily to Ivanič’s (1998) autobiographical self, which involves the authors’ past experiences and knowledge and how these have shaped them as writers. Research question 3 focussed on how these students’ current practices and perceptions can be seen as relating primarily to Ivanič’s (1998) discoursal self – the image a writer seeks to create of themselves in the text – and authorial self – the writer’s presence in the text. The discoursal self is shaped, but not necessarily determined, by the autobiographical self, while the authorial self is so intertwined that it can be considered “an aspect of the discoursal self” (Burgess & Ivanič, 2010, p. 247).

These stances can be said to have emerged from the talk around text analysis:

- embracing intertextual practices;
- resisting intertextual practices;
- adapting to intertextual practices.

While these stances are based upon the perceptions and practices of the participants in the current study, I believe they can provide insights into the practices of beginning student writers more generally.

While a student writer’s experiences and perceptions may be more closely aligned with one stance, they can, and some did, demonstrate affiliations with more than one stance. It is also
important to recognise that the stance a student takes up toward intertextual practices is not static and, like aspects of their writer identity, will likely change and grow over time. Indeed, the identities students take up during their participation in higher education may not represent identities they will retain throughout their lives (Burgess & Ivanič, 2010). However, the stances which beginning writers adopt toward academic intertextual practices during this transition provide important insights into their motivations and understandings.

6.3.1 Embracing intertextual practices

Embracing intertextual practices involves an acceptance of the practices and identities the student writer associates with tertiary academic writing. The practices encountered seem to be a recognisable part of a familiar world the writer relates to in a largely positive way; this is a relatively comfortable space for them, and the identities available to them within it are attractive and desirable. This willingness to take up the intertextual practices they encounter does not necessarily indicate that the student has fully mastered or understood them; rather, they are positively predisposed to the intertextual practices of the academy. Within this interview group, Katrijn, a multilingual English-dominant school-leaver, is the student who is most representative of an embracing stance.

The familiarity with intertextual practices that is a feature of the embracing stance may highlight an alignment between the student writer’s previous educational experiences and those encountered in their university studies, thus relating to the autobiographical self. These prior educational experiences may be recent, so that the student writer is fine-tuning current practices, rather than resurrecting them. There may be a familial tradition of higher education participation, especially in a Western context, demonstrating the role cultural capital can play in successful transition to university study (McKay & Devlin, 2014). For these student writers, university study seems a natural extension of their prior experiences, and their prior positive educational experiences form an important part of their autobiographical selves. In
many ways, Katrijn reflects widely-held preconceptions of a traditional university student: a middle-class school-leaver coming directly to university from secondary school. Katrijn did not mention considering any option other than tertiary studies after finishing her secondary schooling. Higher education provided an identity that she began preparing to take up well prior to enrolment in her first units of study.

A student who takes an embracing stance may also have had opportunities for ongoing dialogue around writing and source use with individuals familiar with the practices of higher education. Other studies have shown that student writers recognise and value the “dialogic nature of academic writing” (Morton et al., 2015, p. 55), which involves not just interacting with other texts, but also with other people, including academics, students and family members. This dialogue helps foster a sense of mentorship, providing the student writer with a framework to decipher the expectations and the context of the written assessment tasks.

Katrijn valued the discussions about academic writing she had with her mother, a published author who completed a PhD, and her previous teachers, who provided specific feedback on the use of evidence and its incorporation in academic texts.

In terms of the discoursal self, a student taking up an embracing stance is likely to feel comfortable drawing upon their prior experiences to inform their practices in the new writing environment, projecting into the text an image of a writer capable of managing the writing situation. The discoursal self is firmly rooted in the student writers’ identity as a successful student; she wants to present herself as a successful student because it is who she believes herself to be. This sense of a writer’s identity can carry through into the authorial self, with embracing writers exhibiting a greater willingness to make judgements and evaluations. For example, Katrijn described deliberately committing to a clear central argument, a practice she carried over from her writing in secondary school; she was also one of the few writers in the cohort that critiqued the model that formed the basis of the essay.
This outward confidence may mask uncertainties, however. A student writer who displays an embracing stance is still working out how to manage intertextual practices in a writing context that may not be as familiar as it initially appears. Clarifying the relationship between source texts and a writers’ own words and ideas can be challenging for even the most experienced writers, and this aspect of academic citation remains occluded for many student writers (Pecorari, 2006), even when the texts they produce are judged to be successful by their assessors. The student writer’s ostensible acceptance of practices may mask underlying misperceptions or concerns. For example, Katrijn still had not mastered important aspects of explicit intertextuality. She expressed uncertainty about how to cite different kinds of sources and the finer points of referencing style, leaving her assumptions about her ownership of knowledge unexamined. Katrijn consistently omitted citations to knowledge gained through classroom discussions and her research and reading, because she felt that the act of acquiring that knowledge and putting it into “her own words” made it hers, in a way that attributable statistics and definitions were not. Her questions focussed on the mechanics of referencing and formatting details, which had been regularly emphasised throughout the course and had consequently drawn her attention and concern. She demonstrated no such concern about omitting citations of the source texts that informed her new knowledge, or about the lack of consistency between her in-text citations and reference list. The fact that she received an HD on the task perhaps indicates her confidence in her intertextual practices was supported by her marker.

6.3.2 Resisting intertextual practices

Student writers enact a resisting stance by pushing back against the expectations around intertextual practices. These writers have not yet found a way to engage with other voices in ways that allow them to express an identity in their writing that is meaningful to them. Although the resisting student writer may reluctantly accede to expectations, the intertextual
practices are not yet persuasive, and an internal resistance develops. Ivanič (1998), for example, found that the mature students in her study, who felt their extensive life and work experience were not always recognised by the university, demonstrated resistance to many of the practices they encountered. In the current study, a resisting stance was demonstrated by Laurent, a multilingual French-dominant Australian permanent resident, and Michael, a monolingual Australian citizen, mature age students who spent years in employment before returning to university study.

A resisting stance may result from a mismatch between prior well-established identities and those identities students perceive as available to them within their new writing context. Students can bring different kinds of authority with them into higher education from prior experiences such as employment, civic participation or parenthood – kinds of authority they may not see as recognised or valued by the university (Ivanič, 1998). Norton (2001) identified such a reaction in her study of English language learners. One of the students in Norton’s study, Katarina, was a highly experienced teacher with a fully developed professional identity that she believed was not recognised by her language teacher, causing her to disengage from classroom activities. Previous studies have shown that students’ prior work experience in particular impacts their source use (Cumming et al., 2016). In the current study, Laurent and Michael’s autobiographical selves were strongly influenced by their recent experiences in the workplace. Their writer identities seemed to be more closely aligned with the kinds of professionals they had been in the past and aimed to become again in future, rather than as university students. These mature-age, middle-class male students described feeling required to stifle significant aspects of their identities to be successful in the writing task that is the focus of this study. For Laurent, it was the creative identity he cultivated through his work in the film industry, which he believed had no place in his academic
writing. In contrast, the lack of control Michael experienced in the academic writing context clashed with his desire to deliberately shape his professional future.

In some instances, this conflict between a student’s strongly held identity and the one they feel obliged to adopt can have a direct impact upon the authorial self they project into the text through their intertextual practices. Laurent pushed back against what he described as the “mechanical” nature of writing in health sciences by persisting with citation practices he felt reflected the values of creativity and independent thinking he brought with him from his experiences in the film industry. He did not cite sources in his discussion of health care strategies, because he believed that he was most credible as an author when he was “using his own brain”. Some of these strategies that Laurent did not cite appeared in other essays in the corpus, leading me to conclude that there was a common source – either a published text or course materials. Laurent did “use his own brain” to select strategies most likely encountered in course materials and classroom discussions that were relevant to the behaviour he identified within the stage he was directed to consider.

Laurent focussed his source use on descriptions of the model (in a similar fashion to the “regurgitating” of his textbook Michael described). This kind of source use echoes Katrijn’s practice of not citing information she believed reflected knowledge she had acquired through her work and study, but the motivation here is quite different. Laurent and Michael negatively interpreted the expectations of the writing context (the “mechanical nature” of the writing, the perceived need to “regurgitate”) which fostered an internal resistance, while Katrijn’s embracing stance tended toward the positive and focussed on what she felt she gained (newly acquired, internalised knowledge).

The resistance associated with this stance can take a variety of forms. Students can respond to threats to their identity by “accommodating the established values and practices of the
context they are entering or – more radically – by questioning and challenging [them] and recognising possibilities of change” (Ivanič, 1998, p. 99). Within the context of this study, external manifestations of a resistant stance were minimal; students did not overtly act on their feelings of resistance. These students aired their frustrations within our talk around text conversations, but they did not raise their concerns with the teaching team or act upon their frustrations within lectures or tutorials. Perhaps because Laurent and Michael (in contrast to the working-class students of Ivanič’s study) shared previous educational experiences and family histories which had given them a familiarity with the environment of university learning and a confidence in their abilities, they did not blame themselves for the frustrations they experienced but located them within the task and/or the institution.

Students who do not overtly question practices or act upon their resistance may feel obliged to take up less authoritative identities within the university writing context (Ivanič, 1998), for example, that of a student fulfilling expectations, rather than a fellow professional in training. Resistant students are not necessarily interested in reflecting the internalised identity of a successful student, as a writer taking up the embracing stance may be; rather, student writers with a resistant stance may feel forced into what they perceived to be the restrictive identity of a student for “extrinsic purposes” (Burgess & Ivanič, 2010, p. 230).

The student writers in the current study seemed prepared to engage in “teacher pleasing” (Stockall & Cole, 2016, p. 348), employing practices they did not embrace to facilitate the changes they wanted to make in their lives and careers by gaining a professional qualification. They identified most closely with the professional identities they hoped to attain as a result of their university study. This finding aligns with Norton’s (2001) concept of imagined communities – that students often project their imagination beyond the classroom where their learning is taking place. They create a world outside their current time and space and a vision of themselves as part of that world – belonging to it. These imagined
communities are often those they seek to join through their learning, and they can be highly invested in these communities. If students do not feel those communities in which they are invested are recognised and acknowledged within the context of their learning, they may disengage and exhibit non-participation (Pavlenko & Norton, 2007). While Laurent and Michael continued to participate in the required learning and assessment activities of the class, they appeared to be somewhat disengaged from the community of higher education. As a result, some of their negative assumptions about the practices they encountered remained unexamined, masking potential misperceptions that, if clarified, could result in a more positive approach.

