



FACULTY OF ARTS AND EDUCATION

## MASTER'S THESIS

Study programme:

Masters in Literacy Studies

Autumn semester, 20.22

Open

Author: Anagor Favour Onyinye

Programme coordinator:

Supervisor:

James Jacob Thomson

Title of master's thesis:

EFL Paraphrasing Competence Among 10th-grade EFL Learners in the Norwegian educational context

Credits: 60

Keywords:

EFL paraphrasing competence; summary writing; plagiarism; reading; secondary school pupils.

Number of pages: ...89.....

+ supplemental material/other: Appendix

Stavanger, November 14, 2022



## **Acknowledgments**

The journey towards completing this thesis has been an exciting one. At this point, I can boldly say that I have learned so many things I did not know about research which can also help me as a teacher. My first appreciation goes to my supervisor, James Jacob Thomson, for his guidance, patience, advice, and excellent supervision, which helped me to complete this thesis. Also, I want to thank my husband for his undeniable support. At a point, I felt like not continuing with the thesis, but his encouragement and support kept me going. Lastly, I want to thank my family and friends who, in one way or another, have contributed to the success of this thesis.



## Abstract

This study investigates the EFL paraphrasing competence of lower secondary school pupils in the Norwegian educational context. It aims to explore the paraphrasing competence of 10th-grade EFL learners aged 15 to 16 in Norway to contribute to understanding pupils' paraphrasing competence at the lower secondary level and to benefit writing instructors working at this level and writing instructors at the tertiary level looking to anticipate their pupils' writing abilities. In order to accomplish the study's objectives, the study addresses three research questions: firstly, which paraphrase types do lower secondary pupils in the Norwegian context rely on when writing summary texts? Secondly, which themes from the source text do pupils draw on when writing summary texts? Finally, to what extent do the identified paraphrasing types correspond with the teachers' reported instructional practices?

This study uses quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. A sample of 34 summary texts was collected from grade 10 pupils to achieve this purpose. For these texts, pupils were asked to summarize a piece of writing taken from a 10<sup>th</sup>-grade English textbook. The pupils' texts were analyzed based on Keck's (2006) taxonomy, which categorizes paraphrase types. The texts were also analyzed using thematic analysis in order to identify which parts of the source text the pupils chose to summarize. The qualitative methods involves asking the teachers to fill out a questionnaire regarding their perceptions and practices regarding paraphrasing in the English subject.

The study's main findings show that lower secondary school pupils in Norway use the four paraphrase types; near copies, minimal revisions, moderate revisions, and substantial revisions while writing summaries. The paraphrase type, which most pupils use in their summaries, falls under the substantial revisions category. For this reason, a thematic analysis of the 34 summary texts was also conducted in order to investigate further which parts of the source text pupils chose to paraphrase.

As the study usefully contributes to the literature, its implications provide valuable insights for writing instructors and research communities. Because it is one of the pioneering studies investigating the EFL paraphrasing competence of pupils in Norwegian lower secondary schools, it contributes new insight to the pre-existing pool of paraphrasing studies. It also offers insight that may prove useful for improving the quality of English writing instruction in the Norwegian lower secondary school context. The findings reveal that while the pupils in Norwegian lower secondary schools are aware of the importance of paraphrasing, individual pupils demonstrate varying levels of paraphrasing competence, and there are certain aspects of paraphrasing that require closer attention.

**Keywords:** EFL paraphrasing competence; summary writing; plagiarism; reading; secondary school pupils



## Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	7
1.1 The aim of the study .....	7
1.2 The motivation of the study .....	9
1.3 Background .....	9
1.3.1 The Norwegian school system.....	10
1.3.2 The history of the English Language in Norway.....	10
1.3.3 The current status of English in Norway 'English in the current curriculum (LK20)' .....	12
2 Literature review .....	14
2.1 Emergence of English Language and Literacy .....	14
2.1.1 Second Language Literacy .....	17
2.2 Reading skills.....	18
2.2.1 Reading in the EFL classroom.....	20
2.2.2 Reading in a Norwegian classroom .....	22
2.3. Writing skills.....	23
2.3.1 Writing in the EFL classroom .....	25
2.3.2 Writing in the Norwegian classroom.....	26
2.3.3 Teaching EFL writing.....	27
2.4 Source criticism and plagiarism.....	29
2.5 Paraphrasing and Summary writing.....	32
3. Methodology .....	37
3.1 Research approach .....	37
3.2 Data collection .....	39
3.2.1 Textual data .....	39
3.2.2 Questionnaire data .....	40
3.3 Data Analysis .....	41
3.3.1 Analysing paraphrase types in the summary texts.....	41
3.3.2 Analysing the themes in the summary.....	45
3.3.3 Analysing the questionnaire data.....	49
3.4 Validity and reliability .....	49
4. Results .....	52
4.1 paraphrasing types in the summary texts .....	52
4.1.1 Near Copies .....	53

4.1.2 Minimal Revisions.....	54
4.1.3 Moderate Revisions .....	55
4.1.4 Substantial Revisions.....	56
4.1.5 Exact Copies .....	57
4.1.6 General Links .....	58
4.2 Thematic Analysis Result .....	59
4.3 Results from teacher questionnaires .....	66
5 Discussion .....	69
5.1 Paraphrasing types in the dataset .....	69
5.2 Teachers' perceptions and instructional practices regarding paraphrasing .....	78
5.3 The themes identified in the summary texts .....	80
5.4 Implications of the study.....	85
5.5 Limitations and Future Research .....	86
6. Conclusions .....	88
References .....	90
Appendix .....	96

### List of Tables

**Table 1.** The Taxonomy of Paraphrase Types. Adaptation from Keck (2006, p. 268). ...**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

**Table 2.** Table showing the frequency of texts (N = 34) that contained each paraphrasing type and total frequency of paraphrasing types..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

**Table 3.** The frequency of texts containing each theme and the total frequency of the themes.  
.....59



# **1. Introduction**

## **1.1 The aim of the study**

This study investigates 10<sup>th</sup>-grade EFL learners' paraphrasing competence in Norway. Paraphrasing is recognized as one of the essentials of academic writing techniques. According to Campell (1998), paraphrasing suggests using another word structure to communicate a specific passage initially established in written or spoken words to formulate one's writing. Paraphrasing competence is the ability to restate a sentence "such that both sentences would generally be recognized as lexically and syntactically different while remaining semantically equal" (McCarthy, Guess, & McNamara, 2009, p.683). A deficiency in such competence has been identified as the inability to use source texts correctly, leading to plagiarism, which is consequentially punishable (Hirvela & Du, 2013). Accordingly, "Paraphrasing is the restating of a sentence such that both sentences would generally be recognized as lexically and syntactically different while remaining semantically equal" (McCarthy, Guess, & McNamara, 2009, p.683). While paraphrasing is the true reflection of the source texts regarding the author (Shi & Dong, 2018), it is more difficult in a foreign language (Keck, 2006, 2014) as it is found to be influenced more by L1 culture and writing experience (Shi & Dong, 2018). In other words, paraphrasing is an essential aspect of writing that involves rearranging pre-existing patterns into original ideas. According to Keck (2006), paraphrasing is viewed by scholars as a necessary skill for academic writing. Consequently, teaching EFL learners how to paraphrase may help them avoid copying from the source text, which can lead to plagiarism. Therefore, this study aims to explore Norwegian EFL learners' paraphrasing competence to gain insight into this phenomenon for the benefit of both researchers and writing instructors.

Studies show that paraphrasing is a skill that experiences a progressive path. In other words, inexperienced EFL learners use paraphrasing as an approach to knowledge

communication (Hirvela & Du, 2013), while experienced EFL writers use paraphrasing as an approach to knowledge transformation (Shi & Dong, 2018). Also, most studies on paraphrasing have investigated tertiary-level writing; none of the reviewed studies were conducted on lower-secondary students. As Carson (2001) posited, tasks exhibiting paraphrasing strategies align with advanced university assignments. This evidence could be one of the reasons most studies have investigated paraphrasing in the context of universities. Although some scholars have researched paraphrasing in countries like Canada, the United States, Korea, Thailand, and Taiwan (Keck, 2006; Shi, 2012; Liao & Tseng, 2010; Ji, 2018; Injai, 2015), none has been carried out in the Norwegian context. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to contribute to understanding pupils' paraphrasing competence at the lower secondary level. It aims to benefit writing instructors working at this level and writing instructors at the tertiary level looking to anticipate their pupils' writing abilities.

This study aims to explore the paraphrasing competence of 10th-grade EFL learners between the age of 15 to 16 years in Norway. A sample of 34 summary texts was collected from grade 10 pupils to achieve this purpose. For these texts, pupils were asked to write a summary of a piece of writing taken from a 10<sup>th</sup>-grade English textbook. The pupils' texts were analyzed based on Keck's (2006) taxonomy, which categorizes paraphrase types. Although the initial aim of this thesis was to investigate the paraphrasing types that 10<sup>th</sup>-grade pupils use when writing summary texts, the results showed that pupils at this level mainly rely on one paraphrasing strategy (see Chapter 4). Thus, a thematic analysis of the 34 summary texts was also conducted in order to further investigate which parts of the source text pupils chose to paraphrase. Also, using questionnaire methods, data regarding the teachers' perceptions of paraphrasing competence were collected for analysis. Hence, the study seeks to answer the research questions: (1) Which paraphrase types do lower secondary pupils in the Norwegian context rely on when writing summary texts? (2) Which themes from the source text do pupils draw on when writing summary texts (3) To what extent do the identified paraphrasing types correspond with the teachers' reported instructional practices? The results are likely to have implications for both researchers and writing instructors.

## **1.2 The motivation of the study**

Paraphrasing, an act of restating sentences and, most importantly, retaining the meaning communicated the same as the source text (McCarthy et al., 2009), is essential for effective writing. However, evidence suggests that paraphrasing is challenging for some EFL students who cannot meet writing requirements (Sun, 2009). According to English First English Proficiency Index (EF EPI, 2020), Norway is ranked third among the tested European Union (EU) countries. Despite this rating, research has shown that most Norwegian students are not well prepared for higher education regarding English writing skills (Lehmann, 1999). Likewise, a study revealed that Norwegian students studying English Language recorded lower scores in writing than what they obtained in reading comprehension, oral comprehension, and linguistic comprehension (Bonnet, 2004).

Similarly, Rødnes, Hellekjær, and old (2014) found that English teachers do not receive adequate training in writing instruction. Hence, improving the EFL learners' writing ability in Norway is essential. One such way is to focus more on quality classroom teaching activities such as engaging in intensive reading since the aim of intensive reading is to assimilate the details of a text, usually done through careful and repeated reading tasks. The study research methods, therefore, take principles from intensive reading and apply them to the teaching of writing, focusing on paraphrasing. In other words, this study investigates the paraphrasing types that pupils use to summarise a text that they are required to read intensively.

## **1.3 Background**

This section discusses the background of this thesis, such as the Norwegian school system, which is how the Norwegian system of education works from kindergarten to the upper secondary school level, the history of the English language in Norway, which has to do with the emergence of the English language in Norway, and the status of English in Norway has to do with the current position of the English language in Norway.

### **1.3.1 The Norwegian school system**

In the Norwegian school system, pupils start primary school at age six, and the enrolment of pupils into primary and lower secondary school is compulsory. The primary and lower secondary school is considered mandatory, and the upper secondary school is considered optional for pupils that want to further their studies in higher institutions. The Norwegian pupils are first enrolled in primary school from grade 1 to grade 10 and lower secondary school from 8<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> grade. Then, they can decide to attend their choice of upper secondary school for three years, referred to as Vg1, Vg2, and Vg3. According to the Council of Europe (2001), the Norwegian lower secondary school, specifically 10<sup>th</sup> grade, pupils should typically be at the B1-B2 level. The Norwegian municipalities are responsible for primary and lower secondary education (compulsory school), while the county is responsible for upper secondary education. The state's educational system is free, binding, and based on social equality (Education, 2016).

There are two main programs in the Norwegian upper secondary school: the general studies program and the vocational education program. Upper secondary education is not compulsory for Norwegian pupils, so students can choose from one of the programs while applying for upper secondary school. The general study program specializes in general studies such as music, drama, sports, dance, and physical education, leading to a general admission certificate (Education, 2016). Students who enroll in vocational education programs can choose their desired program of study in building and construction or health and social services. After two years of apprentices, they can sit for their craftsman's examination, while the general study students sit for their exams after three years.

### **1.3.2 The history of the English Language in Norway**

Before the 1960s, English was not a compulsory subject in Norway, and it was specified by the 1939 Normalplan to be taught in schools but not as a mandatory subject (Drew & Sørheim, 2006). When it became a compulsory subject for all pupils in Norwegian schools, pupils were first expected to develop practical language skills, and what inspired the syllabus was the

behaviorist theories of the classroom approach (Bakken & Lund, 2017). As a result, English was introduced as a compulsory subject in rural areas, whereas it remained optional in urban areas. English was primarily optional for 'academically-oriented pupils'; hence, basic English language knowledge was needed before being admitted into a grammar school (realskole). In 1969 when the new act was passed, it made English compulsory for all pupils to be taught practical English skills before entering lower secondary school. The late introduction of the English language in Norwegian schools prompted the need for speedy progress, majorly in secondary schools. There was negligence as regards oral English because it was considered a difficult skill to learn, thereby restricting it to reading aloud (Drew & Sørheim, 2006).

The 1974 curriculum (M74) introduced English in the fourth grade. This development challenged the method used in teaching pupils like an 11-year-old who had already gotten used to his mother tongue. An alternative way of teaching English was made for 15-year-old and older learners already in grammar school. It brought about the introduction of many new activities in the 1970s and 1980s. According to Drew and Sørheim (2006, p.29), the main focus of the 1974 English language aim was for pupils to comprehend and speak English fluently, thereby making grammar-translation a dominant method for teaching lower secondary schools (ungdomsskolen) and introducing new words in each new paragraph followed by lexical tests. The most important skill to be assessed by the 1974 curriculum was the ability to write. The approach used in the 1974 curriculum was audio-lingual. Later in the 1974 curriculum, there were grammatical introductions and vocabulary in the eight-page guidelines. No new words were to be introduced without the pupils practicing their familiar structures. This teaching method to Norwegian pupils made them fluent speakers of the English Language and actively use English in the classrooms (Drew & Sørheim, 2006, p.29).

Sequentially, the 1987 curriculum (M 87) introduced different activities like games, role play, and drama which gave pupils the opportunity for real communication in the classroom. The M 87 considered communication the most significant part of language learning. There was an introduction to a new textbook designed with beautiful layouts and different communicative activities. The focus was on using the language for other purposes and considering that common mistakes were part of foreign language learning. Much attention was given to creativity, and local teaching materials were introduced to enable Norwegian pupils to

use English to talk about familiar topics and learn about their own culture. Teaching English in the M87 revolved around the theme, and the grammar explanation was brought down to the pupils' level (Drew & Sørheim, 2006).

Finally, the 1997 English curriculum (L 97) believed that mother tongue and foreign language learning generally contribute to language learning because the mother tongue is the foundation for foreign language learning. Language was viewed as the means we employ to communicate and understand our environment. The main objectives of this curriculum were the ability of the Norwegian pupils to develop oral and written English and understand the language, its usage, and the language culture. The L97 curriculum stressed reading and writing in different genres. Diverse language input inspired pupils to read a wide variety of texts such as newspaper articles, pop texts, stories, fairy tales, songs, plays, legends, ballads, and the teachings were based on modern methods. The curriculum emphasized that pupils should learn the English culture, that is, how varieties of English are used in English-speaking cultures, and that pupils should take responsibility for their own learning 'learner autonomy.' The purpose was to encourage the pupils to be readily engage in the learning process and become independent language learners (Drew & Sørheim, 2006).

### **1.3.3 The current status of English in Norway 'English in the current curriculum (LK20)'**

The English Language is globally recognized as essential to learning to communicate with people from several parts of the world. In Norway, English is taught from the first grade and is widely used in educational, business, and entertainment settings, but it is not recognized as an official language. Like some European countries, Norway's English is recognized as a foreign language for international travel, business, and education. In Norwegian schools, English is studied from the first grade (age six) to the foundation level of upper secondary school. The Ministry of Education and Research 2020 brought out a new curriculum that replaced the LK20 curriculum, including the core curriculum, subject syllabi, principles of education, and the distribution of teaching hours per subject. This curriculum is not prescriptive, which allows teachers, and schools to select local teaching materials and methods.

The LK20 curriculum introduced four essential skills for the English language: oral skills, reading, writing, and digital skill, which they considered the most critical skills for all subject learning. The English Language Curriculum (2020, p. 4) states that Norwegian pupils should be able to write correctly in English “Writing in English means being able to express ideas and opinions in an understandable and appropriate manner in various types of texts, both on paper and on screen. Writing requires planning, formulating and processing texts that communicate, and to adapt the language to the purpose, receiver and situation, and to choose appropriate writing strategies. The development of writing proficiency in English progresses from learning single words and phrases to creating different types of coherent texts that present viewpoints and knowledge. It also entails using different types of sources in a critical and verifiable manner.” The teachers were free to select teaching methods and materials and focused on pupils' mastering the four basic skills (LK20, p. 4).

The curricula of the English language subject (competence aims) for grade 10 state that at the end of grade 10, the students should be able to 'use sources in a critical and accountable manner,' write formal and informal texts, including multimedia texts with structure and coherence that describe, narrate, and reflect, and are adapted to the purpose, recipient, and situation' (LK20, p.4). The primary objective of LK20 is to allow the learner to be actively involved in the learning process, understand and speak English fluently, and produce a good text. The preceding explains the high proficiency of Norwegians in English.

## **2 Literature review**

This chapter discusses the basic theories of this thesis, starting with the emergence of the English language and literacy, second language literacy, reading skills, reading in the EFL classroom, reading in a Norwegian classroom, writing skill, writing in the EFL classroom, writing in Norwegian classroom, teaching writing, source criticism, and plagiarism and summary writing and paraphrasing.

### **2.1 Emergence of English Language and Literacy**

As humans, communication lets us share our feelings, beliefs, opinions, knowledge, fears, disappointments, wishes, and promises. The system or medium by which human beings communicate is language. Gelderen (2014) views language as an essential human ability to express our feelings, thoughts, and ideas through face-to-face communication, scientific investigations, and many other purposes. As humans, using language helps us run our day-to-day activities because we can understand one another's feelings and thoughts through communication. Language is a medium of speaking and writing with words; humans learn it to communicate with one another (Wachuku, 2008). Language is specifically attributed to human beings. Acquisition of Language is natural to humans because they are born with the ability that allows children to acquire languages spoken around them (ibid). There are numerous languages around the world today used for communication, but this study shall focus on the English Language.

According to Gelderrn (2014), English is of Germanic origin, even though half of its vocabulary is derived from French and Latin. English became a formal language when the Germanic tribes and their languages spread to the British Isles in 449 (ibid). After Norman's conquest in 1066, when William the conqueror took over the English throne, the English Language was replaced for some time by Anglo-Norman French as the upper-class language while the ordinary people were speaking the English Language in England (Kretzschmar, 2018). The loss of Normandy to the English crown in 1204, when king Philip 11 Augustus



defeated King John of England, brought about the re-emergence of the English Language in England. It was facilitated as the English country houses no longer had time to contact and interact with Normandy; they focused on spending more time interacting with their English subjects (Kretzschmar, 2018). The re-emergence of the English Language also brought about the emergence of literacy. The shift of power from England to French made the England noble families start interacting with the English Language instead of French as their daily language (ibid). It resulted in the early writing in the thirteenth century known as 'Ancrene Wisse', which was first composed in English to help the noble women who wanted to retire from work and pursue a religious vocation (Kretzschmar, 2018).

