Japanese university students’ experience with and perceptions of citations in academic writing

Fumiko Yoshimura

Abstract

This study reports on Japanese university students’ experience with and perceptions of citations in academic writing. Though issues of citations and plagiarism have been discussed seriously and extensively in English-speaking countries (e.g., Howard, 1995; Pecorari, 2003, 2006, 2008; Shi, 2004, 2006, 2008), they have seldom been discussed or researched in Japan. Therefore, in order to contribute additional data on the issues in Japan, a survey was conducted. The findings reveal Japanese university students lack experience, knowledge, and practice in writing with citations. Furthermore, they have a relatively tolerant attitude toward inappropriate citation behaviors, which may lead to inadvertent plagiarism. Recommendations are made based on the findings.

Introduction

The importance of appropriate textual borrowing in academic writing has been recognized internationally. In Japan, more and more universities teach the importance of following citation rules and avoiding plagiarism in some introductory courses. In fact, at this author’s university, students are taught the rules in an “introduction to university studies” course.

In the past decades, efforts have been made to avoid student plagiarism in English-speaking countries by investigating the causes and implementing pre-
ventive measures. One area of focus that has attracted much attention from researchers and practitioners is plagiarism by ESL (English as a Second Language) students. Various reasons have been identified as probable factors behind ESL plagiarism: students’ language proficiency (Keck, 2006), lack of knowledge and/or practice in citation rules (Shi, 2006, 2008), educational background (Pennycook, 1994, 1996), cultural values (Bloch, 2001, 2008), difficulty of academic writing tasks (Abashi & Akbari, 2008), different perceptions about appropriate use of citations (Shi, 2006, 2008) and so on. Native English-speaking university counterparts also commit plagiarism for some of these reasons, but other are specific to ESL students.

Especially, Asian perceptions of acceptable textual borrowing and the underlying assumptions about learning are often contrasted with those of Westerners. It is often said that copying and memorization are conceived as legitimate means of learning in Asia and that this conceptualization of learning causes Asian learners to be susceptible to plagiarism accusations (e.g., Ballad and Clanchy, 1991; Pennycook, 1996).

Though there has been much discussion regarding plagiarism cases by Asian learners (e.g., Bloch, 2001, 2008; Pennycook, 1994, 1996), little research has been conducted regarding the issue in Japanese universities. Since discussion of the matter is not fruitful without sufficient data, the current study was conducted to collect data to investigate the current state of citation use in Japan.

The specific purposes of this study are two-fold: 1) to report on Japanese university students’ experience with and perceptions of citations in academic writing, and 2) to discuss the findings by situating them in the context of studies on academic writing, textual borrowing, and plagiarism.

Research on plagiarism in English-speaking countries

Since the 1990s, issues of plagiarism have been discussed seriously among composition researchers in English-speaking countries (e.g., Buranen & Roy, 1999; Eisner & Vicinus, 2008; Howard, 1995, 2000; Howard & Watson, 2010; Pecorari, 2003, 2006, 2008; Pennycook, 1994, 1996; Roig, 2001,
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2006; Shi, 2004, 2006, 2008). As Pennycook (1996) contends, plagiarism should not be viewed as “a simple black-and-white issue” (p. 201), but be viewed as complex phenomena involving various causes, interpretations, practices, and treatments.

For example, it has been argued that plagiarism should be understood in the context of cultural differences. Pennycook (1996), who noticed differences in the perceptions of memorization as a means of learning between China and the West, argues for the need of reexamining the assumptions that underlie the Western concept of plagiarism. The concept of plagiarism is based on the concept of authors’ ownership of their text. However, Pennycook (1996) maintains that this concept may be specific to the West. Ballad and Clanchy (1991) also assert the importance of considering cultural differences in the underlying assumptions about learning. For example, memorization and copying can be legitimate learning strategies for Asian students; however, Western teachers tend to disapprove of such strategies in favor of fostering critical thinking and creativity in their students.