Traces of resistance can reveal themselves within texts in the representation of discoursal and authorial selves. For example, Michael felt obliged to include a critique of the model, not because he found this writing strategy internally persuasive, but because he felt like he did not have another option. Consequently, he was not able to be critical in a way that was appropriate for the task. Instead, he tacked on an additional paragraph that was not well integrated into his essay, nor was the critique it contained particularly successful. His performance of “the critical student” (Harwood & Petrić, 2012, p. 77) resulted in a discoursal identity that created obstacles for the expression of his authorial self. Abasi, Akbari, and Graves (2006) described a similar resistance to total alignment with a lecturer’s views and interests in postgraduate writers who attempted to retain identities formed through their life experiences, creating tensions and concerns about how their writing would be assessed. In the current study, resistant students also demonstrated a focus on the assessment of their writing, adopting relatively sophisticated intertextual practices, but in a task-focussed way. Both Michael and Laurent synthesised ideas from their source texts, referring to more than one source in a single citation; their primary motivation was to maximise their word count, rather than to create relationships between source texts.
6.3.3 Adapting to intertextual practices

Characteristic of this stance is a willingness to engage with intertextual practices of higher education as student writers understand them but a lack of confidence in that understanding and consequently in their own practices. These writers are likely positively disposed toward the practices they encounter, but they may be uncertain as to how they can employ intertextual practices to achieve their writing goals. Their uncertainty may result in a reluctance to question practices or requirements, even those that are not fully accepted or understood, and they attempt to adapt their practices to accommodate their understanding of the intertextual aspects of university-level academic writing. Ana (a multilingual English-dominant Australian school-leaver), Elizabeth (a monolingual Australian mature-age student), and Bibek (a mature-age multilingual Nepali-dominant international student) were most closely aligned with this stance.

For students demonstrating an adapting stance, familiarity with higher education may not be a central aspect of their autobiographical selves and prior educational experience may not have a strong positive influence. Both Elizabeth, who described being disengaged in her high school studies and uncertain of her career path, and Ana, who took up university study out of a sense of industriousness and a desire to commit to a course of action in her life, came from working-class backgrounds with parents who had either not attempted or completed a university degree. These students described their choice to attend university as one of several options they considered (including employment and vocational training), rather than the natural progression it was for Katrijn. The students in the current study who were most closely aligned with an adapting stance shared a relative unfamiliarity with the Australian higher education system and the associated expectations around academic writing. Like Laurent and Michael, Bibek developed a strong identity as a professional in his field prior to his Australian university studies. However, his formative educational experiences, including
prior tertiary study, occurred in the non-Western context of Nepal and so he tended to view them as unhelpful to him in his Australian studies. An adaptive stance is aspirational, in that the students were often keen to use practices to craft a persona of the knowledgeable student they hope to be, as opposed to the current identity of a confident student projected by a writer with an embracing stance.

For some of the student writers in the current study, their lack of experience appeared to constrain their ability to construct discoursal or authorial selves in their texts. Ivanič (1998) recognised that a student’s socio-economic background has the potential to contribute to a sense of powerlessness in institutions of higher education, “a view of themselves as people without knowledge and hence without authority” (p88). Altidor-Brooks (2014) identified similar concerns in the students who participated in her study; a student named Anna in that study identified herself as a beginner and her inexperience as a reason no one would “trust” her, and she repeatedly questioned her intertextual and textual practices. In the current study, Elizabeth also expressed a belief that source use was required of students to counterbalance a lack of knowledge and experience, and she did not understand intertextuality as a set of practices shared amongst novice and experienced academic writers alike. Bibek, on the other hand, had a strong sense of professional identity, but he was uncertain how to apply his knowledge within the context of university academic writing. He located his difficulties within himself, rather than within the discipline or the task, in contrast to Michael and Laurent.

Students working from an adapting stance may strive to project a discoursal self of a successful student in their texts, not because this is how they necessarily see themselves at this point in time, but because this is who they want to become – and who they want to be in the eyes of their marker. These “possible selves” (Pavlenko & Norton, 2007) shape their decisions and practices in their academic writing tasks and can provide “an evaluative and
interpretive context for such decisions” (p. 670). One imagined community (Norton, 2001) for these writers is the community of higher education they seek to join. Ana often spoke of her writing in terms of getting “the right mark” or answering the “right” question and indicated that the lecturer wanted to students to address specific topics because they were “part of the syllabus”. Other studies have also noted the gaining of marks as a motivation for referencing in undergraduate students’ academic writing (Stockall & Cole, 2016). Bibek was also strongly influenced in his writing choices by his (generally quite accurate) understanding of his lecturer’s position and requirements, often speaking of the concepts stressed during lectures and tutorials and the influence this had on his writing, even though he did not feel entirely successful in his attempts in this task. Previous research studies of postgraduate student writers found marker expectations exerted a strong influence on students’ choices in their writing (Abasi et al., 2006; Harwood & Petrić, 2012), indicating that this characteristic of student writers appears to manifest in their earliest attempts at academic writing and persist throughout their educational journey.

This vision of the potential self of a successful student can influence the intertextual practices of students with an adapting stance in ways that directly impact the authorial self. The writers in this study who exhibited this stance tended to disappear into the text, and their voices are largely absent. This occurred because they relied heavily on their source texts. For example, Elizabeth consistently presented the information she incorporated from her sources as direct quotes, expressing many of her key points in the exact words of her cited authors. Ana opened and closed many of her paragraphs with integral citations with the author as subject, placing the words of cited authors in a position that is often used by more experienced writers to establish the purpose of a paragraph in their own words (at the beginning) and to pull together the information they have provided for their readers (at the end). The writers working from this stance were also less likely to make evaluations or judgements when they
used sources and tended to use less modality in their writing. As K. Hyland (2012) has noted, voice in academic writing is related to “a disciplinary-appropriate system of meanings” and involves students recognising “how things are done” (p. 134), and not all students have equivalent experiences with the ‘essayist literacy’ practices of higher education. This seems to be true of these adapting students.

6.3.4 Stances toward intertextual practices and identity

The stances toward intertextual practices described in section 6.3 are strongly linked to students’ developing identities as learners and writers. They are influenced not only by the students’ prior experiences (which shape their autobiographical selves) but also by their hopes for the future, the imagined communities they seek to join (Norton, 2001). These past experiences and imagined future selves interact differently across the different stances.

The students who demonstrate the embracing stance to the intertextual practices they encounter continue to see themselves as the successful students they were in the past, and they want to be acknowledged as such by their markers. The autobiographical self is based strongly in prior educational experiences, and their expectations are relatively well aligned with the intertextual practices they encounter. Their discoursal identity is aligned to the successful student they believe themselves to be: “This is who I am.” In many ways, they already are members of their desired community – that of higher education – and their intertextual practices, and their marks, reflect this.

Students who are resistant to the intertextual practices they encounter often make a pragmatic choice to don a mask that protects the identity they bring with them to higher education: “This is who I have to be now.” While their prior educational experiences have shaped their autobiographical self, other life experiences, such as employment or industry experience, are more immediately influential. The discoursal identity they assume for their academic writing
tasks is one they hope will get them through their current situation. As writers, they are focussed on the present, trying to project an identity of a compliant student that is acceptable to the marker of the moment, and their intertextual practices vary accordingly. The imagined community that drives them is not necessarily linked to the community they experience in institutions of higher education. Instead, they must pass through higher education to get to their professional community and the desired identities that await them there.

Students who take an adapting stance toward intertextual practices are also putting on a mask, but theirs is one of aspiration: “This is who I hope to be.” They hope that by wearing the mask of the successful student, they will come to inhabit that identity, to themselves and their markers. The experiences that shaped their autobiographical selves are not as informed by proximity to traditions of higher education, and so the intertextual practices they encounter in their university studies are relatively unfamiliar to them. Consequently, these students experience uncertainty and lack confidence in their attempts to take up those practices. Nonetheless, they may aspire to attain the identities they see as available within higher education and are likely to be attracted to them, as are those who seek their identity within the imagined community of their future profession.

6.4 Bringing the strands together

A key strength of this study is the mixed methods design that brings together an analysis of authentic student texts with an exploration of those same students’ perceptions of their experiences as writers and learners, their intertextual practices and their texts. The stances identified in the talk around text study provide deeper insights into the themes related to intertextual practices coming out of the textual analysis and shed light on the motivations and understandings of the students who employed those practices within the analysed texts. In this section, I bring together the findings of these two strands.
The findings of this study help refute deficit discourses associated with first-year writers and their texts which focus on identifying what writers do not understand or do (Lillis, 2013) and hold students responsible for their perceived lack of preparedness for university study (Lawrence, 2005). The mixed methods textual analysis showed that many of the intertextual practices these students employed in their assessment tasks were largely aligned with the conventions of disciplinary academic writing, and they were often successful in responding to expectations that had been explicitly addressed within the unit of study. The qualitative talk around text analysis demonstrated that while the practices they took up in response to those expectations may have appeared superficially similar, their motivations for doing so and the extent to which those practices were internally persuasive varied significantly, informed by their backgrounds and prior experiences. Taken together, the findings from both strands reveal strengths as well as opportunities for both students and educators to develop greater understanding around intertextual practices.

A key area of difficulty for beginning student writers stems from those practices that are not clearly expressed or visible within the writing context, making the practices ‘occluded’. Swales (1996) originally used this term to refer to specific academic genres that novice researchers were often required to produce without having access to exemplars or the opportunity to practice their production, thus rendering the genres “out of sight” (p. 46). Pecorari (2006) argued that occlusion could also occur in relation to specific features of visible texts (like postgraduate theses), demonstrating that although explicit intertextuality may be quite apparent in the text through academic citation, specific features of that intertextuality are less so (for example, the accuracy of the writer’s interpretation of the original text). While beginning university students may have had prior opportunities to practice the production of academic essays, university essays are not often published, and thus authentic models of assessment are not typically available to students.
Some practices students are expected to engage in within their texts are more likely to be visible. The undergraduate essay is a pedagogical genre (Nesi et al., 2017) used to advance not just undergraduate students’ content knowledge but also their mastery of writing practices in their discipline, including academic citation and the formatting of references. These students’ comments during the interviews showed they recognised it as such. They understood they were expected to learn a specific referencing style and demonstrate that learning in their writing. For example, based upon the course materials, support documents and students’ comments in the interviews, it appears they received significant instruction about the importance of adhering to a particular referencing style (APA).