Literacy connotes the ability to read and write. According to Hall (1994), literacy development is a natural phenomenon that begins at the early stage of the child's life and does not occur formally at a particular age. Before the 1970s, it was opined that a child needed to be enrolled in a formal school setting for literacy to develop (Teale & Sulzby, 1986). In other words, the child must be readily prepared and systematically and sequentially taught by teachers to be literate. However, Hall's perception of literacy development as a natural phenomenon brought about 'emergent literacy.' Hall (1994) noted that emergent literacy suggests that literacy acquisition should be seen in the same way as oral language acquisition. Emergent literacy is when the child is aware of his environment and can use verbal language to communicate. At this stage, knowledge and abilities can be developed when the child is provided with a suitable environment for the natural development of these skills (Hall,1994). Halliday (1973) bolsters this point by saying that emergent literacy development occurs when the child can use his L1 proficiently without being aware of his linguistic environment.

The word 'emergent literacy' is used to describe a new perception into the understanding of the initial behaviors of children in the advancement of reading and writing skills (Teale & Sulzby, 1986). The process of becoming a literate individual starts right after birth, meaning that the child's early stage is a critical stage when the development of reading and writing takes place (ibid). The study of Clay (1966) about young children gave a perception of early childhood literacy. It was known that literacy development starts much earlier before children enroll in a formal school. Clay's conclusion revealed a compromised standard for children being readily prepared or taught systematically by a teacher before literacy occurs. It is so because

young children display essential literacy behaviors before preschool, which helps them during the formal school years (Teale & Sulzby, 1986). In other words, in the stage where children play with printed texts and draw meaningless lines on paper, they unconsciously learn how to read and write, and that is when early literacy begins.

Furthermore, young children engage in reading and writing in many ways, but we tend to ignore them (Goodman, 1986). Goodman emphasizes the children's early expression of reading and writing. He proposes that children make sense of their environment through print when reading and writing. He also states that emergent literacy occurs during pre-school when awareness about the literacy process occurs (Goodman, 1986). Barton (1994) bolsters this point by arguing that the literacy process starts at birth, specifically in a literate environment. He maintains that literacy is essential to verbal communication and social interaction. He opposes the view that literacy begins when a child enrolls in a formal school setting, supporting the idea that literacy preparation starts in infancy. Rhyner (2009), in his studies on literacy development, explains that the outcome of a child in a school is mainly determined by a 'set of tools or skills acquired in pre-school years. He further clarifies that literacy development is the main aspect that connects to the knowledge and skills gained during pre-schooling and formal schooling. Rhyner concurs that children display noticeable 'literacy-related' reactions as toddlers even when they cannot read or write, which researchers described earlier as 'emergent literacy.'

In conclusion, emergent literacy starts from birth when the child makes sense of his/her surroundings. The social-cultural background of an individual plays a vital role in his literacy development, which needs to be reinforced by a conducive learning environment instead of compulsorily being taught sequentially and systematically under the auspices of a teacher (Cambourne, 1983). The learning environment can make or mars a child's literacy development. A child that grows up in western society or a literate environment will develop literacy skills more than the counterpart. Some researchers like Halliday (1973), Cambourne (1983), Goodman (1980), and Smith (1971) questioned the concept of a child being taught reading and writing sequentially and systematically under the auspices of a teacher when some children start formal schooling with the consciousness of literacy and its use. Children who have opportunities to tell stories, read and write at home are likely to be somewhat literate when they start school.

### **2.1.1 Second Language Literacy**

Unlike the first language, learning a second language takes a different process. According to Drew and Sørheim (2006), L2 learning occurs in entirely different conditions from the L1, except that the child is born and brought up in a bilingual family or environment. For someone to learn an L2, there is already an L1 which may interfere with or help in the L2 learning. This interference may result from the differences and similarities in language structure and vocabulary of both languages, and it is paramount that language teachers make the language learners aware of these differences and similarities for language proficiency (Drew & Sørheim, 2006). L2 learning takes place in a formal setting, requiring the learner to sit under a language tutor in a classroom to learn the language rules and usage. Drew and Sørheim (2006) opine that L1 learning occurs in a typical environment, that is, the environment where the child is born and brought up, while L2 learning occurs in an environment where the individual involved tries to learn a target language of the new environment where he found himself in order to fit into the new setting and communicate effectively. In other words, L1 learning occurs unconsciously, while L2 learning takes a conscious effort to be learned. The condition for learning L1 differs regarding the learner's age, time, place, and purpose. According to Drew and Sørheim (2006), L2 learning occurs after a person reaches a certain age. They have a specified time to be taught the language, they need to be in an educational setting such as a classroom, and the purpose of learning L2 is not limited to communication but for work and to learn the new environment's culture.

Meanwhile, Flognfeldt and Lund (2021) outline some L2 learning strategies that can help the L2 learner learn the target language faster and proficiently. Teaching strategies can be divided into two categories: those related to input and output. The input is the learners' exposure to the target language, that is, the language that the learners hear and read daily. At the same time, the output is the learners' ability to produce the language in writing or speaking based on what they have heard or read. If the L2 learners express themselves in the target language, it will help them know the differences and similarities between the target language and their language and be able to fill the gap to develop language competence (Flognfeldt & Lund, 2021).

Some people believe that learning L2 is mainly effective when the learner is in the country or environment where they use the language, as it will expose them to more input and output (ibid). Flognfeldt and Lund (2021) suggested an immersion program whereby the L2 learner will be immersed in the new language, which provides the opportunity for sufficient language input and output. The belief is that by being exposed to the new language and using it frequently, the L2 learner will gain the language efficiently. The input and output of the new language should as well be meaningful to the learner. Language educators should allow L2 learners to explore and understand the new language's linguistic structures, phenomena, and systems (Flognfeldt & Lund, 2021).

Notwithstanding, several factors affect L2 learning. Based on Drew and Sørheim (2006), the significant factors that affect L2 learning are social and individual factors. The attitude of the society or environment toward the language being learned is regarded as the social factor because different countries have different attitudes to English as L2. Some countries see L2 as being imposed on them to their native language's detriment, while some see it as a gateway to the global world (ibid). In other words, the attitude of the country where the L2 learning is taking place can be pivotal for the L2 learning process. Another social factor is the level of exposure to the new language. If the L2 learner is not well exposed to the language materials such as books, the internet, tapes, films, computer games, newspapers, and magazines, L2 learning will be hindered (Drew & Sørheim, 2006). Individual factors also affect language learning. Such factors are motivation, intelligence, strategies, belief, preferences, age, self-confidence, attitude, and personality of the L2 learner (ibid). These factors' presence, absence, or wrong application can also be significant for the L2 learning process.

## **2.2 Reading skills**

In general, reading as a receptive language skill is decoding written symbols with the purpose of comprehension. Thus, reading can be defined as an activity that enables the understanding and meaning of a written text (Richards & Schmidt, 2010). The person reading a text decodes it through various means since it is complex and multidimensional (Alyousef, 2006). An author does not attach a particular meaning to his written work because doing so could limit the text.

Individuals can interpret a written text differently based on their approach, social background, interests, and age. The main purpose of reading is to construct meaning from the written text.

Besides writing, listening, and speaking, reading is an essential language skill. It is a process that enables the learner to comprehend the meaning of a written text (Richards & Schmidt, 2010, as cited in Ferdila, 2014). According to Grabe and Stoller (2002), reading is a complex procedure used to interpret a written symbol to derive meaning and understand this material appropriately. Reading requires a high-level discipline from the reader to comprehend the text correctly. Richard and Renandya (2001) see reading as a language skill that needs more attention in the second and foreign language teaching activities. Alyousef (2005) buttresses that reading is interactive. This interaction occurs as soon as the reader encounters the written text and begins studying and categorizing the vital information to share and discuss with friends. Also, Alyousef (2005) posits that reading is something that can aid the reader in growing their intellect as they seek to get appropriate information that will help them express their ideas after reading the text. Reading is a "springboard" that allows the reader to master other language skills. It is essential for learning as the outcome is helpful to students (Harmer, 2004).

Moreover, reading can be helpful if it considers the source of learning other language skills. The development of grammar, vocabulary, and other primary language skills comes from reading (Evans, Hartshorn, & Anderson, 2010). Reading can be intensive or extensive, depending on the purpose. Intensive reading is a reading activity in the classroom with the teacher's guidance and is targeted at paying attention to details (See Harmer, 2007). While extensive reading is when a reader seeks information by reading vast material with pleasure (Day & Bamford, 2004), intensive reading conforms with a careful and detailed reading of short passages in the textbooks without rushing to understand and comprehend (Miller, 2013). Although reading skills can be developed through extensive and intensive reading, this study focuses on intensive reading affecting written production regarding paraphrasing. Intensive reading typifies reading in the classroom by the students under the auspices of the teacher. It is reading to find a piece of specific information about a concept. Hence, it is not geared towards reading a long text but a short text in a meticulous manner. Thus, the teacher chooses the intensive reading materials based on what he or she wants the students to study.

In addition, Rashidi and Piran (2011) conceived that intensive reading has to do with comprehension, especially at the syntactic and lexical levels. When intensive reading is applied continually, it dramatically impacts the students' syntactic and lexical mastering levels. Thus, according to Mart (2015), intensive reading focuses on correctness rather than eloquence by highlighting the comprehensive study of grammar and vocabulary. Also, the students improve their writing skills when guided reading (intensive) is implemented in the language classroom (ibid). In other words, if the teacher gives a detailed analysis of the intensive reading materials, it helps the learners to master the language skills efficiently, especially their writing skills. In this context, it is plausible that engaging in intensive reading activities can give EFL learners paraphrasing competence because it has a significant relationship with the degree of text comprehension (Erhel & Jamet, 2006) and interpreting capacity (Russo & Pippa, 2004).

### **2.2.1 Reading in the EFL classroom**

Many researchers have concluded that understanding a written text is necessary for academic success, thereby seeing reading as the essential goal in EFL learning (Lynch & Hudson, 1991). The secret of every academic success is hidden in written texts because they offer many pedagogical benefits (Richards & Renandya, 2002). For instance, they provide a good model for writing, offer the opportunity to introduce new topics, help in language acquisition, and stimulate discussion to study the language (ibid). As EFL learners, reading in a foreign language can be challenging and taxing. It is because reading comprehension requires a certain level of proficiency in the target language. These reading skills can be realized when adequate reading strategies are applied in the EFL reading classroom (Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Hellekjær, 2007; Šamo, 2009).

According to Grabe and Stoller (2002), different learning resources in the EFL classroom will help improve reading skills. Learning resources include reliable reading materials, grouped readers, and other methods such as oral reading and pre-and post-reading activities. The teachers can also directly or indirectly teach their pupils about the development of self-monitoring skills and reading plans. Prereading activities are essential because they make the reader aware of the form and contents of the future text. On the other hand, post-reading

activities allow the teacher and the pupil to evaluate the level of text comprehension and talk about incomprehension to develop pupils' self-monitoring skills (Day & Bamford, 1998). Another reading strategy is oral reading-related activities. It is a situation where the teacher reads aloud or dramatizes the text. This strategy, according to Brewster, Ellis, and Girard (2004), Hall (1994), and Rixon (1992), motivates and educates the EFL reader as it often provides understandable effort for developing readers. It also helps to establish good learning conditions, which is advantageous as such conditions may improve pupils' self-confidence and motivates them to read, and, in turn, cause them to read more which will aid the development of reading skills (Krashen, 1984; 2004).

Moreover, for the benefit of the EFL reader, researchers came up with models of the reading processes. This reading process assists the teacher and the pupil gain insight at all reading stages. In the context of EFL reading, Silberstein (1987) mentions three reading strategies: the top-down model, the bottom-up model, and the interactive model. A structural linguist, Leonard Bloomfield, on the bottom-up model, describes reading as a 'process of manipulating phoneme-grapheme relationships' (Dubin & Bycina, 1991). The bottom-up model of reading helps to practice reading during reading instruction to build up the learner's reading interpretation skills from the bottom up, beginning with the minor units and single letters and building up to words and phrases (Cahyono & Widiati, 2006). According to Farrel (2008), the comprehension of a written text relies on the reader's knowledge of vocabulary and syntax. In other words, the bottom-up model of reading is a process of reading where the EFL reader begins from the minor units of language and progresses to the largest units. That is, from letters to words, phrases, and then sentences, as the meaning of the text is taken from the text itself.

On the other hand, the top-down model propounded by Kenneth Goodman and Frank Smith in 1979 and 1984 is that reading is a process of recreating meaning and that understanding the units of meaning in a written text is beyond words and phrases (Dubin & Bycina, 1991). This model believes that for comprehension to occur, the EFL reader must use their cognitive ability when reading. Goodman (1984) and Smith (1979) believe that a top-down approach to the reading process is knowledge-driven. That is, the meaning of a text is not entirely within the text. Instead, the EFL reader can drive or interpret the meaning of the text using previous knowledge of events or situations. This model is helpful for EFL teaching and

reading as it makes the learner involve actively in the reading process because the reader uses the knowledge of vocabulary, phrases, sentence structures, and understanding of the world to interpret the text (Cahyono & Widiati, 2006). The reader is not dependent on the text but uses previous knowledge to make correct predictions and verify hypotheses (Goodman, 1984; Smith, 1979).

The interactive model believes that reading should comprise bottom-up and top-down models. The EFL reader should use the idea of the word and background knowledge to interpret a written text (Rumelhart, 1977). This model believes that reading comprises the interaction of all meaning-related activities. The learner's previous knowledge and prediction play an essential role in the reading process, but at the same time, the rapid and accurate method of the text's actual words is critical (Carrell, Devine, & Eskey, 1988; Dubin & Bycina, 1991). According to Harmer (2001), the details of individual words often help us understand the whole, and often it is the whole that helps us know the individual components. In other words, interpreting a text word by word helps us understand the whole text, and analyzing a text using background knowledge can also allow us to understand the individual terms. The nature of the text plays an essential role in helping the reader to understand a written text (Carrell & Eisterhold, 1988). In summary, the researchers designed the reading process to help both the EFL teacher and the learner in the reading process, as reading in a foreign language can be challenging and multi-faceted.

### **2.2.2 Reading in a Norwegian classroom**

According to the Norwegian English subject curriculum 2020, reading is presented as one of the five basic skills, together with oral, written, numeracy, and digital skills (Ministry of Education and Research, 2020). It involves meta-cognitive skills and reading strategies to create meaning in a text and its contexts (ibid). In the Norwegian reading classroom, the learner is at the centre of the reading process and can use his cognitive ability to make sense of the text. As Urquhart and Weir (2014) posited, reading seems to focus on a 'reader-driven' rather than a 'text-driven' approach in the Norwegian classroom. Norwegian EFL learners should be able to read 'English texts fluently and to understand, explore, discuss, learn from and reflect upon



different types of information (Ministry of Education and Research, 2020). They should be able to read English text confidently, comprehend it, and use it to function or participate appropriately in society. The learners are expected to 'understand, reflect on and acquire insight and knowledge across cultural borders and within specific fields of study to help 'promote the general education perspective and strengthen democratic involvement and co-citizenship' (Ministry of Education and Research, 2020) through the reading of different texts. The Norwegian English subject syllabus's emphasis on the learner's ability to understand, reflect on and assess a wide variety of different text genres shows that it promotes a meta-awareness of texts (Bakken, 2017).

According to Charboneau (2012), Drew (2004), and Hellekjær (2007), the teaching of reading by Norwegian teachers is traditionally based on their textbooks. The standard approach to teaching reading in the Norwegian EFL classroom depends on the intensive task of reading books rather than extensive reading activities (Drew, 2004, 2009a; Hellekjær, 2007). The intensive reading of textbooks requires the learner to read the text in detail. It is primarily a short text, and the learner is meant to read line by line, as she focuses on the linguistic aspects like grammatical structures of words, phrasing, and sentences, which will, in turn, be used in translation and analysis of the text. On the other hand, extensive reading requires the learner to read a longer text fluently and emphasize the meaning of the text rather than the linguistic structures. One reason for including intensive rather than extensive reading is that they believe it helps develop learners' reading skills.

### **2.3. Writing skills**

Writing is "a matter of arrangement, of fitting sentences and paragraphs into prescribed patterns" (Silva, 1990, p. 14). It is one of the essential skills in language teaching and learning activities for English as first learners. Tangpermpoon (2008) defined writing as the ability to generate the symbols and signs required to express thoughts and feelings by an inscription and transfer the received information in the brain into written form. Also, it is how ideas are shown, conveyed, and offered to the reader in sentences and paragraphs (Nunan, 2003). One primary aim of teaching foreign language skills through intensive reading is that writing skills are

targeted at making the EFL learners actively use the information gained in the classroom to express their thoughts in a foreign language (Güzel & Barın, 2013). One such way is engaging them in paraphrasing activities to build their writing proficiency. Writing is not just about transmitting codes into the target language; it is a complex and vital process.

While writing is one of the essential skills in foreign language teaching and learning activities, it is known that mastering this skill can be difficult and challenging for EFL learners. To buttress this fact, Tangpermpoon (2008), Jordan (2003), and Stubbs (1980) defined writing as the ability to produce the symbols and signs needed for expressing thoughts and ideas in a motorized way, carefully writing down the organized information from your brain, and expressing your thoughts and feelings with the use of signs. According to Köksal (1999), writing has three dimensions: cognitive, affective, and kinetic. The cognitive dimension is the learner's ability to mentally process, observe and interpret the acquired information. The affective dimension is readiness, easiness, eloquence, and eagerness to write. At the same time, the kinetic perspective is the organization of muscles into actions using a pen or pencil, paper, or notebook in writing. In other words, writing is a combination of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains, making it the most difficult language skill to acquire because it comprises a mental process and physical action.

Writing is essential in second or foreign language teaching and learning processes. It requires patience, practice, and creative thinking, a necessary part of human life that is inescapable. Mastering writing skills help students express their feelings, thoughts, and imaginations clearly and comprehensively. Nunan (2003) supports this notion by viewing writing as a way we reveal our feelings and thoughts and pass them on to the reader in sentences and paragraphs. On the other hand, Nordin (2017) sees writing as a skill that can be learned by constant practice and posits that it is a process that comprises reviewing, researching, and reorganizing thoughts on a piece of paper. From these views, one can deduce that for a written text to be considered good, the writer must have organized his thoughts meaningfully for effective communication. Writing allows students to self-expression because good writing skills are essential for being academically successful. As a result, the relationship between writing, thinking, creating, and life experience cannot be neglected.

### **2.3.1 Writing in the EFL classroom**

Writing, an essential skill in foreign language learning, requires the learner to master spelling, grammar, and language structures. However, it is known that learning to write in a new language can be challenging. According to Hyland (2014), studies from different researchers have shown that a text written by L2 or EFL writer is mostly less cohesive, less fluent, shorter, and contains more errors than a text written by an L1 writer. The reason is that when EFL learners start to write in a foreign language, they must learn new words and linguistic structures to construct meaningful sentences. Learning vocabulary and grammatical rules poses a problem as he struggles to find the correct words. To demonstrate writing proficiency, one must have language proficiency in that Language (Celik, 2019). The EFL writer cannot achieve foreign language learning without language proficiency.

Moreover, in foreign language teaching, writing is believed to be the last stage of language skills and the most challenging skill, which demands that the EFL writer writes correctly concerning content and organization and by the grammatical rules (Demirel, 2016). Thus, writing is practiced by reading (to learn written conventions) and writing (to put those conventions into practice). Güzel and Barın (2013) say that learners in foreign language teaching mostly use the knowledge from the classroom with writing activities to express their ideas in language writing. Writing skills can be developed in a foreign language classroom when the activities and exercises performed in the classroom attract the learner's attention. Foreign language teachers should include various writing activities to improve the learners' writing skills. In other words, constant writing practice can help to improve writing skills.

