

Source-Based Writing of the High- and Low-Proficiency Adolescent L2 Writer

Gillian Baxter

A Thesis

In the Department of

Education

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Master of Arts (Applied Linguistics)

at Concordia University

Montréal, Québec, Canada

March 2023

© Gillian Baxter, 2023

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By: Gillian Baxter

Entitled: Source-Based Writing of the High- and Low-Proficiency Adolescent L2 Writer
and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (Applied Linguistics)

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final examining committee:

_____ Examiner

Dr. Kim McDonough

_____ Thesis Supervisor

Dr. Heike Neumann

Approved by

Dr. Kim McDonough, Graduate Program Director

Dr. Pascale Sicotte, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science

Abstract

Source-Based Writing of the High- and Low-Proficiency Adolescent L2 Writer

Gillian Baxter

Writing from sources is a fundamental academic skill that poses a challenge for students at all educational levels. However, few studies have investigated source use in the high-school context. The current study examines the source-based writing of 43 adolescent L2 writers. Students were classified into high- ($N = 25$) and low-proficiency ($N = 18$) levels based on scores obtained on an integrated writing task. They then completed an additional source-based writing task. Essays were analysed for four variables: amount of source use, accuracy of source ideas, adequacy of attribution to source authors, and language used to integrate source information. Correlation coefficients suggested a significant relationship between writing scores and certain source-use patterns. Independent samples *t*-tests revealed significant differences between the two proficiency groups for accuracy of source use, adequacy of attribution to source authors, verbatim copying with no citation, and indirect source use with implicit citation. The findings suggest that although high-school L2 writers are ready to meet certain demands of source-based writing, they require support in source-use subskills. This has implications for the eventual creation of pedagogical interventions designed to guide novice writers at this educational level through the developmental process of effective source-based writing.

Keywords: source use; developmental process; high- and low-proficiency high-school L2 writers

Acknowledgements and Dedication

First of all, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Heike Neumann. From the early phases of this endeavour almost two years ago, your unwavering support and guidance have helped me persevere through to the culmination of what is now this final product. With your help, I have accomplished things I did not always believe possible. Thank you for pushing me out of my comfort zone so many times and in so many ways.

I would also like to extend my sincere thanks to Dr. Kim McDonough for her guidance and feedback on the proposal and final version of this thesis. Your time and contribution are integral to this project and very much appreciated.

I am also very grateful to Sarah for her help at various stages throughout the writing process.

Lastly, I would like to acknowledge my family and dedicate this thesis to them. To my husband, my daughters, and my parents, I am grateful for your patience and steadfast support. Thank you for always believing in me.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	vii
Chapter One	1
Reading and Writing Connections	2
The Developmental Trajectory of Source Use.....	2
Pedagogical Interventions and Source-Based Writing	3
This Thesis	4
Chapter Two.....	5
Literature Review.....	5
Source Use and Adolescent L2 Writers	5
Source-Use Patterns and Related Challenges	6
Writing Proficiency and Source-Use Patterns	7
Methodology.....	9
Research Context	9
Participants.....	10
Procedure	10
Analysis.....	11
Type and Amount of Source Use.....	12
Adequacy of Attribution to Source Authors	13
Accuracy of Information Drawn from Sources.....	13
Language Used to Integrate Information from Source Material	15
Results.....	19
Relationship Between Writing Scores and Source-Use Integration Patterns	19
Source-Use Integration Patterns of High- and Low-Proficiency L2 Writers	20

Discussion	22
Conclusion	25
Chapter Three.....	27
Implications for Education.....	27
Implications for Research	29
Conclusion	30
References.....	31

List of Tables

Table 1. <i>Type of Source Use Coding with Examples</i>	13
Table 2. <i>Adequacy of Source Attribution Scoring with Examples</i>	14
Table 3. <i>Accuracy of Source Use Scoring with Examples</i>	14
Table 4. <i>Language Used to Integrate Information from Source Material with Examples</i>	17
Table 5. <i>Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation Coefficients Between Writing Score and Other Variables</i>	19
Table 6. <i>Means, Standard Deviations, and Standard Error Means for all Variables by Proficiency Level</i>	20
Table 7. <i>Results of Independent Samples t-Tests and Effect Sizes for All Variables</i>	21

Chapter One

The ability to write from sources has become recognized as a fundamental academic skill for students in all educational contexts and one that is not without its share of challenges. Indeed, the execution of integrated writing tasks (IWTs) demands a complex interplay between skills such as reading and writing (Asención Delaney, 2008; Plakans, 2008, 2009) leading researchers to claim this cornerstone of academic writing as a construct in its own right (Asención Delaney, 2008; Chan & Yamashita, 2022; Cumming, 2014; Plakans, 2008, 2009). Knoch and Sitajalabhorn's (2013) definition conveys the intricacy of IWTs described as:

tasks in which test takers are presented with one or more language-rich source texts and are required to produce written compositions that require (1) mining the source texts for ideas, (2) selecting ideas, (3) synthesising ideas from one or more source texts, (4) transforming the language used in the input, (5) organizing ideas and (6) using stylistic conventions such as connecting ideas and acknowledging sources. (p. 306)

A defining feature of IWTs is that writers are required to transform the language found in source texts for use in their own work. Of the essential features listed above, this one has been the subject of the most extensive investigation to date. Although modifying source language may appear to be a relatively simple task, paraphrasing is a challenging operation requiring instruction and practice (Hirvela & Du, 2013; Keck, 2006). Whether or not a student is able to use this skill effectively provides valuable insight as to both the learner's understanding of source material and their ability to write (Hirvela & Du, 2013). Failure to successfully transform source language may result in patchwriting, defined as "copying from a source text and then deleting some words, altering grammatical structures, or plugging in one-for-one synonym substitutes" (Howard, 1992, p. 233) and may lead to (perceived) plagiarism-related issues (Keck, 2006; Li & Casanave, 2012; Pecorari, 2003; Shi, 2004).

I first encountered the term "patchwriting" when I undertook the teaching of students enrolled in the Secondary 5 Enriched English as a Second Language (EESL) program which, as stipulated in the Quebec Education Program (Ministère de l'Éducation [MEQ], n.d.), features source-based writing as an integral part of the curriculum. In the context of this program, students are required to carry out tasks in which they demonstrate their ability to select, organise, and use information from source material in their own writing. At that time, I was intrigued to discover that there was a label to describe a phenomenon I had frequently observed over the course of my teaching career.

It was not until a few years later when I had the opportunity to take an Applied Linguistics Literacy course with Dr. Heike Neumann that I encountered the term once again. It was then that my interest in the relationship between reading and writing was further nurtured and that I truly began to comprehend the complexity of effective source-based writing. Perhaps most striking was the realisation that my high-school writers seemingly displayed source-use patterns and encountered challenges akin to those in other educational settings. My desire to comprehend the phenomenon deepened and gave rise to what would eventually materialize as this thesis.

Reading and Writing Connections

Given the shift away from independent writing prompts to the use of more authentic IWTs (Cumming, 2014; Plakans, 2008; Plakans & Gebril, 2012) in both the second-language (L2) academic classroom and the context of large-scale assessments (Cumming, 2014; Grabe & Zhang, 2013; Knoch & Sitajalabhorn, 2013; Plakans, 2008; Plakans & Gebril, 2012; Uludag et al., 2019; Weigle & Parker, 2012), the relationship between reading and writing has garnered much attention in L2 research over the last few decades (Grabe & Zhang, 2013). Addressing the complexities of IWTs is imperative for both learning and assessment purposes (Cumming et al., 2005; Weigle & Parker, 2012), and knowledge gained from this long-standing area of interest among L1 scholars has served to inform researchers in their quest to understand specific challenges that may arise in the L2 context (Grabe, 2003; Grabe & Zhang, 2013).¹

In order to shed light on each of the operations involved in IWTs and to uncover the challenges associated with each one, some studies have examined factors that come into play at different points during the composing process (Asención Delaney, 2008; Neumann, Leu, McDonough, Gil, & Crawford, 2020; Plakans, 2008, 2009; Plakans & Gebril, 2012), whereas others have identified source-use patterns in students' final products (Hirvela & Du, 2013; Keck, 2006, 2014; Pecorari, 2003; Shi, 2004). Researchers have analysed the performance of students of varying proficiency levels (Asención Delaney, 2008; Cumming et al., 2005; Gebril & Plakans, 2013; Plakans & Gebril, 2012; Shi, 2004; Weigle & Parker, 2012) and educational experience (Asención Delaney, 2008; Doolan, 2021; Keck, 2014; Neumann et al., 2019; Pecorari, 2003; Weigle & Parker, 2012; Wette, 2017) on various types of source-based writing tasks (Keck, 2006; Payant et al., 2019; Shi, 2004; Uludag et al., 2019; Weigle & Parker, 2012). Although studies confirm that first-year undergraduate students struggle with effective source use (e.g., Cumming et al., 2016; Grabe & Zhang, 2013; Hirvela & Du, 2013), ineffective source use persists into the later stages of students' academic careers (Howard et al., 2010; Pecorari, 2003; Weigle & Parker, 2012; Wette, 2017, 2021). Consequently, there remains a need to pursue the investigation of this construct in order to determine writers' needs at specific moments in their development and to design appropriate pedagogical interventions to help address source-use issues in various educational contexts (Merkel, 2020; Neumann et al., 2019).

The Developmental Trajectory of Source Use

Without dismissing the valid concern of “prototypical” plagiarism (Pecorari, 2003, p. 318), Howard's (1992) call for an alternate stance on what has traditionally been referred to as “plagiarism” and her position on patchwriting as a valuable strategy used by both L1 and L2 novice writers as they navigate their way through the unfamiliar territory of academic writing has urged numerous scholars to follow suit in their claims to have patchwriting recognized as a developmental strategy rather than an intentional ethical violation (Abasi & Akbari, 2008;

¹ Recent research has suggested that there may in fact be more similarities in matters relating to source use between these two populations than previously believed (Chan & Yamashita, 2022) and that the lines differentiating the categorization of L1 and L2 learners may at times be blurred (Wette, 2018).

Howard et al., 2010; Li & Casanave, 2012; Pecorari, 2003, 2015; Wette, 2017). Indeed, some researchers have deemed effective source-based writing a developmental process (Storch, 2012; Wette, 2010, 2021) and have identified patterns representative of different levels in the evolution of this complex skill.