Based on students’ interview statements, this appears to have been an aspect of explicit intertextuality that was directly and frequently addressed in their first semester of university study. Consequently, many of these students appeared to equate explicit intertextuality with the accurate formatting of citations and references. It is important to note that every student interviewed had at least one question about formatting, and not insignificant portions of the interviews were dedicated to conversations about the intricacies of APA style. The analyses revealed that many of these students were engaged in relatively sophisticated citation practices for beginning writers, indicating significant effort and attention was expended in developing their referencing skills. For example, there were numerous examples of multiple citations in the corpus, where several sources are included in a single citation, requiring a synthesising of ideas across sources. However, the focus on referencing and academic citation within the unit of study obscured the deeper possibilities of meaning-making involved in the creation of heteroglossic texts, rendering those possibilities less visible to students. In fact, it may have contributed to the resistant stance toward intertextual practices demonstrated by Laurent and Michael, who were deeply frustrated by what they perceived as the emphasis on the surface features of APA formatting in their feedback.
Other practices, especially many of those connected to the rhetorical purposes of academic citation, were decidedly less visible to these student writers. The rhetorical purposes of source use in academic writing will vary from task to task (Campbell, 1990), making rhetorical purpose less amenable to the kinds of general advice more likely to be found in course materials. The rhetorical purposes of using citations did not appear to be a focus within the unit of study; none of the students described participating in classroom discussions around the purpose of evidence in this task, and only one student (Katrijn) described having these kinds of conversations in prior educational settings. The course materials and support information provided within the unit of study did not address the rhetorical purposes of academic citation in academic writing more generally or within this task specifically, meaning this aspect of intertextuality was likely to be less obvious than were expectations around integration or essay structure. In other words, students received direct information about what explicit intertextuality might look like within their texts, but little about how it works to create meaning.

The focus on formatting, structure and information display within the course materials had a direct impact on students’ intertextual practices. For the most part, they were careful to document the sources of factual knowledge (e.g., statistics and clinical information about health risk behaviours) and descriptions of the model and its stages located in the required textbooks. Hendricks and Quinn (2000) characterise this as an understanding of knowledge as “something out there” (p. 451); knowledge that is encountered rather than constructed. The qualitative findings from both strands of the study highlight that students’ cited attribution was focussed on documenting what could be considered established knowledge encountered in authoritative texts, especially the kinds of knowledge that students believed they were required to reproduce.
For example, Michael, who demonstrated a resisting stance toward intertextual practices, described “regurgitating” the descriptions of the stages of the model from his textbook, and he carefully cited this information. This “knowledge-telling” (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987) aspect of citation was an unsatisfying practice for Michael. He recognised the need for student writers to demonstrate their basic understanding of underlying concepts and theory, but what he perceived as the requirement to parrot back information frustrated and demotivated him. Ana and Bibek, on the other hand, believed that bringing in fundamental concepts from their source texts helped them effectively establish the context for their writing. These two writers, who demonstrated an adapting stance, found a level of reassurance that they were on the right track when they provided and cited definitions and factual statements. Sources set the scene for these student writers, rather than informing the discussion.

The prevalence of citations for definitions and facts revealed in the textual analysis indicates that many student writers perceived the acknowledgement of factual information and background knowledge – Hendricks and Quinn’s (2000) “something out there” information – to be an important function of intertextuality in academic writing. The findings of the talk around text analysis, however, demonstrated frustration on the part of some students who experienced it as a demotivating parroting back of information, while others incorporated it into their practices as a positive way to stay focussed on the task.

Numerous studies have found that different kinds of knowledge trigger different approaches toward citation for undergraduate academic writers (Angelil-Carter, 2000; Chandrasoma et al., 2004; Shi, 2010, 2011). Students’ choices around what not to cite also provide significant insights into their understanding and implementation of intertextual practices. The findings of the qualitative textual analysis highlighted the fact that students’ application of the model within their essays often went uncited. Specifically, these student writers often suggested
specific strategies that could be used within the various stages of the model, and they were far less likely to cite these strategies than they were to cite definitions or other factual knowledge. Uncited information about applying the model appeared to represent information acquired through classroom discussions or their self-directed library research and reading, what Shi (2010) calls knowledge “as a result of learning” (p. 9). This knowledge was often internalised to such an extent that students did not perceive a need to cite sources or tease out which texts were most influential in their learning processes. They believed that through their own efforts, they had created knowledge that was new to them and had expressed their understanding in their own words.

Perhaps these students writers have a point. Stockall and Cole (2016) have used the term “transformality” (p. 352) to refer the ways writers engage in this kind of appropriation of the language and ideas of others to make meaning for themselves. For the writers in this study, this transformed knowledge gained through learning belonged to them in a way that facts and definitions, often expressed in language that remained markedly similar to the source text, did not. The fact that none of the marker feedback on the essays in the talk around text strand of the study negatively commented on the lack of citations for strategies (even those strategies that appeared across several texts in the corpus) may indicate that the lecturer responded positively to this practice.

In the current study, the shared practice of non-citation of strategies appeared to have different meanings for writers with different stances. For Laurent (resisting stance), the omission of citations for applied knowledge gained through reading and classroom interactions was an expression of his self-confidence, perhaps based on his relative familiarity with higher education. While he recognised that he had acquired knowledge of healthcare provider strategies from existing sources, he seemed surprised when I asked why he had not cited those sources. Laurent believed he was demonstrating independence and
highlighting his critical thinking skills by not referring to sources when recommending specific strategies for health care practitioners. He saw citations as a kind of crutch, something for writers to fall back on when their own ideas are not enough.

However, students working from an adapting stance were less likely to share this confidence and did not appear to internalise acquired information from their sources in the same way. For example, Elizabeth identified herself as a novice in her field with no credibility of her own. When she did make recommendations regarding strategies, which she did far less frequently than writers with an embracing or resisting stance, she was also likely to leave them uncited, perhaps reflecting reluctance to take on the persona of a qualified professional due to her lack of confidence. These findings seem to indicate that shared practices can arise from very different perceptions and motivations. The three stances identified in this study can provide insights into those perceptions and motivations that academic and support staff can use to inform their interactions with learners and better communicate with them about the complexity of the range of intertextual practices available to them.

6.5 Key contributions of the study

The current study has revealed patterns of intertextual practices within the disciplinary texts of a large, linguistically diverse group of first-year writers, adding to our knowledge about this under-researched group. Much of the previous research has focused on more advanced undergraduate students and postgraduate students (Ådel & Garretson, 2006; Swales, 2014; Wette, 2017b). Moreover, previous studies involving systematic textual analysis of first-year writers’ texts have been situated within first-year composition or EAP courses (Keck, 2006, 2014; J. J. Lee et al., 2018), with a focus on multilingual writers. In contrast, the current study has provided a comprehensive exploration of the intertextual practices of first-year
undergraduate writers from diverse backgrounds – monolingual and multilingual; local and international.

The mixed methods design of the study has added to our knowledge of the intertextual practices of first-year undergraduate students. Few mixed methods investigations of intertextual practices in student writing exist (Petrić & Harwood, 2013; Samraj, 2004; Wette, 2017b), with even fewer focusing on beginning undergraduate writers in the first year of university study (Wette, 2018). The mixed method design of this research has given these novice writers a strong voice. In the textual analysis, the large number of authentic texts in the corpus has enabled rich and detailed patterns of students’ intertextual practices to emerge. The talk around text analysis has also provided rich insights from the student writers themselves into why those patterns might exist. A key strength of this study is the in the combination of elements just described: it is a rare example of naturalistic mixed-methods research situated within an academic discipline, focussing exclusively on beginning first-year undergraduates from diverse language backgrounds and incorporating both a systematic textual analysis of a large corpus and interviews with students writers who contributed to the corpus.

The current study demonstrates the importance of addressing intertextuality in beginning academic writing in a positive way that highlights student practices that are beginning to align with academic expectations. By identifying common patterns of intertextual practices within the texts produced by a diverse cohort of first-year students, the current study has added to the growing body of research (Ädel & Garretson, 2006; J. J. Lee et al., 2018; Swales, 2014; Wette, 2017b) that shows that student writers’ intertextual practices are often broadly consistent with common features of intertextuality in academic writing. Additionally, this research has revealed evidence of more sophisticated intertextual practices than might be expected from novice writers. Too often, student writing is problematised at the institutional
level, with discourses around intertextuality narrowed to discussions of formatting or policy compliance and instruction and feedback focussed on the elimination of errors (Abasi & Graves, 2008; Chandrasoma et al., 2004; Shi, 2006). This problematisation is especially common in the discourses surrounding the practices of multilingual writers, and international students in particular (Moore & Harrington, 2016; Murray, 2010).

While it should be acknowledged that language background and educational experiences play a role in how students develop and engage in intertextual practices, this study demonstrates that it is dangerous to pigeon-hole students or use their language backgrounds to make sweeping assumptions about their practices. In a diverse cohort of students, the current study has illustrated important commonalities in the practices of monolingual and multilingual writers. Local monolingual students also find aspects of intertextuality within the context of university academic writing to be new and unfamiliar, and university staff who engage with first-year students need to assess the existing knowledge and capabilities of the students they encounter (Stockall & Cole, 2016).

The current study contributes to a growing body of research that prioritises students’ prior experiences, future goals and imagined communities in the understanding of their development as writers. The study also rejects a one-size-fits-all strategy focussed on generic, transferable academic citation and referencing skills. The talk around text strand of the current study has increased our understanding of the impact of emerging writer identities on the intertextual practices of beginning writers, producing important insights into their experiences, motivations and understandings. Furthermore, the study has identified stances that students may take toward intertextual practices in their academic writing, adding valuable insights into how beginning writers position themselves with respect to the expectations and practices of their disciplinary communities. The study has revealed the complex relationship between student writers’ developing identities and their intertextual
practices. Students can engage in similar practices in their academic writing, but their motivations and understandings, as highlighted in their stance toward intertextual practices, can vary greatly. These stances are influenced by the prior experiences and cultural capital students bring with them to their tertiary studies.

6.6 Recommendations

The findings of this study allow for several recommendations that apply to teaching practice, task design and support provision, and the institutional context.