Meanwhile, the differences in the cultural expectations of how written texts are organized affect the EFL writer. The EFL learners are taught with different approaches based on their cultural background. Most times, the learners of EFL may lack the social context while writing because they are not familiar with the social aspects as they appear in the text (Weigle, 2002). The social context is an essential ingredient in writing, which the EFL teachers should consider for the benefit of the learners. The inability of learners to comprehend and interpret texts can affect their writing performance and can be traced to a lack of language proficiency (ibid).

Hence, gaining cultural knowledge of the target language is paramount to writing proficiency, and this can be acquired if the learners invest a sufficient amount of time.

### **2.3.2 Writing in the Norwegian classroom**

In the Norwegian core curriculum, writing is an essential basic skill, and it is described in every subject curriculum in the LK20 curriculum (Framework for basic skills, 2012). Based on the framework for basic skills, writing is described as 'expressing oneself understandably and appropriately about different topics and communicating with others in the written mode' (ibid, p. 10). It is a skill essential to express feelings and ideas. Understanding and developing writing skills is necessary for learning, work life, and social participation (ibid). When teaching writing as an essential skill in a Norwegian classroom, the teachers are meant to focus on enhancing pupils' ability to create texts that can be read and understood by others. According to Lavin (2003), 'output generates rather different cognitive processes from those generated by input and encourages learners to notice syntactic features and consequently, given suitable conditions, improve their output.' In other words, teaching writing as an essential skill in the Norwegian classroom means that the pupils should be allowed to express themselves in writing through constant practice. That is, the classroom should primarily expose pupils to communicative aspects of writing rather than technical ones.

The English subject is structured into four main subject areas: 'Language learning,' 'Oral communication,' 'Written communication,' and 'Culture, society, and literature' (LK20 English subject curriculum, 2020). Written communication plays a vital role in other subject areas because it aims at understanding the English Language through reading and writing. It involves using a range of texts to motivate pupils and acquire knowledge. Students at Norwegian schools must write different text genres and understand the difference between formal and informal writing. In the Norwegian English curriculum, writing skill is seen as 'being able to express ideas and opinions understandably and purposefully using written English' (LK20 English subject curriculum). The students should be able to create enough vocabulary, plan, formulate and work with different text genres to develop writing proficiency in the English Language.

According to the Norwegian curriculum of English subject, one of the competence aims for 10th grade concerning writing states that after year 10, the students should be able to 'write formal and informal texts, including multimedia texts with structure and coherence that describe, narrate and reflect, and are adapted to the purpose, recipient, and situation' (LK20 English subject curriculum, p. 9). Accordingly, students must know the difference between formal and informal writing. Express themselves fluently and coherently in writing and use idiomatic expressions accurately. Therefore, it is believed that when students practice writing and producing texts, it helps to improve their writing skills by mastering content and organization of sentence structures.

### **2.3.3 Teaching EFL writing**

It is paramount to teach proficient writing in the early stage of pupils in schools (Drew & Sørheim, 2006). Hyland (2003,p. 2) identified six different aspects of teaching writing and gaining writing skills which include,

- Language structures
- Text functions
- Creative expressions
- Composing process
- Topics and content
- Genre and context of writing

Being proficient in English language writing skills involves the ability to master the vocabulary, grammatical structures, contents, and organization of sentences. Hyland (2003) believes that focusing on the language structures by the English teachers in a writing classroom will help the student master the rules of English grammar, construct correct sentences, and have a successful exposition of texts which are the primary conditions for good writing. This aspect of teaching writing requires the students to be taught new grammar rules and vocabulary and apply it to

their subsequent writing activities. It links the language vocabulary, phrases, and sentences to the language rules. Hyland suggests that this aspect of teaching writing should be mainly used for students that have low proficiency in writing skills. The essence is to build their confidence as good writing skill is believed to be the ability to write clearly and accurately and not mainly the meaning of the text (Hyland, 1996).

There are different text functions in English language writing. For example, learning sentence structures and patterns of language writing will enable the students to produce high-quality text. Therefore, in teaching writing for EFL learners, the students should be given text function orientation to enable them to make successful paragraphs with different sentence types and functions. It helps the student structure text from the introduction, the body, and the conclusion. According to Hyland (2003), the text models are provided to give the students insight into how language is used to perform certain functions in a written text which will, in turn, improve the learner's understanding of the language and how to apply it. Hence, in the teaching of writing, focusing on creative expression will help to develop students' reflections and words. The teaching organization should reflect students' ideas and personal experiences by allowing them to write based on their imaginations and individual experiences. It makes it easy for students to express themselves creatively without the teacher's interference (Hyland, 2003). The students usually enjoy creative writing as it allows them to exercise and experiment with their language development and many children prefer writing to speaking (Drew & Sørheim, 2006). Creative writing includes personal narratives, stories, poems, plays, and dialogues (ibid). Personal essays play an essential role in developing the learners' writing skills. It is easy to produce because it is based on the writer's personal experiences. The students use their imagination to create stories in story writing, and most children enjoy creating stories (Drew & Sørheim, 2006).

The teaching of composing process in the writing classroom will help the students in the writing process. According to Hyland (2003), teaching the composing approach in writing will give students background knowledge on composing written text, such as brainstorming, drafting, revising, and feedback. The advantage of this teaching process is that it helps to understand what teachers can do to improve the learners' writing skills. It also makes the learner go through cognitive stages such as revising and drafting their text content and topic to produce

and evaluate quality text (ibid). While teaching the writing process, it is essential to focus on the topic and scope of the text. The content and topic of the text and topics the students will write on are exciting themes. Providing the students with the familiar subject matter will allow them to express themselves better. According to Hyland (2003), providing students with familiar topics will give low and high language proficiency students the ability to write meaningful text with the multiple information provided.

Nevertheless, understanding the purpose of any written text will enable the learner to produce a successful text. Therefore, the students should be taught to acquire the knowledge necessary to produce contextual text while at school. Drew and Sørheim (2006) outlined the genres of different text functions as letter-writing, emails, diaries, postcards, descriptions, reports, logs, advertisements, instructions, and articles. Each of the genres has its practical functions. For instance, article writing is a way of communicating to a large audience through the press, diary writing helps to record and summarise events, and writing an advertisement promotes a product, service, or event; report writing is a way of reporting events and businesses. The style of these text genres can be written as formal or informal, depending on the purpose and audience. Teaching students the different ways of writing text genres will help them to understand how to organize and use language in different situations or contexts (Drew & Sørheim, 2006). Implementing the functional text model in the language classroom will help the students understand the appropriate language use and apply it while writing.

## **2.4 Source criticism and plagiarism**

Recently, much attention has been paid to EFL students' inappropriate use of source texts (particularly learning English as a foreign language), and examples of such are textual borrowing which professors and administrators have tagged as "plagiarism" (Keck, 2006). Pecorari and Petric (2014) viewed plagiarism as several academic misbehaviors involving inappropriate citation, referencing, poor paraphrasing skills, and handing in someone's writing as your own. As Park (2003) posited, plagiarism includes literary theft, stealing (by copying) the ideas or another author's words, and making them as one's own without properly referencing the source. In other words, plagiarism is considered to be "literary theft" (Park, 2003, p. 472)

and should be punished accordingly (Bloch, 2012; Pecorari, 2001). It could also be referred to as stealing words and ideas beyond what would typically be general knowledge (Park, 2003). From the view of the Association of American Historians, plagiarism is 'the misuse of the writings of another author : [...] including the limited borrowing, without attribution, of other's distinctive and significant research findings, hypotheses, theories : [...] or interpretations' (Fialkoff, 1993).

Plagiarism is as old as writing itself. In other words, it is not a new existence. It was hidden from the public gaze until the advent of mass-produced writing (Park, 2003). Plagiarism can be viewed through different lenses; 'now widely considered a vice, in days past it was sometimes considered a virtue, imitation being considered the highest form of flattery (ibid, p.473).' The Elizabethan playwright Ben Johnson first used the term 'plagiary,' meaning literary theft, at the start of the 17th century (Mallon, 1989). Then, borrowing from other writers' work was very common (Park, 2003). The 'textual misappropriations', as called by Thomas (2000), became so common as mass-produced books were more widely accessible and more written texts to copy. By the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century, copyright laws defined plagiarism more clearly, and plagiarists were opposed to flaunting public attitudes regarding literary content and strong moral opinions of literary theft. It was very tough for writers to establish before then to protect authorship (Goldgar, 2001). Since the advent of mass-produced books and internet accessibility, the opportunity to plagiarise other people's work has been inevitable (Park, 2003). Plagiarism is typically punishable at universities, where students will receive a failing grade or even be expelled. Hence, EFL learners ought to be conscious of this offense and be prepared to master paraphrasing to avoid its future penalty.

Park (2003) said the term 'plagiarism' is not ambiguous. Still, it has many complications as soon as it applies to academic settings because 'between imitation and theft, between borrowing and plagiarism, lies a wide, murky borderland' (The Economist, 1997). According to Brandt (2002), Wilhoit (1994), and Howard (2002), students plagiarise in four significant ways. Firstly, they steal text from another source and give it out as their own. For instance, copying a whole paper from a source material without appropriate referencing or handing in other students' work, with or without that student's information (e.g., copying a computer disk). Secondly, they present a paper published by someone and give it as their own. Thirdly, they



Copy some sections of text from one or more source materials and provide proper documentation (including the complete reference) but leave the quotes, thus giving the impression that the text has been paraphrased rather than directly quoted. Finally, they paraphrase text from one or more source materials without providing suitable documentation.

One of the main problems that EFL students have is mistaking paraphrasing for summarizing. So, most students struggle with differentiating between paraphrasing, which according to Roig (2001, p.319), 'involves restating text from a source in the writer's own words,' and summarising, which 'condenses large quantities of text into a few sentences to convey the main points of the original.' In other words, when paraphrasing, the entire text is to be represented in one's own words, while in summary writing, the source text's main ideas and the essential points are to be represented using one's own words. Paraphrasing is broader, while summary writing is short.

Plagiarism has raised many controversies among scholars. Hence, Kolich (1983, p.145) tagged it 'the worm of reason' that "starves the seeds of originality." It lacks respect for originality and creativity. Plagiarism violates all five fundamental values of academic integrity – "honesty, trust, respect, fairness, and responsibility" (International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI, 1999 [2013])). The issue of plagiarism has led many researchers to suggest approaches that teachers can use to help learners prevent over-dependence on borrowing from source texts. In this view, one of the most widely recommended pedagogical approaches that can prevent plagiarism is the teaching of paraphrasing (Howard, 1995; Currie, 1998; Hyland, 2001). EFL teachers must teach the students meanings of academic honesty and cases of plagiarism to enable them to read, understand and analyze institutional approaches to academic dishonesty (Hawley, 1984; Whitaker, 1993; Wilhoit, 1994). Adopting paraphrasing activities in the classroom helps to direct students on the appropriate way of writing and avoid copying someone else's work. According to Kantz (1990), it is necessary to construct vital rhetoric purpose into our assignments in the classrooms and curricula, giving students a much clearer insight when they start their writing and work through a writing activity.

## 2.5 Paraphrasing and Summary writing

Summary writing and paraphrasing are similar, but this section discusses summary writing and paraphrasing separately despite their similarities. Summary writing as an aspect of writing plays a vital role in developing learners' writing competence. According to Langan and Jenkins (1993, p. 120), summary writing is "the reduction of a large amount of information to its most important points." It allows learners to exercise their knowledge of synonyms and sentence structures. Friend (2001, p.3) viewed summary writing as "the process of determining what content in a passage is most important and transforming it into a succinct statement in one's own words." Summary writing is a vital and indispensable academic skill for second (L2) or foreign language learners (Yu, 2008). Summarisation arguably is the most challenging and demanding educational activity for a foreign language learner (Hirvela & Du, 2013). The summary writing skill is quite complicated in its process because it involves mental and intellectual reasoning. According to Kintsch and Van Dijk (1978), there are three processes involved in producing good summary writing: Comprehension of the original text, condensation of the thoughts and ideas in the original text, and production of the ideas in one's words. In contrast, essential requirements for developing a good summary are getting a full appreciation of the text, selecting and identifying important information and the central idea of a text, eliminating unimportant or redundant information, unifying similar ideas into categories, and writing in one's words (Casazza, 1993).

In this regard, summary writing can help provide young EFL learners with an excellent foundation to build other areas of language communication and provide valuable opportunities to search for lexical and syntactical meanings and use those meanings to communicate. So, the EFL learners' ability to write a good summary is vital for academic achievement, mainly for upper-secondary and university students who are often expected to complete different writing tasks that involve consolidating information from numerous sources (Kirkland & Saunders, 1991). Studies reveal that learners often must draw on source texts when carrying out assignments or tests (Hale et al., 1996; Carson, 2001). For instance, learners should produce information from given reading material while completing in-class and take-home assessments and when fulfilling writing tasks such as lab reports, article summaries, critiques, and research

papers (Hale et al., 1996; Carson, 2001). Scholars have also shown that there is a relationship between language by eye (reading) and language by hand (writing) (Berninger et al., 2002). In this context, it is plausible that engaging in intensive reading and summary writing activities can stimulate paraphrasing competence among EFL learners. The reason is that paraphrasing competence is significantly related to the degree of text comprehension (Erhel & Jamet, 2006) and interpreting capacity (Russo & Pippa, 2004).

One primary aim of teaching foreign language skills through summary writing and intensive reading is that writing skills are targeted at making the EFL learners actively use the information gained in the classroom to express their thoughts in a foreign language (Güzel & Barin, 2013). A possible approach is to engage them in paraphrasing activities in school to build their writing proficiency. Paraphrasing means "Using different phrasing and wording to express a particular passage that was originally written or spoken by someone else to blend the others' ideas smoothly into one's own writing" (Campell, 1998, p.86). It entails expressing the meaning of a passage or paragraph in one's own words without distorting the writer's original ideas. It is crucial to one's productive language competence (Martinot, 2003). It can enable reading comprehension by changing the text into a more understanding construct (McNamara, Ozuru, Best, & O'Reilly, 2007), and it can also help improve writing skills (McCarthy et al., 2009). The most vital and accurate process of rewriting source texts in one's own words without altering the meaning of the original sentence is through paraphrasing (Shi, 2004). It is a valuable means for borrowing people's ideas and applying them in one's writing. Another name for paraphrasing is an indirect quotation. Instead of copying another person's idea precisely the way it is, paraphrasing helps writers use their own words.

Paraphrasing is one challenging skill for EFL learners because it entails comprehending the original text and having the appropriate vocabulary competence to write it differently using one's own words while maintaining its original meaning. It is a process of rewording, rewriting, and restating sentences with the original source's original meaning. The paraphrased sentences are syntactically different but semantically the same. New World Dictionary (1994) defines paraphrasing as "a rewording of the meaning expressed in something spoken or written." It uses different words to express what has already been written or said. Phrases or sentences convey the same meaning using other words (Bhagat & Hovy 2013). On the same notion, McCarthy et

al. (2009) opine that paraphrasing is rewording sentences and retaining their meaning precisely the way it is in the original text. To paraphrase is to restate or rewrite a source material in one's own words without alteration is the main idea found in the source material (Veit, Gould & Clifford 1994). Paraphrasing requires that the meaning of the source material should be retained while the expression is changed. To achieve this, the EFL learner must understand and express the source text differently. The critical idea or information described in the source material must be correctly interpreted for paraphrasing.

Paraphrasing is an unavoidable skill for students because it will help them achieve academic success. In other words, it is an advantage for EFL learners. In terms of comprehension, the student's understanding and interpretation improve as they engage in paraphrasing exercises. Their ability to paraphrase text implies that they understand the text correctly. Also, it helps students master new vocabulary; their vocabulary level will be expanded. They use new words often synonymously (Leibensperger, 2003; Booth College Writing Center, 2012). Therefore, paraphrasing is vital in helping students integrate sources, which is an indispensable instrument. McInnis (2009) states that combining evidence from source materials cannot be achieved without paraphrasing. Aside from paraphrasing being an essential instrument, it prevents all written texts from being plagiarised. In other words, it helps students to avoid plagiarism as it causes problems for higher education students and allows them to produce good academic papers. For several reasons, paraphrasing is helpful for second or foreign language acquisition. According to Loh (2013), students can be beneficial by paraphrasing, especially when explaining ideas in tables, diagrams, and charts. Higher Score (2007) noted that paraphrasing is helpful for exam preparation, especially for English tests like TOEFL, IELTS, and TOELC. That is to say; it plays a vital role in note-making from reading and note-taking in lectures that can enhance learners' comprehension and later help them in their future careers. By participating in paraphrasing activities, the students acquire second or foreign language skills to assimilate the text content.

Paraphrasing as a complex skill must be done strategically to achieve a satisfying result. In this context, the role of classroom teachers cannot be overlooked. The EFL learners need qualified language teachers to guide them in paraphrasing activities. They should employ illustration and group discussion in their language classroom as Freeman and Freeman (1994)

believe that if the students discuss what they read in a group, it will improve their understanding level because discussing in a group gives them quality chances to gain social and language information needed to comprehend any given text. Also, Wu (2008) suggests that using exciting pictures while teaching students language learning helps improve and strengthen their vocabulary. There is also the need to teach the students how to paraphrase idioms as they are fixed phrases that may be difficult to paraphrase. According to Wu (2008), teaching English idioms using retelling and rewriting activities increase students' understanding and helps them to remember what they have learned, as remembering allows the teacher to know the amount of knowledge the students have acquired.

Based on Kalchayanant (2009), there are three primary strategies for effective paraphrasing. The strategies are using synonymous words or phrases to replace the ones from the source, making sure that the substituted words represent the same meaning, and changing the word or sentence forms from a verb to noun, adjectives to nouns, adjectives to verbs, and vice versa (Kalchayanant, 2009). Besides, Dung (2010) stated the three paraphrasing strategies thus: changing structure and grammar paraphrase (syntactic paraphrase), changing word paraphrase (semantic paraphrase), and changing structure (organization). Changing structure and grammar paraphrasing involves changing the source's syntactical and grammatical formation of words, phrases, and sentences, for instance, changing a phrase or sentence from positive to negative. Changing word phrases means changing a word or sentence order, such as changing a verb to a noun or noun to an adjective, and vice versa. And the change of structure involves changing the structure of the ideas.

Nonetheless, scholars have investigated the type of paraphrasing strategies that learners adopt regarding English as a second language (L2) or EFL (Keck, 2006; McCarthy et al., 2009). Researchers and writing instructors have emphasized that paraphrasing is essential to avoid committing plagiarism (Keck, 2006; McInnis, 2009). Such emphasis has been noted to enhance understanding, develop memory and brighten ideas (Reid, Lienemann, & Hagamann, 2013). The extent to which sentence structure varies with the completeness of word meanings and connection with linguistic differences determines successful paraphrasing (McCarthy et al., 2009). It means that "paraphrasing techniques can be a function of syntactic and lexical knowledge" (Ji, 2018, p. 21) and that L2 or EFL writers' language proficiency is determined

partly by the quality of their paraphrasing competence (Ibid). Although paraphrasing is essential in overall writing competence, it is only one of many aims to be covered at the lower secondary level. Paraphrasing competence is not explicitly mentioned in the English subject curriculum (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020). Thus, it may be overlooked by teachers who focus on covering the explicit formulations of the curriculum's competence aims. In this context, likely, high school teachers may not adequately engage in imparting such skills to their students, given that they are required to cover a myriad of topics.

### **3. Methodology**

This chapter discusses the approaches used in collecting data and analyzing the result obtained from this study. Section 3.1 discusses the research approach, 3.2 data collection, 3.3 data analysis, 3.3.1 Analyzes paraphrase types in the summary texts, 3.3.2 Analyzes the themes in the summary, 3.3.3 questionnaire data analysis and 3.4 Validity and Reliability.