For example, Storch's (2012) study investigating the impact of instruction (i.e., citation practices, paraphrasing, summarising, synthesising) on undergraduate L2 writers' source use suggested that students progress from an initial stage of overreliance on source language and incorrect use of citations, to reduced reliance on source language but with more evidence of inaccurate transformation, to the eventual stage of effective transformation of source language and accurate use of citations. Similarly, Wette's (2021) "trajectory of skill development in source-based writing" (p. 17) details characteristics typical of each stage as students progress from novice and postnovice to proficient writers. These stages trace the evolution from "illegitimate source text use" to "legitimate but inexperienced source text use" to "legitimate, effective source use" (p. 13) with behaviours such as unattributed verbatim copying and patchwriting appearing at the lower end of the scale and inaccurate paraphrases and shorter copied strings becoming evident as students advance toward the eventual use of accurate paraphrases and citation practices. In addition to operations such as these, effective source use also implies that students eventually make the transition from a knowledge-telling to a knowledge-transforming stage (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987) whereby they develop a sense of authorial agency and display a more thorough engagement with source material (Wette, 2021). These features can serve as benchmarks that may prove useful to both instructors and students and may guide researchers and educators in the development of pedagogical interventions relevant to each stage.

Pedagogical Interventions and Source-Based Writing

Indeed, with respect to effective and appropriate source use, Pecorari (2015) asserts that "to a great extent we can teach our way out of the problem" (p. 97). Over the last few years, a number of studies have investigated the effect of instruction on various aspects related to source-based writing (e.g., Cooney et al., 2018; Doolan & Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2016; Liu et al., 2016; Storch, 2012). Some of these interventions are intended to raise students' awareness of plagiarism policies (Pecorari & Petric, 2014) or to teach the mechanics of citation (e.g., Fazilatfar et al., 2018). However, they do not guarantee students' ability to apply this knowledge in subsequent source-based writing tasks (Cooney et al., 2018; Du, 2019; Howard, 1992; Pecorari, 2003; Pecorari & Petric, 2014; Storch, 2012; Wette, 2010).

Recent studies have advanced investigation in this regard by examining the effect of instruction on both appropriate and effective source use. For example, Du (2019) defined subsets of operations involved in source use (e.g., accurate representation of source information, linguistic modification of source language, attribution to source authors) and noted evidence of postinstruction improvement in all three operations related to appropriateness and all but one of the four operations required for effective source use. Similarly, McDonough et al. (2014)

observed evidence of postinstruction improvement in students' use of verbatim copying from source material (i.e., shorter word-for-word copied strings) and their inclusion of explicit references to source material in the topic sentences of summary paragraphs. Neumann, Leu, McDonough, and Crawford (2020) also confirmed that providing instruction which targeted specific problematic areas (i.e., source-text comprehension, vocabulary development) in addition to citation-skill instruction contributed to more accurate and effective use of source information and paraphrasing skills, thereby enhancing the overall quality of source use in student writing.

Scholars call for the early implementation of explicit instruction such as this and adequate practice of the various subskills involved in source-based writing tasks (Cumming et al., 2016; Wette 2010, 2021). Grabe and Zhang (2013) claim that “the best general approach to instruction, therefore, is to begin instruction on reading/writing tasks much earlier, much more explicitly, and with much more iterative practice” (p. 19). It would perhaps then be pertinent to adopt a proactive approach and implement such instruction and practice before students enter the realm of higher education. However, as mentioned, this requires interventions designed in consideration of the specific context for which they are intended (Merkel, 2020; Neumann et al., 2019). Although students in the high-school classroom may be expected to carry out IWTs in their disciplinary courses or L2 classes, as it stands now, there is a marked absence in literature pertaining to source-based writing at the preuniversity level.

This Thesis

Given the above, this thesis investigates the source-use patterns of high-school writers and compares them to those of university students as per findings drawn from prior research conducted at the university level, and aims to determine high-school writers' specific needs in order to inform the field in the eventual development of pedagogical interventions appropriate for use in the L2 high-school classroom. In this way, adolescent L2 writers might become better equipped to face the challenges related to the source-based writing that will be required of them as they embark on their university career, and this will perhaps spur their development toward the ultimate goal of becoming proficient academic writers.

In line with the requirements for a manuscript-based thesis, the following chapter is a “full submittable draft of a manuscript” detailing an exploratory study of the source-based writing of high- and low-proficiency adolescent English L2 writers.

Chapter Two

Writing from sources is an integral part of academic work and assessment for students in all contexts and across educational levels (Cumming et al., 2016; Howard et al., 2010; Keck, 2006; McDonough et al., 2014). Given the complex interplay between reading and writing skills involved in integrated tasks (Asención Delaney, 2008; Plakans, 2008, 2009), these prove challenging for both first- (L1) and second-language (L2) writers from the early through later stages of their academic career (Doolan & Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2016; Pecorari, 2003; Wette, 2017). Research has identified source-use patterns and challenges that arise due to factors including, but not limited to, proficiency level (Asención Delaney, 2008; Doolan, 2021; Grabe & Zhang, 2013), reading comprehension (Neumann et al., 2019; Plakans, 2009; Plakans & Gebril, 2012), and language repertoire (Howard et al., 2010; Neumann et al., 2019).

Studies have demonstrated the efficacy of targeted instruction on subskills of source-based writing (Cumming et al., 2016; Du, 2019; Wette, 2010). However, (post)novice L1 and L2 writers still struggle with source integration as evidenced by inaccurate representation of source ideas (Neumann et al., 2019; Storch, 2012; Wette, 2010), inadequate attribution practices (Doolan, 2021; Du, 2019; Weigle & Parker, 2012), and patchwriting (Cumming et al., 2005; Shi, 2004; Wette, 2017) in their work, prompting researchers to regard effective source use as a developmental process (Storch, 2012; Wette, 2010, 2017) which evolves with experience over many years (Cumming et al., 2016; Li & Casanave, 2012; McDonough et al., 2014).

Researchers call for early intervention and adequate practice in source-use related matters (Cooney et al., 2018; Cumming et al., 2016; Du, 2019) and pedagogical interventions designed in consideration of contexts in which they will be implemented (Neumann et al., 2019). One such context is the secondary-school language classroom. Source-based writing tasks are a fundamental part of the high-school curriculum; however, L2 writing in this context remains an underexplored area of investigation (de Oliveira & Silva, 2013; Ortmeier-Hooper & Enright, 2011). To address this gap, this study analysed the source-based writing of high- and low-proficiency adolescent L2 writers to examine the relationship between scores obtained on an integrated writing task (IWT) and students' source-use integration patterns on a different task and to identify similarities and differences between the two groups. The study provides information that may ultimately serve in the creation of pedagogical materials designed to enhance the source-based writing skills of this underinvestigated population.

Literature Review

Source Use and Adolescent L2 Writers

Cumming et al. (2016) affirm that “learning and teaching writing from sources is integral to education for all ages and literacy abilities from adolescence into mature adulthood” (p. 53), yet their synthesis of research indicates limited investigation of source-based writing at the high-school level with only one study featuring representatives from the adolescent L2 writing community (i.e., Reynolds & Perin, 2009). This paucity of research extends beyond the domain of high-school source-based writing to the consideration of adolescent L2 writers at large (de Oliveira & Silva, 2013; Ortmeier-Hooper & Enright, 2011). Scholars stress the necessity of

expanding this research area to gain further knowledge of this “distinct” and “unique” population (Ortmeier-Hooper & Enright, 2011; Silva, 1993) and the characteristics which set it apart from the postsecondary population that remains the primary focus of L2 writing research to date (Cumming et al., 2016).

Ortmeier-Hooper and Enright (2011) maintain that adequate understanding of adolescent L2 writers requires consideration of their educational context, the prominence of identity negotiation and social interaction in teenagers’ lives, and the role of writing in determining their (post)secondary pathways. High-school writers are the university students of the future for whom writing from sources is a fundamental practice (Cumming et al., 2016; Keck, 2006; Wette, 2017). We would do well to be informed as to the characteristics of their writing to better prepare them for tasks that lie ahead. Kibler and Hardigree’s (2017) case study provides insight into the ways in which high-school L2 writers progress in their quest to achieve the level of source-based writing required in the university context. The authors tracked one L2 writer’s use of evidence (i.e., type, function, reporting verbs) in argumentative writing from high school through university, noting, for example, the writer’s evolution from using “unincorporated quotations” (i.e., decontextualized verbatim source use which failed to provide explicit reference to source authors; p. 85) in Grades 9 through 12, to “incorporated quotations” (p. 85) which provided information about the source author or text, to the eventual use of paraphrase in Grade 13 and throughout university. Doolan (2021) also sought to comprehend the particularities of this population by comparing the source-based writing of L1 and L2 first-year-composition (FYC) students as they entered the postsecondary context in order to identify the type of source information included in students’ texts and the language (i.e., direct quotation, paraphrase) used to integrate this information. The author emphasized the importance of examining characteristics of students’ writing as they begin university to “help researchers reconcile performance at this stage of development with the wealth of research on source-based writing as students advance through later stages of their college careers” (p. 139).

However, this “wealth of research” is insufficient as it is limited to the source-use patterns of university-level (post)novice writers. Therefore, there remains much to be gained by developing a deeper understanding of adolescent L2 writers and the characteristics of their source-based writing and bridging the gap between the secondary- and tertiary-level contexts (Ortmeier-Hooper & Enright, 2011).

Source-Use Patterns and Related Challenges

Researchers have identified patterns in students’ source use and pinpointed specific challenges faced by novice writers as they engage in source-based writing. These challenges manifest in different ways and are attributable to various causes. Chan and Yamashita’s (2022) meta-analysis of integrated writing (IW) and its correlates investigated learner-external (e.g., number and genre of source texts) and learner-internal (i.e., age and language proficiency) factors that impacted students’ performance on IWTs. For example, students may struggle with the selection and use of source ideas because they are subjected to timed exam-like conditions (Plakans, 2009; Uludag et al., 2019) or because they must work with multiple source texts, thus complexifying the task at hand (Chan & Yamashita, 2022; Doolan, 2021). Source-use challenges

may relate to the number of source ideas present in students' writing, adequacy of citation practices, transformation of source language (e.g., Cumming et al., 2005; Doolan, 2021; Gebril & Plakans, 2013; Weigle & Parker, 2012), and/or accuracy of representation of source ideas (Du, 2019; Storch, 2012; Wette, 2010, 2018).