6.6.1 Teaching practice

*Link intertextual practices to the writing task*

In my experience, academics involved in the teaching of first-year students expend significant time and effort to support learners. However, Chanock (2010) has argued that for many subject lecturers, the discourses of their discipline are so familiar as to seem transparently obvious, which may explain the overly simplified, general nature of the writing advice often given to students. The challenge is to reframe the existing support – to move it away from general statements about referencing and citation (such as “use examples to support your ideas” or “provide examples from the literature”) to more contextualised, targeted advice about the role of intertextuality to support learning in the first year more generally and within specific assessment tasks (for example, “provide a source to help justify why a strategy you suggest is likely to be effective” or “use your textbook to help you outline the stages and find journal articles to help you justify strategies”). Additionally, subject lecturers and academic literacy specialists can incorporate examples from previously submitted assignments in support resources within the unit of study. The use of examples from authentic student texts has been consistently identified as an important strategy for supporting first-year writers (Charles, 2006; Devereux, Wilson, Kiley, & Gunawardena,
2018; Pardoe, 2000; Shi, 2010); however, the models of academic writing beginning writers encounter in their reading and research are often the work of experts positioning their own research findings against that of their peers and colleagues in published research articles.

Another important step toward achieving greater specificity would be for academics to articulate for themselves how they see students using sources in a successful response to the task during initial task design. Academic literacy specialists could provide valuable support to subject lecturers and teaching teams at this point in the process. Bringing together content and disciplinary knowledge, language and learning expertise and different perspectives of student engagement with written tasks can generate important insights and reveal opportunities to clarify expectations and disciplinary practices around source use.

Lectures and tutorials present another opportunity to target information about intertextual practices. In response to the challenges beginning student writers face, lecturers and tutors of first-year students often incorporate presentations on generic topics such as essay structure and referencing styles in the early units in many degree courses, indicating a willingness to set aside valuable class time to orientate novice writers to their new context. For example, in the unit of study that is the focus of this research, support information focussed on a generic overview of essay structure and task analysis and an introduction to the referencing style to be used in the unit of study. In that same semester, a similar introduction to APA referencing was provided in another core first-year unit of study within the nursing degree course. The result was two disconnected introductory lectures within the first year of the nursing degree course that covered quite similar generic information. As is often the case, the specific disciplinary and task-specific characteristics of source use so necessary to the development of students’ intertextual practices were much less likely the focus of explicit instruction.
To address this, subject lecturers and tutors could change the way they use the time that they may already allocate to support beginning students to address the development of more specific intertextual practices tied to the writing context, including the identification of common knowledge within the topic area. Academics responsible for the design of first-year units within a degree course can work together to highlight the features of intertextuality within a disciplinary context across their subject units over the course of the semester, including collaborations with academic literacy specialists. This would serve to better integrate conversations about source use with the subject content and reduce the likelihood of repeated doses of generic referencing instruction at the beginning of the course.

*Clarify marking practices around intertextuality and referencing*

Lecturers have limited time to mark assessment tasks, and so they must make difficult choices in how to allocate that time. A demonstration of conceptual understandings is likely to be prioritised above the intertextual practices like citation and formatting that nevertheless receive significant attention within the unit of study. Indeed, Wette (2018) has encouraged academic literacy specialists to recognise that subjects lecturers may not closely scrutinise students’ source use, as it is not a primary criterion for a successful task. This was borne out by the findings of this study – students in the interview group who received higher marks on this task demonstrated a more confident authorial presence (itself a significant intertextual practice) despite problematic citation practices that did not appear to impact their final mark on the task.

The difficulty is not what markers prioritise, but that different lecturers and tutors may prioritise quite differently. As a result, students can receive very mixed messages about intertextuality and citation practices in academic writing, and they are left in the difficult position of trying to determine the priorities of individual lecturers. Requirements appear arbitrary and negotiable from unit to unit, or even within units with large teaching teams.
University academics involved in the teaching of first-year courses could benefit from a shared vocabulary and understandings around first-year writer strengths and challenges. Wette (2017a) has suggested a staged approach toward L2 writer’s source-based academic writing, identifying four phases of writing development: novice, post-novice, intermediate and proficient. I would argue that such an approach has broader applications for both monolingual and multilingual writers enrolled in university degree courses. Opportunities for discussion within teaching teams of the characteristics of source-based texts produced by novice undergraduate writers in the context of a staged developmental approach could help academics teaching in the first year articulate the expectations for source-based writing, for themselves and their students, as well as informing consistent marking practices within and across first-year units. Studies like the one reported in this thesis can be a valuable tool in identifying the practices of novice writers within the first stage of their writing development.

6.6.2 Task design

*Question the expectations placed on beginning writers, particularly in applied degrees*

Academics responsible for the design of assessment in the first year of university study should carefully consider the kinds of knowledge, experience and intertextual practices required to complete those tasks. In line with a staged approach described above, in the early tasks in the first semester, students should be directed toward articulating their developing understandings of the disciplinary field they seek to join, rather than assuming the persona of a practicing professional. This could allow them to develop their intertextual practices and re-orient them to their new university context before transferring those practices to a professional context.

Bazerman (2006, p. 27) argued that when students are asked “to behave too professionally prematurely, the authority of the disciplinary discourses may wash over and obliterate their
ability as individuals to engage with and grow into disciplinary possibilities. We may put them into positions too distant from their current selves for them to make sense of.”

Additionally, applying theory to professional practice has consistently been identified as a challenge for beginning writers in the health sciences (Borglin, 2012; Gimenez, 2008; Mitchell, 2018). It may not be reasonable to ask beginning students to adopt a professional persona in their academic writing tasks in the first semester, much less to draw upon source texts to support the claims they make while assuming this persona.

6.6.3 Support for beginning writers

*Ensure opportunities exist for individualised support for beginning writers*

The current study reveals the complex relationship between student writers’ developing identities and their intertextual practices. Students can engage in similar practices in their academic writing, but their motivations and understandings, as highlighted in their stance toward intertextual practices, can vary greatly. These stances are influenced by the prior experiences and cultural capital students bring with them to their tertiary studies. Student writers require opportunities to connect their prior academic writing experiences with current expectations; these can be provided by university staff who take on the responsibility to guide students in the process of mastering the discourses of higher education (McKay & Devlin, 2014), a role commonly assumed by academic literacy specialists.

In many institutions, however, there is a trend toward the outsourcing or automation of student writing support, through offsite commercial providers, helpdesk-style drop-in centres offering generalised advice, or technology solutions that focus on sentence-level issues and citation formatting (or some combinations of these). While there may be a place for these kinds of services in larger institutional approaches to first-year writing and transition, they cannot provide the kinds of insights students can gain into their own learning and writing
practices through ongoing interaction with experienced academic writers. Academic literacy specialists within tertiary institutions are uniquely placed to support the developing identities of beginning student writers as, for many of us, conversations with individual students about their learning and academic writing are a significant and rewarding aspect of our day to day work. Academic literacy specialists work to help students create connections between who they are as learners, who they want to be in their writing and how they engage with their source texts. Working from the concepts of stances toward intertextual practices, as described in the findings of this thesis, may help academic literacy specialists position the disciplinary characteristics of intertextuality for beginning writers in ways that could better resonate with their own learning and writing goals, in ways that are not likely to occur through drop-in centres or online services.

6.6.4 Institutional contexts

*Explicitly reject deficit approaches*

The final recommendation is that institutions of higher education need to demonstrate they value the diversity of their student cohort and recognise the contributions their experiences make to the learning environment through the explicit rejection of deficit discourses surrounding beginning writers. This broad recommendation flows from all the preceding recommendations.

Too often, beginning students’ academic writing in general, and intertextual practices in particular, are considered in the light of what writers do not understand or do not do (Lillis, 2013) and the burden of responsibility is placed onto students for their perceived lack of preparedness for university study (Lawrence, 2005). However, the current study’s findings highlight that these beginning writers’ intertextual practices broadly followed patterns that indicate an awareness (if not mastery) of many of the expectations associated with university-
level academic writing, and they provide evidence of unexpectedly sophisticated intertextual practices employed by many of these writers, indicating they expended effort and attention in developing their skills. The findings also indicate that the broad patterns of practices evident in the data were consistent across all the student groupings, demonstrating commonalities amongst groups of students from different language backgrounds and educational experiences in these early stages of university study. I do not claim that beginning students do not have difficulties related to their intertextual practices in their early assessment tasks; rather, that the challenges they experience are reasonable and understandable within the context of their learning and should not be used within institutions to problematise students.

Deficit approaches can be most apparent in institutional policies around academic writing and the intertextual practices of citation and referencing, positioning them in the context of policy compliance, regulation of student behaviour and moral judgement. This kind of positioning has been identified as problematic for beginning student writers (Abasi & Graves, 2008; Altidor-Brooks, 2014; Cleal, 2005; Howard, 1995; Li & Casanave, 2012); it can cause students to connect the requirement to cite sources within their academic writing to their lack of status or power, affecting their ability to write confidently (Read et al., 2001) and their level of engagement with their written tasks. Instead, institutions can reposition their policy statements to emphasise citation as a shared practice of knowledge creation amongst academic writers at all levels of content knowledge and expertise. University policies on plagiarism and academic misconduct are consistently communicated to students; the epistemological underpinnings of academic citation (Hendricks & Quinn, 2000) and the benefits to student learners should be communicated just as consistently.
6.7 Limitations of the study

The first limitation of the research carried out in this thesis is its relatively narrow scope. This research focuses on one genre of academic writing (the essay) within one discipline (health sciences) at one Australian university. Consequently, the generalisability of the findings across task types, disciplines and institutions should be carefully considered. The rich detail characteristic of qualitative research allows the reader to compare their context with that presented in the study and evaluate the relevance of the findings to other populations and situations (Heigham & Croker, 2009), however, and I have attempted to provide sufficient descriptive detail to enable my readers to do so.

A second limitation relates to the selection criteria for the language background variable. The initial survey asked participants to identify the primary language used at home with their families and then asked them to indicate whether that language was the only one used in their family home. Participants who indicated that they used only English with their families, and no other language, were classified as monolingual; all others were classified as multilingual, with the multilinguals further classified according to their visa status (local or international). The interview data revealed that the phrasing of the question might have resulted in different interpretations, potentially resulting in a small number of students (particularly Generation 1.5 students with relatively limited proficiency in their family language) being classified as monolingual, while others of similar backgrounds were classified as multilingual. This issue reflects the complexities of classifying writers according to their language background in society at large and specifically within the tertiary institutions. The traditional L1/L2 designations oversimplify the varied life experiences and spectrum of language use that are becoming more typical of students coming into higher education (Doolan, 2014; Eckstein & Ferris, 2017). This ambiguity in the questionnaire could potentially be resolved by including in the survey questions on the extent of past and current use of languages other than English.
A third limitation relates to the data collection for the talk around text interviews. A gap of about two months passed between students’ submission of their essay task at the end of the semester and the collection of the interview data just prior the following semester. The essay was submitted in the final week of semester, just before the exam period; scheduling the interviews before exams or earlier in the break between semesters would likely have limited the number of students available to participate in the interviews. As a result, some students found it challenging to provide detailed descriptions of their approaches to source use in the essay task or to recall the specific thought processes behind some of their decisions. Ensuring students are able to carve time out of their busy lives to participate in research often requires trade-offs, and the longer time frame between essay submission and interview was one made for the current study. Notwithstanding the time gap, the talk around text discussions provided valuable insights into these students’ practices and perceptions.