#### **3.1 Research approach**

Research methods are the tools used to conduct research; these tools can be either qualitative, quantitative, or mixed. Qualitative research takes place in a natural environment and allows the researcher to develop many details by studying people's life experiences, behavior, and involvement in the actual experiences (Creswell, 1994). The methods used in qualitative research are observations, interviews, and images, enabling the researcher to investigate a social phenomenon. Researchers use these instruments to access, know and explain the meanings of a given object, behavior, and events being investigated (Hennick et al. 2011, p.9). Qualitative research uses "data collection procedures that result primarily in open-ended, non-numerical data which is then analyzed primarily by non-statistical methods" (Dornyei, 2007: 24). The researcher then intuitively interprets the data intending to provide a better understanding of a variety of phenomena being studied (2007: 37-38). An example of such an analytical procedure is thematic analysis.

Thematic analysis is a method used in the analysis of qualitative data, and it involves looking through a data set to identify, analyze and report recurrent patterns (Clark & Braun, 2006). In other words, thematic analysis is used to carefully search a data set to identify meaningful themes or patterns. Clark and Braun (2012) also believe that the method of identifying, organizing, and enabling an understanding of the patterns of meaning (theme) across a data set is known as thematic analysis. According to them, it helps the researcher to understand and make sense of the common meanings and experiences by concentrating on the meaning within a data set (ibid). The importance of patterns of meaning that thematic analysis permits the researcher to identify must be considered following its relationship to the specific

topic and the research question being explored (Clark & Braun, 2012). A thematic analysis aims to identify themes in the data set that are essential and, at the same time, exciting and use them to answer the research questions or address an issue (Clarke & Braun, 2013).

Quantitative research, on the other hand, involves "data collection procedures that result primarily in numerical data which is then analyzed primarily by statistical methods" (Dornyei, 2007, p. 24). Hence, quantitative research is constituted as a result of a numerical or statistical approach to research design. It also generates meanings through the objectivity revealed by the data collection (Williams, 2007). The data collected from quantitative research is used to quantify the information and subject it to statistical treatment to support or disprove alternate knowledge claims. As Leedy and Ormrod (2001, p. 102) put it, "quantitative researchers seek explanations and predictions that will generate to other persons and places, and the intent is to establish, confirm, or validate relationships and to develop generalizations that contribute to the theory."

Collecting or analyzing data using both the qualitative and quantitative study methods in a single research study is called a mixed method (Creswell, 2003; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). The most common reason for using mixed methods is to triangulate the data, i.e., to offer two different perspectives of the same phenomenon, thus raising the validity of the findings. For instance, to collect a mixture of data, researchers might distribute a survey containing closed-ended questions to collect the numerical or quantitative data and conduct an interview using open-ended questions to collect the narrative or qualitative data (Williams, 2007). The aim of using mixed methods by researchers is to draw from the strengths of both methods and minimize their weaknesses.

This study used mixed methods because it combines quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. In order to analyze data collected from the text written by grade 10 school pupils in Norway, a quantitative approach is used to investigate the EFL paraphrasing competence in the Norwegian context. The texts were also analyzed using thematic analysis in order to identify which parts of the source text the pupils chose to summarize. The qualitative approach was used to analyze a questionnaire given to the two English teachers whose pupils' texts were used for this study. It is used to ascertain the extent to which teachers address



paraphrasing and plagiarism in their writing instruction with the participating pupils. The interview data would be used to aid the interpretation of the results from the textual analysis.

### **3.2 Data collection**

This section describes the procedures for collecting the data. While section 3.2.1 describes the procedures for collecting the textual data, section 3.2.2 describes the procedures for collecting the questionnaire data.

#### **3.2.1 Textual data**

The study population was EFL learners in the 10th grade (aged 15 to 16) attending lower secondary school in Norway. The sample school for this study is one state secondary school on the South West coast of Norway. One state school is used because English is taught as a foreign language in all state secondary schools in Norway, which use the same English syllabus and curriculum (LK20). The participants wrote the summary texts in the autumn semester of year ten, and the majority of the pupils were of Norwegian ethnicity, but some pupils had other ethnic backgrounds. The participants' teachers were contacted ahead of time to inform them about this study and the type of data that would be collected, and they gave their full consent.

The participants were given a short text to read and summarize in their own words to explore the students' paraphrasing competence. The pupils summarised a text, which was taken from a textbook designed for year 10, called "War on Waste," Haegi, Madsen, and Mohammed-Roe (2021), which was about 400 words, and they were asked to summarize the text in 50 – 100 words. The text was about three people who went out of their way to find solutions on how to keep the environment clean. The text was chosen because it addressed the issues affecting every human being. Also, it is an interesting storyline. The pupils were informed that their text would be used for research purposes. They were informed that they would remain anonymous and that their involvement would have no effect on their schoolwork. They were given the opportunity to refuse to submit their text. They were 15-16 years of age, and according to the CEFR, their level of English proficiency is probably at the B1-B2 level. The pupils' texts did not contain identifiable information about the pupils. Thus, this study was not registered with

the Norwegian Centre for Research Data (NSD). The pupils read the "War on Waste" text on a computer (This reflects the increased use of digital tools in many Norwegian schools). The pupils completed the task within 30 minutes and submitted their texts on Google Classroom. The summary text was collected from 34 pupils from two classes in different lesson periods, and their teachers agreed upon the data collection methods and time. The participants' teachers carried out the writing task on behalf of the researcher. From the data collected, the highest number of words in the pupils' summaries is 266, and the lowest is 13.

### **3.2.2 Questionnaire data**

In order to supplement the textual analysis, a short questionnaire was given to the participating teachers (see appendix). Although the original plan was to interview the teachers, but it would consume more time. In order to lower the time that teachers would use, the researcher considered using a questionnaire. The questionnaire focused on the extent to which teachers address paraphrasing and plagiarism in their writing instruction with the participating pupils. The questionnaire guide was designed to help respond to the study question: "To what extent do the identified paraphrasing types correspond with the teachers' reported instructional practices?" The questionnaire data is used to aid the interpretation of the results from the textual analysis. The questionnaire is divided into two sections. The first section is about the teachers' backgrounds, and the second is about their views and practices regarding paraphrasing and plagiarism. In the background section, two questions were devised, which focused on the teacher's level of English education and their years of experience in lower secondary school. The second section has seven questions. Three questions are in Likert scale format, and the rest of the four questions are given to allow the teachers to describe their paraphrasing teaching practices freely. The questionnaire also was intentionally kept short to encourage the teachers to provide longer answers. These four questions comprise the teacher's instructional approach to paraphrasing, the importance of paraphrasing to pupils' writing skills, a description of the pupils' level of paraphrasing competence if they have experienced their pupils plagiarising; how many people, and how many times, and how they handle the situation. The questionnaire was given to two teachers from the participating pupils' class. The questionnaire guide was designed

through a google form, and it was sent to the teacher's email address to fill in and return to the researcher's email address. The teachers were informed about the questionnaire and its purpose before time and gave their full consent.

### **3.3 Data Analysis**

In this section, the methods for data analysis are explained. The first procedure analyzed the result using Keck's (2006) categorization of the paraphrase types, which includes near copies, minimal revisions, moderate revisions, and substantial revisions. These paraphrase types are explained in detail with their examples. The second procedure is thematic analysis. This study's thematic analysis is also explained in detail with the identified themes and the examples of those themes, as seen in the pupils' summaries. Thirdly, a detailed explanation of the procedure used to analyze the teachers' questionnaire is in this section. Finally, this section explains the validity and reliability of this study, taking note of the internal and external validity as regards this study.

#### **3.3.1 Analysing paraphrase types in the summary texts**

This exploratory study analyzed the sample of summary texts written by 10th-grade pupils following Keck's (2006) categorization of paraphrase types. Based on Keck's approach, the participants' summary task was evaluated using codes to determine cases of an attempted paraphrase. Attempted paraphrases, as defined by Keck, are "passages within a student summary which (a) were based upon a specific excerpt of the source text, and (b) contained at least one word-level change made to that excerpt" (Kecks, 2006, p. 265). Changes in word choice, such as synonyms, replacing a one-word function with another, changing the verb to noun form, etc., are seen as word-level changes. Changes in subject-verb agreement, grammatical numbers, punctuation, and reordering phrases and clauses were not counted as attempted paraphrases (ibid). The sentence in the pupils' summary task that copies the source phrases or clauses with no word level changes was coded as an exact copy (Keck, 2006).

The researcher began by tracing each pupil's summary sentences to sentences in the source text to categorize attempted paraphrases (Kecks, 2006). This process was done using a website called Diffchecker (2020) to detect the differences and similarities in pupils' summaries and the source text. The coder was helped by a highlight automatically inserted by the computer program. The highlighted phrases or sentences are used to show the cases in which words or phrases used in the pupils' summaries also appeared in the original text. Each summary was coded using the following categories: word lengths, unique links, general links, and reporting phrases (e.g., 'according to.....'). However, following Keck's perspective, the reporting phrase will not be included in the paraphrase word count.

Unique links relate to lexical words such as nouns, adjectives, and verbs used in the paraphrase and occur in the source in a similar context as in the paraphrase (Kecks, 2006). For example:

**1a** Living a zero-waste life means that you don't send any waste to landfill.

(Original excerpt)

**1b** The meaning of living a zero-waste life is **that you don't send any garbage to**

**landfill** (Attempted paraphrase)

In Example 1b, the paraphrase contains two different unique links: " that you don't send any " (five words), and " to landfill " (two words). Hence, the total number of words contained within unique links for this paraphrase is seven.

General links are lexical words used in the pupils' summary as they appeared in the source and other places in the source text (Keck, 2006). General links are underlined in this example 2 below:

**2a** She started recycling and composting her waste, and she only buys clothes in second-hand stores. (Original excerpt)

**2b** She began to reuse and turn her garbage into fertilizer and also resolved to purchase clothes from shops selling used clothes. (Attempted paraphrase)

In the above example 2b, the paraphrase contains two words, "she" and "her," which also appear in the source text. These borrowed words are a bit different from the unique links identified in Example 1 because they appear in other places in the original excerpt. In "War On Waste," the word "she" occurs ten times; "her" occurs five times. While unique links are tied only to a definite excerpt of the original text, general links appear in many places and are more likely to be words related to the source text's essential main ideas. Thus, it is conceivable to think that general links are somewhat more acceptable than unique links, even though it is yet to be empirically investigated. This study compared how the two different links are used in different paraphrase types by coding the two different types of borrowed words separately (Keck, 2006). Hence, this study adapted Keck's Taxonomy to categorize the paraphrase types that were observed in this particular dataset

The taxonomy of paraphrase types is classified into Minimal Revision Near Copy, , Moderate Revision, and Substantial Revision. Near copy is a paraphrase attempt that encompasses 50% or more of the words borrowed from the source. Most near copies contain the mean length of the unique links of about five words and above (Kecks, 2006). The following extract from the pupils' text shows the example of Near Copy:

**3a** Meet three people who have taken matters into their own hands. (Original excerpt)

**3b** The text is about **three people that have taken matters into their own hands**. (text 18)

Minimal Revision is an attempted paraphrase by which 20–49% of the paraphrase contains words from the unique links. It comprises pupils' elaborative phrases or clauses that reduce the words to less than 50% in the unique link (Kecks, 2006). The example is shown below:

**4a** Planet Earth is being slowly suffocated by man-made waste. (Original excerpt)

**4b** The planet is dying because of **man-made waste**. (text 29)

Moderate Revision is a paraphrase type, which includes less than 20% of the paraphrase words as contained in the unique link of the original excerpts. It uses the same number of general and unique links. In Moderate Revision, the unique links are only the individual words or two-word phrases borrowed from the source (Kecks, 2006). For example:

**5a** Not only have they changed their lifestyle to be more sustainable, they inspire people to reduce their own waste. (Original excerpt)

**5b** The text was about some people that **have changed their** life for the better. (text15)

Finally, Substantial Revisions do not include words from the source. While the meaning remains similar, the source text has been completely reworded. Although it can include a few words in the General link from the source with a mean of 12% but does not contain Unique Links, and over 85% of Substantial Revisions will not include words from the source (Kecks, 2006). For example:

**6a** Meet three people who have taken matters into their own hands. (Original excerpt)

**6b** Three people show and tell what they do to help the earth be a better place for the environment. (Text 2)

Meanwhile, the sentences within a pupil's summary that copied the phrases or clauses of the source without any word-level changes were coded as 'Exact Copies' (Kecks, 2006). For example:

**7a** The purpose was to make people see the amount of trash an average person produces.  
(Original excerpt)

**7b** **The purpose was to make people see the amount of trash an average person produces.** (Text 34)

**Table 1** below presents examples of the taxonomy of paraphrase type:

<b>Paraphrase type</b>	<b>Linguistic criteria</b>	<b>Examples</b>
		Original Excerpt Not only have they changed their lifestyle to be more sustainable, they inspire people to reduce their own waste.
Near Copy	50% or more words contained within unique links.	<b>Not only have they changed their</b> way of life <b>to be more sustainable</b> , but they also encourage individuals <b>to reduce their own waste</b> .
Minimal Revision	20–49% words contained within unique links.	<b>Not only have they changed their</b> way of life <b>to be more</b> viable, but they also motivate individuals to cut the level of their garbage.
Moderate Revision	1–19% words contained within unique links.	<b>Not only have they</b> transformed their way of life in a viable way, but they also encourage individuals to cut the level of their garbage.
Substantial Revision	No unique links.	This article is about people who did not just transform their way of life in a liveable way but also motivated individuals to cut the level of their garbage.

**Table 1.** The Taxonomy of Paraphrase Types. Adaptation from Keck (2006, p. 268).

The purpose of creating the paraphrase types is to be able to describe the rate of borrowing strategies among EFL learners in Norway. Four paraphrase types were developed with the use of unique link variables. The measures used to describe each paraphrase type, as shown in Table 1, were selected in order to have a significant difference from each category in their use of unique links. The paraphrases analysis within each type showed that the categories differ in their dependence on the unique links and the number of words contained within them (Keck, 2006). Therefore, the data analysis in this study followed the categorization of the paraphrase types. The researcher analyzed the results taking note of the number of each paraphrase type in each pupil's summary and how many summaries contained the paraphrase types.

### 3.3.2 Analysing the themes in the summary

Having analyzed the pupils' summaries using Keck's categorization of paraphrase types, it resulted that most of the paraphrases were found to be Substantial Revisions. This raised the

question of what pupils were chosen to include from the source text. To answer this question, the researcher also decided to analyze the pupils' texts using thematic analysis in order to identify which parts of the source text the pupils chose to summarize.

The researcher conducted the thematic analysis by carefully searching the pupils' data set to identify meaningful themes or patterns (Clark & Braun, 2006). The pupils' summaries were traced sentence to sentence to identify a theme or more from each sentence. Having identified the themes, the researcher coded the themes using the following language attributes: Overview, Person 1's actions, Person 2's actions, Person 3's actions, Actions of all 3 people, Advice for readers, Person 1's view, Person 2's view, Person 3's view, Views of all 3 people, Writer's view, Metatext, Person 2's actions result, Person 2's cause of actions, and Company's descriptions based on the source text.

Overview means a short description of the source text that gives general information about the subject matter. Person 1's actions refer to the actions performed by the first character in the source text. Person 2's actions refer to the actions performed by the second character. Person 3's actions are the actions performed by the third character. Actions of all 3 people are the actions performed by the three characters in the source text and represented in the pupils' summaries in one sentence. Advice for readers is advice given to the readers by the source text characters or the writer. Person 1's view is the personal view of the first character in the source text. Person 2's view is the view of the second character. Person 3's view is the view of the third character. Views of all 3 people are the views of the three characters in the source text represented in the pupils' summaries in one sentence. The writer's view is the view of a pupil about the source text. Metatext is the introduction of the summary text. Person 2's actions result from the actions performed by the second character in the source text. Person 2's cause of actions is the cause of the actions performed by the second character. Company descriptions is the description of the company created by the source text's characters.

The following examples show each theme as identified from the pupils' summaries: (Note: grammar and spelling errors have been retained from the pupils' summary texts)

Overview means a short description of the source text that gives general information about the subject matter, as shown in extract 8:



**8** It is a text that talks about 3 different people who have changed their lifestyle because of the waste problem we have in the world. (Overview)

Person 1's actions refer to the actions performed by the first character in the source text, as shown in extract 9:

**9** She started recycling and started to shop things from second hand stores. (Person 1's action)

Person 2's actions refer to the actions performed by the second character, as shown in extract 10:

**10** The second person made people carry all the trash they use in a day. (Person 2's action)

Person 3's actions are the actions performed by the third character, as shown in extract 11:

**11** And the third person made a website that people could send their worn clothes so other people could use it. (Person 2's action)

Actions of all 3 people are the actions performed by the three characters in the source text and represented in the pupils' summaries in one sentence, as shown in extract 12:

**12** They have done lots of different things to help the environment and showed it to the people. (Actions of all 3 people)

Advice for readers is advice given to the readers by the source text characters or the writer, as shown in extract 13:

**13** Some of her tips to start are to start using a reusable bag, steel or glass bottle you can refill, and change to a bamboo toothbrush. (Advice for readers)

Person 1's view is the personal view of the first character in the source text, as shown in extract 14:

**14** She thinks that doing little things is better than doing nothing. (Person 1's view)

Person 2's view is the view of the second character, as shown in extract 15:

**15** Another one thinks it's better to see how much you really use so that you're more aware of your usage. (Person 2's view)

Person 3's view is the view of the third character, as shown in extract 16:

**16** so she came up with a website called “shop,wear and swap so when people got tired of the clothes they could swap their clothes with each other. (Person 3's view)

Views of all 3 people are the views of the three characters in the source text represented in the pupils' summaries in one sentence, as shown in extract 17:

**17** They have different opinions on what they think is more important. (Views of all 3 people)

The writer's view is the view of a pupil about the source text, as shown in extract 18:

**18** Clothing is something people just throw away even tho they are completely useable.

(Writer's view)

Metatext is the introduction of the summary text, as shown in extract 19:

**19** Hi, in this text I'm going to write about the 'war on waste' text. (Metatext)

Person 2's actions result from the actions performed by the second character in the source text, as shown in extract 20:

**20** His dumpster dives have raised awareness about food waste, not only in the United States but in other parts of the world. (Person 2's action result)

Company descriptions is the description of the company created by the source text's characters, as shown in extract 21:

**21** Clothes Loop makes it possible for people to renew their wardrobe and be sustainable at the same time. (Company's description)

Person 2's cause of actions is the cause of the actions performed by the second character, as shown in extract 22:

**22** Rob Greenfield was an environmental activist and wanted to show people how much trash we all use so he wore his trash for 30 days. (Person 2's cause of actions)

The researcher analyzed the result taking note of the total number of each identified theme in pupils' summaries and the total number of summaries that contained each theme.

### **3.3.3 Analysing the questionnaire data**

To analyze the questionnaire data, the researcher went through the two teachers' responses to see the similarities and differences in their responses and how they addressed paraphrasing and plagiarism in their writing instruction with the participating pupils. Since the teachers' information was anonymous, the researcher used A and B to identify them. The questions and responses from each teacher were kept separately, which helped the researcher compare the two responses and how they relate to the textual data obtained from the pupils.

The responses obtained from the questionnaire data helped the researcher to interpret the results from the textual analysis. For instance, in one of the questions, the teachers were asked what they do to teach their pupils about paraphrasing. The responses given by the two teachers show that they consistently teach the pupils to write what they read and heard in their own words, which helped to interpret the result obtained from the paraphrasing analysis, where the majority of the pupils summarized the source text in their own words.

### **3.4 Validity and reliability**

The aim of every researcher is for the result obtained from a data set to measure what it is supposed to measure. Mackey and Gass (2022) opine that we always desire that after investing most of our time and energy trying to design a study, the results of our study would represent what we want them to represent in a meaningful way. The significance also would not be limited to only the tested population but also a more significant population when experimented with by another researcher (*ibid*). To strengthen the validity of this study, the researcher used mixed methods for data collection. There are several types of validity, but this study will focus on internal and external validity.