Some studies have found that reading-comprehension issues hinder students' ability to select, use, and integrate source information accurately and effectively in their own work (Asención Delaney, 2008; Gebril & Plakans, 2013; Plakans, 2009; Plakans & Gebril, 2012; Storch, 2012; Weigle & Parker, 2012; Wette, 2010). Others have found a relationship between source-use issues and students' writing proficiency (Cumming et al., 2005; Doolan, 2021; Gebril & Plakans, 2013; Hirvela & Du, 2013). Payant et al.'s (2019) examination of the relationship between scores obtained on a reading-comprehension task and students' performance on a large-scale assessment task (i.e., Canadian Academic English Language Integrated Writing Task) suggested that reading abilities impacted students' IWT scores. In contrast, Plakans and Gebril's (2012) study examined ways in which L2 undergraduate students interacted with source texts while composing an argumentative text and learners' reported perceptions of their comprehension of source material in relation to essay score. The authors found that both low- and high-scoring writers drew on information from source texts for use in their own writing leading the authors to advance the possibility of a "threshold for integration of reading and writing" (p. 31) whereby only a certain degree of comprehension may be required to use source texts to carry out IWTs. Neumann et al.'s (2019) novice L2 writers faced both comprehension issues, as evidenced by difficulties in selecting appropriate information to use in their own writing and the inaccurate portrayal of source material in their texts, and writing-related challenges such as inappropriate paraphrasing caused, in part, by an overreliance on verbatim notes taken from source texts, and inadequate citation practices displayed by either failure to include a citation or by incorrect use of the targeted citation style.

The aforementioned findings suggest that the relationship between proficiency level and source use merits further attention.

Writing Proficiency and Source-Use Patterns

Studies suggest that in both L1 and L2 contexts, students' overall writing proficiency may influence their source-use patterns (Cumming et al., 2005; Doolan, 2021; Gebril & Plakans, 2013). Unlike the current study which uses writing scores obtained on an IWT to group students by proficiency level before analysing students' source use on a different IWT, some studies have used independent writing tasks to group students by proficiency level (e.g., Asención Delaney, 2008; Cumming et al., 2005) with subsequent examination of participants' source use on an IWT. Others have used one IWT for both the purpose of writing proficiency measures and analysis of source-use patterns (e.g., Doolan, 2021; Weigle & Parker, 2012).

Research investigating students' source-use patterns has often compared the performance of L1 and L2 writers (e.g., Doolan, 2021; Keck, 2006, 2014; Shi, 2004). Although specific

challenges related to L2 learning and language-learner characteristics (e.g., limited language proficiency, repertoire, and/or background knowledge) do exist (Grabe & Zhang, 2013), recent research has begun to shy away from treating these two populations as distinct entities in source-use related matters. Based on their synthesis of IW correlates and moderator variables, Chan and Yamashita (2022) suggest that perhaps the construct of integrated writing is not “substantially different between L1 and L2” (p. 12). Wette (2018) also highlights the difficulty in distinguishing between “L1” or “L2”, noting, for example, “Generation 1.5 students who migrated to an English-speaking country in time to complete their secondary education in English-medium institutions but who may speak their L1 at home” (p. 64). That said, the following literature, which includes L1 versus L2 comparisons, nonetheless provides valuable insight into source-use patterns of high- and low-proficiency writers and consequently, provides context for the discussion of the current study.

Some studies have investigated the relationship between writing proficiency and amount of source information in students’ texts. For instance, Gebril and Plakans (2013) found that the lower-level writers in their study used less source material than the high performers. Neumann, Leu, McDonough, and Crawford (2020) found that students in one of three experimental groups in their study (i.e., the group with lowest language-use level as per scores obtained on a summary writing task) obtained the highest scores for source use on the postintervention writing exam despite an overall lower number of source use instances than other groups. The authors suggest that a prudent selection of source material may result in more accurate use and more appropriate transformation of source language, even for students who display lower writing proficiency.

Other studies have examined the adequacy of attribution to source authors. For example, Weigle and Parker’s (2012) study of (under)graduate students’ source-based writing showed no significant relationship between writing scores and attribution to sources suggesting that writers of all proficiency levels may struggle with this aspect of source use. In contrast, Doolan (2021) found that despite obtaining lower scores of overall writing quality on an IWT, L2 students in his study displayed a more “responsible” use of sources than L1 participants with regard to source attribution, whereas Shi (2004) found that undergraduate L2 writers cited sources less frequently than their L1 counterparts.

Given its interconnectedness with patchwriting, defined by Howard (1992) as “copying from a source text and then deleting some words, altering grammatical structures, or plugging in one-for-one synonym substitutes” (p. 233), students’ ability to transform language from source material has been extensively investigated in both L1 and L2 contexts. Although patchwriting may be “characteristic of undergraduate L2 student writing” (Du, 2019, p. 61), it can potentially lead to plagiarism-related issues (Keck, 2006; Li & Casanave, 2012; Pecorari, 2003; Shi, 2004), thus accounting for the attention devoted to this aspect of source use. Cumming et al.’s (2005) analysis of L2 writers’ source use in reading-to-write summary tasks revealed lower-level writers displayed more instances of verbatim source text use than higher-proficiency writers. Shi (2004) also found that L2 students included more textual borrowing (i.e., use of source language modified to varying degrees and included in student writing with or without reference or

quotation) without references than L1 writers. These findings are echoed by Keck (2006) whose investigation into the summary writing of L1 and L2 writers revealed a higher use of “Near Copies”, defined as “paraphrases which are composed primarily of long copied strings taken from the original excerpt” (p. 268), by L2 writers. Similarly, in his study investigating source use in summaries written by English as a foreign language (EFL) students, Li (2021) found that less-proficient students used more exact copies and fewer paraphrases than those with higher proficiency. In contrast, Weigle and Parker (2012) found only few differences in the amount of textual borrowing by L2 students of different proficiency levels on an argumentative essay noting that non-referenced borrowing occurred more frequently overall. However, they did acknowledge that students who obtained lower scores on the Georgia State Test of English Proficiency (GSTEP) IWTs included longer quotations from source material in their texts than high-scoring students.

In brief, although IWTs remain fundamental in both learning and assessment contexts, they continue to pose a challenge for L1 and L2 writers. As discussed, previous research suggests that the amount of source use, accuracy of source ideas, adequacy of attribution to source authors, and linguistic modification to source material may be influenced by writing-proficiency level and educational experience. Despite evidence of the effectiveness of targeted pedagogical interventions, student writers continue to struggle with source-use challenges as they engage in the complex developmental process of learning to write from sources, and some remain inadequately prepared to meet source-based writing demands at the university level.

Research to date has examined defining characteristics in the work of novice writers as they begin and pursue their postsecondary education. However, it is relevant to cultivate a greater awareness of *preuniversity* L2 writers, to determine their specific needs, and to develop pedagogical interventions appropriate for use in the ESL high-school classroom. In this way, adolescent L2 writers may become better equipped to carry out source-based tasks that await them as they embark on their university career. To this end, this study investigates the following research questions:

1. What is the relationship between adolescent English L2 students’ writing scores on an IWT and their source-use integration patterns on a different IWT?
2. What similarities and differences exist in the source-use integration patterns of high- and low-proficiency adolescent English L2 writers?

Methodology

Research Context

This naturalistic study took place in a public French-medium high school in a bilingual French-English suburban community in Greater Montreal, Canada. The school population consists of approximately 3,400 students from Secondary 1 (Grade 7) through Secondary 5 (Grade 11), and both Core (ESL) and Enriched (EESL) English as a Second Language programs as stipulated in the Quebec Education Program (Ministère de l’Éducation [MEQ], n.d.) are

offered at all levels. Students receive 100 hours of ESL instruction divided into approximately 80 75-minute classes between September and June. The current study targeted students in the EESL program. This population is representative of EESL classrooms in Greater Montreal regarding the diversity of students' L1 background and use of English outside the language classroom. EESL students are “confident second language learners who use English to explore a wide variety of complex issues and abstract ideas” (MEQ, n.d., p. 3) and are equipped to go beyond the Core program requirements. Source-based writing is an integral part of this curriculum. Students are expected to understand, select, and use information from various source materials to write texts for different purposes and audiences using an effective language repertoire and accurate language conventions.

All Secondary 5 students must write a uniform English examination produced by the MEQ and achieve a passing grade in the course to obtain their high-school diploma. The EESL examination requires students to write a 400-word informative text in which ideas from multiple source texts are summarised and presented in the form of a magazine article. Articles are graded by the teacher using an analytical rubric (MEQ, 2023) which clearly states that students' texts must not show evidence of patchwriting, defined as “using phrases from research materials, verbatim or by making minor changes here and there (e.g., deleting, adding or substituting words; changing verb forms or word order), and combining them with one's own writing” (p. 5). Texts containing a significant amount of copied or patchwritten text are considered plagiarism and reported to the Quebec Secondary Diploma and Certification Board.

As part of the required coursework and in preparation for the final examination, these Secondary 5 EESL students wrote four source-based informative texts (i.e., feature articles, discussion essays) during the school year. Three of these were teacher-produced assignments and one was a ministerial uniform examination authorised for use for training purposes. This study took place in the spring, and texts collected for analysis were completed as students' third source-based assignment of the year.

Participants

Invitation to participate was extended to 119 Secondary 5 EESL students in four intact groups taught by the same teacher who had 15 years of teaching experience. Parental consent was obtained for 58 students aged 16 to 18 years ($M = 16.62$, $SD = 0.62$). Participants signed letters of assent granting permission to have their writing used in this study. With the exception of three students who attended primary school in another province or country, all participants attended French-language primary and high school in Quebec. Students' self-identified L1s were as follows: French (41%), English (19%), other (24%), bilingual English/other language (16%).

Procedure

Since the study involved minors under 18, the researcher first obtained authorisation to contact students from the Director of Educational Services and the school principal, then visited the four groups to explain the study and recruit participants. Parental consent forms, letters of assent, and background questionnaires eliciting information about participants' age, gender, place of birth, educational background (i.e., language of instruction in primary and secondary

school), and use of English outside the ESL classroom were distributed. At recruitment time, students had already completed two source-based assignments (i.e., one in-class IWT and one uniform examination used for training purposes). Consent was requested for access to source-based discussion essays completed in class, accompanying evaluation rubrics, and writing scores obtained on the uniform practice examination. Participants returned completed documents to the researcher within two weeks following the initial visit.