A fourth limitation of this study is the lack of a systematic comparison of the students’ writing with their source texts. Such a comparison was impractical due to the size of the corpus used in the textual analysis. This lack of comparison limits my ability to make claims with any certainty about the accuracy or extent of students’ paraphrasing.

The final limitation relates to the fact the study employed ethnography as method, rather than as methodology or deep theorising (Lillis, 2008). This study did not employ the sustained involvement of the researcher in the writing context that characterises studies grounded in ethnographic methodology or theorising; that type of sustained involvement was not my goal in this mixed methods study, however. One of the goals of this research is to provide insights into students’ understanding and practices through both qualitative and quantitative analyses, at a very specific point in their lives – their first semester of university study – and I do believe that has been achieved. While one-off interviews produce what Lillis calls “glimpses” (p. 361) into the student writer’s experiences, the glimpses provided by the current study
generated meaningful insights into these writers’ practices and who they were at that point in their lives.

6.8 Future directions

The findings and limitations of the current study indicate several possible directions for future research. As identified in Chapter 2, there is currently a gap in our knowledge of the intertextual practices in the disciplinary academic writing of undergraduate university students, particularly in the first year of their study. The findings of this research make a valuable contribution, but further investigations are needed that specifically focus on first-year writers from diverse language backgrounds enrolled in university degree courses and the texts they produce for assessment. Specifically, although it was not the primary analytical focus, the current study is a rare example of an investigation into the practices of local and international multilingual academic writers. The practices of multilingual Generation 1.5 students in Australian higher education are under-researched (Williamson, 2015), and more studies in this area could reveal valuable insights into this group of beginning writers whose numbers are growing.

Further investigations of first-year students’ intertextual practices across different genres would greatly increase our understanding of and our ability to support first-year writers. The current study was limited to the analysis of texts of a vague and ubiquitous genre, the university essay. The types of assignments that fall into the category of “university essay” are broad; the term itself is vague and contested. The findings of this research demonstrate that a one-size fits all approach to source use and intertextuality is problematic even for this one genre (however broad the category). Students must employ intertextual practices across a wide range of genres (including lab reports, reflective tasks, presentations, placement observations, and many others) throughout their undergraduate degree, many of which they
will encounter in their first year. Investigations across and within different genres would reveal the diversity of intertextual practices students encounter in the first year of university study, as well as uncovering how the stances students take up toward intertextual practices may vary across these diverse genres.

Finally, studies of a more longitudinal nature, involving cyclical conversations and the collection of a number of texts, could show the development of students’ intertextual practices and writer identity across the first year of university study. Although intertextual practices were not their primary focus, McNamara, Morton, Storch, and Thompson (2018) have demonstrated international students’ perceptions of academic writing, including source use, develop and grow significantly across the first year, and Burgess and Ivanič (2010) have identified time as an important factor in the development of writer identity. Further talk around text studies involving more than the one-off interviews that were the basis of the interview strand of the current study could provide valuable insights into students’ changing practices during this pivotal time in their transition to university study and throughout their studies.

6.9 Concluding remarks

This research has revealed that the range of intertextual practices employed by first-year writers is often surprisingly sophisticated and is always informed by their prior experiences, current constraints, future goals and possible selves. Student writers do not work in a vacuum; they have reasons for the choices they make in their writing and the ways they engage with their source texts.

I was struck time and again throughout the writing of this thesis by how much my own reactions to a new and challenging writing environment mirrored these first-year writers’ descriptions of their own experiences. During the writing of this thesis, I have had to examine.
my own intertextual practices, repeatedly and at length, and find my own voice so that I could say something meaningful and useful about the students’ voices. I have had the humbling experience of putting forward my own writing for evaluation and feedback, not as a peer or professional colleague, but as a novice negotiating my own entry into a new discourse community. It was exhausting and exhilarating and at times confounding – this is where our first-year students live.

With the massification of universities and the increasing diversity of the student cohort, it becomes more and more challenging to work with individual students in ways that allow them to reveal their strengths and challenges. The findings of this study have shown that while there are patterns and similarities in the practices employed by many first-year writers, the underlying experiences and beliefs that inform their practices vary greatly and directly impact their writing and learning. University staff who teach and support first-year students must themselves be supported by their institutions’ approaches to teaching and learning to respect this diversity and to welcome students who embody it.
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Appendix 1: Participant information statement

INFORMATION LETTER TO STUDENT PARTICIPANTS

TITLE OF PROJECT: Intertextual practices in academic writing: A study of local and international undergraduate Health Sciences students

PRINCIPAL SUPERVISOR: Dr. Marie Stevenson STUDENT RESEARCHER: Ms. Leighana Thornton

PROGRAMME IN WHICH ENROLLED: PhD, Faculty of Education and Social Work, University of Sydney

Dear Participant,

As a student enrolled in ..., you are invited to participate in a research study investigating how undergraduate Health Sciences students use outside sources in their academic writing, and how they understand the role of outside sources in written assessment tasks, specifically essays.

What is the purpose of this study?
The goal of this study is to better understand the choices students make when writing assessment tasks, as well as what academic staff understand and communicate to students in this area. The data for this project will be collected in this unit ..., and will involve an analysis of written essays and essay feedback, and interviews with both students and academic staff over the course of this semester.

Who is conducting this study?
This research project is being conducted by Leighana Thornton, an Academic Skills Adviser at ACU, and will form the basis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education at the University of Sydney, under the supervision of Dr. Marie Stevenson, Lecturer in TESOL, Faculty of Education and Social Work, the University of Sydney. This project has been approved by the ACU Human Research Ethics Committee.

What is involved in this study, and how long will it take?
If you consent to be involved in this project, you may be invited to participate in at least one, or possibly all of these activities:

- A brief demographic survey requiring no more than 10 minutes to complete, in week 10.

- An analysis of your essay for this unit, and the feedback you receive from your lecturers. This activity would not require any of your time.

- Two interviews, each lasting about an hour. In the first interview, we would talk about your learning background, and in the second we would discuss the essay that you wrote, so you should bring a copy of the essay with you. You would not need to do any preparation for these interviews. They will take place in a relaxed and private environment on campus, in my office in the Academic Skills Unit, in the final weeks of this semester, and will be organised at a time that is mutually convenient.

Not all of the students who volunteer to take part in this study will be required to participate in every phase of the research project.

What are the benefits of this study?
It is hoped that the findings of this study will help teachers and support staff to better understand what beginning university students know and what they do in their writing, which may lead to better teaching and learning opportunities for both students and staff.

You may also personally benefit from the opportunity to think more deeply about how and why you make choices about outside sources as you write essays and other assessment tasks, allowing you to develop your skills and knowledge in academic writing and using sources.
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Are there any risks associated with this study?
There are no foreseeable risks to you from participating in this study. Some people may feel anxious during an interview, if that happens, there are Counsellors available to assist.

What if I decide not to participate?
You are free to decide not to participate in this project, with no effect on either your mark on the assignment or on your overall mark in this subject. Your ability to access the support services provided through the Academic Skills Unit will also not be affected in any way.

Can I withdraw from the study?
If you decide to participate, you can change your mind and withdraw your participation at any time. You do not need to give any reason for doing so, and your mark and your access to support services will remain entirely unaffected.

Will anyone else know about my participation in this study?
If you decide to participate in this project, your confidentiality and privacy will be protected. All data collected will be used only for the research purposes of this project. No one except the researchers will have access to the data, and it will not be used to calculate your final mark for the unit. Your privacy will be protected at all times by using an identifying code instead of your name. While the data will be used in the publication of the results of the project (in the thesis, and in appropriate academic journals, for example), you will never be identified; only pseudonyms and aggregated data will be used. Finally, if you decide to participate, you will be provided with a summary of the findings of the project, once the data analysis and reporting is complete; also, a full copy of the thesis will be accessible through the Australian Digital Theses database.

Who can I contact if I want to know more about this study?
If you would like further information or have any questions about this project, you can contact Leighana Thornton or Marie Stevenson by phone or by email:

Ms. Leighana Thornton
Academic Skills Unit
Australian Catholic University, North Sydney campus
(02) 9799-2526
leighana.thornton@acu.edu.au

Dr. Marie Stevenson
Lecturer, TESOL
Faculty of Education and Social Work
University of Sydney
(02) 9351-8884
marie.stevenson@sydney.edu.au

What if I have a complaint or concern?
If you have any complaints or concerns about this project, you can contact the Human Research Ethics Committee at ACU:

Professor John Ozolins
Chair, Human Research Ethics Committee
Australian Catholic University, Melbourne campus
(03) 9653-3140
john.ozolins@acu.edu.au

What should I do if I want to participate?
If you decide to participate, please sign both copies of the consent form you received with this letter. Keep one copy for your records, and return one copy to one of the sealed collection boxes this week. These boxes are clearly labelled "Research Project", and they are located in the Library on level 2, near the Loans Desk, and at the main Reception in the Carroll Building on level 3.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this invitation.

Kind Regards,

Ms. Leighana Thornton
Student Researcher

Dr. Marie Stevenson
Principal Supervisor
Appendix 2: Consent form

CONSENT FORM
Copy for Researcher / Copy for Participant to Keep

TITLE OF PROJECT: Intertextual practices in academic writing: A study involving local and international undergraduate Health Sciences students

SUPERVISOR: Dr. Marie Stevenson
STUDENT RESEARCHER: Ms. Leighana Thornton

I .................................................. (the participant) have read and understood the information provided in the Letter to Participants. Any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in the following activities, realising that I can withdraw my consent at any time (without adverse consequences):

1. Demographic survey		yes / no
2. Collection of essay for analysis		yes / no
3. Interview 1: Literacy history		yes / no
4. Interview 2: Essay task			yes / no

I agree that research data collected for the study may be published or may be provided to other researchers in a form that does not identify me in any way.