The internal validity of a research is the degree to which the experimented results reflect the truth or real-life situation of the population under study (Mackey & Gass, 2022). In other words, internal validity measures how well a study is structured or conducted and how

accurately the results reflect the studied population. This study is internally valid because it used mixed data collection methods and represents real-life phenomena. Before choosing the text to summarize by the pupils, the researcher considered their age, interests, grade, time, length of the text, the content, and the environment. The text was extracted from their English textbook to represent the kinds of texts pupils usually read. The pupils wrote the summary text under conditions typical of timed written school assignments, and they wrote the text individually and quietly on a computer. Also, the questionnaire given to the teachers was formulated using the Likert scale, and 50% of the questions were meant for long answers to enable the teachers to give a detailed explanation of their answers. The purpose was to get a valid response from them to respond to the study's research question: "To what extent do the identified paraphrasing types correspond with the teachers' reported instructional practices?" The teachers were also given enough time to respond to the questions correctly. The two teachers who participated in this study were from different classes and were meant to know that they should respond individually, not collectively.

External validity is the extent to which the relevance of the findings of a study can be generalized to other larger populations of language learners with different situations, settings, and times (Mackey & Gass, 2022). In other words, the external validity of a study is the application of a scientific study's conclusions outside that study's context, which helps to answer the question: can the study be applied to the real world? It is also how well a research study's result can likely apply to other settings. This study's external validity is limited since only one Norwegian state secondary school was used. Notwithstanding, the result obtained from this study can be tentatively applied to other 10<sup>th</sup> grades EFL learners in the Norwegian context since all Norwegian state secondary schools learn English as a foreign language and use the same English syllabus and textbook. Further study could be conducted with a larger population by using different schools in Norway and other countries that learn English as a foreign language to increase the external validity.

According to Mackey and Gass (2022), the reliability of the results is the consistency of a measuring instrument and the degree to which the measuring instrument produces stable and consistent results. In other words, reliability refers to how consistently a research method measures something. The measurement is reliable if the same result can be consistently

obtained using the same conditions. The reliability of the results does not rely on the tools used; instead, it examines the procedures used for the analysis to obtain the results. Therefore, the analysis of this study is reliable because it relies on a systematic categorization of paraphrase types taken from a previous study. It followed a process of conducting a systematic thematic analysis, which involves identifying themes and trialling them to best capture the dataset's content. Also, the questionnaire dataset is small, which means that it could easily be used to support the interpretation of the textual results.

## 4. Results

This chapter is made up of three sections. Section 1 presents the paraphrasing result following the data obtained from the pupils’ summaries. The results were analyzed following Keck’s categorization of paraphrase types: Near Copy, Minimal Revisions, Moderate Revisions, Substantial Revisions, and other attempted paraphrases such as General Links and Exact Copies. Section 2 presents the thematic analysis results of the data obtained from the pupils’ summaries with the identified themes. Section 3 presents the results of the teachers’ questionnaire.

### 4.1 paraphrasing types in the summary texts

Frequency	Near copy	Minimal revision	Moderate revision	Substantial revisions	Exact copy	General links
Number of summaries that contained paraphrasing types	9	7	12	34	3	21
Total number of each paraphrase type	14	8	16	162	5	67
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>88</b>

**Table 2.** Table showing the frequency of texts (N = 34) that contained each paraphrasing type and total frequency of paraphrasing types

Table 2 above shows the frequency of the total number of summaries containing the paraphrasing types: Near Copy, Minimal Revisions, and Moderate Revisions. It also shows the total number of Exact Copies and the General Links contained in the pupils’ summaries.

### 4.1.1 Near Copies

The first paraphrase type in Table 2 is Near Copy this category was defined by Keck (2006) as a paraphrase attempt that encompasses 50% or more of the words borrowed from the source. The total number of Near Copy found within the Unique Links of the pupils' summaries is fourteen, and the total number of summaries that contained Near Copy is nine.

The following extracts show examples of near copies in the pupils' summaries:

**23a.** According to Singer, it's better to make small changes instead of doing nothing at all. (Original excerpt)

She often says that **it's better to make small changes** that **nothing at all**.

(text 14)

**23b.** Meet three people who have taken matters into their own hands. (Original excerpt)

The text is about **three people** that **have taken matters into their own hands**.

(text 18)

These extracts show that some pupils' summaries almost copied the source text but only made minor changes. For example, in extract number 1, the sentence in text 14 contains fourteen words, nine of which were copied exactly from the source, and five were changed, which shows that 50% of the words were borrowed from the source. The exact borrowed words or phrases from the source are in bold. Extract in 23b also shows that some pupils' summaries almost copied the source text. The sentence in text 18 contains fourteen words. While nine were copied exactly from the source, five were changed, showing that 50% of the words were borrowed from the source. The pupil only made minor changes from the source. Therefore, the extracts above from the pupils' summaries are classified as Near Copies.

#### 4.1.2 Minimal Revisions

The second paraphrase type in Table 2 is Minimal Revisions. It is an attempted paraphrase by which 20–49% of the paraphrase contains words from the unique links. It comprises pupils' elaborative phrases or clauses that reduce it to less than 50% unique link words (Keck, 2006). The total number of Minimal Revisions found within the Unique Links of the pupils' summaries is eight and the total number of summaries that contains Minimal Revisions is seven.

The following extracts show examples of Minimal Revisions in the pupils' summaries:

**24a.** The purpose was to make people see the amount of trash an average person produces.

(Original excerpt)

The reason he did this **was to show people the amount of** one person's trash. (text 18)

**24b.** Planet Earth is being slowly suffocated by man-made waste. (Original excerpt)

The planet is dying because of **man-made waste**. (text 29)

In these extracts, some pupils' summaries copied 20-49% of the source text but made some elaborative changes to the phrases and clauses within unique links that reduced the number of exact borrowed words from the source. For example, in extract number 3, the sentence in text 18 contains fifteen words, six of which were copied exactly from the source, and nine were changed, which shows that 40% of the words were borrowed from the source. Extract number 4 also shows how the elaborate changes to the phrases made by the pupil reduced the number of exact borrowed words from the source. The sentence contains nine words, three of which were copied exactly from the source, and five were changed, which shows that only 30% of the words were borrowed from the source. Therefore, the above extracts from the pupils' summaries are classified as Minimal Revisions.



### 4.1.3 Moderate Revisions

The third paraphrase type in Table 2 is Moderate Revisions. It is a paraphrase type, which includes less than 20% of the paraphrase words as contained in the unique link of the original excerpts (Keck, 2006). The total number of Moderate Revisions found within the Unique Links of the pupils' summaries is sixteen, and the total number of summaries that contained Minimal Revisions is twelve.

The following extracts show examples of Moderate Revisions in the pupils' summaries:

**25a.** Meet three people who have taken matters into their own hands. Not only have they changed their lifestyle to be more sustainable, but they also inspire people to reduce their waste. (Original excerpt)

'war on waste' text, it is a text that talks about 3 different people who have changed their lifestyle because of the waste problem we have in the world. (text 1)

**25b** She came up with a website called Clothes Loop with the motto "shop, wear and swap". (Original excerpt)

she started a store **called** clots loop, where you can buy clothing. (Text 9)

In the above extracts, some pupils' summaries copied less than 20% of the source text. The extracts show that unique links are only the individual words or two or three-word phrases borrowed from the source. The pupils form 80% of the words in the summaries. For example, in extract number 25a, the sentence in text 1 contains twenty five words, five of which were copied exactly from the source, and twenty were changed, which shows that less than 20% of the words were borrowed from the source. The extracted borrowed words or phrases from the source are also in bold. Extract number 25b also shows that less than 20% of the words were borrowed from the source. The sentence from text 25 contained twelve words, two of which were copied exactly from the source, and ten were changed, which shows that less than 20% of

the words were borrowed from the source. Therefore, the above extracts (i.e., the attempted paraphrases) from the pupils' summaries are classified as Moderate Revisions.

#### 4.1.4 Substantial Revisions

The fourth paraphrase type in Table 2 is Substantial Revision. It does not include words from the source. Although it can include a few words in General Link from the source with a mean of 12% but does not contain Unique Links, and over 85% of Substantial Revisions will not include words from the source (Keck, 2006). The total number of Substantial Revisions found within the Unique Links of the pupils' summaries is one hundred and sixty-two, and all 34 summaries contained Substantial Revisions

The following extracts show examples of Substantial Revisions in the pupils' summaries:

**26a.** Meet three people who have taken matters into their own hands. (Original excerpt)

Three people show and tell what they do to help the earth be a better place for the environment. (Text 2)

The text I read today was about waste and how three people chose to live their lives more environmentally-friendly, trying to save the planet.(Test 6)

**26b.** Clothes Loop makes it possible for people to renew their wardrobe and be sustainable at the same time. (Original excerpt)

At the clothes loop you can trade old clothes for new ones and that makes it cheaper and makes us throw out less clothing. (Text 25)

Rose Duong made a website called "Clothes loop" and it's all about buying clothes then swap it with other customers. (Text 14)

The above extracts show that pupils' summaries did not copy the source text; instead, they summarised the source text using their own words. The pupils formed more than 90% of the words in the summaries. For example, in extract 26a, the sentence in text 2 contains eighteen

words, two of which were copied exactly from the source, and sixteen were changed, which shows that less than 10% of the words were borrowed from the source. The exact borrowed words or phrases from the source are underlined and can be classified as General Links because no other words can replace them based on how they were used in the source text. Extract in 26b also shows pupils' summaries did not copy the source text. The sentence from text 25 contained twenty-four words, two of which were copied exactly from the source, and twenty-two were changed, which shows that less than 10% of the words were borrowed from the source. The 'clothes loop' is a General Link. Therefore, the above extracts from the pupils' summaries are classified as Substantial Revisions.

#### 4.1.5 Exact Copies

Keck does not categorize Exact Copy as a paraphrase type, and it is used to classify those sentences within a pupil's summary that copied the phrases or clauses of the source without any word-level changes (Keck, 2006). The total number of Exact Copy found within the Unique Links of the pupils' summaries is five, and the total number of summaries that contained Exact Copy is three.

The following extracts show examples of Exact Copies in the pupils' summaries:

**27a.** Clothes Loop makes it possible for people to renew their wardrobe and be sustainable at the same time. (Original excerpt)

**Clothes Loop makes it possible for people to renew their wardrobe and be sustainable at the same time.** (Text 11)

**27b.** The purpose was to make people see the amount of trash an average person produces. (Original excerpt)

**The purpose was to make people see the amount of trash an average person produces.** (Text 34)

These extracts show that some pupils copied 100% of the source text without word-level changes. For example, in extract 27a, the sentence in text 11 contains eighteen words, all of which were copied exactly from the source text, showing that 100% of the words were borrowed from the source. The exact borrowed words or phrases from the source are in bold. Extract 27b also shows that some pupils' summaries copied the source text. The sentence in text 34 contains fifteen words, which were copied exactly from the source, showing that 100% of the words were also borrowed from the source text. Pupils did not use quotation marks or any other strategy to show that they had copied. Therefore, the above extracts from the pupils' summaries are classified as Exact Copies.

#### 4.1.6 General Links

General Link is one of the lexical words identified in the pupils' summaries, and it appears in many places and is more likely to be words related to the source text's essential main ideas (Keck, 2006). General Links are words used in the source text that other words cannot replace without changing the main idea of the source text. The total number of General Links found within the pupils' summaries is sixty-seven, and the total number of summaries that contained General Links is twenty-one.

The following extracts show examples of near copies in the pupils' summaries:

**28a.** The adventurer and environmental activist Rob Greenfield wants people to reflect on the environmental situation of today, and he wants to inspire people to make some changes in their lives. (Original excerpt)

Rob Greenfield was an environmental activist and wanted to show people how much trash we all use so he wore his trash for 30 days (Text 12).

**28b.** Australian Rose Duong noticed how fast clothes moved through the store where she worked, and the number of returns made her question where the clothes ended up.

(Original Excerpt)

Rose Duong started noticing how fast clothes moved out the store and much that

got returned. (Text8)

The extract above shows the use of General Links in the pupils' summaries. The underlined words 'Rob Greenfield,' 'environmental activist,' 'he,' and 'Rose Duong' in texts 12 and 18 are General Links. Those words cannot be replaced with other words because they are the subject of those sentences, and when replaced, the sentences will have no subject matter.

## 4.2 Thematic Analysis Result

Themes	Total number of themes	Total number of texts
Overview	48	31
Person 1's actions	51	26
Person 2's actions	34	19
Person 3's actions	27	17
All 3's actions	8	7
Advice for readers	12	9
Person 1's view	7	5
Person 2's view	1	1
Person 3's view	2	2
All 3 views	1	1
Writer's view	2	1
Metatext	1	1
Person 2's actions result	2	2
Person 2's cause of actions	3	3
Company's descriptions	4	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>34</b>

**Table 3.** The frequency of texts containing each theme and the total frequency of the themes.

Table 3 above shows the frequency of the total number of summaries containing the themes: Overview, Person 1's actions, Person 2's actions, Person 3's actions, Actions of all people, Advice for readers, Person 1's view, Person 2's view, Person 3's view, Views of all people, Writer's view, Metatext, Person 2's actions result, Person 2's cause of actions, and

Company's descriptions. It also shows the total number of pupils' summaries that contained the themes. The following are examples of each of the themes identified in the pupils' texts.

The first theme on the Table is Overview, a short description of the source text that gives general information about the subject matter. In "War on Waste," some pupils' summaries provide a general overview of the text without the details. The total number of Overviews in pupils' text is forty-eight, and the total number of summaries that contained Overview is thirty-one. The following extracts show examples of Overviews in the pupils' summaries:

**28.** Three people show and tell what they do to help the earth be a better place for the environment. (Text 2)

**29.** And the last story is about a woman who made a website where different people can trade clothes. (Text 23)

**30.** Rose Duong is a woman who figured out that at her store a lot of clothes went to waste and just got thrown away. (Text 25)

The extracts above show how the pupils' summaries in texts 2, 23, and 25 give short general summaries of what the source text is all about. The source's general subject matter and meaning are found in the above extracts.

"War on Waste" has three characters; Lauren Singer, Rob Greenfield, and Rose Duong. Lauren Singer is the first person the text talks about; therefore, she is referred to as 'Person 1'. Person 1's actions referred to the actions performed by Lauren Singer. In the corpus, the total number of Person 1's actions is fifty-one, while the total number of summaries that contained Person 1's actions is twenty-six.

The following extracts show examples of Person 1's actions in the pupils' summaries:

**31.** First we meet Lauren Singer who is now living a plastic free life and a waste free life. (Text 1)

**32.** She started recycling and started to shop things from second hand stores. (Text 4)

**33.** She buys groceries with no packaging at the farmers' market. (Text 11)

The above extracts show the pupils' summaries from texts 1, 4, and 11, and the summaries represent the actions performed by Person 1 in the text.

Person 2's actions referred to actions performed by Rob Greenfield in the source text. The total number of Person 2's actions is thirty-four, and the total number of summaries that contained Person 2's actions is nineteen.

The following extracts show examples of Person 2's actions in the pupils' summaries:

**34.** The second man, Rob Greenfield, chose to do social experiments by "wearing" all the trash he made/used (Text 6).

**35.** He lived as an average american for 30 days and then wore every piece of trash he produced on him (Text 14).

**36.** He also did a lot of dumpster diving in order to find out how much good food is being wasted. (Text 17)

The above extracts show the pupils' summaries from texts 6, 14, and 17, and the summaries represent the actions performed by Person 2 in the source text.

Person 3's actions are performed by Rose Duong, referred to in this analysis as 'Person 3.' The total number of Person 3's actions is twenty-one, and the total number of summaries that contained Person 3's actions is seventeen.

The following extracts show examples of Person 3's actions in the pupils' summaries:

**37.** And last we meet Rose Duong that really saw how fast people got rid of clothes instead of giving them away. (Text 1)

**38.** Rose Duong, she came up with a website called Clothes Loop with the motto "shop, wear, and swap" (Text 11).

**39.** When she worked at a clothing store, she saw how new clothes were moved everywhere around the store.

The above extracts, as represented by the pupils' summaries, show the actions performed by Person 1 in the source text. All 3's actions are those performed by the three people in the source,

which some pupils summarised together in a sentence. The total number of Actions of all 3 people is eight, and the total number of summaries that contained All 3's actions is seven.

The following extracts show examples of All 3's actions in the pupils' summaries:

**40.** They have done lots of different things to help the environment and showed it to the people (Text 5).

**41.** But three people are trying to take that matter into their own hands and have changed their lifestyle because of that. (Text 29)

**42.** They show their different ways of saving the earth. (Text 9)

The extracts above, taken from texts 5, 29, and 9, show how some pupils' summaries represent the actions performed by all three persons in one sentence.

Advice for readers encompasses all the advice given to the readers by the pupils through their summaries and those given by the characters in the source text. The total number of Advice for readers is twelve, and the total number of summaries that contained Advice for readers is nine.

The following extracts show examples of Advice for readers in the pupils' summaries:

**43.** And according to singer, it's better that you use reusable stuff like a reusable bag or a glass or metal bottle (Text 29).

**44.** It's better to make small changes; everything helps (Text 27).

**45.** They come with tips to how you can see how much you use and solutions to the problems (Text 2).

These extracts show the advice given to the readers. Texts 29 and 2 are the advice given to the reader by the characters in the source text, while text 27 is the advice given to the readers by a pupil.

Person 1's view is the personal point of view of Person 1 on the issues under discussion. The total number of Person 1's views is seven (7), and the total number of summaries that contained Person 1's view is five (5).



The following extracts show examples of Person 1's views in the pupils' summaries:

**46.** She thinks that doing little things is better than doing nothing (Text 21).

**47.** She believes everyone can do the same (Text 26).

**48.** Dumpster Dive is a good choice to not waste food (Text 31).

The above extracts from texts 21, 26, and 31 show the personal point of view of Person 1 in the pupils' summaries.

Person 2's view is the personal point of view of Person 2, which is seen in the pupils' summaries. The total number of Person 2's views in the pupils' summaries is one, and the total number of summaries that contained Person 2's views is one.

The following extract show examples of Person 2's views in the pupils' summaries:

**49.** Another one thinks its better to see how much you really use so that you're more aware of your usage (Text 2).

The extract from text 2 shows the personal point of view of person 2 in a pupil's summary.

Person 3's view is the personal point of view of Person 3, as identified in the pupils' summaries. The total number of Person 3's views, as represented in the Table, is two, and the total number of summaries that contained Person 3's views is two.

The following extracts show examples of Person 3's views in the pupils' summaries:

**50.** so she came up with a website called "shop,wear and swap so when people got tired of the clothes they could swap their clothes with each other (Text 12).

**51.** One of them even made an app where you could swap clothes, so that you don't have to buy new things (Text 2).

These extracts from texts 12 and 2 show the personal point of view of Person 3 in pupils' summaries.

Views of all 3 people are the point of view of the three persons, as identified in the pupils' summaries. The total number of all 3's views, as represented in Table 3, is one, and the total number of summaries that contained all 3's views is one.

The following extract shows examples of All 3's views in the pupils' summaries:

**52.** They have different opinions on what they think is more important.

The above extract from text 2 shows that the three characters in the source text have different points of view about life, as seen in a pupil's summary.

Some pupils give their personal views of the source text while writing summaries, and those views are what is referred to as the writer's view. The total number of writer's views, as represented in Table 3, is two, and the total number of summaries that contained the writer's view is one.

The following extract shows examples of the writer's views in the pupils' summaries:

**53.** Clothing is something people just throw away even though they are completely Useable (Text 8).

**54.** This is a very efficient way to save our planet and save money (Text 8).

These extracts from text 8 show that a pupil gives his/her views about the actions of the characters in the source text.