Once consent forms were returned, the teacher provided the researcher with writing scores obtained on the practice examination, and participants' ($N = 58$) scores were recorded. Source use and writing ability were assessed on this task by means of two separate evaluation rubrics. To establish a measure of writing-proficiency classification for the purpose of this study, only the result for writing ability was considered. This result did not include a sub-criterion for assessment of source use as the consideration of such would necessarily have resulted in an increase or decrease in writing scores in line with strengths or weaknesses related to students' source-use patterns, consequently overlapping with variables investigated in the study. The writing rubric (MEQ, 2023) contained three weighted criteria: text form (15 points), vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics (20 points), and language register and idiomatic language (15 points), for a total maximum score of 50 points. Since this study examined the relationship between source use and writing proficiency as well as source-integration patterns of high- and low-proficiency adolescent L2 writers, students were classified into two groups based on these writing scores ($M = 43.24$, $SD = 3.54$). Students whose scores were above and below 0.5 standard deviation from the mean were grouped into high- ($N = 25$) and low-proficiency ($N = 18$) levels, respectively. Subsequent essays written by these 43 students ranging from age 16 to 18 ($M = 16.65$, $SD = 0.65$) were retained for analysis.

These naturalistic data consisted of a discussion essay in which students summarised expert opinions for and against a current issue (i.e., sexting among teenagers) presented in source material. Students completed the task over two 75-minute class periods. Three days before the first class, students received three source texts ranging from 563 to 1,129 words. They were allowed to highlight information in the texts and take notes in the margins. In line with restrictions imposed for the high-school-leaving exam, the teacher did not discuss the content of texts with students. As per the two source-based tasks completed earlier in the year, students were instructed to use quotations sparingly, avoid verbatim copying and patchwriting, and provide adequate attribution to source authors in their essays. Students were not taught a specific citation style. Rather, they were instructed to provide the author's name and article title for each instance of source use and were given examples of reporting phrases (e.g., In the article, "The Dangers of Teen Sexting", Dr. Lohmann notes that...) to use in their essays. The essays were completed during the second class period after which the researcher photocopied those written by students who had agreed to participate. Once grading was complete, the researcher obtained participants' evaluation rubrics from the teacher.

Analysis

The essays were transcribed by the researcher and verified to ensure accuracy of transcription. Since accuracy of language (i.e., spelling, grammar, capitalization, and punctuation) was not a variable under investigation in this study and to facilitate readability during analysis, minor spelling errors were corrected. The 43 essays ranged in length from 276 to 603 words with a mean of 442 words ($SD = 73.42$).

Guided by prior research on source-use integration skills of students at the undergraduate level (Du, 2019; Gebril & Plakans, 2013; Keck, 2006, 2014; McDonough et al., 2014; Neumann et al., 2019; Neumann, Leu, McDonough, & Crawford, 2020; Shi, 2004; Uludag et al., 2019; Wette, 2018), this study investigated the relationship between source use and writing scores and differences in source-use patterns of high- and low-proficiency adolescent L2 writers as demonstrated through: (a) total amount of source use, (b) adequacy of attribution to source authors, (c) accuracy of information drawn from sources, and (d) language used to integrate information from source material.

The researcher developed a preliminary coding scheme for each variable based on previous studies (Du, 2019; Neumann et al., 2019; Uludag et al., 2019), tested it on a random sample (10% of the data), and made adjustments as required. The basic unit of analysis was the orthographic sentence, defined by McDonough et al. (2014) as “a sequence of words ... [starting] with a capital letter and [ending] with a period, regardless of its grammatical status” (p. 24). The only exceptions to this were sentence fragments or phrases that started with a capital letter and ended with a period and which served as citations to the previous sentence (e.g., “According to the article, ‘Sexting and the Law’”). In these (rare) instances, the citation was considered part of the preceding sentence.

Once the final coding scheme was developed, a research assistant was trained and independently coded a subset of the data (i.e., six essays or approximately 15%) for the four variables under investigation. To determine interrater reliability, two-way mixed-effects single-measures intraclass correlation coefficients were calculated for amount of source use (.67), attribution to source authors (.99), and accuracy of source use (.83). Interrater reliability analysis using Cohen’s Kappa was performed to determine consistency among raters for language used to integrate source material (.91). Tables 1 to 4 provide examples of the coding categories.

Type and Amount of Source Use

To determine the total amount of source use in each essay, each sentence was analysed to determine if it contained an example, fact, or idea (Uludag et al., 2019) which could be traced to source material (Keck, 2006; Shi, 2004). In line with Uludag et al. (2019), “topic sentences and statements of common knowledge were not counted as source-text use” (p. 3). In addition, sentences intended as a citation for those that preceded them (e.g., “This was mentioned in ‘Caught your teen sexting?...’ by Sonja Haller.”) and sentences referring to general content or which summarised information within source texts (e.g., “Sonja Hinduja, Ph.D., and Justin W. Patchin, Ph.D., tell us all the ways that someone can partake in the activities safely.”) were not coded as source use. The mean amount of source use per essay was then calculated by dividing the number of sentences containing source use by the total number of sentences in the essay.

Table 1*Type of Source Use Coding with Examples*

Code	Description	Example from student text	Excerpt from source text
Idea	Idea traced to sentence(s) in source text	Furthermore, another reason to send nudes is because of love.	“Why are teens doing it?... They may be in love” (Lohmann, 2012, “Why?” section).
Example	Example traced to sentence(s) in source text	Like what Dr. Lohmann states that their friends could single them out by using the statement “everyone is doing it.”	“You may feel pressured to have some too, especially if your friends single you out if you don't ... you may feel you need to do the same since ‘everyone else is doing it’” (Lohmann, 2012, “Why?” section).
Fact	Fact or statistic traced to sentence(s) in source text	Firstly, sexting is now quite common enough that a study revealed 27% of teens aged between 12 and 17 have already received a sext.	“[Researchers] found that 15% and 27% of teens ages 12 to 17 had sent and received sexts, respectively” (Haller, 2019, “Consensual Sexting” section).

Adequacy of Attribution to Source Authors

For this variable, Du’s (2019) scoring rubric was adapted to a three-point scale. Since students were not explicitly taught a specific citation style, this was scored as shown in Table 2. Once sentences containing source use in student texts were scored for adequacy of attribution, the mean was calculated by dividing the total score obtained by the total number of sentences containing source use in the essay. Sentences containing an implicit citation or for which no citation was necessary were not considered in this calculation.

Accuracy of Information Drawn from Sources

Each instance of source use identified in student texts was scored for accuracy. Linguistic modification to language taken from source texts as well as lexical and grammatical accuracy were not taken into account when coding for content accuracy (Uludag et al., 2019). In addition, direct quotations were not scored for accuracy (Storch, 2012). Neumann et al.’s (2019) three-point scale was adapted and used for scoring. Examples and explanations are provided in Table 3. Once each instance of source use was scored for accuracy, the mean was calculated by dividing the total score by the total number of sentences containing source use in the essay.

Table 2*Adequacy of Source Attribution Scoring with Examples*

Score	Description	Example from student text
2	Student provides author's or expert's name and title of article/magazine.	Indeed, as explained by <u>Raychelle Cassada Lohmann, Ph.D.</u> in her text " <u>The Dangers of Teen Sexting</u> ": the prefrontal cortex is not completely developed for teens.
1	Student attempts to identify source by providing information such as name of expert, title of article, or reporting phrase.	<u>The University of Utah's Department of Psychology</u> mentioned that 25 percent of the teens who received nudes had forwarded it to someone else. In fact, <u>Sonja explains</u> that this kind of "proper" sexting among, generally older, teens can be viewed as "healthy relating".
0	Student makes no reference to source material.	Peer pressure is mainly why it is not recommended.

Table 3*Accuracy of Source Use Scoring with Examples*

Score	Description	Example from student text	Excerpt from source text	Explanation
2	Information correctly reflects ideas, facts, and/or statistics in source material.	In addition, according to the text "Sexting: Advice for Teens" by Sameer Hinduja, Ph.D., and Justin W. Patchin, Ph.D., sexting is a natural action that many people partake in during a relationship.	"Sharing pictures with romantic partners is a natural part of any relationship" (Hinduja & Patchin, 2018).	
1	Information is mostly accurate but may be misinterpreted; original meaning may be modified slightly.	If other teens see your sext, they could decide to bully you because of it. This could make you scared to go to school and it	"Another emotional catch is that sexting may lead to bullying for the teen whose photos have been solicited to others. This creates a harsh	Student adds (plausible) idea that the threat of bullying could create fear of going to school.

Score	Description	Example from student text	Excerpt from source text	Explanation
		creates a world of stress around you.	world for a teen to live” (Lohmann, 2012, “Emotional Consequences” section).	However, this is not explicitly mentioned by the author.
0	Information is unclear, misleading, confusing, or misrepresents source ideas; statistics are incorrectly reported.	Developing sexually transmitted viruses can lead to multiple consequences, including death.	“Also, it is important to discuss the consequences of acting out sexually (pregnancy, STDs, etc.)” (Lohmann, 2012, “Protect your Teen” section).	Student draws conclusions based on extrapolation of source information.

Language Used to Integrate Information from Source Material

The coding scheme for this variable was developed by adapting those used in prior research (i.e., Gebril & Plakans, 2013; Neumann et al., 2019; Shi, 2004). The three main categories of language use were: direct quotations (with quotation marks and citation of source or with implicit citation of source), indirect source use (paraphrase of source information with explicit or implicit citation of source, no citation of source, or no citation necessary), and verbatim copying without quotation marks (with or without citation of source). As per Neumann et al. (2019), implicit citation occurred when “students cited the source in one sentence and continued to discuss information from that source in the following sentence” (p. 109). All instances of explicit citation were deemed as such, even if source-use attribution was only somewhat adequate.