NAME OF PARTICIPANT:

SIGNATURE: 				DATE:

SIGNATURE OF SUPERVISOR:

DATE:

SIGNATURE OF STUDENT RESEARCHER:

DATE:
Appendix 3: Initial survey

Demographic/language background survey

Name: ________________________________  Student ID: ________________

1. Gender:  □ Male    □ Female

         □ 50 – 59    □ 60 and above

3. What is your visa status?
   □ Australian citizen  □ International student on a student visa
   □ Australian permanent resident  □ Other (please specify) ________________

4. If you are on a student visa, what country do you come from? ________________

5. What is the main language you speak with your family? ________________

6. Is this the only language you speak with your family? □ Yes  □ No
   a. If no, what other language(s) do you speak? ________________

7. Do you write in any language other than English? □ Yes  □ No
   b. If yes, what other language(s) do you write? ________________

8. How long have you studied in an English-speaking environment (including your time at ACU)?
   □ Less than 1 year  □ 1 – 2 years  □ 3 – 4 years  □ 5 years or more
   □ All of my education has been in an English-speaking environment

9. Did you complete your High School Certificate (or equivalent) in Australia?
   □ Yes  □ No
Appendix 4: Extract of interview (Michael)

LT: So thinking generally about the assignment that you were asked to write, why do you think you were asked to write this assignment on this topic? What was the purpose of it?

St: I suppose it was to get people used to applying theory, models, to real situations, I suppose. Um, I don't know, I suppose just to get us used to writing essays and research and that sort of stuff.

LT: So it's sort of a training ground for you.

St: Yeah, exactly. It wasn't a particularly easy one for our first essay.

LT: I didn't think so either. (laughs)

St: So it wasn't just me?

LT: No. What did you find challenging about it?

St: Um, one particular thing was the stages we were asked to use. So I found it difficult I kind of um, worked out a way that I could sort of use the later stages of the model.

LT: Which is where the health practitioner is involved.

St: Yeah! I thought, ok you've got these two stages, one where the person doesn't know they've got a problem, where they wouldn't seek advice from a health practitioner in the first place, so I kind of found that difficult, sort of, what they wanted from us. If it had've been the later stages, you know, the action stage or the maintenance stage, it would have been a lot easier, maybe that's why they *were* chosen, I don't know. But I found myself not really having much to talk about, in those two stages, and I sort of tried to cleverly word things so I could talk about those later stages anyway, I don't know if that's right or wrong, but, um, yeah, I just I don't think talking about those two stages would have been particularly, it wasn't particularly useful for anything. Um, yeah, I don't know.

LT: Well, I did talk to, um, the Ls about that, and I think that is something they are aware of, and it is, it's interesting when you, um, create an assessment task, all the things you are trying to assess in your students, and trying to carefully pick it so you get what you want. It's not always an easy thing to do.

St: Yeah, I can imagine.

LT: So, what kinds of information or instructions about what you needed to do were you given specifically for this task?

St: Um, I think it was just what was in the unit outline.

LT: Did they talk about it much in the lectures or the tutorials?

St: I know there was that lecture that we gave, and that was helpful because she actually used this essay as the essay, not just generic information which was good, and she gave us ideas about how to structure this essay which was helpful. I used that. And other than that, I don't know if we
really went over it. See, my tutor was very sort of, vague, and I don't know. He was really interesting, but as for help?

LT: Yeah. Did many students ask question in the tute about the assignment?

St: Not really. It was 8:00 in the morning, so I was still half asleep. (laughs)

LT: Nobody was asking any questions about much of anything. (laughs)

St: No, not really. (laughs) Just kind of... the tutor would show up about 20 minutes late. We'd just sit there, he'd waffle on for a bit, and then we left, so. (both laugh)

LT: That sounds very interesting. (both laugh)

St: Yeah. Really interesting guy—I liked the guy. But, as for, you know... this sort of stuff...

LT: Yeah. So, and in terms of which types of sources you should use or what kinds of things they were looking for in your research did you get much information about that?

St: Not really.

LT: So you figured it out on your own.

St: Yeah. And I think that can be a good thing, but it can also be a bad thing for a lot of people because, I felt because I'd done some of this stuff last year, that really helped me.

LT: And if you hadn't had that, how do you think you would have gone?

St: Awww, not nearly as well I don't think.

LT: Yeah.

St: What did I get for this? 27 or something like that?

LT: Yeah.

St: So was that a good mark or how did most do?

LT: Yeah. Yeah.

St: That's good. (both laugh)

LT: You did quite well, overall, generally speaking. So, specifically speaking of the research you did for this essay, what did you do to find those sources? How did you get started?

St: Um, yeah, I had a, I used the textbook, and I also had another textbook that kind of went into more detail about that model. It's really, a really small textbook, the one that we're given and it doesn't work that well. Um, not much detail about it. So I used the two textbooks first and then um, I'd done a similar, well not really similar, but an essay on addiction last year also, and some of the stuff that I said in my introduction I think I used the same sort of sources and so, yeah, I usually, look at the government websites and I'll use the database, like um, CINAHL, um, and something like that to find specific sort of things. General information I'll try to get from textbooks or from the
government websites or Cancer Council or something like that. Um, and then, yeah, for specific stuff I'll look for studies, research, and things from the databases.

LT: And when — you said you use a variety of kinds of sources, so when you use textbooks and you use research articles and studies, do you use the information you find in those sources differently? What do you use a textbook for versus what you'd use a research study for?

St: Um, (long pause), I suppose I use the textbook for more general sort of information. It was more useful for detailing what the model was about um, and whereas you're not going to find a systematic review on this model. You're going to find, that's where you're going to get your statistics from, you know, the treatment methods, what worked and what doesn't. Um, yeah, so more of the, more of the general statements you know the theory, stuff I can use the textbooks for, but for making sort of individual points using stats or, whether or not something works, that's where I try and use studies and things.

LT: So, theory from the textbook, application from the studies maybe?

St: Yeah, yeah.

LT: How did you choose the behaviour that you identified? It was smoking, wasn't it?

St: Yeah.

LT: How did you choose that one?

St: Um, I usually, when I'm choosing my topic I usually keep in mind that I'm going to have to be able to find information on it, so that always plays a bit part. I considered doing something different, because I knew everyone would do smoking, but um, and I had a, I looked at doing um crystal meth initially. I thought, oh yeah, I generally know about it, given my, I know a bit about it, but there wasn't anywhere near as much research as tobacco research, so I think when to save time when you're researching you've kind of got to know what you're looking for.

LT: Definitely.

St: And if you don't, then it's going to take you a long time or it's not going to be very good. So, um, something like smoking you can kind of think of ideas that you might want to talk about and then try to look for information on those things, otherwise it's just a disaster, really. Just too much information out there.

LT: So in some sense, your research helps you guide your topic choice.

St: Yeah, yeah, definitely. I try to keep in mind how much information there will be. Sometimes, it might be worse to have too much information.

LT: Yeah.

St: Um, but yeah, I try, I definitely try when I'm choosing a topic — the availability of resources.

LT: So did you find that there was the right amount of information about smoking, or was there too much and you had to do too much narrowing, or...
St: Yeah, I think there was too much, yeah.

LT: So crystal meth was too little and smoking was too much.

St: Yeah. I'd like something in between. (both laugh)

LT: So would you say in some sense that the early stages of your research can be a little bit exploratory, so you're trying to figure out what you might wanna address?

St: Yeah, I suppose I have a rough idea when I'm starting, but it does change really as you find things, you know, you kind of change the path and, um, yeah.

LT: So were you satisfied with the sources that you found for this assignment, and how you used them?

St: Um, I don't think it was one of my best essays, and I think that's because I had difficulty with the question, actually. I'd written the entire essay and I had done my referencing and everything and I was completely ready to hand in when I saw Denise, which was probably a mistake. (laughs) (40:59)

And, um, she told me to change it all, so... I felt like, uh, yeah. It was kind of a bit patchy after that, after I had to change it because I didn't want to change it too much because I'd done it all.

LT: Did you feel like you had a lot of work to do after that meeting with ?

St: Yeah, yeah, because she said it was, because the discussion part was a big part of it, and I hadn't done it properly.

LT: What was missing from your discussion that she identified?

St: Um, basically she said any discussion at all.

LT: She thought it was too descriptive or...?

St: Um, it was too down one line, which is what I'm inclined to think like. And I sort of still didn't really know what I was supposed to do after meeting her. I knew I had to change something, but...

LT: How did you decide what to change then?

St: Um, I had a long conversation with a guy who had just finished up a psychology degree, so he said, yeah, I know what they're asking, and he kind of guided me a little bit. So he sort of told me that if you say something, you've got to find something that looks at the other side of it. There's something here (flips through the pages of his essay)...

LT: Can you find a place where you did that?

St: Um, on the third page. (Flips through pages for several seconds) Or fourth page... Oh, here we go. (Points to page)

LT: Yep.

(Pause while St reads page silently)
St: So, I’ve kind of said that, um, you know, sort of criticising the model a little bit here and said a better predictor of behaviour is actions taken in the past but then this sort of last bit says but this leaves a grim prognosis...

LT: Pretty sad (both laugh)

St: And so it’s doing something. It might be better than doing nothing at all so kind of said one thing then said but on the other hand this, and that’s kind of what I was missing, and I did say that a couple of times, I tried to put things like that in.

LT: So this was something that you specifically changed after you got people to read your assignment.

St: Yeah, I think this whole paragraph I slotted in and took things out from other places.

LT: So are these critiques of the model things that um you believe are problems with the transtheoretical model or are they things that you found in sources?

St: Um, (pause) definitely the point about um that the precontemplation stage and you know, trying to talk about it when, as a health practitioner they’re not gonna look, be seeking help in the first place. I think that was something I came up.

LT: I thought that was a clever um subtle comment on the task as well?

St: Yeah! It was, it was (laughs). Yeah, it was like, I’ll have a dig there.

LT: Yeah, so I thought that was really clever the way that you did that.

St: Yeah. There was a bit of bitterness there. (Both laugh) Came out a little bit.

LT: Well done (laughs).

St: Well that’s kind of true.

LT: IT’s definitely true.

St: It’s a very practical thing, quitting smoking and I don’t know, I just find talking about all this theory not very helpful.

LT: Yeah, hmmm.

St: I don’t know. Maybe I just don’t know enough about it.

LT: Well, but that can also be. I think, a challenge in the early units that you take, is that is often very theory-heavy and they are trying to give you sort of a foundational view but sometimes that foundation without the context can sometimes seem a bit disconnected, you know?

St: Yeah, that’s true. And to really get the foundation you need to do a lot of reading and it adds so much more time to the, to how long things take, and often you don’t have that time or you don’t want to put in that much time. (laughs)
(47:04) LT: So do you think that is a presumption that your lecturers make that you are doing enough reading to understand the foundation?