Shi (2006) reports the results of her interviews with international students, which reveal differences between Western and Asian educational contexts and perceptions of appropriate citations. In her study, while 60% of German and American students had the experience of practicing citations, only 8% of Asian students had such experience (p. 270). While 82% of native English-speaking students believe that words are owned by individuals, 56% of Asian students believe that words are shared and can be copied (p. 272). While the importance of avoiding plagiarism is taught explicitly in Western countries, it tends to be ignored or overlooked in Asian countries (pp. 270-271). Thus, culture has a great impact on people’s perceptions of appropriate textual borrowing.

International differences in the standards of appropriate citations may also contribute to ESL students’ susceptibility to plagiarism, as reported by Heitman and Litewka (2011). Unlike the US, where plagiarism is well defined and explicitly taught to university students, some countries lack formal policies or guidelines for plagiarism or have different standards for appropriate cita-
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tions. In Brazil, as they report, textual copying is not as important a criterion of plagiarism as a lack of acknowledgement (p. 105). According to Chee Ling (as cited in Sutherland-Smith, 2008, p. 133), in-text citation may not be a common practice in China.

In addition to the differences of perceptions on appropriate textual borrowing, ESL students are handicapped because of their poor language proficiency. Keck (2006) conducted an experiment to compare L1 and L2 writers’ usage of paraphrases in summary writing and found that while L1 writers had succeeded in revising the source substantially, L2 writers had failed to do so because of their limited language proficiency, and as the result they had unintentionally borrowed many words from the source. Therefore, she contends, students’ language proficiency should be taken into consideration in plagiarism judgment.

Differences of the contexts of secondary and post-secondary education may also be responsible for students’ inappropriate citation practices. Since authorship, citation rules, and plagiarism are concepts characteristic of academic writing, some researchers (e.g., Chanock, 2008; Rose, 1996) perceive student plagiarism as an issue of “acculturation.” Chanock (2008), for example, highlights how knowledge and knowledge construction are viewed differently in the two contexts: that is, while knowledge is viewed as facts in one context, it is viewed as the writer’s interpretation and needs to be evaluated in the other. Thus, the importance of credible citation practices for sound knowledge construction in the academic community may be recognized relative to students’ degree of acculturation to the practices.

In addition, differences among individual students’ interpretations of appropriate citation practices should be taken into account. Students develop their own theory of appropriate citations in their own unique learning context and sometimes over or under-cite sources. Even if citation rules are taught explicitly, how sources are actually used in a specific writing task is often “occluded” in Pecorari’s (2006) term, and not known to the reader. Shi’s (2008) research on citation behaviors of university undergraduates reveals how students’ judgments on appropriate textual borrowing depend on their interpreta-
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tions of borrowing. For example, the students’ interpretations of whether the source should be credited or not and which citation form should be employed depend on their interpretations of whether a piece of information is common knowledge or not, or who has the ownership of an idea when a student thinks he or she has learned it or has the same idea.

As is shown above, various sets of factors need to be considered in comprehending the issue of plagiarism. Plagiarism includes various practices, from copying someone else’s paper and turning it in as the writer’s own work, to failing to acknowledge the source properly, and to copying too much language from the source text. Therefore, some researchers (e.g., Howard, 1995, 2000; Pecorari, 2008; Pennycook, 1996; Roig, 2006) have attempted to categorize plagiarism in accordance with the nature of borrowing (i.e. idea versus language), the degree of copying, and the degree of the intention to deceive. For example, Howard (1995) grouped it into “cheating,” “non-attribution,” and “patchwriting” (p. 799). “Cheating” means turning in someone else’s work as the writer’s own. “Non-attribution” constitutes incomplete citation, including copied passages from the source without attribution or quotation marks. “Patchwriting” refers to attempted but failed paraphrasing, containing a surface structure too close to the source text. Howard (2000) later rephrased the categories as “fraud, insufficient citation, and excessive repetition” (p. 488). Roig (2006) made a distinction between “plagiarism of ideas” (p. 4) and “plagiarism of text” (p. 6). “Plagiarism of ideas” refers to the usage of someone else’s ideas as the writer’s own, and “plagiarism of text” indicates too much direct usage of the source author’s language without quoting the text. Roig (2006) claims that “plagiarism of text” is the most common form of plagiarism among researchers and recommends that academic writers paraphrase source texts sufficiently in order to avoid it.