Prior research has discussed the optimal measure to define verbatim copying when analysing copied strings from source material (e.g., Cumming et al., 2005; Gebril & Plakans, 2013; Keck, 2006; Shi, 2004). In this study, verbatim copying was defined as any four or more consecutive words taken from the source text (Shi, 2004) and included in students’ essays without quotation marks. Borrowed strings which included only minor changes (e.g., pronoun to noun change; substitution of article, preposition, or conjunction; reordering of words) were also coded as verbatim copying. However, reporting phrases or attributions to experts (e.g., “University of Texas researchers confirmed that”) were disregarded when coding for this variable even if they were copied verbatim. An additional subcategory (i.e., verbatim copying without quotation marks but with implicit citation of source) was added to the coding scheme based on evidence in the data. Examples of the nine coding categories are provided in Table 4. Once the total amount of each type of language use was determined for the essay, ratios were

calculated by dividing the number of instances of each type by the total number of sentences containing source use in the essay.

Table 4*Language Used to Integrate Information from Source Material with Examples*

Code	Definition	Example from student text	Excerpt from source text
DQC	Direct quotation with quotation marks and explicit citation	Jeff Temple, researcher at the University of Texas states that <u>“its not only normal but a developmental and biological imperative.”</u>	“However, Temple is working off a ‘truth’ that ‘adolescents’ exploration of their sexual identity is <u>not only normal but a developmental and biological imperative</u> ” (Haller, 2019, “Consensual Sexting” section).
DQIC	Direct quotation with quotation marks and implicit citation	According to the text, “The Dangers of Teen Sexting” the brain area that is responsible for problem solving, impulse control and choosing the best option is not fully developed for teenagers. Moreover, the same text states that <u>“A third of the teens stated that they didn’t think about the legal ramifications or consequences of their actions.”</u>	“Sadly <u>a third of the teens stated that they didn’t think about the legal ramifications or consequences of their actions</u> ” (Lohmann, 2012, “Recent Research” section).
VBC	Verbatim copying without quotation marks but with explicit citation	Several Texas researchers associated <u>sending and receiving unwanted sexts</u> with symptoms of increased <u>stress, anxiety and depression</u> in adolescents.	“While <u>sending and receiving unwanted sexts</u> has been associated with higher reports of <u>depression, anxiety and stress</u> , wanted sexts were not linked to psychological distress according to a published 2019 study, Texas researchers pointed out” (Haller, 2019, “Consensual Sexting” section).
VBNC	Verbatim copying without quotation marks and with no citation	This type of exchange <u>can lead to bullying</u> due to the pictures that <u>have been solicited to others.</u>	“Another emotional catch is that sexting <u>may lead to bullying</u> for the teen whose photos <u>have been solicited to others</u> ” (Lohmann, 2012, “Emotional Consequences” section).

Code	Definition	Example from student text	Excerpt from source text
VBIC	Verbatim copying without quotation marks but with implicit citation	That number should be higher when we look at Jeff R. Temple, lead researcher and University of Texas Medical Branch director, saying that adolescents exploring their sexual identity is not only normal but it's a developmental and biological imperative. He also states that other researchers <u>failed to distinguish sexts that were</u> wanted and sexts that were not.	"However, Temple is working off a 'truth' that 'adolescents' exploration of their sexual identity is not only normal but a developmental and biological imperative," according to the published paper. The problem with existing sexting studies is that they <u>failed to distinguish between sexts that were</u> sent or received and were consensual, non-consensual, or coerced" (Haller, 2019, "Consensual Sexting" section).
ISUC	Indirect source use with explicit citation	Also <u>bullying can result after participating in sexting</u> according to Raychelle Cassada Lohmann.	"Another emotional catch is that sexting may lead to bullying for the teen whose photos have been solicited to others" (Lohmann, 2012, "Emotional Consequences" section).
ISUNC	Indirect source use with no citation	<u>Exchanging sext with your partner that you trust is a normal step of a relationship.</u>	"Sharing pictures with romantic partners is a natural part of any relationship" (Hinduja & Patchin, 2018).
ISUIC	Indirect source use with implicit citation	According to Jeff R. Temple, lead researcher and University of Texas Medical Branch director of behavioural health and research, the exploration of a teen's sexual identity is normal and part of growing up. <u>Sexting can encourage that healthy exploration if handled well.</u>	"In a new research paper published this week in Lancet Child Adolescent Health, researchers concluded that consensual sexting 'in a committed partnership might be indicative of healthy exploration'" (Haller, 2019, para. 1).
ISUNCN	Indirect source use with no citation necessary	At that age, hormones are really starting to take over your minds and you may want to start flirting or maybe they engage in sexual intercourses with their partners.	Information is mined from source texts but is too general to pinpoint to a specific sentence; information can be traced to more than one source text.

Note. Underlined portions indicate examples of students' transformation of language from source texts.

Results

This section presents the findings regarding both research questions. An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests. Effect sizes for mean differences and correlations were calculated and reported following Plonsky and Oswald's (2014)² field-specific benchmarks of small ($d = .40$, $r = .25$), medium ($d = .70$, $r = .40$), and large ($d = 1$, $r = .60$) for applied linguistics research.

Relationship Between Writing Scores and Source-Use Integration Patterns

The 43 essays contained a total of 550 ($M = 12.79$, $SD = 3.50$) instances of source use with a mean ratio of .58 ($SD = .11$) per essay. Examination of adequacy of attribution to source author scores suggested most students experienced considerable difficulty in their citation practices with a mean of 0.57 out of 2 ($SD = 0.35$). However, participants generally used source information accurately overall ($M = 1.71/2$, $SD = 0.24$). As shown in Table 5, all categories of language used to integrate information from source material (i.e., direct quotations, verbatim copying, indirect source use) were represented in the corpus. However, texts showed very little evidence of direct quotations with implicit citation and indirect source use with no citation necessary. The most frequently used types of linguistic modification were indirect source use without citation ($M = .39$, $SD = .24$) and with citation ($M = .16$, $SD = .19$) followed by verbatim source use with citation ($M = .14$, $SD = .13$).

Pearson correlation coefficients (two-tailed) were calculated to investigate the relationship between writing scores and each variable. Results indicated a non-significant positive correlation between writing scores and amount of source use (.20). A statistically significant positive relationship was found between both writing scores and adequacy of attribution to source authors (.40), and writing scores and accuracy of source use (.50) with a medium effect size. As indicated in Table 5, coefficients computed to investigate the correlation between scores and each type of linguistic modification ranged from -.36 to .31. However, these were only found to be statistically significant for verbatim copying with no citation, indirect source use with citation, and indirect source use with implicit citation. A small effect size was found for these relationships.

Table 5

Means, Standard Deviations, Correlation Coefficients Between Writing Score and Other Variables

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>r</i>
Writing score	43.09	4.17	-

² Plonsky and Oswald (2014) examined effect sizes for mean differences (d values) and correlations (r) as reported in 346 primary studies and 91 meta-analyses to establish a scale specific to L2 research for the interpretation of effect sizes.

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>r</i>
Amount of source use	.58	.11	.20
Attribution to source authors score	0.57	0.35	.40**
Accuracy score	1.71	0.24	.50***
DQC	.08	.11	-.10
DQIC	.00	.01	.13
VBC	.14	.13	.08
VBNC	.12	.12	-.36*
VBIC	.02	.05	-.03
ISUC	.16	.19	.31*
ISUNC	.39	.24	-.17
ISUIC	.08	.08	.31*
ISUNCN	.01	.03	.08

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

Source-Use Integration Patterns of High- and Low-Proficiency L2 Writers

Table 6 provides the descriptive statistics for all variables for both groups. Independent samples *t*-tests were used to investigate the variation between high- and low-proficiency groups for each variable. Levene's test for equality of variances ($p > .05$) was found to be violated for the following: accuracy of source use, direct quotation with implicit citation, verbatim copying without citation, verbatim copying with implicit citation, indirect source use with citation. A *t* statistic not assuming homogeneity of variance was computed for these variables (see Table 7).

No significant difference was found in the mean amount of source use between the two groups ($t = 1.29$), with a small effect size. Statistically significant differences were found between the mean scores for adequacy of attribution to source authors ($t = 2.37$), and accuracy of source use ($t = 2.73$), with medium effect sizes of $d = .73$ and $d = .91$, respectively. A statistically significant difference was found between the means of the two groups for verbatim copying with no citation ($t = -2.26$), and indirect source use with implicit citation ($t = 2.11$), with medium ($d = -.76$) and small to medium ($d = .65$) effect sizes respectively. No significant differences were found for direct quotations with citation and implicit citation, verbatim copying with citation and with implicit citation, or the other types of indirect source use (i.e., with citation, without citation and with no citation necessary).

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations, and Standard Error Means for all Variables by Proficiency Level

Variable	Proficiency	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>SE</i>
Writing score	High	46.28	1.31	.26
	Low	38.67	2.20	.52
Amount of source use	High	.60	.09	.02

Variable	Proficiency	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>SE</i>
Attribution to source authors	Low	.55	.13	.03
	High	0.67	0.38	.08
Accuracy of source use	Low	0.43	0.24	.06
	High	1.79	0.17	.03
	Low	1.59	0.28	.07
Language Integration Type				
DQC	High	.06	.12	.02
	Low	.09	.10	.02
DQIC	High	.01	.02	.00
	Low	.00	.00	.00
VBC	High	.16	.16	.03
	Low	.12	.08	.02
VBNC	High	.08	.09	.02
	Low	.17	.15	.04
VBIC	High	.02	.03	.01
	Low	.03	.06	.01
ISUC	High	.20	.21	.04
	Low	.11	.14	.03
ISUNC	High	.36	.24	.05
	Low	.43	.23	.05
ISUIC	High	.10	.09	.02
	Low	.05	.06	.01
ISUNCN	High	.01	.03	.01
	Low	.00	.02	.00

Table 7

Results of Independent Samples t-Tests and Effect Sizes for All Variables

Variable	Mean Difference	Standard Error Difference	95% CI		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
			<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>				
Amount of source use	.04	.03	-.02	.11	1.29 ⁺	41	.204	0.40
Attribution to source authors score	0.24	0.10	0.04	0.45	2.37 ⁺	41	.023	0.73
Accuracy score	0.20	0.07	0.05	0.35	2.73 ⁺⁺	26.48	.011	0.91
DQC	-.03	.03	-.10	.04	-.85 ⁺	41	.399	-0.26
DQIC	.01	.00	.00	.01	1.44 ⁺⁺	24	.164	0.38

Variable	Mean Difference	Standard Error Difference	95% CI		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
			<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>				
VBC	.03	.04	-.05	.12	.78 [†]	41	.439	0.24
VBNC	-.09	.04	-.17	-.01	-2.26 ^{††}	24.90	.033	-0.76
VBIC	-.01	.02	-.04	.02	-.78 ^{††}	25.14	.441	-0.26
ISUC	.10	.05	-.01	.20	1.86 ^{††}	40.65	.070	0.54
ISUNC	-.06	.07	-.21	.09	-.85 [†]	41	.401	-0.26
ISUIC	.05	.02	.00	.10	2.11 [†]	41	.041	0.65
ISUNCN	.01	.01	-.01	.02	.93 [†]	41	.357	0.29

Note. CI = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

[†]equal variances assumed. ^{††}equal variances not assumed.