St: Yeah, yeah, and if you were to ever bring that up they might say well, you should have done the reading and then you’d understand, which is fair enough. But in reality I don’t know how many people are actually going to do it.

LT: Did you find with a full time load, are you a full time student or part time?

St: Well I um I got some credits from last year so I was doing three subjects. Um

LT: How did you find the reading load for three subjects?

St: Um, it’s manageable. Um but I wasn’t slacking off by any means. Um. This subject wasn’t too bad, it was more anatomy that was killing me.

LT: Yeah, those science subjects can be killers.

St: (laughs) Yeah, so much content.

LT: So the critique of the model in the first stage, there’s not much of a role for the health professional, is the one that you came up with, and so the second criticism, does that come from Morrison et al, or is that another criticism that you felt, and then you went and found a source that supported your view?

St: Um, I think this was from one of the textbooks I had. Yeah. (long pause) Yeah. I’m not really sure how I came up with that.

LT: It’s interesting that you chose that section because that was one that I wanted to talk about because of the way that you did critique the model and I think make a veiled comment on the task as well, so I think that was actually very interesting part of your assignment there.

St: Is that a good thing?

LT: Yeah! It was a good thing! Yeah. I did think so. I also wanted to have a look at um, the paragraph that you um wrote on it’s on the first page, it’s the second paragraph, one that starts ‘During the precontemplation stage…’ so tell me what’s happening in that paragraph there, if you want to take a minute to have a look at it.

(long pause while St reads paragraph)

(49:55)

St: This is mostly stuff I just regurgilated from the textbooks. And I think the thing was to outline the issues in that particular stage. And then’s yeah; that’s the first stage which I didn’t think was too terribly useful (both laugh), so I just kind of came up with what I could from the textbook and paraphrased it.
LT: I'm interested in the way that you combined your sources here, because if you look at the citations in that paragraph, each of those citations draws on more than one source to talk about the point that you want to make. How did you go about doing that?

St: Um, the other thing was I was a fair bit over on the word count, and I had to do a lot of cutting down so um, wherever I could I tried to combine points um if two different authors were saying the same thing I would cite them both um, or if I just wrote a sentence that incorporated two points, I would cite them. I don't know if that's the right way to do it.

LT: It is, yeah, that is the right way to do it, and that is often a strategy we encourage students to use because it is a way that you can work in more sources and build that credibility by saying more than one person says this thing. So your whole paragraph isn't a summary of one person, it brings those two together.

St: It draws on more sources and puts them together, rather than summarising. Yeah, I guess that's what I try and do. Yeah, I don't know, say, say how I've sort of have the same citation there, because one thing that I find with um, different markers, some people say, I've written an essay where basically after every sentence where I haven't had a citation, they've put question mark citation and others say that you've got too many citation, too many brackets going on there I don't really know the right way. I guess it depends on the marker. (S2:23)
Appendix 5: Sample essay

The essay included in this appendix is an original scan of Michael’s essay.
Tobacco smoking in Australia is the leading cause of preventable death, making it one of the country's most widespread health risk behaviours (Cancer Council, 2010). The addictive nature of smoking tobacco is primarily the reason for this statistic. The transtheoretical model of behaviour change is widely used by health professionals in an attempt to help people with smoking cessation (Barkway & Kenny, 2009). It is a stage-based model that uses cognitive and behavioural strategies to facilitate change (Barkway & Kenny, 2009). This essay will outline the issues in the first two stages of this model, the precontemplation and contemplation stages, and discuss goals and strategies that could be used to facilitate change in a person who is addicted to nicotine.

During the precontemplation stage an individual may not be aware that their smoking behaviour is damaging to their health, or they may underestimate the health risks involved. A lack of knowledge or information about the health risks associated with smoking may contribute to this lack of awareness (Barkway & Kenny, 2009; Morrison et al., 2008). Individuals who smoke can also be in denial about the negative consequences of smoking, and may lack self-efficacy, that is, they lack belief in their own ability to be able to manage the process of change (Barkway & Kenny, 2009; Morrison et al., 2008). Smokers may also experience other barriers to change, such as psychological and physiological dependence, and the unpleasant withdrawal symptoms associated with this dependence, such as anxiety, irritability and restlessness (Morrison et al., 2008; Jarvis, 2004). As per the transtheoretical model, the person would need to progress the contemplation stage, in order to recognise their need to change (Barkway & Kenny, 2009).

When trying to assist a person to quit smoking at the precontemplation stage, one primary goal as a health practitioner would be to encourage the person to recognise their need to change by outlining the health risks and encouraging the person to talk about their smoking
behaviour (National Cancer Institute, 2005). Fiore, Jaen and Baker (2009) suggest that motivational techniques are a useful strategy for encouraging the person to think about their smoking behaviour. One technique that could potentially have an effect is providing some facts about the health risks of smoking. The Department of Health and Ageing (2004) outlines some impacts on health that could be used to stimulate thought in this stage. This includes that smoking is the known cause of 25 or more diseases including lung cancer and heart disease (Department of Health and Ageing, 2004). Fiore, Jaen and Baker (2009) also recommend mentioning short-term health impacts such as shortness of breath and increased risk of respiratory infections. It may be important to note, however, that this information is available to the public, and can also be found printed on each packet of cigarettes. It is necessary to establish why these warnings have been ignored in the past and how it can be made clearer to the individual that these are real and present dangers. This is crucial as if other sources of information have been ignored, the advice given may also be ignored. One strategy to deal with this is to personalise the information given, mentioning the risks that may be more relevant to the individual, and encourage the person to talk about why quitting is relevant to them, any past attempts to quit and any personal barriers they may face such as a partner who smokes (Fiore, Jaen & Baker, 2009).

At the contemplation stage of the transtheoretical model, the person is now aware of the health risks of smoking, self-efficacy is important for progression (Barkway & Keray, 2009). The person may recognise health risks and need to change, but haven't decided which course of action they will take, or if they will take any course of action at all (Morrison et al., 2008). During this stage a person may also seek information about the health risks associated with smoking, how susceptible they are to these risks, and information about the various courses of action that are available to help them with smoking cessation (Morrison et al., 2008). The barriers and benefits of change are now consciously considered, and a person might put more
emphasis on the benefits of quitting than they would in the pre-contemplation stages (Morrison et al., 2008).

When somebody is in the contemplation stage, some goals for the health practitioner could include suggesting effective courses of action, encouraging the person to focus more on the benefits of cessation and improving the person’s self-efficacy so that they can start making concrete plans to quit; hence moving to the preparation stage of the transtheoretical model. Morrison et al. (2008) states that during this stage an individual may be more likely to seek information about their addiction. A health practitioner could suggest known effective ways to quit, satisfying this need for information. Lai et al. (2010) and Stead & Lancaster (2005) found counselling services that used various cognitive and behavioural techniques to be effective for smoking cessation. Stead et al. (2008) and Hughes et al. (2009) also found that nicotine replacement therapy and anti-depressants can increase the chance of quitting by between 50% and 70%. Although this statistic is high it ignores the fact that such interventions cost considerable amounts of money. Therefore while these interventions may be considered, they are only useful to a certain demographic. If, however, the practitioner is able to persuade the individual to cease smoking with the incentive of saving money they have offered a tangible incentive for the client.

Morrison et al. (2008) explains that in the contemplation stage, people are likely to give more weight to the barriers to quitting. A health professional might try to encourage more focus on the benefits and less on the barriers to quitting by putting emphasis on benefits relevant to the individual, and asking the individual to identify potential barriers and discuss these in a problem solving manner (Fiero, Jaen and Baker, 2009). Jarvis (2004) states that psychosocial factors have a large role to play in smoking maintenance. It is important to have a high level of self efficacy to be able to cope with specific circumstances when they arise. Volitional help
sheets list scenarios where a person may be tempted to smoke, such as when drinking in a bar, and encourage the person to link these scenarios with appropriate behavioural responses (Armitage, 2008, p. 559). This strategy may help improve a person's self-efficacy as they suggest practical ways of overcoming barriers to cessation (Armitage, 2008).

There are a couple of issues, however, that have not been addressed, this essay suggests methods for changing the conceptions of the client from a precontemplative to contemplative outlook, but does so without addressing why the client has sought counsel in the first place. A person in the precontemplation stage, by definition, would see no need to seek help for their addiction. Furthermore, in reference to the methodology itself, there is some suggestion that factors such as self-efficacy and motivation are not improved through the interventions described above but are improved as a result of having taken action. This is not the only criticism of the model, it is also suggested that simply relying on an intention to change is not a valid predictor of future behaviours. A better predictor of behaviour is actions taken in the past (Morrison et al., 2008). This however leaves a grim prognosis for the smoker, and therefore it seems that a proactive approach to behaviour change is better than none at all.

Due to the addictive nature of smoking, health professionals need to tackle the issue strategically and have a repertoire of effective strategies for dealing with the many aspects of nicotine addiction. Information can be provided to encourage recognition of need to change and to suggest courses of action. It is important to have a multi-faceted approach that takes into account the physiological and psychosocial aspects of this issue, and tailors strategies to the individual. The transtheoretical model of behaviour change gives health professionals an idea of which type of intervention to use depending on how ready the person is to quit. In the precontemplation and contemplation stages of this model, interventions that help with motivation, the perception of benefits versus barriers as well as self-efficacy are vital.
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Appendix 6: Assignment instructions

Assessment Task 1: Essay

Topic:
Using the precontemplation and contemplation stages of the transtheoretical model of behaviour change discuss how to facilitate change in a person who has an addictive health risk behaviour.

Provide an outline of the issues in the precontemplation and contemplation stages, and discuss the goals and strategies you (as the health professional) would use to implement the model.

You need to find and evaluate appropriate literature to support your discussion.

The essay task has two stages:

Stage 1 is a group exercise and requires a concept map and essay plan (including references). Preparing a concept map, essay plan and references that will help you prepare the final essay. Essay writing skills are difficult to master and require practice of technical and creative components. This is a group activity of 3-4 people per group. The Group will give individuals an opportunity to discuss how to prepare material for an essay and a chance to brain storm content.

Concept maps and plans will be presented in Tutorials. There will be peer assessment – that is class will give feedback on the maps and plans.

Stage 2 Submitting the final essay. This is an individual task. After completing the group preparation of a concept map and plan, individuals can develop, change, expand or personalise their final essay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Word Length</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 1. Concept Map</td>
<td>Week1 Group Presentation in Tut</td>
<td>No more than two pages or 5 pages of PowerPoint slides</td>
<td>Peer assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Essay Plan (including references)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 1. Completed Essay</td>
<td>Week 12</td>
<td>1,000 words</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marking Criteria: Attached to this unit outline.