Some pupils use metatext to describe or introduce the source text. The total number of metatext in the pupils' summaries, as represented in Table 3, is one, and the total number of summaries that contained metatext is one.

The following extract shows examples of the Metatext in the pupils' summaries:

**55.** Hi, in this text I'm going to write about the 'war on waste' text (Text 1).

The above extract shows the use of metatext from a pupil's summary.

The consequences of Person 2's actions are a semantic theme used to identify the result of the actions performed by Person 2 in the source text, as seen in the pupils' summaries. The total number of Person 2's action results, as represented in Table 3, is two, while the total number of summaries that contained Person 2's action result is two.

The following extract shows examples of Person 2's action results in the pupils' summaries:

**56.** His dumpster dives have raised awareness about food waste, not only in the United States but in other parts of the world (Text 11).

**57.** His dumpster diving has raised awareness about food waste, not only in the United States of America but around the world too. (Text 30)

These extracts from texts 11 and 30 show the result of the action performed by Person 2 in pupils' summaries.

Cause of Person 2's actions is a theme used to identify the cause of the actions performed by Person 2 in the source text, as seen in the pupils' summaries. The total number of Person 2's cause of action, as represented in Table 3, is three, and the total number of summaries that contained Person 2's cause of action is three.

The following extract shows examples of Person 2's cause of action in the pupils' summaries:

**58.** The reason he did this was to show people the amount of one person's trash (Text 18).

**59.** And he did that because he wanted to inspire people (Text 12).

The above extracts from texts 18 and 12 show the cause of actions performed by person 2 in the pupils' summaries.

A company description is a theme used to identify where some pupils' summaries described the company created by the characters in the source. The total number of company descriptions, as represented in Table 3, is four (4), and the total number of summaries that contained company descriptions is three (3).

The following extract shows examples of company descriptions in the pupils' summaries:

**60.** Clothes Loop makes it possible for people to renew their wardrobe and be sustainable at the same time (Text 11).

**61.** At the clothes loop you can trade old clothes for new ones (Text 25).

These extracts from texts 11 and 25 show that some pupils' summaries described the company created by the source text's characters.

### 4.3 Results from teacher questionnaires

This section presents the teachers' answers to the seven questions asked in the questionnaire. In order to protect the teachers' privacy, they are referred to henceforth as Teacher A and Teacher B

The first question asked the teachers how important they think paraphrasing competence could be for students' writing skills. Teacher A gave a rating of 3, and teacher B gave a rating of 4.

The second question asked the teachers how they would describe the students' paraphrasing competence level in the 10th grade. Teacher A gave a rating of 3, and teacher B gave a rating of 3.

The third question asked teachers what they do to teach their pupils about paraphrasing. They answered the following:

- The importance of retelling what you've read/heard with your own words (Teacher A).
- I try to teach them that paraphrasing is an important tool. It is important to avoid plagiarism, but also to get a better understanding of the topics we're working on by being able to explain/write in their own words. Paraphrasing is something that pupils will have to do later in their studies and most likely in their future workplace (Teacher B).

The fourth question asked the teachers if they had experienced their pupils have plagiarized something.

- Yes (Teacher A)
- Yes (Teacher B)

The fifth question asked the teachers if the above is yes, how many pupils have plagiarized something this year?

None during important tests and such, unknown during everyday classes (Teacher A).

We started a book project after the summer, and our focus has mainly been on reading. The pupils have been writing a reading log. However, the log is very short and the focus has been on what they remember from what they read. I have not detected any plagiarism so far this school year. My answer above is based on last year. We had different projects, both written and oral, and some pupils plagiarized often (Teacher B).

The sixth question asked the teachers if the above question is yes, how many times have these pupils plagiarized something?

- Not sure (Teacher A).
- This year none. Last year a handful of students did it from time to time, and a few did it every time we worked on something (Teacher B).

The seventh question asked the teachers what they do (or what they would do) when they catch pupils who have plagiarized something.

- Tell them to rewrite the paragraph using their own words, and also tell them that the plagiarized paragraph is invalid. (Teacher A).
- I explain the importance of not plagiarizing. They are then given the option to rewrite what they handed in. The parts that are plagiarized are not viewed as their work and cannot be assessed, except that they were able to gather information (Teacher B).

The eighth question asked the teachers is whether summary writing is a viable solution for training pupils to avoid plagiarism.

Answer: Teacher A gave a rating of 3, and teacher B gave a rating of 4.

The ninth question asked the teachers if they had any further comments about paraphrasing and/or plagiarism, to which both teachers answered “NO.”



## 5 Discussion

After the presentation of the study findings in chapter four, this chapter discusses the study findings. First, it discusses the findings of the paraphrase types that the lower secondary pupils use to summarise a text in section 5.1. Following that, it discusses the teachers' instructional practices and perceptions of paraphrasing in section 5.2. Section 5.3 of this chapter elucidates what the pupils did with the source text. While section 5.4 presents the study's implications, section 5.5 states the study's limitations and gives recommendations.

### 5.1 Paraphrasing types in the dataset

This study concerns the paraphrasing competence of 10<sup>th</sup>–grade EFL learners in the Norwegian context. The researcher undertook this investigation by giving the 10th-grade pupils a text to summarize. After collecting the data from the pupils, Keck's (2006) categorization of paraphrase types was used to analyze the data. The study then develops the first research question regarding the paraphrase types that lower secondary pupils in Norway rely on while writing summaries. This study finds that the present lower secondary school pupils in Norway used the four paraphrase types; near copies, minimal revisions, moderate revisions, and substantial revisions. The paraphrase type, which most pupils used in their summaries, falls under the substantial revision category. In other words, the lower secondary school pupils that partook in this study summarized a text in their own words. The result also indicated that some pupils copy the source text without word-level changes or quotation marks. This result shows that even though most Norwegian lower secondary school pupils summarize a text in their own words, some do not.

In general, researchers believe summary writing plays a vital role in developing learners' writing competence since it is "the reduction of a large amount of information to its most important points" (Langan & Jenkins, 1993, p. 120). This view allows learners to exercise their knowledge of linguistic competence and sentence structures. Casazza (1993) supports this claim by saying that the essential requirements for developing a good summary involve getting a full appreciation of the text, selecting and identifying important information and the central

idea of a text, eliminating unimportant or redundant information, unifying similar ideas into categories, and writing in one's words. The literature suggests that paraphrasing entails comprehending the original text and having the appropriate vocabulary competence to write it differently using one's own words while maintaining its original meaning (McCarthy et al., 2009). Keck emphasized that paraphrasing is essential to avoid committing plagiarism and came up with the type of paraphrasing strategies that learners adopt regarding English as a second language (Keck, 2006). He classified the paraphrasing strategies as an attempted paraphrase, which he defined as "passages within a student summary which (a) were based upon a specific excerpt of the source text, and (b) contained at least one word-level change made to that excerpt" (Kecks, 2006:265)," which he categorized into four paraphrase types. This view means that by paraphrasing mostly without drawing on the original wording, many of these 10<sup>th</sup>-grade pupils demonstrated a relatively high level of paraphrasing competence.

Based on the results presented in chapter 4, the data from the text given to the pupils showed that 9 out of 34 pupils used Near Copies in their summaries. Near Copy is a paraphrase attempt that encompasses 50% or more of the words borrowed from the source (Keck, 2006). Keck also states that the ability to rewrite another writer's idea without exactly copying them is the essential function of paraphrasing. The use of Near Copies by the pupils may result from insufficient linguistic competence to express their thoughts. In other words, these pupils may rely more heavily on using the original wording from the source text because they lack the sufficient vocabulary to convey a similar meaning using different words. Ji (2018, p. 21) justified this claim by saying that "paraphrasing techniques can be a function of syntactic and lexical knowledge" and that EFL writers' language proficiency is determined partly by the quality of their paraphrasing competence. Researchers like Currie (1998), Howard (1996); Johns and Mayes (1990); Shi (2004) have also suggested that linguistic proficiency may affect students' choices to copy from original texts. The summary writing skill in a foreign language is quite a complicated process because it involves mental and intellectual reasoning, and EFL learners find it challenging since they need a certain level of linguistic competence to write a good summary. Hirvela and Du (2013) supported this claim by saying that summarisation is the most challenging and demanding educational activity for a foreign language learner. The finding of this study regarding Near Copies is consistent with Keck (2006) and Shi (2004), who found that L2 learners use Near Copies in writing summaries more than L1 learners.



For example, in excerpt 23a (see chapter 4), the original excerpt has "it's better to make small changes" and "nothing at all." The pupils copied the wording of the source text without quotation marks but reformulated the start of the sentence. Also, in excerpt 23b, the original text has a clause "have taken matters into their own hands," and in the attempted paraphrase from text 18, the pupil reformulated the start of the sentence but copied the wording of the end of the sentence "have taken matters into their own hands." The Near Copies examples show that the pupils copied the entire clause of the original text without word-level changes or quotation marks to show that they have copied the source. The reason for not using quotation marks may be that the pupils did not know that they should use them, or they are ignorant of the fact that they have committed "literary theft" (Park, 2003, p. 472). On the contrary, "taken matters into their own hands" is an idiom. Learners at this level might find it particularly difficult to reformulate idioms as these are typically fixed phrases. Learners cannot change single words in idioms without losing the metaphorical meaning, and finding a different phrase that conveys a similar meaning likely requires relatively high linguistic competence. However, on the other hand, whether or not copying idioms can be considered plagiarism is perhaps a matter worthy of debate.

Consequently, teaching pupils how to paraphrase idioms is something that lower-secondary teachers could focus on. They can achieve that through retelling and rephrasing activities in the classroom. Wu (2008) believes that teaching English idioms using retelling and rewriting activities increase students' understanding and helps them to remember what they have learned, as remembering allows the teacher to know the amount of knowledge the students have acquired. Also, through group discussion, Freeman and Freeman (1994) believe that if the students discuss what they read in a group, it will improve their understanding level because discussing in a group gives them quality chances to gain social and language information needed to comprehend any given text. Moreover, through quality illustration, Wu (2008) suggests that using exciting pictures while teaching students language learning helps improve and strengthen their vocabulary. Hawley (1984), Whitaker (1993), and Wilhoit (1994) also suggested that EFL teachers must teach the students the meanings of academic honesty and cases of plagiarism to enable them to read, understand and analyze institutional approaches to academic dishonesty.

This study reveals that some pupils used the Minimal Revisions category of paraphrases in their summaries based on the presented result in chapter 4. Keck defined Minimal Revisions as an attempted paraphrase in which 20–49% contains words from the unique links. The sentences in Minimal Revisions contain pupils' elaborative phrases or clauses that reduce it to less than 50% unique link words (Keck, 2006). Specifically, the findings of this study show that 7 out of 34 pupils used Minimal Revisions in their summaries. Using this paraphrase type will not be easy to detect that the writer has plagiarized, as most of the language used comes from the writer. Minimal Revisions can be characterized as what Currie (1998, p. 12-13) points out as the "fuzziness of the concept of plagiarism and how difficult it is to identify." The use of Minimal Revisions by these pupils shows they have acquired some knowledge of synonyms. In other words, their linguistic competence is higher than that of the pupils that used Near Copies. Also, even though Minimal Revisions contain most of the writer's words, they contain two or more level phrases from the source text. That is why Keck (2006, p. 275) says, "It is unclear whether Minimal Revisions would be automatically classified by professors as "too close to the original," in the same way that Near Copies likely would be." Roig (2001), through his studies, found that many professors usually debate over the acceptance of paraphrases that contain two or more level phrases copied from the source text. In this context, Keck's studies found that most L1 and L2 students used Minimal Revisions when paraphrasing (Keck, 2006), and these standards seem to be applicable also at the lower secondary level in the Norwegian context.

For instance, in excerpt 24a, the pupil used most of his own words in the paraphrase (see chapter 4). In other words, 70% of the words in the sentence are the writer's words and not from the source text. These sentences have also been formulated in a way that is less likely to be identified by a plagiarism detector. So this might be a strategy that learners use to pass off others' work as their own. The writer borrowed two phrases, "was to" and "people the amount," from the source text. This form of summarizing agrees with Shi (2004), who believes that paraphrasing is the most vital and accurate process of rewriting source texts in one's own words without altering the meaning of the original sentence. This finding implies that if the pupils can practice paraphrasing regularly, they will become good writers, showing that they understand the source text correctly. This view is further supported by Leibensperger (2003), who posits

that paraphrasing is vital in helping students integrate sources, which is an indispensable instrument and the skill needed for successful writing

According to the findings of this study, Moderate Revision is another category of paraphrase type identified in the pupils' summaries. Moderate Revision is a paraphrase type, which includes less than 20% of the words in the original text. In Moderate Revision, the unique links are only the individual words or two-word phrases borrowed from the source (Keck, 2006). The findings of this study show that 12 out of 34 pupils used Moderate Revisions in their summaries. Unlike Near Copies and Minimal Revisions, Moderate Revisions make several clause-level changes and changes to words (ibid). Moderate Revision paraphrasing requires a higher amount of linguistic competence to achieve. That is to say, the pupils that use Moderate Revisions in their summaries are linguistically sufficient in changing the lexis and clauses in the sentences using their own words. This finding is consistent with Martinot (2003), who noted that paraphrasing is crucial to one's productive language competence to justify the importance of language competence because it uses different words to express what has already been written or said.

Texts 1 and 9 from the extracts in chapter 4 show that the pupils used almost their own words to paraphrase the sentences in 25a and b. In example 25a, the writer merged two sentences into one. In the first sentence, he changed the clause "Meet three people who have" to "it is a text that talks about 3 different people who have" "people" in the unique links can be referred to as General links. Therefore, the writer only copied the phrase "who have" from the original text. The writer also changed "three" in the original text to "3." In the second sentence, the writer copied "changed their lifestyle" precisely from the source text, while the rest of the sentence is formed from the writer's own words. In example 25b, the writer only copied the individual words of the source text "a" and "called," while the rest of the words in that sentence came from the writer. These changes made by the pupils need a good knowledge of appropriate synonyms. In other words, these pupils have gained a certain level of linguistic competence. Again, this view is in line with Martinot (2003), who believes paraphrasing is crucial to one's productive language competence.

In the last category, findings of this study show that 34 out of 34 pupils who participated in this investigation used Substantial Revisions in their summaries. Substantial Revision is a

paraphrase type that does not include words from the source but retains the meaning of the source text. Although it can include a few words in the General link from the source with a mean of 12% but does not contain Unique Links, and over 85% of Substantial Revisions will not include words from the source (Keck, 2006). Substantial Revisions are believed by researchers such as Keck (2006) and Shi (2004) to be the most acceptable way of paraphrasing. The reason is that the words of the source author are typically changed while the meaning remains the same. This context agrees with what McCarthy et al. believe to be paraphrasing; accordingly, paraphrasing is rewording sentences and retaining their meanings precisely the way they are in the original text (McCarthy et al. 2009). Kalchayanant (2009) also supports this claim by identifying paraphrasing strategies as using synonymous words or phrases to replace the ones from the source, making sure that the substituted words represent the same meaning, and changing the word or sentence forms from a verb to a noun, adjectives to nouns, adjectives to verbs, and vice versa. To successfully achieve paraphrasing under the Substantial Revisions category, the writer must be linguistically competent. According to Keck (2006), linguistic competence plays a significant role in the writer's choice of words. In that case, the findings of this study reveal that most Norwegian lower secondary school pupils have acquired a certain level of English language competence.

The examples in extract 26 in the result presented in chapter 4 show that the writers originally formed 95% of the words in texts 2 and 25. In sentence 26a, the writer only copied the General links "Three people" of the original excerpt, while all the words in the unique links were changed. In the second sentence, the writer also copied only the General links "Clothes Loop" of the source text and changed all the words in the unique links to his own words. The above extracts show that Norwegian lower secondary school pupils can write the text in their own words without borrowing from the source. This view is supported by the Norwegian English curriculum, which states that writing skill is seen as 'being able to express ideas and opinions understandably and purposefully using written English' (LK20 English subject curriculum). These 10<sup>th</sup>-grade pupils show that they are able to read and interpret a short text without aid from the teacher. Not only were they not aided, but they could also retell the content of the source text in their own words. This outcome demonstrates a relatively high level of linguistic competence in grammar and vocabulary. Furthermore, upper secondary schools and

universities are likely to be able to build on this competence by challenging pupils to draw together information from several sources in their text-writing processes.

Besides the paraphrasing categories, the findings in this study indicate that even though these pupils paraphrased in their own words, most of them who used Substantial Revisions in their summaries only summarized the source text, which was the instruction given to them. The difference between summarizing and paraphrasing is that while paraphrasing "involves restating text from an original source in the writer's own words, summarising condenses large amounts of text into a few sentences for the purpose of conveying the main points of the original" (Roig, 2001, p. 319). This claim was also supported by Langan and Jenkins (1993, p. 120), who believe that summary writing is "the reduction of a large amount of information to its most important points." Although paraphrasing and summarizing take the same process, paraphrasing is more complex, and one of the main problems that EFL students have is mistaking paraphrasing for summarizing. As young learners, it is paramount for language instructors to help them know the difference between paraphrasing and summarizing, even though this might not be the primary focus of their language learning at this stage, and teaching them the differences will give them the opportunity to know what to do when the need arises. The present study asked pupils to summarise a single text, but when writing more complex types of text, pupils may find that they need to summarise several sources while also paraphrasing several others. Consolidating information in this manner in a foreign language is likely to require a high level of writing competence

Another issue indicated from the pupils' summaries is inappropriate grammatical and sentence structures and misspelling of words. While researchers like Keck (2006); Shi (2004); Currie (1998), and Ji (2018) note that the linguistic competence of EFL learners plays a vital role, others, e.g., Dung (2010); Nordin (2017) and Ji (2018) pointed out other factors required for successful writing or paraphrasing such as the knowledge of the target language's grammatical, sentence, and lexical structures. In example 26b (see chapter 4) regarding the sentence in text 25, the writer should apply a comma after " At the clothes loop " before starting the following clause and a full stop after "new ones" to start a new sentence instead of a conjunction "and" joining the two sentences together. The last word in that sentence was wrongly used; the write was supposed to say "clothes" instead of "clothing." In 25b, the writer

spelled "clothes" as "clots." This shows that because they use substantial revisions does not mean they are producing these flawlessly. Their ability to summarize in their own words shows that they have comprehended the source text's meaning and can reformulate it in their own words. However, the findings suggest that these technical aspects of written communication could be considered a different skill, which may require further attention from teachers.

The writers' L1 may influence the inappropriate use of grammatical and sentence structures and misspelling of words found in their summaries, as indicated by Drew and Sørheim (2006). They posit that L2 learning occurs in entirely different conditions from the L1, except that the child is born and brought up in a bilingual family or environment. For someone to learn an L2, there is already an L1 which may interfere with or help in the L2 learning. This interference may result from the differences and similarities in language structure and vocabulary of both languages, and it is paramount that language teachers make the language learners aware of these differences and similarities for language proficiency (Drew & Sørheim, 2006). From another perspective, spelling errors and inappropriate sentence structures were found in all the pupils' summaries. These errors could also be the reason Hyland (2014) finds that studies from different researchers have shown that a text written by L2 or EFL writer is mostly less cohesive, less fluent, shorter, and contains more errors than a text written by an L1 writer. The reason is that when an EFL learner starts to write in a foreign language, he must learn new words and linguistic structures to construct meaningful sentences. Thus, learning vocabulary and grammatical rules poses a problem as he struggles to find the correct words.

The findings of this study also identified that some pupils copied the source text exactly, and Keck classified this type as an Exact Copy. It is used to classify those sentences within a pupil's summary in which the phrases or clauses of the source are copied without any word-level changes (Keck, 2006). An exact copy was identified from 5 out of 34 summaries written by the pupils. There are no word, phrase, or clause-level changes in these pupils' summaries. They copied the exact words of the source text without quotation marks to indicate that they had copied. The professors and administrators have tagged this type of textual borrowing as "plagiarism" (Keck, 2006). Wilhoit (1994), Brandt (2002), and Howard (2002) identified ways that students plagiarise. First, they steal text from another source and give it out as their own.