Discussion

This study is unique in its focus on the source-based writing of high-school English L2 writers. Its design differs from those discussed in the literature review in its use of writing scores obtained on a separate IWT to group students by proficiency level and subsequent analysis of source-use patterns on a different IWT. Given that source-based writing is a construct in its own right requiring complex interplay between reading and writing skills, thus different to the skills and processes elicited in independent writing tasks (Asención Delaney, 2008; Plakans, 2008, 2009), and that the use of a single IWT for both writing-proficiency classification and analysis inevitably melds source-use and writing abilities, it was deemed preferable to use two separate IWTs for the purpose of classification and analysis.

Due to the sparsity of research available regarding the source-based writing of this population, findings are discussed against studies conducted at the tertiary level. Thus, results shed light on the relationship between students' writing scores and source-use patterns, illustrate similarities and differences in the source use of high- and low-proficiency adolescent writers, and provide grounds for comparison between high-school writers and their university counterparts.

In terms of the relationship between students' writing scores and source use, a negative correlation (see Table 5 for all *r* values) was found between scores and verbatim source use without citation, whereas a positive correlation was found between scores and adequacy of attribution to source authors, accuracy of source use, indirect source use with citation and with implicit citation. Regarding the transformation of source language, some similar patterns were observed between high-school and tertiary writers. For example, students' use of direct quotations was minimal (e.g., Chen & Wang, 2022; Doolan, 2021; Neumann et al., 2019; Weigle & Parker, 2012) and did not appear to be related to writing scores (Cumming et al., 2005; Gebriel & Plakans, 2013). Likewise, the two most frequently used language types in this study (i.e., indirect source use with and without citation) align with those noted by Neumann et al. (2019) and Chen and Wang (2022). As writing scores increased, there were fewer instances of verbatim

copying without citation in students' texts and more indirect source use with citation and implicit citation. This is also in line with some prior research (Cumming et al., 2005; Gebril & Plakans, 2013). However, it contrasts with Doolan (2021), whose L2 students included more (indirectly) referenced paraphrases than L1 students despite higher overall writing scores obtained by the latter. Increased scores were also associated with an increase in attribution to source authors, although most students still experienced considerable difficulty in this regard. Although a specific citation style was not explicitly taught, this result is somewhat surprising since students had previously received feedback on two IWTs, were given examples of reporting phrases, and were instructed to provide attributions for any information stemming from source material. Previous studies have documented similar struggles experienced by university students (e.g., Neumann et al., 2019; Storch, 2012). Indeed, Weigle and Parker's (2012) participants failed to provide an attribution to source texts most of the time regardless of test scores.

Although no correlation was found between writing scores and the amount of source use in students' texts, data showed that essays contained a substantial amount of source information despite the exclusion of thesis statements and topic sentences from the source-use count. In addition, these high-school writers used more source information than Uludag et al.'s (2019) undergraduates. That said, the latter were subject to stricter time constraints in the different phases of the task, potentially limiting use of source material. However, despite the considerable amount of source use in their essays, these high-school students generally represented information accurately, and their ability to do so increased with writing scores. Limited research exists investigating accuracy of source-use representation in L2 writing (Neumann et al., 2019), and to the author's knowledge, few studies examine its correlation with writing scores. Nonetheless, the findings of this study show that adolescent writers' ability to accurately use source information matched, and at times surpassed, that of their (post)novice university-level counterparts (e.g., Chen & Wang, 2022; Du, 2019; Neumann et al., 2019; Storch, 2012; Uludag et al., 2019; Wette, 2010, 2017, 2018), a notable feat given potential challenges related to the number (i.e., three) of source inputs (Chan & Yamashita, 2022; Doolan, 2021) and restrictions regarding support provided by the teacher.

In sum, as writing scores increased, students displayed more accurate use of source information and a developing awareness of the need to provide references to source material for both verbatim and indirect source use. However, evidence of patchwriting remained. Since source texts were provided by the teacher making instances of potential plagiarism easily identifiable, it is unlikely students would have intentionally omitted citations to pass off ideas as their own (Neumann et al., 2019), instead perhaps believing explicit reference to be facultative at times. Moreover, the evidence of verbatim copying *with* citation suggests students recognized the need for attribution when using word-for-word source language. Similarly, with indirect source use accounting for over half the language in their texts, students in this educational context demonstrated a concerted effort to paraphrase source ideas but perhaps underestimated the importance of providing attributions even when attempts were made to transform source language.

The second research question compared the source-use integration patterns of high- and low-proficiency adolescent L2 writers. Independent samples *t*-tests (see Table 7 for all *t* values) showed statistically significant differences between the two groups for verbatim copying without

citation. This aligns with some previous studies (e.g., Cumming et al., 2005; Li, 2021) but contrasts with others (e.g., Gebril & Plakans, 2013; Weigle & Parker 2012). Significant differences were also found regarding indirect source use with implicit citation. In contrast to Neumann et al. (2019), this remained infrequently used overall. Since using implicit citation entails the ability to introduce an idea in one sentence and to elaborate on this idea in others, it is perhaps not surprising that this manipulation of source information occurred only occasionally among the adolescents in this study and to a greater degree by high-proficiency writers. Significant differences between the two groups were also observed in scores for accuracy of source use and attribution to source authors. Although students generally represented source ideas accurately, the high-proficiency group outperformed the low-proficiency group in this regard. This echoes Du (2019), whose high-performing sophomores obtained higher scores for “representation of source ideas” than low-performing students. Finally, the high-proficiency students in the current study also provided more adequate attributions to source authors. Although this is in keeping with Cumming et al.’s (2005) and Du’s (2019) L2 research, investigations comparing source-attribution practices of L1 and L2 undergraduate writers have produced conflicting results (e.g., Doolan, 2021; Shi, 2004). The struggle with source attribution displayed by both groups in the current study along with seemingly inconclusive findings in others corroborate Doolan’s (2021) claim that “educators, students, and researchers would do well to more clearly understand (a) how common indirectly and uncited source use is, (b) when source citation is required, and (c) when using source ideas without including a citation is widely-accepted” (p. 138).

Although a statistically significant positive correlation was found between writing scores and indirect source use with citation, no significant differences between group means were found for this variable and indirect source use without citation, the most frequently used type of language integration overall. In addition, no significant difference was noted in the amount of source information used by the two groups. This concords with Plakans and Gebril’s (2012) follow-up investigation into the relationship between writing proficiency and source use by a small sub-group of their EFL participants. In contrast, Gebril and Plakans (2013) found lower-proficiency EFL writers used source material less than higher-proficiency writers, whereas Doolan (2021) noted L2 FYC writers used more source information than their L1 counterparts in one of two prompts. Although Gebril and Plakans (2013) suggest “limited linguistic resources” may hinder students’ ability to use source information in their essays, students in both groups in the current study had seemingly crossed the “proficiency threshold” (p. 22) necessary to understand and use information provided in source texts. In terms of students’ use of direct quotations, the findings here echo those of Gebril and Plakans (2013) and Weigle and Parker (2012) who also found no significant difference between the means of different proficiency groups. Students’ infrequent use of direct quotations in the current study is unsurprising as they were instructed to use quotations sparingly. In addition, Hirvela and Du (2013) suggest that direct quotations act as a safeguard when students lack the ability to accurately represent the meaning of source information. That source ideas were used with a high level of accuracy in this study suggests students in both proficiency groups felt confident in their comprehension abilities to move beyond reliance on quoting directly from source texts.

In brief, the source-based writing of the high-proficiency adolescent L2 writers was characterized by a more accurate use of source information and a tendency to provide more

adequate attributions to source authors than their low-proficiency peers. Furthermore, while the former demonstrated an occasional attempt to include indirect source use with implicit citation in their essays, those written by the latter contained more instances of verbatim copying without citation.

The current findings imply that, like their tertiary-level counterparts, high-school L2 writers are cognitively and linguistically ready to carry out IWTs. However, they require guidance and support in certain subskills (i.e., citation practices, paraphrasing) related to source use. The challenges displayed by students in both proficiency groups suggest that it would be relevant to design pedagogical interventions to raise students' awareness of both *when* and *how* (Doolan, 2021; Wette, 2021) to include citations. For instance, these writers would perhaps have benefited from explicit instruction on how to use a specific citation style rather than relying solely on examples of reporting phrases. Moreover, since the low-proficiency writers faced greater challenges transforming language from source material and relied more heavily on verbatim copying, it might be relevant to implement differentiated paraphrasing instruction (e.g., Du, 2019) for each subgroup and include systematic practice of these subskills as part of this high-school curriculum.

Conclusion

This study reports on the relationship between writing scores and source use and highlights similarities and differences in the source-integration patterns of high- and low-proficiency adolescent L2 writers and how they fare in comparison to (under)graduate writers. Evidently, the small sample size and specific population limit the potential for generalizability of results. Since these students were enrolled in an enriched English program, they had already achieved a certain level of language proficiency. Furthermore, the high- and low-proficiency groups were determined by use of writing scores that fell within 0.5 standard deviation from the mean. This may not have been a great enough distinction to expose significant variations in patterns between groups.

Despite these limitations, this study provides initial insight into the source use of a population that has not been well documented to date and reveals findings that have implications for writing pedagogy in the high-school L2 classroom. Firstly, results suggest that the high-school students' performance on IWTs bears greater similarities than differences to that of writers in higher education. As such, the constancy of the construct of source-based writing and its related challenges may perhaps transcend the particularities of diverse contexts. That is not to advocate a one-size-fits-all approach to writing pedagogy. Indeed, adolescent writers constitute a unique population which merits thorough understanding and interventions designed in consideration of its distinctness (Ortmeier-Hooper & Enright, 2011; Silva, 1993). However, effective source use is a developmental process (Storch 2012; Wette, 2010), and for these students, that process has clearly begun. Tertiary-level research has demonstrated the efficacy of explicit instruction and practice on certain source-use operations (Du, 2019; Storch, 2012; Wette, 2010). An incremental application of these or similar practices should become a constitutive part of the secondary curriculum.