Submission Instructions: You need to submit your Assignments in the 1st Year assignment box. Students need to attach an Assignment Coversheet (see Blackboard) to the assignment ensuring that they have signed the statement that the work is original. The marking criteria sheet should also be attached to the back of your essay in order to receive feedback on your work. Please ensure you keep an electronic copy of your essay.
## Appendix 7: Marking criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Distinction (85-100%)</th>
<th>Distinction (75-84%)</th>
<th>Credit (65-74%)</th>
<th>Pass (55-64%)</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction and Review</strong>&lt;br&gt;Position Statement</td>
<td>The position statement outlines the main points and provides a clear, strong statement of arguments to be discussed.</td>
<td>The position statement outlines the topic of the essay and makes the main points clear.</td>
<td>The position statement outlines some of the main points but does not name the topic.</td>
<td>The position statement does not state the topic or does not present what will be discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence and Examples</strong></td>
<td>Clear articulation of how the model stages are applied. Each point is supported by appropriate reference.</td>
<td>Each point is identified and the model stage is not addressed. Evidence for choice and evidence of other models are not addressed.</td>
<td>Each point is not addressed. Evidence for models is not addressed.</td>
<td>Each point is not addressed. Evidence for models is not addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong></td>
<td>Arguments and support are provided in a logical order that makes it easy and interesting to follow the author’s train of thought.</td>
<td>Arguments and support are provided in a logical order that makes it easy and interesting to follow the author’s train of thought.</td>
<td>Arguments and support are provided in a logical order that makes it easy and interesting to follow the author’s train of thought.</td>
<td>Arguments and support are not provided in a logical order that makes it easy and interesting to follow the author’s train of thought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusion</strong></td>
<td>The conclusion is a strong, effective restatement of the position statement. The conclusion is meaningful.</td>
<td>The conclusion is a meaningful restatement of the position statement.</td>
<td>The conclusion is meaningful.</td>
<td>The conclusion is not meaningful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources and References</strong></td>
<td>All sources are used for quotes, statistics, and facts, and all facts are accurately quoted and referenced differently.</td>
<td>Most sources used are not accurate or are not referenced.</td>
<td>Some sources used are not accurate or are not referenced.</td>
<td>All sources are not referenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sentences and Paragraphs</strong></td>
<td>All sentences are well constructed and varied. All paragraphs are well constructed and varied.</td>
<td>Most sentences are not well constructed or are not varied.</td>
<td>Some sentences are not well constructed or are not varied.</td>
<td>All sentences are not well constructed or are not varied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanics - Grammar, Spelling, and Punctuation</strong></td>
<td>The text contains errors in grammar, spelling, or punctuation that may distract the reader from the content and interrupt the flow.</td>
<td>The text contains errors in grammar, spelling, or punctuation that may distract the reader from the content and interrupt the flow.</td>
<td>The text contains errors in grammar, spelling, or punctuation that may distract the reader from the content and interrupt the flow.</td>
<td>The text contains errors in grammar, spelling, or punctuation that may distract the reader from the content and interrupt the flow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: __________________________  Markers Signature: __________________________  Date: ____________
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Appendix 8: Essay writing guide

The following essay writing guide was provided to students by the lecturer in charge of the unit of study.

There is material on LEO outlining how to write essays - you should review it.

Academic essays are about the course material - readings and lectures - use this material in your answers.

DON'T use clichés, platitudes or "common sense" your personal opinion, beliefs or "feelings" are not relevant.

When your essay asks, "what do you think?" or "what is your opinion?", it is not an invitation for you to dump your thoughts on the page, expound your beliefs or feelings or say what comes into your head - it is an invitation or more correctly an instruction for you to identify the relevant literature, find opinions that agree with you and use them to illustrate and convey your position.

Essays require 2 skills -
1. technical skills eg structure, layout, referencing, spelling and grammar
2. creative skills eg content and how to arrange and present it.

You should master the technical skills ASAP and never lose any marks for poor skills.

The creative skills come with knowledge and research, that is finding articles related to the topic and understanding them, and practice.

A common problem is not answering the question - you need to spend some time understanding each word in the question and make sure what you write is answering the question and just something you would like to say.

Focus of Assignment and Structure

Introductions

These require a lot of care - the function of an introduction is to tell the reader what you are going to do - a very short summary of your answer, points you consider important, maybe some definitions - but it must give the reader some idea of where you are going. It provides criteria that the reader uses to judge whether you have achieved your goal - that is answer the question.

Some writers launch straight into answering the question - leaving readers wandering where the roller coaster was going.

To fix this
1. read other peoples introductions (and Abstracts).
2. identify what the argument is going to follow then read and see if you are correct.
3. watch for the use of key words and concepts, note how concepts are defined and usually the definitions are drawn from the literature and references provided.
4. alter you are comfortable doing this try and rewrite the introduction for essays you have written in the past.

Body

Without an appropriate introduction - you can't get a good body

Better marks are given to essays that:
- Focus on the essay topic and did not go off track;
- Write very clearly using an academic writing style rather than informal language;
- Avoided making bold assumptions or assertions without accurate evidence and examples;
- Used correct grammar and spelling - this lets the reader focus on your argument rather than trying to work out what you are saying.

Conclusions

Without an appropriate introduction - you can't get a good conclusion

Content

Essays should follow an "argument" not just present a collection of facts or rely on assertion without evidence, or put a number of arguments that collectively were incoherent.

Some other areas of confusion included:

Style and Clarity

Never use absolute words like "never", "always", "profound", "every", "must", "should" "vital" unless you are absolutely sure they are appropriate. They restrict your position and it is very easy to later add and for a marker to say "that's not true". "Must" can have particularly nasty effects for it carries and element of
judgment, instruction and superiority - these do not have much of a place in an academic essay you need to be discursive, but definite (clear meaning), not preachy or closed off to argument. It is a word that conveys your conclusions but gives the reader no idea of how you reached them.

These words are often linked to "spin doctoring" - to convince with out providing argument, or to create impressions by misusing or changing the meanings of words.

Some references seem to originate form spin doctors rather than academic sources using considered argument. When using professional association publications you need to remember their goal is their growth in power and influence, not the correct accurate presentation of things.

As noted the 2 essay writing skills are:
1 technical eg structure, layout, referencing
2 creative eg content and how to arrange and present it. In writing the
- 1st step is to identify what you want to say, devise the argument, work out how to communicate with your audience. (use Concept maps or Mind mapping to assist here)
- 2nd step is to take these creative ideas and make them technically sound and put them on paper in a competent format - this may take 3, 4, or 5 edits to reach an acceptable standard.

Many essays have the feel of an early draft - repetitious content, ill formed ideas, contradictory ideas and/or definitions, poor organisation and spelling and grammar mistakes.

Early drafts do not endear readers (or markers).

Spelling and Grammar
To fix Spelling and Grammar problems
1 Use the Grammar checker on your computer
2 Check Blackboard for Academic skills Modules
3 Ask someone else to read/edit your essay before submission

Most of your essays are written using Word - this program has a powerful (if not always correct) grammar checker YOU SHOULD use it. It is very hard to give the benefit of doubt if it is clear that the grammar checker has not been used.

Referencing and Use of Sources
A Reference list is a list of the books articles etc that were used in the essay, a bibliography is a list of the books articles etc that you read (but may not have referred to directly in the essay).

DO NOT USE Wikipedia - it is not an academic source of information ("academic" implies that the information presented has been vetted by other academics). Unvetted sources - Women's Weekly, and Wikipedia do not supply any guarantees that they are accurate.

Writing a reference list is a purely technical skill who you should never give away marks for poor referencing.

You need to acquire the necessary knowledge - see the ACU Study Guide

There are 2 areas that you need to master:
1 In text referencing
2 Bibliography or reference list (occurs at the end of the essay).

In text referencing - if you use ideas from another author you use brackets and enclose the name(s) of the author, year of publication, and if relevant page numbers: (Smith and Jones, 1927, pp 33-35). If you use words from another author you enclose the quotation in inverted commas (quotation marks) then use brackets and enclose the name(s) of the author, year of publication, and if relevant page numbers: (Smith and Jones, 1927, pp 33-35).

Endnote is a software program to assist bibliography preparation and formatting. It is available to download at no charge from the Library website.

To fix this
1 read the ACU Study Guide

Formal writing is a skill you have to learn, like walking - it is easy once you have learnt it.

From here on the standards expected of your writing increases. LEARN the techniques - now.

Another issue arising from the use of sources, is the age of some references. There is no problem using old references, they allow you to introduce an historical perspective, refer to leading or seminal writings but there is a problem when old references refer to a problem or data and then talk you use it as if it is a current
- it may well still be a problem but you need to establish this with contemporary references. The relevance of references varies with the discipline area - techniques or procedures based articles may be out of date with in a year or 2; philosophy still uses 2,000 old references as does some areas of psychology,
Appendix 9: HREC Approval

Human Research Ethics Committee
Committee Approval Form

Principal Investigator/Supervisor: Dr Marie Stevenson - Sydney University
Co-investigators:
Student Researcher: Ms Leighanna Thornton - Sydney University/Student - ACU Staff Member

Ethics approval has been granted for the following project:
Interpersonal practices in academic writing: A study involving local and international undergraduate Health Sciences students. (Intertextual practices in academic writing)

For the period: 14 April 2011 to 31 August 2011
Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) Register Number: N2011 17

Special Condition(s) of Approval

Prior to commencement of your research, the following permissions are required to be submitted to the ACU HREC:

N/A

The following standard conditions as stipulated in the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans (2007) apply:

(i) that Principal Investigators/Supervisors, provide, on the form supplied by the Human Research Ethics Committee, annual reports on matters such as:
- security of records
- compliance with approved consent procedures and documentation
- compliance with special conditions, and

(ii) that researchers report to the HREC immediately any matter that might affect the ethical acceptability of the protocol, such as:
- proposed changes to the protocol
- unforeseen circumstances or events
- adverse effects on participants

The HREC will conduct an audit each year of all projects deemed to be of more than low risk. There will also be random audits of a sample of projects considered to be of negligible risk and low risk on all campuses each year.

Within one month of the conclusion of the project, researchers are required to complete a Final Report Form and submit it to the local Research Services Officer.

If the project continues for more than one year, researchers are required to complete an Annual Progress Report Form and submit it to the local Research Services Officer within one month of the anniversary date of the ethics approval.

Signed: ___________________________ Date: ____________
(Research Services Officer, McAuley Campus)