Research on textual borrowing and plagiarism in Japan

Asian perceptions of learning and acceptable textual borrowing, which underlie the issue of plagiarism, have been investigated and the common assertions point to the contributions of Confucian traditions and “collectivism”
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(Bloch, 2008, p. 219) on Asian learning strategies of memorization and imitation and how these factors affect Asian perceptions of appropriate textual borrowing (Bloch, 2001, 2008). However, the term Asian may be overgeneralized. While the term Asian includes not only Chinese but also Japanese, Korean, Thai, Malaysian, Indonesian and so on, Chinese students were the main research target in these studies. However, since cultural and educational traditions differ across Asian countries, it would be a mistake to ignore possible differences. Thus, I would argue that while Chinese perceptions have been studied and discussed to some degree as a representative group of Asian learners (e.g., Bloch, 2001, 2008; Pennycook, 1994, 1996), the situation in Japan has been insufficiently studied or reported thus far. A few studies that focused on the Japanese context include Dryden’s (1999) study which reports on Japanese epistemological tradition in which the concept of plagiarism has no place and Wheeler’s (2009) empirical study which shows that the main cause of plagiarism from students in Japan is not cultural values but rather insufficient understanding of what constitutes plagiarism.

Perhaps one of the most important studies on these issues in Japan was conducted by Rinnert and Kobayashi (2005). They conducted a large-scale survey in Japan (N=715) and in the US (N=76) in order to explore Japanese university students’ knowledge about and attitudes toward citations and analyzed the results according to academic level and academic discipline. The main findings from their study are: (a) Significantly fewer Japanese students (39%) received formal training in writing compared with American counterparts (69%). (b) Japanese students received writing instruction that placed less emphasis on supporting points, quoting, and paraphrasing than American students. (c) Japanese students had much more tolerant attitudes toward plagiarism than Americans. In sum, this study reveals a lack of practice in writing, a lack of knowledge about citation conventions, and less strict attitudes toward inappropriate citation practices on the part of Japanese students.

The current study was conducted to add more empirical data on the issue of Japanese students’ experience with and perceptions of citations. Recently, citation rules are taught at an early stage of undergraduate education in many
Japanese universities. Therefore, the situation may have changed since the Rinnert and Kobayashi’s surveys which were administered in 1999 and 2000 (Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2005). As explained in the previous section, plagiarism includes various practices, differing in terms of factors such as the purpose of borrowing, the amount of borrowing, the degree of language change, and the accuracy of source acknowledgement. These differences are reflected in different citation behaviors included in the second set of the questionnaires used in the current study.

**The current study**

At the end of the second semester of 2012, a survey was conducted to investigate Japanese university students’ experience with and perceptions of citation practices. For the survey, two sets of questionnaires (Questionnaires 1 & 2) were created by the author and copies were handed to students in a freshman class (Refer to Appendix A). All the students were in the department of English at a private university in Japan and they were given a ball-point pen as the reward for their participation. They filled in the questionnaires at home and turned them in in the following class. Seventy-five students participated in the survey.

Questionnaire 1 asked about students’ experience with and knowledge about citations in Japanese and English writing. They were specifically asked about their experience of writing a paper with citations, their knowledge about citation rules, and their experience of practicing part-skills such as writing a summary or a paraphrase, in Japanese and English writing (Refer to the Appendices A & B for the questionnaires in Japanese and English, respectively).

In Questionnaire 2, students were asked to judge if the citation behaviors described from items 1 to 23 were appropriate or inappropriate (Refer to the Appendices A & B). The behaviors described from 1 to 18 indicate borrowing for ideas while items 19 to 22 indicate borrowing for language. Item 23 regards asking a native speaker of the foreign language in which a paper is written to proofread the paper. Item 16 represents an appropriate citation behav-
ior and behavior 23 may be acceptable if the purpose of the paper is not to measure the student’s foreign language proficiency. Other behaviors are regarded as plagiarism in English-speaking countries with different degrees of gravity as an academic misconduct.

Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of the citation behaviors of borrowing for ideas. The citation behaviors differ with regard to the reliability of the sources, the number of the sources borrowed, the amount of change in the language form, the accuracy of source acknowledgement. Regarding the reliability of the sources, papers published in books or articles and student papers are contrasted as examples with high and low reliability. As for the number of sources, borrowings from a single source or multiple sources are differentiated. Concerning the amount of change in the language form, contrasts are drawn based upon whether the writer used the texts without any language change, with little change, or used the writer’s own words in explanations. Next, comparisons are made regarding the accuracy of acknowledgement, no acknowledgement, acknowledgement only in the reference list, or acknowledgement in both the text and the reference list. Descriptions in 17 and 18 are about handling a secondary source with multiple primary sources, which are referred to as “occluded cases” by Pecorari (2006). These plagiarism cases are difficult to recognize because on the surface they look like following the citation rules as they contain acknowledged and possibly quoted primary sources. According to Pecorari (2006), these practices are regarded as one type of plagiarism in English-speaking countries because the reader may interpret that it is the writer of the text who found, read, and understood the primary sources and integrated them into his or her text, while, in fact, these things are done by the author of the secondary source. (p. 330)

Table 2 is a summary of citation behaviors in which language is borrowed from someone else’s text to convey the writer’s own meaning. These descriptions were included because it is said that many Asian students believe that it is all right to use others’ words because words are shared (Shi, 2006, p. 272). The amount of borrowing differs as is shown in Table 2. Description 23 asks about students’ perceptions of asking a native speaker of the language
Results of Questionnaire 1

Data from 75 students were collected. In terms of gender, there were 20 male and 55 female students. Students’ responses to Questionnaire 1 are
summarized in Table 3. Even near the end of the second semester of their freshman year, only 19% of the students had the experience of writing a paper with citations. Sixty percent of the students answered that they had heard about citation rules. Most students (73%) had learned about them in an “introduction to university studies” course while only 9% answered that they had known them before entering university.

Regarding their experience with and knowledge about citation rules in Japanese writing, 55% of the students answered that they had learned about them. When they were asked about their experience of writing a summary or a paraphrase, the percentages were very low, 35% and 5%, respectively. Only 16% of the students knew how to write references.

As for the students’ experience with and knowledge about citation rules in English papers, 37% answered that they had learned about them. Very few students had had the experience of writing a summary (11%) or a paraphrase (5%), and only 13% knew how to write references.

**Results of Questionnaire 2**

Students’ responses to Questionnaire 2 are summarized in Table 4, which shows students’ perceptions of appropriateness of different types of textual borrowing.

Regarding borrowing for ideas, the most influential factor on students’ perceptions seems to be whether or not the sources were acknowledged. For
Table 3. Results of Survey 1: Students’ experience with citations and related skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge or skills</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Background information</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Experience of writing a paper with citations</td>
<td>14 (19%)</td>
<td>59 (79%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Knowledge about citation rules</td>
<td>45 (60%)</td>
<td>29 (39%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Experience of learning citation rules</td>
<td>41 (55%)</td>
<td>33 (44%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. Experience of learning summarizing</td>
<td>27 (35%)</td>
<td>44 (59%)</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. Experience of learning paraphrasing</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>70 (93%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. Knowledge about referencing</td>
<td>12 (16%)</td>
<td>58 (77%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. Experience of learning citation rules</td>
<td>28 (37%)</td>
<td>46 (61%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9. Experience of learning summarizing</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>64 (85%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10. Experience of learning paraphrasing</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>70 (93%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11. Knowledge about referencing</td>
<td>10 (13%)</td>
<td>63 (84%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

example, if the group of descriptions 8-10 is compared with descriptions 11-13, the percentages of students who perceived the behaviors appropriate or inappropriate differ significantly. This is shown in the comparison of the pairs of descriptions 8 & 11, 9 & 12, and 10 & 13, where the percentages of students who perceived the behavior to be appropriate drop significantly by crediting the sources in the reference list. However, adding in-text citations did not contribute to better perceptions, as can be seen in the comparison between the group of descriptions 11-13 and the group of descriptions 14-16. On the contrary, the comparisons between the pairs of descriptions 11 & 14, 12 & 15, and 13 & 16 reveal a slight decrease in the percentages of students who perceived the behaviors favorably.