This study validates adolescent L2 writers' readiness to handle the demands of source-based writing and lends weight to Grabe and Zhang's (2013) call for early implementation of explicit instruction and practice in IWTs. Future research could compare the source-based writing of high-school writers in core English programs with lower proficiency levels to that of advanced learners, potentially revealing more subtleties in the source-use patterns of these two adolescent populations. Once these discerning characteristics have been identified, pedagogical interventions relevant to each stage could be developed (Wette, 2010) and studied in the high-school classroom. This could help adolescent writers consolidate their source-use practices, be better equipped for source-based writing at the postsecondary level, and hasten their progress toward becoming proficient academic writers.

Chapter Three

The previous chapter concluded with a brief discussion as to possible future directions for research on source-based writing pedagogy in the high-school language classroom. This final chapter furthers this deliberation and elaborates on the pedagogical implications that stem from the study's findings.

As mentioned, a substantial body of research conducted over the last few decades has informed the field as to challenges related to source-based writing at the tertiary level (e.g., Asención Delaney, 2008; Chen & Wang, 2022; Hirvela & Du, 2013; Neumann et al., 2019; Keck, 2006; Wette, 2010) and has provided evidence that shortcomings endure even in the work of students at the postgraduate level (Pecorari, 2003). Some recent studies have shed light on the effectiveness of pedagogical interventions targeting different aspects of source use (Cooney et al., 2018; Cumming et al., 2016; Doolan & Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2016; Du, 2019; Liu et al., 2016; Neumann, Leu, McDonough, & Crawford, 2020), and the endorsement of early implementation and sufficient practice in source-use subskills has ensued (Cumming et al., 2016; Cooney et al., 2018; Du, 2019; Wette, 2021). Other scholars continue to investigate the construct of integrated writing (e.g., Chan & Yamashita, 2022) in the aim to consolidate understanding of the different factors which may impact students' performance on integrated writing tasks (IWTs). In light of this, it seems that we have not yet exhausted the subject of source-based writing and that for novice L1 or L2 writers, the pathway to attain "legitimate, effective source use" (Wette, 2021, p. 13) may still remain somewhat obscure.

Consequently, this thesis was motivated by the underlying question as to what must be done in order to help students become effective source-based writers and avoid potential setbacks in their academic pathways because of deficient source-use practices as well as the speculation that systematic, planned intervention at earlier points in students' education could contribute to more effective source-based writing at the tertiary level. However, to conduct research examining the efficacy of pedagogical interventions at the secondary level without first taking stock of the source-use patterns of high-school L2 writers would be premature. As such, this study constitutes a contribution in that regard and lays the foundation for further research in this domain.

Implications for Education

The identification of source-use patterns and challenges in the writing of high- and low-proficiency adolescent L2 writers has certain pedagogical implications. To begin, while students in both groups in the current study had reached a level of proficiency which allowed them to sufficiently comprehend information from multiple sources and use it accurately in their own writing, most experienced difficulty in providing adequate attribution to source authors. This is characteristic of the work of novice and postnovice writers (Wette, 2021). However, it is also an aspect of source use which has proven responsive to instruction (Du, 2019; McDonough et al., 2014; Storch, 2012). Indeed, Wette (2010) notes that "mechanical and rule-governed components appear to be readily learned, even after a short unit" (p. 169). This is encouraging in that what might be considered the most significant problem area identified in the context of this study is one that can be addressed and rectified by means of explicit instruction and this, in a relatively

short period of time. Thus, the teaching of source-citation skills and perhaps even a specific citation style would be a relevant addition to this curriculum. In the same way, the most frequently used type of language transformation in this study was indirect source use *without* citation. Therefore, students attempted to paraphrase source material but again, attribution to source authors was either inadequate or omitted completely. Thus, together with explicit instruction on *how* to accurately cite sources, instructors in this educational context could integrate instruction on *when* to do so (Doolan, 2021; Wette, 2021).

Moreover, although there was a marked attempt on the students' part to transform source language in their essays, lingering evidence of verbatim source use by writers in both groups suggests that they would benefit from targeted paraphrasing instruction (e.g., Doolan & Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2016; McDonough et al., 2014; Storch, 2012; Wette, 2010) in order to decrease instances of patchwriting. As mentioned, given that the source material was provided by the teacher, it is unlikely that students copied with intention to deceive, and the debate on deceptive versus unintentional plagiarism (Howard et al., 2010; Pecorari, 2003, 2015; Wette, 2021) is not to be undertaken here. Indeed, Wette (2021) affirms that “non-deceptive plagiarism (usually in the form of patchwriting) is a developmental stage that novices will pass through if provided with instruction, guidance, and opportunities for extensive practice” (p. 8). Pecorari (2015) even speculates as to “whether students who are encouraged to patchwrite can become better, autonomous writers” (p. 97). This raises an interesting point. Indeed, Leu and Neumann (in press) expand on this consideration and call for the development of pedagogical interventions designed to help students make deliberate use of language from source material as a language-learning tool with the aim of helping them gradually reduce their dependency on it. In so doing, novice writers can eventually become more autonomous in their transformation of source language in ways that comply with institutional policies on plagiarism (Leu & Neumann, in press).

The students in this study, to varying degrees, displayed evidence of both indirect source use (i.e., paraphrasing) and verbatim copying, and in both cases, with and without citation. These inconsistencies suggest uncertainty on their part as to what effective and appropriate source use looks like in practice. In consideration of this, it would seem that these adolescent writers presume that when source language has been paraphrased, attribution can be omitted, or that when source language has been copied verbatim but includes a citation, it is considered an acceptable practice. Thus, to rectify these types of misconceptions, teachers could provide examples and counterexamples of paraphrases and citations (Du, 2019; Wette, 2021) and have students edit incorrect usage of each. Given that the high-school-leaving exam is a high-stakes assessment and one in which patchwriting can lead to serious repercussions, preparation carried out during the school year could include having students work from sentences in source texts and practise making minimal modifications to source language (i.e., patchwriting) eventually progressing to substantial revisions (Keck, 2006). Furthermore, this instruction could be differentiated for students in each subgroup depending on their current level of ability, beginning with, for example, instruction in either word- or sentence-level modification techniques (McDonough et al., 2014). Alternately, students could be guided through the steps of Leu and Neumann's (in press) proposed sequential approach gradually moving from the inclusion of whole-sentence quotations from source texts in their work to quoted phrases and eventually, to the paraphrasing or summarising phase. Perhaps being supported through a process such as this

along with being provided with examples of patchwritten through to paraphrased text would help students better understand the phenomenon and eventually reduce the occurrence of patchwriting in their own work.

Along with challenges faced by students in both proficiency groups, the low-proficiency writers in this study experienced struggles of their own. Indeed, these students showed more evidence of verbatim copying without citation than those in the high-proficiency group and a lower score in accuracy of source use, albeit this did remain relatively high overall. In addition to reasons previously stated, this dependence on verbatim copying and less accurate representation of source ideas could be attributed to a lack of thorough understanding of source material on their part. In this way, explicit reading-comprehension instruction (e.g., providing guiding questions and allowing students to discuss the content of source texts in small groups) as well as vocabulary-building exercises (Neumann, Leu, McDonough, & Crawford, 2020) would perhaps be relevant for this subgroup. Since teachers in this particular context are forbidden from discussing source material with students in the preparatory phase of the ministerial examination, these types of practice exercises should be carried out with texts of similar length and complexity level during the execution of in-class IWTs.

Implications for Research

In addition to implications for L2 writing pedagogy, the findings outlined here have ramifications for future research. In the first place, one line of study would be to investigate the efficacy of the aforementioned instructional techniques in a high-school language classroom. For example, Doolan and Fitzsimmons-Doolan (2016) affirm that their series of reading-to-write curricular interventions would be suitable for use in the high-school context. Likewise, Cooney et al. (2018) adopted a sequential approach in their series of learning and practice activities targeting specific subskills (e.g., paraphrasing, summarising, evaluating sources) developed to guide first-year university students through the process of learning to write from sources. These activities would potentially be adaptable to the secondary level. It would be pertinent to explore the impact that interventions such as these may have in contexts like the one addressed in the current study.

Next, the first chapter of this thesis discussed scholars' perspectives regarding effective source use as a developmental trajectory with distinct stages and patterns (Storch, 2012; Wette, 2017, 2021) and the need for pedagogical interventions designed to target each of the source-based writing subskills (e.g., Cooney et al., 2018; Doolan & Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2016; Du, 2019) at each stage of development (Wette, 2010, 2017, 2021). Based on the results of this study, we can conclude that the source-text use of these advanced English L2 learners displayed multiple characteristics of novice and postnovice writers (Wette, 2021) and fluctuated between "illegitimate" and "legitimate but inexperienced" (p. 13). Two potential lines of future research stem from these observations. Firstly, it would be relevant to investigate the source-use patterns of students in the Core English program (MEQ, n.d.) to see where they stand in comparison to EESL students. Although students in the Core program have not yet achieved the same level of language proficiency as their advanced counterparts, they are still expected to carry out IWTs and to use ideas from both listening and reading texts in their own writing.

Secondly, it would be pertinent to push the investigation of advanced high-school learners' source use above and beyond the variables (i.e., amount of source use, attribution to source authors, accuracy of source use, language integration type) investigated here and to examine the ways in which source information is used in their texts. For example, in this study, students' source use was characterized by the straightforward listing of facts, examples, and ideas from source material. This denotes behaviour typical of the knowledge-telling stage (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987). That said, the task requirements in this study did clearly state that students were to present the experts' opinions and viewpoints, not their own. Other studies have documented similar tendencies in the work of novice writers' and have noted students' inability, or even their reluctance, to progress to the knowledge-transforming stage (Abasi & Akbari, 2008; Doolan, 2021; Hirvela & Du, 2013; Li & Casanave, 2012; Neumann et al., 2019). Therefore, it would be relevant to examine the advanced L2 adolescent learners' ability to transform source information by offering them tasks in which they are required to engage more profoundly with source material, to develop a sense of authorial agency (Jeffery & Wilcox, 2016), to use sources to support their own ideas and arguments (Du, 2019), and to synthesise ideas stemming from multiple source texts (Wette, 2021).