For instance, copying a whole paper from a source material without appropriate referencing or handing in other students' work, with or without that student's information. Second, they present a paper written by someone else and give it as their own. Third, they Copy some sections of text from one or more source materials and provide proper documentation but leave out the quotes, thus giving the impression that the text has been paraphrased rather than directly quoted.

The examples in 27a and b (see chapter 4) show that the pupils in texts 11 and 34 copied the original text in 27a and b with no changes to the phrases and clauses. According to Park (2003), this type of copying is typically punishable at universities, where students will receive a failing grade or even be expelled. On this notion, Howard (1995), Currie (1998), and Hyland (2001) believe that adopting paraphrasing activities in the classroom helps direct students on the appropriate writing and avoid copying someone else's work. In exact copy sentences, quoting the source text is not a problem as long as direct quotes are marked using inverted commas. From the study findings, the sentences in extracts 27a and b are entirely exact copies because the pupils did not use any inverted commas to show that they quoted the source text. This error shows that the pupils need to learn more about the conventions of presenting quotes from the source text: when to quote and the technicalities of quoting.

From another perspective, General Link is one of the lexical words identified in the pupils' summaries from the findings of this study. The research results showed that 21 out of 34 summaries contained General Links. According to Keck (2006), General Links are not classified as Exact Copies; instead, they are words used in the source text that other words cannot replace without changing the source's main idea. They appear in many places and are more likely to be words related to the source text's essential main ideas. The underlined words in extracts 26a and b in chapter 4, "Three people, Clothes Loop, and Rose Duong," are the General links of the source text, which other words cannot replace; otherwise, it will affect the main idea of the source text. These pupils were able to pick out the essential words and phrases that could not be changed. Again, this shows a high level of comprehension and demonstrates that the pupils have a relatively high level of written English competence.

## **5.2 Teachers' perceptions and instructional practices regarding paraphrasing**

The second research question in this study is to know if the identified paraphrasing types, which the pupils' used in their summaries, correspond with the teachers' reported instructional practices. As discussed in this section, this study shows that 34 out of 34 pupils sampled for this study used Substantial Revisions in their summaries, which is the type of paraphrasing the writers are supposed to write in their own words. Although other paraphrasing types were identified, the most frequent type was substantial revisions.

In the questionnaire (see the appendix), the researcher asked the teachers what they do to teach their pupils about paraphrasing. The teachers responded that they teach the students the importance of rewriting or retelling what they read in their own words. This response goes in line with the idea of Howard (1995), Currie (1998), and Hyland (2001), who believe that adopting paraphrasing activities in the classroom helps to direct students on the appropriate way of writing and avoid copying someone else's work. The scholars also believe that one of the most widely recommended pedagogical approaches that can prevent plagiarism is the teaching of paraphrasing (ibid). Also, in the Norwegian curriculum of English subject, one of the competence aims for 10th grade concerning writing states that after year 10, the students should be able to 'write formal and informal texts, including multimedia texts with structure and coherence that describe, narrate and reflect, and are adapted to the purpose, recipient, and situation' (LK20 English subject curriculum, p. 9). According to the teachers' responses, the pupils are made to know that paraphrasing is unavoidable in their future studies, which was also supported by Higher Score (2007). This view posits that paraphrasing is helpful for exam preparation, especially for English tests like TOEFL, IELTS, and TOELC, and it enhances learners' comprehension and later helps them in their future careers (Higher Score, 2007). Similarly, supporting the teachers' responses, the Norwegian English curriculum also states that understanding and developing writing skills is necessary for learning, work life, and social participation (LK20).

Another question asked the teachers if they had experienced their pupils have plagiarized something. The teachers responded that they had experienced some of their pupils plagiarizing. This line of response buttresses the findings of this study, which shows



that some pupils used Exact Copies in their summaries despite their teachers teaching them to write or retell what they have read in their own words. This result justifies Shi (2004), who noted that paraphrasing is a challenging skill for EFL learners because it entails comprehending the original text and having the appropriate vocabulary competence to write it differently using one's own words while maintaining its original meaning. These pupils may not write in their own words due to their inability to comprehend the source text and vocabulary incompetence. Erhel and Jamet (2006) and Russo and Pippa (2004) posit that the reason students plagiarize instead of paraphrasing is that paraphrasing competence is significantly related to the degree of text comprehension and interpreting capacity.

In that regard, Kantz (1990) believes that it is necessary for language teachers to construct vital rhetoric purpose into the students' assignments in the classrooms and curricula activities, giving them a much clearer insight when they start their writing and work through a writing activity. While universities have stringent rules about plagiarism, having such stringent rules at lower secondary schools seems overly restrictive. For some pupils, part of the process of learning how to summarise and paraphrase may involve copying the wording of the source text. As long as teachers have the tools to check their pupils' texts for plagiarism, teachers can open a dialogue with these pupils to explain why copying the wording of others is unethical. After having conducted this kind of diagnostic assessment, lower secondary English teachers will be able to train their pupils to express thoughts using their own words rather than having to rely on the wordings of others.

Overall, from the findings of this research, the teachers' responses suggest that their views and practices are in line with paraphrasing research. They showed that the identified paraphrasing types used by the pupils in their summaries corresponded with the teachers' reported instructional practices. Their answers also underline that developing paraphrasing competence is a process that demands ongoing teacher-pupil dialogues. Teachers also need to provide pupils with plenty of opportunities to write non-fiction texts using their own wordings. They can provide scaffolding by, for example, showing examples of how to reword texts, by asking pupils to recount a text orally, or by training pupils to use tools like thesauruses.

### 5.3 The themes identified in the summary texts

After analyzing the pupils' summaries using Keck's (2006) categorization of paraphrase types, the researcher decided to know what else the pupils did with the source text. This view gave rise to the third research question about what else pupils did with the source text. To achieve this, the researcher used thematic analysis to identify the recurrent patterns or themes in the pupils' summaries. By going through the pupils' summaries, the researcher identified fifteen themes. This study showed that even though all the identified themes were found in the pupils' summaries, the "overview" theme was the most frequent. It shows that most Norwegian lower secondary school pupils know the importance of overview in summary writing.

The first theme identified in the pupils' summaries is 'overview.' An overview is a short description of the source text that gives general information about the subject matter. The findings showed that 31 out of 34 pupils used overview in their summaries. The result supports Kintsch and Van Dijk (1978), who identified three processes involved in producing good summary writing: the comprehension of the original text, condensation of the thoughts and ideas in the original text, and production of the ideas in one's words. In this view, for these pupils to write the overview of the source text, they must have intensively read it to understand its central idea. The reason is that the standard approach to teaching reading in the Norwegian EFL classroom depends on the intensive task of reading books rather than extensive reading activities (Drew, 2004, 2009a; Hellekjær, 2007). To read intensively means reading carefully and paying attention to detail while reading short passages in textbooks without rushing to understand and comprehend (Miller, 2013). They have also acquired the necessary language competence to condense the source text's information to its most minor essential point. For that reason, Evans, Hartshorn, and Anderson (2010) believe that the development of grammar, vocabulary, and other primary language skills comes from reading.

Moreover, many researchers have concluded that understanding a written text is necessary for academic success, thereby seeing reading as the essential goal in EFL learning (Lynch & Hudson, 1991). In support of this view, Richards, and Renandya (2002) state that the secret of every academic success is hidden in written texts because they offer many pedagogical benefits. For instance, they provide a good model for writing, offer the opportunity to introduce

new topics, help in language acquisition, and stimulate discussion to study the language (ibid). The implication is that identifying the overview in the pupils' summaries shows that they understood the source correctly after reading it extensively.

In chapter 4, extracts 28, 29, and 30, extracted from texts 2, 23, and 25, gave an overview of the information in the source text, and the sentences gave the reader what to expect from the content of the entire text. These examples demonstrate the Norwegian lower secondary school's English literacy and writing skill levels, which can be achieved through constant practice. To support this claim, Flognfeldt and Lund (2002) believe that if the L2 learners express themselves in the target language, it will help them know the differences and similarities between the target language and their language and be able to fill the gap to develop language competence. Also, Celik (2019) states that to demonstrate writing proficiency, one must have language proficiency in that language. Moreover, writing is an essential basic skill in the Norwegian curriculum, and it is described as 'expressing oneself understandably and appropriately about different topics and communicating with others in the written mode' (LK20, p. 10).

Other themes identified in the pupils' summaries are Person 1's actions, Person 2's actions, and Person 3's actions. In "War on Waste," there are three characters: Lauren Singer, Rob Greenfield, and Rose Duong. The first person the text talks about is Lauren Singer, the second person is Rob Greenfield, and the third person is Rose Duong. The actions performed by each of these three people were written separately by the pupils in their summaries. The findings from this study show that 26 out of 34 pupils wrote the actions performed by Person 1, and 19 pupils wrote the actions performed by Person 2, and 17 pupils wrote the actions performed by Person 3. This result shows that pupils summarized Person 1's action more than Person 2, and 3. The reason may be that Person 1 is described first in the text, so it seems that this person is the most easily accessible, and therefore their views and actions are easier to summarise. This may indicate that the pupils are not carefully reading the whole text. Perhaps their attention diminishes, meaning that they fail to comprehend the actions and views of persons 2 and 3. Alternatively, perhaps they begin summarising the actions and views of all three people but find this time-consuming and therefore stop offering such a detailed summary after summarising the first person's actions and views only. A final possibility is that they intend to

use Person 1 as an example from the text. As Person 1 is the first to be described, it makes sense that they are being used as an example.

However, the pupils rarely seem to explicitly state that they are using Person 1 as an example, and they may assume that the teacher implicitly understands that they are using Person 1 as an example. This indicates that teachers may need to offer their pupils further training to understand the processing needs of their readers. In other words, pupils may benefit from learning to guide their readers more explicitly. Notwithstanding, the pupils' ability to identify the actions of each of these three people and write them out depends on their reading comprehension level. In this view, the Ministry of Education and Research (2020) states that Norwegian EFL learners should be able to read "English texts fluently and to understand, explore, discuss, learn from and reflect upon different types of information." They are supported by Richards and Schmidt (2010), who see reading comprehension as the ability to understand the meaning of a written text. In other words, this finding reveals that in the Norwegian lower secondary school, the pupils are taught how to read, the importance of reading comprehension, and writing down accurately what they have read.

The examples from extracts from texts 33, 35, and 38 show that pupils identified the actions performed by each of these three people through their intensive reading of the source text. This type of summary aligns with Friend (2001, p.3), who viewed summary writing as "the process of determining what content in a passage is most important and transforming it into a succinct statement in one's own words." The actions performed by each of these three people are the most important content of the source text, which cannot be overlooked.

Based on this study, the researcher also found that some pupils summarized the actions performed by these three people in one sentence instead of separating them. The findings show that seven pupils summarized the source text this way. This type of summary may result from the view of Hirvela and Du (2013), who believe that summarisation is the most challenging and demanding educational activity for a foreign language learner. The pupils' inability to summarize the actual content of the source may be that they found summarization very difficult and did not understand the source text or lacked the language and syntactical competence.

Extracts 40 and 42 of the study findings show that the pupils highlighted the three people's actions without explaining them in detail. The reader may find it difficult to comprehend since what they did to help the environment, or the earth was not mentioned.

Another theme identified from the pupils' summaries is 'Advice for readers.' The researcher classified those sentences that refer to the readers as 'Advice for readers.' The result of this study shows that nine summaries contained 'Advice for readers.' Every text is written to be read, so every writer considers the reader's interest while writing. Reading can be considered a source of learning other things, and the pupils consider the readers' interest in their summary. They understand that every reader reads with expectations, so they included things that would benefit the reader in their summaries. This context is consistent with Alyousef (2005), who posits reading as something that can aid the reader in growing their intelligibility as they seek to get appropriate information to help them express their ideas after reading the text.

From the findings, extracts 44 and 45 in texts 27 and 2 show that the sentences refer to the readers and contain what they can do to help themselves. This finding implies that the pupils carry the readers along in their summaries.

The researcher also identified Persons 1, 2, and 3 views as the theme. These are the views given by each of the three characters in the source text as identified in the pupils' summaries. This study shows that five summaries contained Person 1's views, one summary contained Person 2 views, and two summaries contained Person 3 views. For the pupils to identify the views of each of these three people shows that they read the source text in detail and comprehended it properly. The pupils that included these views in their summaries recognized that they were part of the important content of the source text. This finding goes in line with Friend (2001, p.3), who viewed summary writing as "the process of determining what content in a passage is the most important and transforming it into a succinct statement in one's own words." The pupils seem to summarize actions more than views, which may be because it is easier to summarise what someone does than to summarise what someone thinks. On the other hand, it is plausible that the source text emphasizes these people's actions more than their views. Even though strong opinions about climate change clearly drive their actions, a good summary of the source text would mention both views and actions.

Extracts 46, 49, and 50 from texts 21, 2, and 12 show the identified views in the pupils' summaries (see chapter 4). The three sentences in the extracts show the ideas or points of view of the three characters in the source text as written by the pupils. The cited extracts show that pupils' summaries overrepresented person 1's views and actions. The pupils' summarised the views and actions of person 1, ignoring that of persons 2 and 3. The reason may be that they have become tired or merely use Person 1 as an example. The teachers should make the pupils understand the need to include all the important points of the source text in their summaries because ignoring essential parts of the source text in summaries of this kind does not make a good summary.

In the pupils' summaries, the result and cause of the actions of Person 2 were also identified, as seen in extracts 56 and 58 (see chapter 4). These themes identified by the researcher explain the reason and consequences of the actions performed by Person 2 as written in the pupils' summaries. The result from this study shows that two summaries contained the result of the actions performed by Person 2, while three summaries contained the cause of his actions. "War on Waste" has three characters, and they perform different actions. They all have reasons for their actions and the results of their actions, but from the pupils' summaries, only person 2's cause and the result of actions were seen. These three people wanted to achieve the same purpose, which is keeping the environment clean, but they went about it differently. The story behind Person 2's seems more attractive to the pupils. Rob Greenfield wore a piece of trash for thirty days and also went dumpster diving sounds interesting, especially for children. This attraction may be why more attention was paid to the cause and result of his actions because the pupils love and appreciate that part of the source text. This viewpoint is consistent with Casazza (1993), who states that one of the essential requirements for developing a good summary is getting a full appreciation of the source text.

Other themes such as Metatext, company descriptions, the writer's view, and the views of the three people were also identified in the pupils' summaries. The findings of this study showed that apart from summarization and paraphrasing, Norwegian lower secondary school pupils could do other things with a passage from a source text. The use of thematic analysis has been able to help the researcher identify these functional themes from the pupils' summaries.

## 5.4 Implications of the study

This study offers valuable contributions. First, its implication for practice offers an avenue for improving the quality of English writing instruction in the Norwegian lower secondary school context. The findings reveal that while the pupils in Norwegian lower secondary schools are aware of the importance of paraphrasing, individual pupils demonstrate varying levels of paraphrasing competence, and there are certain aspects of paraphrasing that require closer attention. For example, none of the pupils demonstrated that they were able to correctly mark a quote from the source text using inverted commas. Such a gap signaled a vacuum that must be filled to improve quality classroom teaching that can help English teaching at the lower secondary level. In such a situation, classroom teaching can be updated to match the required standard for performance in paraphrasing, improving the EFL learners' writing ability. Specifically, it will create an avenue for preparing the pupils on how to avoid being caught up with plagiarism. Specifically, it can help writing instructors identify the inadequacies of their students.

Second, the study's implications are valuable for research purposes. The study contributes usefully to the literature because it is one of the pioneering studies investigating the EFL paraphrasing competence of pupils in Norwegian lower secondary schools, as most previous studies focus on university-level writing. In that view, the knowledge contribution can become a building block on which other researchers develop their studies. The study is particularly invaluable because it focuses on lower secondary school pupils. At this stage, it is often not considered that such sets of pupils should acquire paraphrasing competence that can help improve their writing skills. In particular, such requirement is given more attention at the higher institution level, which might become too difficult to prepare the students in most cases. Thus, the study becomes an eye-opener to other research studies in a similar context and beyond.

## 5.5 Limitations and Future Research

While this study offers valuable insight into the paraphrasing competence of lower secondary EFL learners in the Norwegian context, it is not without some limitations. Although this study justifies the validity and reliability of the study using a triangulation method of data analysis, one limitation identified is that it used only one Norwegian secondary school for its analysis. In practice, if the data collected for this study is administered to many schools, it would be time-consuming and challenging to analyze, given the scope of a master's thesis. For this reason, time is another constraint recognized as a limitation. Although it can be argued that sampling pupils in one school can yield a probability that the study result is reliable, using only one school may be inadequate to generalize the findings. Supposing that the researcher believes that if the same study is conducted on other Norwegian lower secondary schools, the result would be the same, the claim cannot be proven until the investigation has been conducted. While for this reason, the external validity of this study is deemed inadequate, and the researcher recommends that future research that includes different Norwegian lower secondary schools is carried out to strengthen the external validity.

Due to time and physical restraints, the researcher conducted the study using the questionnaire instead of the interview method. Although it is plausible that the interview method may induce a level of bias if used, using the questionnaire is a limitation identified by the researcher because the interview will allow an in-depth study of the topic than using a questionnaire. Also, the questionnaire was relatively short, which was done intentionally to encourage teachers to provide longer answers. Nevertheless, further questions could have been asked, for example, regarding the various themes that pupils are expected to include in a summary. Additionally, the questionnaire could have been sent to a larger sample of teachers, but two teachers were used. The sample of teachers used for the study is also a limitation identified by the researcher. Therefore, the researcher recommends that future research consider using a larger sample of teachers and interview methods where possible.

The thematic analysis was conducted because the paraphrasing analysis revealed that the pupils mostly produced substantial revisions. Although this analysis produced some valuable findings, few previous studies have conducted an analysis like this on pupil texts, so the analysis had a limited theoretical basis. However, as a result, the methods used by this study are quite



innovative and demonstrate the benefits that the thematic analysis method can offer when conducting an investigation of lower secondary written competence.

## 6. Conclusions

Paraphrasing competence is one of the essential skills for written competence, and studies show that paraphrasing, tailored towards procedure and approach, is a skill that experiences a progressive path. It is acknowledged that while inexperienced EFL learners use paraphrasing as an approach for knowledge communication Hirvela and Du (2013), experienced EFL writers use it for knowledge transformation (Shi & Dong, 2018). However, as most studies on paraphrasing have investigated tertiary-level writing, none of the reviewed studies was conducted on lower-secondary students. Also, most scholars have researched paraphrasing in countries like Canada, the United States, Korea, Thailand, and Taiwan Keck (2006), Shi (2012), Liao and Tseng (2010), Ji (2018), Injai (2015), but none have been carried out in the Norwegian context. On the same trajectory, a study revealed that Norwegian students studying English Language recorded lower scores in writing than what they obtained in reading comprehension, oral comprehension, and linguistic comprehension (Bonnet, 2004). Based on this background, this study investigated the paraphrasing types that pupils use to summarise a text they are required to read to address the potential gaps.

Therefore, this study investigated the EFL paraphrasing competence of Norwegian lower secondary school pupils. It raised three research questions for the investigation and used quantitative and qualitative research approaches for data collection. While the pupils were asked to paraphrase a text through a summary writing exercise, their teachers were asked to report their perception regarding the pupils' paraphrasing competence. Using Keck's (2006) taxonomy of paraphrase types, the study analyses the data collected from the pupils and their teachers based on their summary writing ability and perceptions of paraphrasing competence. The study's main findings showed that lower secondary school pupils in Norway use the four paraphrase types; near copies, minimal revisions, moderate revisions, and substantial revisions while writing summaries, but the paraphrase type, which most of the pupils used in their summaries fall under the substantial revisions category.

Moreover, the researcher used thematic analysis to identify the recurrent patterns or themes in the pupils' summaries, revealing what the pupils did with the source text to assess their

paraphrasing competence. For example, the thematic analysis revealed that all pupils understood the importance of offering an overview of the source text. Also, that pupils seemed to summarise the earlier parts of the text more than the later parts. This may be attributed to several reasons, thus warranting further research attention. Finally, findings regarding the teacher's instructional practices and perceptions of paraphrasing reveal that some pupils used Exact Copies in their summaries despite teachers teaching them to write or retell what they read in their own words. This result corroborates Shi (2004), who noted that paraphrasing is a challenging skill for EFL learners because it entails comprehending the original text and having the appropriate vocabulary competence to write it differently using one's own words while maintaining its original meaning.

Finally, the study identifies some implications for practice and research. It reveals that while the pupils in Norwegian lower secondary schools are aware of the importance of paraphrasing, individual pupils demonstrate varying levels of paraphrasing competence, and there are certain aspects of paraphrasing that require closer attention. For example, none of the pupils demonstrated that they were able to correctly mark a quote from the source text using inverted commas. As the study usefully contributes to the literature, its implications provide valuable insights for writing instructors and research communities. Because it is one of the pioneering studies investigating the EFL paraphrasing competence of pupils in Norwegian lower secondary schools, it contributes new insight to the pre-existing pool of paraphrasing studies. While these contributions are evident, they highlighted some limitations and suggested that further studies investigating similar research are valuable for generalizability.

## References

- Alyousef, H. S. (2006). Teaching Reading Comprehension to ESL/EFL Learners. *Journal of Language and Learning*, 5(1), 63-73.
- Bakken, A. (2017). Notions of EFL reading in Norwegian curricula, 1939-2013. *Acta Didactica Norge*, 11(2), 1. <https://doi.org/10.5617/adno.4474>.
- Barton, D. (1994). *Literacy: An Introduction to the Ecology of Written Language*. Blackwell.
- Berninger, V. W., Abbott, R. D., Abbott, S. P., Graham, S. & Richards, T. (2002). Writing and reading: Connections between Language by hand and language by eye. *Journal of learning disabilities*, 35(1), 39-56.
- Bhagat, R., & Hovy, E. (2013). What is paraphrase?. *Association for Computational Linguistics*, 39, 463-472.
- Bloch, J. (2012). *Plagiarism, Intellectual Property and the Teaching of L2 Writing: Explorations in the Detectionbased Approach* (Vol. 24). Multilingual Matters.
- Brandt, D. S. (2002). Copyright's (not so) little cousin, plagiarism, *Computers in Libraries*, 22 (5) 39-42.
- Braun, V. & Clark, V. (2013) Teaching thematic analysis: Overcoming challenges and developing strategies for effective learning. *The Psychologist*, 26 (2), 120-123.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol 2: Research designs: *Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological*, 57-71.
- Cahyono, B. Y. & Widiati, U. (2006). The teaching of EFL reading in the Indonesian context: The state of the art. *Teflin Journal*, 17(1), 36-58.
- Cambourne, B. (1983). 'Learning about learning by watching little kids writing.' *English in Australia*, 66: 18-26.
- Carrell, P. L., & Eisterhold, J. C. (1983). Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy. *TESOL quarterly*, 17(4), 553-573.
- Carrell, P. L., Devine, J., & Eskey, D. E. (Eds.) (1988). *Interactive approaches to second language reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carson, J. (2001). A task analysis of reading and writing in academic contexts. Linking literacies: *Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections*, 48-83.
- Casazza, M. E. (1993). Using a model of direct instruction to teach summary writing in a college reading class. *Journal of Reading*, 37(3), 202-208.
- Celik, B. (2019). Developing Writing Skills Through Reading. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 6(1), 206-214.
- Charboneau, R. (2012). Approaches and practices related to the teaching of EFL reading at the Norwegian primary level. In Hasselgreen, A., Drew, I. & Sørheim, B. (eds.), *The young language learner: Research-based insights into teaching and learning*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Clay, M. M. (1966). *Emergent reading behaviour* (Doctoral dissertation, ResearchSpace@Auckland).
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Currie, P. (1998). Staying out of trouble: Apparent plagiarism and academic survival. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(1), 1-18.
- Day, R. R. & Bamford, J. (2004). *Extensive Reading Activities for Teaching Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Demirel, Ö. (2016). *Yabancı dil öğretimi, Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık*.
- Diffchecker (accessed 10.09.2022) from <https://www.diffchecker.com/diff>
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methodologies*. Oxford University Press.
- Drew, I. & Sørheim, B. (2006). *English Teaching Strategies – Methods for English Teachers of 10 to 16-year-olds*. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget
- Dubin, F., & Bycina, D. (1991). Academic reading and the ESL/EFL teacher. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (2nd ed.) (pp. 195-215). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- English First English Proficiency Index (EF EPI, 2020). The world's largest ranking of countries and regions by English skills [Online] <https://www.ef.com/wwen/epi>
- Erhel, S., & Jamet, E. (2006). Using pop-up windows to improve multimedia learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 22(2), 137-147.
- Evans, N., Hartshorn, K., & Anderson, N. (2010). *A research based approach to materials development for reading*. In N. Harwood (Ed.), *Materials in ELT: Theory in practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, N., Hartshorn, K., & Anderson, N. (2010). A research based approach to materials development for reading. In N. Harwood (Ed), *Materials in ELT: Theory in practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Farrell, T.S.C. (2008). *Teaching reading to English language learners: a reflective approach*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Corwin Press (Sage Publications).
- Fialkoff, F. (1993). There's no excuse for plagiarism, *Library Journal*, 118 (17), 56.
- Flognfeldt, M. E., & Lund, R. E. (2021). *English for teachers and learners*. Cappelen Damm.
- Freeman, D. E., & Freeman, Y. S. (1994). *Between worlds: Access to second language acquisition*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Friend, R. (2001). Effects of strategy instruction on summary writing of college students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 26 (1), 3-24.
- Gelderen, E. V. (2014). *A history of the English language*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Goldgar, B. A. (2001) Imitation and plagiarism: The Lauder Affair and its critical aftermath, *Studies in Literary Imagination*, 34 (1), 1–17.
- Goodman, Y.M. (1986). Children coming to know literacy. In Teale, W.H. and Sulzby, E. (eds.), *Emergent Literacy: Writing and Reading*. Norwood: NJ Ablex.
- Grabe, W. & Stoller, F. (2002). *Teaching and researching reading*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Güzel, A. ve Barın, E. (2013). *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretimi, Ankara: Akçağ*
- Haegi, E., Madsen, T. & Mohammed-Roe, S. (2021). *Engelsk 10 fra Cappelen Damm*. Cappelen Damm.

- Hale, G., Taylor, C., Bridgeman, B., Carson, J., Kroll, B., & Kantor, R. (1995). A study of writing tasks assigned in academic degree programs. *ETS Research Report Series*, 1995(2), i-61.
- Hall, N. (1994). The emergence of literacy, In Stierer, B. & Maybin, J. (eds.), *Language, literacy and learning in educational practice* (pp. 15-30). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Halliday, M.K. (1973). *Explorations in the Function of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Harlow: UK. Pearson Longman.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *How to Teach English*. (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed) England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hellekjær, G. O. (2007). Reading: from a forgotten to a basic skill. *Språk og språkundervisning*, 2. 23-26.
- Hennink, M., Hutter, I. & Bailey, A. (2011). Qualitative research methods. *Critical Public Health*, 22 (1):111-112
- Highe. (2007). *How to paraphrase effectively*. Retrieved from [www.higherscore.ca](http://www.higherscore.ca)
- Hirvela, A. & Du, Q. (2013). Why am I paraphrasing? Undergraduate ESL writers' engagement with source-based academic writing and reading. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12(2), 87–98.
- Howard, R. M. (1995). Plagiarisms, authorships, and the academic death penalty. *College English*, 57(7), 788-806.
- Howard, R. M. (2002). Don't police plagiarism: just teach!, *Education Digest*, 67(5), 46–50.
- Hyland, F. (2001). Dealing with plagiarism when giving feedback. *ELT Journal*, 55(4), 375-381.
- Hyland, K. (1996). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2014). *Second Language Writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Injai, R. (2015). An analysis of paraphrasing strategies employed by Thai EFL University students: Case study of Burapha University. *ICLLCS 2015*, 122.
- International Centre for Academic Integrity (ICAI) (1999 [2013]), 'Fundamental values project', at <http://www.academicintegrity.org/icaei/resources-2.php>.
- Ji, N. Y. (2018). Investigation into validity of paraphrasing task as a writing performance test item for EFL learners. *Modern English Education*, 19(2), 20-29.
- Johns, A., & Mayes, P. (1990). An analysis of summary protocols of university ESL students. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 253–271.
- Johnson, R. B. & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14-26.
- Jordan, R. R. (2003). Academic Writing Course-Study Skill in English, Pearson Education, 2003: *Academic Writing Course-Study Skill in English* (Vol. 1). Bukupedia.
- Kantz, Margaret. (1990). Helping students use textual sources persuasively. *College English* 52, 74–91.
- Keck, C. (2006). The use of paraphrase in summary writing: A comparison of L1 and L2 writers. *Journal of second language writing*, 15(4), 261-278.
- Kintsch, W. & van Dijk, T. A. (1978). Toward a model of text comprehension and production. *Psychological Review*, 85(5), 363-394.
- Kirkland, M. R., & Saunders, M. A. I? (1991). Maximising student performance in summary writing: Managing cognitive load. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(1), 105-21.
- Knowledge Promotion Reform (2006). *Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training*. [http://www.udir.no/Stottemeny/English/Curriculum-in-English/\\_english/Knowledge/promotion---Kunnskapsloftet/](http://www.udir.no/Stottemeny/English/Curriculum-in-English/_english/Knowledge/promotion---Kunnskapsloftet/)

- Köksal, K. (1999). *Okuma Yazmanın Öğretimi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Kolich, Augustus M. (1983). Plagiarism: The worm of reason. *College English*, 45, (2), 141-148.
- Krashen, S. D. (1984). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. D. (2004). *The Power of Reading: Insights from the research*, (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed) Westport, Conn.: Libraries Unlimited.
- Kretzschmar Jr, W. A. (2018). *The emergence and development of English: an introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Langan, J., & Jenkins, L. (1993). *Ten steps to advancing college reading skills*. Marlton: Townsend Press.
- Lavin, R. S. (2003). *Dimensions of Extensive Writing*, <http://jalt-publications.org/archive/proceedings/2003/E074.pdf>
- Leedy, P. & Ormrod, J. (2001). *Practical research: Planning and design* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Lehmann, T. M. (1999). Literacy and the Tertiary Student: *Why Has the Communicative Approach Failed?* (Doctoral dissertation, Univ.).
- Leibensperger, S. (2003). *Decide when to quote, paraphrase & summarise*. Retrieved from <http://www.uhv.edu/ac/style/quote.aspx>
- Liao, M. T., & Tseng, C. Y. (2010). Students' Behaviors and Views of Paraphrasing and Inappropriate Textual Borrowing in an EFL Academic Setting. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied*.
- Loh, Y. L. (2013). Errors in paraphrasing and strategies in overcoming them. *Journal of Creative Practices in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 4-17.
- Lynch, B., & Hudson, T. (1991). EST reading. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (2nd ed.) (pp. 216-232). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2022). *Second language research: Methodology and design* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Mallon, T. (1989). *Stolen Words: forays into the origins and ravages of plagiarism* (London, Ticknor & Fields).
- Mart, C. T. (2015). Combining extensive and intensive reading to reinforce language learning. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World*, 5(4), 85-90.
- Martinot, C. (2003). Pour une linguistique de l'acquisition La reformulation: du concept descriptif au concept explicatif. *Langage et société*, (2), 147-151.
- McCarthy, P. M., Guess, R. H., & McNamara, D. S. (2009). The components of paraphrase evaluations. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41(3), 682-690.
- McInnis, L. (2009). Analysing English L1 and L2 paraphrasing strategies through concurrent verbal report and stimulated recall protocols. Master's thesis, Education, Graduate Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning, University of Toronto.
- McNamara, D. S., Ozuru, Y., Best, R., & O'Reilly, T. (2007). *The 4-pronged comprehension strategy framework*. In D. S. McNamara (Ed.), *Reading comprehension strategies: Theories, interventions, and technologies* (pp. 465-496). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum
- Ministry of Education and Research. (2020). *The English subject curriculum* (Revised ed.). Oslo, Norway: *The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training*. Retrieved March 31, 2022, from <http://www.udir.no/kl06/ENG1-03?lplang=eng>
- Nordin, S. M. (2017). The best of two approaches: Process/genre-based approach to teaching writing. *The English Teacher*, 11.

- Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training (UDIR). (2012). Framework for Basic Skills. [http://www.udir.no/contentassets/fd2d6bfbf2364e1c98b73e030119bd38/framework\\_for\\_basic\\_skills.pdf](http://www.udir.no/contentassets/fd2d6bfbf2364e1c98b73e030119bd38/framework_for_basic_skills.pdf)
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English. Language Teaching*. New York: Mc Graw Hill.
- Park, C. (2003). In other (people's) words: Plagiarism by university students--literature and lessons. *Assessment & evaluation in higher education*, 28(5), 471-488.
- Pecorari, D. (2001). *Plagiarism and international students: How the English-speaking university responds*. In *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 229-245). The University of Michigan Press.
- Pecorari, D., & Petric, B. (2014). Plagiarism in second-language writing. *Language Teaching*, 47(3), 269-302.
- Rashidi, N. & Piran, M. (2011). The Effect of Extensive and Intensive Reading on Iranian EFL Learners' Vocabulary Size and Depth, *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2, (2), 471-482
- Rhyner, P.M. (2009). *Emergent Literacy and Language Development: Promoting Learning in Early Childhood*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Richards, J. S. and Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman Dictionary of Language and Teaching Applied Linguistics* (4th ed.). Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited.
- Rixon, S. (1992). English and other languages for younger children: practice and theory in a rapidly changing world. *Language Teaching*, 2, 73-93.
- Roig, M. (2001). Plagiarism and paraphrasing criteria of college and university professors, *Ethics and Behaviour*, 11(3) 307-324.
- Russo, M., & Pippa, S. (2004). Aptitude to interpreting: Preliminary results of a testing methodology based on paraphrase. *META*, 49(2), 409-432.
- Russo, M., & Pippa, S. (2004). Aptitude to interpreting: Preliminary results of a testing methodology based on paraphrase. *META*, 49(2), 409-432.
- Šamo, R. (2009). The age factor and L2 reading strategies, in Nikolov, M. (ed), *Early Learning of modern foreign languages: Processes and outcomes* (pp.121-31). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Shi, L. & Dong, Y. (2018). Chinese graduate students paraphrasing in L1 and L2 contexts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 34, 46-56.
- Shi, L. (2004). Textual borrowing in second-language writing. *Written Communication*, 21, 171-200
- Shi, L. (2012). Rewriting and paraphrasing source texts in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(2), 134-148.
- Silberstein, S. (1987). Let s take another look at reading: Twenty-five years of reading instruction. *Language Teaching Forum*, 25(4): 18-35.
- Silva, T. (1990). *Second language composition instruction: developments, issues, and directions in ESL*, In Kroll, B. (Ed.), *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 11-23
- Smith, F. (1971). *Understanding Reading*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Stubbs, M. (1980). *Language and literacy: The sociolinguistics of reading and writing*. Routledge & Kegan Paul, 9 Park St., Boston, MA 02108.
- Sun, YC (2009). Using a two-tier test in examining Taiwan graduate students' perspectives on paraphrasing strategies. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 10(3), 399-408.
- Tangpermpoon, T. (2008). Integrated approaches to improve students writing skills for English major students. *ABAC Journal*, 28(2).



- Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (Eds.). (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Teale, W.H. & Sulzby, E. (1986). *Emergent Literacy: Writing and Reading*. Norwood: NJ. Ablex.
- The Economist. (1997, April 3). What's wrong with copying?  
<https://www.economist.com/moreover/1997/04/03/whats-wrong-with-copying>
- THOMAS, M. W. (2000). Eschewing credit: Heywood, Shakespeare and plagiarism before copyright, *New Literary History*, 31 (2), 277–294.
- Urquhart, A. H., & Weir, C. J. (2014). *Reading in a second language: Process, product and practice*. Hoboken, NJ: Taylor and Francis.
- Utdanningsdirektoratet (2020). Curriculum in English (ENG0-04) [Online]  
<https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04>
- Veit, R., Gould, C., & Clifford, J. (1994). *Writing, reading and research*. New York: Macmillan.
- Wachuku, U. (2008). *An Introduction to the Phonetics and Phonology of English* (2<sup>nd</sup>ed.). Alphabet Publishers.
- Weigle, S. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Whitaker, Elaine E. (1993). A pedagogy to address plagiarism. *College Composition and Communication*, 44, 509–514.
- WILHOIT, S. (1994). Helping students avoid plagiarism, *College Teaching*, 42 (4), 161–165.
- Williams, C. (2007). Research methods. *Journal of Business & Economics Research (JBER)*, 5(3).
- Wu, S. Y. (2008). Effective Activities for Teaching English Idioms to EFL Learners. *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. XIV.
- Yu, G. (2008). Reading to summarise in English and Chinese: A tale of two languages? *Language Testing*, 25(4), 521–551.

## Appendix

### Paraphrasing Questionnaire

Questionnaire guide for teachers (to be completed in writing) About this written questionnaire:

Dear respondent,

This questionnaire concerns your teaching of paraphrasing in the 10th grade English subject. For the sake of privacy, please write your answers anonymously. In other words, please refrain from using your name and pupil names. Otherwise, you may include as much detail in your answers as you see fit. The questionnaire form should take 15 minutes to complete. After completing the questionnaire, you may contact me at [favouranagor2014@gmail.com](mailto:favouranagor2014@gmail.com) if you wish for your answers to be deleted.

About the research project:

This questionnaire will determine views about EFL learners' paraphrasing competence in Norway. The study aims at gaining insights into the Norwegian EFL learners' paraphrasing competence for the benefit of both researchers and writing instructors. Hence, your participation will help the researcher highlight the status of the EFL learners' paraphrasing competence in Norway. Furthermore, your contribution to obtaining the necessary data for this research is significant for achieving a master's degree at the University of Stavanger.

Thank you.

Anagor Favour [favouranagor2014@gmail.com](mailto:favouranagor2014@gmail.com)

### Background

Please, choose one option only

(1). What is your level of English education?

Mark only one oval

a. 0 study points

b. 30 study points

- c. 60 study points
- d. 90 study points
- e. Other (please specify)

.....

(2). How many years of teaching experience do you have at lower secondary school?

Mark only one oval

- a. 1-2 years
- b. 3-5 years
- c. 5+ years

### Questionnaire

Please, choose only one option

(1). How important do you think paraphrasing competence could be for the student's writing skills? (1 = unimportant, 5 = very important)

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

(2). How would you describe the level of the students' paraphrasing competence in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade? (1 = very poor, 5 = very good)

Mark only one oval

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

(3). What do you do to teach your pupils about paraphrasing (if anything)?\*

---

---

---

---

---

(4) Have you experienced that your pupils have plagiarized something?

Mark only one oval.

Yes  No

If the above is yes, how many pupils have plagiarized something this year?\*

---

---

---

---

---

Also, if yes, how many times have these pupils plagiarized something?

---

---

---

---

---

(5) What do you do (or what would you do) when you catch pupils who have plagiarized something?

---

---

---

---

---

(6) Summary writing is a viable solution for training pupils to avoid plagiarism (1 =

Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly \*agree)

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

(7). Do you have any further comments about paraphrasing and/or plagiarism?

---

---

---

---

---