Conclusion

To conclude, this preliminary investigation at the high-school level contributes to an underexplored area of investigation, that of L2 writing in the secondary context. Indeed, limited research exists not only in the area of source-based writing at the high-school level but that of the adolescent L2 writer at large. Given that effective source use develops with experience and over the course of many years and remains a challenge even in the later stages of students' academic careers, it is reasonable to surmise that intervention at the preuniversity level may prove beneficial to student writers.

Thus, by identifying the defining characteristics of the source-based writing of high- and low-proficiency adolescent L2 writers, the results of this study can serve to inform researchers and educators and provide insight which may prove valuable in the quest to design instructional materials appropriate for use at this level. By implementing explicit source-based instruction at earlier moments in students' academic pathways, we may pave the way toward more effective and appropriate source use by this population in their current educational context and beyond.

References

- Abasi, A. R., & Akbari, N. (2008). Are we encouraging patchwriting? Reconsidering the role of pedagogical context in ESL student writers' transgressive intertextuality. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27(3), 267–284. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2008.02.001>
- Asención Delaney, Y. (2008). Investigating the reading-to-write construct. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7(3), 140–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.04.001>
- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Chen, W., & Wang, J. (2022). Understanding source use by undergraduate post-novice EFL writers for the sustainability development of academic literacy: Abilities, challenges, and strategies. *Sustainability*, 14(4), 2108. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14042108>
- Chan, S., & Yamashita, J. (2022). Integrated writing and its correlates: A meta-analysis. *Assessing Writing*, 54, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2022.100662>
- Cooney, A., Darcy, E., & Casey, D. (2018). Integrating reading and writing: Supporting students' writing from source. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 15(5), 1–18. <https://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol15/iss5/3>
- Cumming, A. (2014). Assessing integrated skills. In A. J. Kunnan (Ed.), *The companion to language assessment* (pp. 1–14). John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118411360.wbcla131>
- Cumming, A., Kantor, R., Baba, K., Erdosy, U., Eouanzoui, K., & James, M. (2005). Differences in written discourse in independent and integrated prototype tasks for next generation TOEFL. *Assessing Writing*, 10(1), 5–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2005.02.001>
- Cumming, A., Lai, C., & Cho, H. (2016). Students' writing from sources for academic purposes: A synthesis of recent research. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 23, 47–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2016.06.002>
- de Oliveira, L. C., & Silva, T. (Eds.). (2013). *L2 writing in secondary classrooms: Student experiences, academic issues, and teacher education*. Routledge.
- Doolan, S. M. (2021). An exploratory analysis of source integration in post-secondary L1 and L2 source-based writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 62, 128–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.01.003>
- Doolan, S. M., & Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S. (2016). Facilitating L2 writers' interpretation of source texts. *TESOL Journal*, 7(3), 716–745. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.239>

- Du, Y. (2019). Effect of an EAP unit on EFL student effective and appropriate source-use skills. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 40, 53–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.06.002>
- Fazilatfar, A. M., Elhambakhsh, S. E., & Allami, H. (2018). An investigation of the effects of citation instruction to avoid plagiarism in EFL academic writing assignments. *SAGE Open*, 8(2), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2158244018769958>
- Gebriel, A., & Plakans, L. (2013). Toward a transparent construct of reading-to-write tasks: The interface between discourse features and proficiency. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 10(1), 9–27. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2011.642040>
- Grabe, W. (2003). Reading and writing relations: Second language perspectives on research and practice. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 242–262). Cambridge University Press.
- Grabe, W., & Zhang, C. (2013). Reading and writing together: A critical component of English for academic purposes teaching and learning. *TESOL Journal*, 4(1), 9–24. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.65>
- Haller, S. (2019, June 28). Caught your teen sexting? Don't 'freak out,' experts say. Study found it can be healthy. *USA TODAY*. <https://www.usatoday.com/story/life/allthemoms/2019/06/28/consensual-teen-sexting-could-healthy-university-of-texas-research-says/1585657001/>
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J.W. (2018). *Sexting: Advice for teens*. Cyberbullying Research Center. <https://cyberbullying.org/sexting-advice-teens>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2012.11.005>
- Howard, R. M. (1992). A plagiarism penitence. *Journal of Teaching Writing*, 11(2), 233–245.
- Howard, R. M., Serviss, T., & Rodrigue, T. K. (2010). Writing from sources, writing from sentences. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 2(2), 177–192. <https://doi.org/10.1558/wap.v2i2.177>
- Jeffery, J. V., & Wilcox, K. C. (2016). L1 and L2 adolescents' perspectives on writing within and across academic disciplines: Examining the role of agency in writing development. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 8(2), 245–274. <https://doi.org/10.1558/wap.28750>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.09.006>

- Keck, C. (2014). Copying, paraphrasing, and academic writing development: A re-examination of L1 and L2 summarization practices. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 25, 4–22. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.05.005>
- Kibler, A. K., & Hardigree, C. (2017). Using evidence in L2 argumentative writing: A longitudinal case study across high school and university. *Language Learning*, 67(1), 75–109. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12198>
- Knoch, U., & Sitajalabhorn, W. (2013). A closer look at integrated writing tasks: Towards a more focussed definition for assessment purposes. *Assessing Writing*, 18(4), 300–308. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.09.003>
- Leu, S., & Neumann, H. (in press). Patchwriting: Co-opting a transgressive practice for pedagogical purposes. In R. Wette (Ed.), *Teaching and learning source-based writing: Current perspectives and future directions* (pp. 101–114). Routledge.
- Li, J. (2021). Examining EFL learners' source text use in summary writing. *Language Teaching Research*, 00(0), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211055887>
- Li, Y., & Casanave, C. P. (2012). Two first-year students' strategies for writing from sources: Patchwriting or plagiarism? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(2), 165–180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.002>
- Liu, G.-Z., Lin, V., Kou, X., & Wang, H.-Y. (2016). Best practices in L2 English source use pedagogy: A thematic review and synthesis of empirical studies. *Educational Research Review*, 19, 36–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2016.06.002>
- Lohmann, R. C. (2012, July 20). The dangers of teen sexting. *Psychology Today*. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/intl/blog/teen-angst/201207/the-dangers-teen-sexting>
- McDonough, K., Crawford, W. J., & De Vleeschauwer, J. (2014). Summary writing in a Thai EFL university context. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 24(1), 20–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.03.001>
- Merkel, W. (2020). A case study of undergraduate L2 writers' concerns with source-based writing and plagiarism. *TESOL Journal*, 11(3), 1–16. <http://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.503>
- Ministère de l'Éducation. (n.d.). *English as a second language: Core program, enriched program*. Gouvernement du Québec. http://www.education.gouv.qc.ca/fileadmin/site_web/documents/dpse/formation_jeunes/5-pfeq_engseclangmerged.pdf
- Ministère de l'Éducation. (2023). *Guide for parents: Uniform examination, English as a second language, enriched program*. Gouvernement du Québec. http://www.education.gouv.qc.ca/fileadmin/site_web/documents/education/Guide_parents_ESL_Enriched_SecV.pdf

- Neumann, H., Leu, S., & McDonough, K. (2019). L2 writers' use of outside sources and the related challenges. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 38, 106–120. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.02.002>
- Neumann, H., Leu, S., McDonough, K., & Crawford, B. (2020). Improving students' source integration skills: Does a focus on reading comprehension and vocabulary development work? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 48, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100909>
- Neumann, H., Leu, S., McDonough, K., Gil, L., & Crawford, B. (2020). Does the quality of source notes matter? An exploratory study of source-based academic writing. *TESL Canada Journal*, 37(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v37i1.1333>
- Ortmeier-Hooper, C., & Enright, K. A. (2011). Mapping new territory: Toward an understanding of adolescent L2 writers and writing in US contexts. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20(3), 167–181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2011.05.002>
- Payant, C., McDonough, K., Uludag, P., & Lindberg, R. (2019). Predicting integrated writing task performance: Source comprehension, prewriting planning, and individual differences. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 40, 87–97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.06.001>
- Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second-language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(4), 317–345. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2003.08.004>
- Pecorari, D. (2015). Plagiarism in second language writing: Is it time to close the case? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 30, 94–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2015.08.003>
- Pecorari, D., & Petric, B. (2014). Plagiarism in second-language writing. *Language Teaching*, 47(3), 269–302. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000056>
- Plakans, L. (2008). Comparing composing processes in writing-only and reading-to-write test tasks. *Assessing Writing*, 13(2), 111–129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2008.07.001>
- Plakans, L. (2009). The role of reading strategies in integrated L2 writing tasks. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 8(4), 252–266. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2009.05.001>
- Plakans, L., & Gebril, A. (2012). A close investigation into source use in integrated second language writing tasks. *Assessing Writing*, 17(1), 18–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2011.09.002>
- Plonsky, L., & Oswald, F. L. (2014). How big is “big”? Interpreting effect sizes in L2 research. *Language Learning*, 64(4), 878–912. <http://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12079>

- Reynolds, G. A., & Perin, D. (2009). A comparison of text structure and self-regulated writing strategies for composing from sources by middle school students. *Reading Psychology, 30*(3), 265–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02702710802411547>
- Shi, L. (2004). Textual borrowing in second-language writing. *Written Communication, 21*(2), 171–200. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088303262846>
- Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(4), 657–677. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587400>
- Storch, N. (2012). Incorporation of source material: The effect of instruction. *TESOL in Context, 22*(1), 38–55.
- Uludag, P., Lindberg, R., McDonough, K., & Payant, C. (2019). Exploring L2 writers' source-text use in an integrated writing assessment. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 46*, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100670>
- Weigle, S. C., & Parker, K. (2012). Source text borrowing in an integrated reading/writing assessment. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*(2), 118–133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.004>
- Wette, R. (2010). Evaluating student learning in a university-level EAP unit on writing using sources. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 19*(3), 158–177. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2010.06.002>
- Wette, R. (2017). Source text use by undergraduate post-novice L2 writers in disciplinary assignments: Progress and ongoing challenges. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 37*, 46–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.05.015>
- Wette, R. (2018). Source-based writing in a health sciences essay: Year 1 students' perceptions, abilities and strategies. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 36*, 61–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.09.006>
- Wette, R. (2021). *Writing using sources for academic purposes: Theory, research and practice*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429057519>