Another important factor seems to be the degree of language change. Within the respective groups of descriptions 3-5, 8-10, 11-13, and 14-16, the percentages of students who perceived the behavior appropriate rise in accordance with the degree of language change. If we take the example of the group of descriptions 3-5, we can find that the percentages increase from 12%
Table 4. Results of Survey 2: Students' perceptions of appropriate textual borrowing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation behaviors</th>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Textual borrowing for ideas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 0 (0%)</td>
<td>74 (99%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 12 (16%)</td>
<td>62 (83%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 9 (12%)</td>
<td>66 (88%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 14 (19%)</td>
<td>59 (79%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 25 (33%)</td>
<td>50 (67%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 5 (7%)</td>
<td>70 (93%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 24 (32%)</td>
<td>51 (68%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 15 (20%)</td>
<td>60 (80%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 19 (25%)</td>
<td>56 (75%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 36 (48%)</td>
<td>39 (52%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 46 (61%)</td>
<td>29 (39%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 54 (72%)</td>
<td>19 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 60 (80%)</td>
<td>14 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 43 (57%)</td>
<td>30 (40%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 52 (69%)</td>
<td>21 (28%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 54 (72%)</td>
<td>19 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary citations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 8 (11%)</td>
<td>66 (88%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 24 (32%)</td>
<td>50 (67%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Textual borrowing for language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 26 (35%)</td>
<td>48 (64%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 18 (24%)</td>
<td>55 (73%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. 6 (8%)</td>
<td>67 (89%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. 4 (5%)</td>
<td>69 (92%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The issue of proofreading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. 47 (63%)</td>
<td>26 (35%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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to 19% by changing the language form a little, and then to 33% by putting it in the writer’s own words. The other groups of descriptions show similar tendencies.

The increase in the number of sources also seems to improve students’ favorable perceptions. This is shown in the pairs of descriptions 1&3, 2&4, 6&8, and 7&9, where the percentages of appropriate judgments are higher in the second description in each pair.

It seems that the reliability of the sources had some effect on students’ perceptions. When descriptions 1-5 and 6-10 are compared, higher credibility results in a lower percentage of students who perceive the behaviors as inappropriate. Differences can be found between the pairs of descriptions 2 & 7, 3 & 8, and 5 & 10.

Concerning textual borrowing for language, many students perceived such borrowing as inappropriate. However, the percentages of inappropriate judgments get lower as the amount of language borrowing gets smaller, which is shown in 92% for borrowing two or three paragraphs, 89% for borrowing one paragraph, 73% for borrowing two or three sentences, and in 64% for borrowing one sentence. Regarding the issue of a text being proofread by a native speaker of the language, the majority of the students accepted the behavior.

Discussion

It is surprising that only 19% of the students had the experience of writing a paper with citations when almost one year had passed since they first entered university. However, this is in accordance with the results of Kobayashi and Rinnert’s interview study (2002, p. 100), Rinnert and Kobayashi’s survey study (2005, p. 38), and Shi’s (2006) interview study. These studies revealed a lack of experience in practicing writing in general and especially in practicing writing with citations. Among the students who had learned about citations, many had learned about them only in the “introduction to university studies” course. Since writing is not emphasized in Japanese secondary education as Kobayashi and Rinnert report (2002, p. 100), general and academic writing
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conventions should be taught at an early stage of Japanese postsecondary education.

Regarding their experience with and knowledge about citations and writing part-skills, while students had learned about them, very few of them had actually practiced the skills of summarizing or paraphrasing. Their lack of knowledge about referencing shows that students may not have learned the details of citation rules. When the part-skills of summarizing and paraphrasing are compared, more students had the experience of summarizing than paraphrasing. It may be because students had been tested on their summarization skills if they had used “the admission based on recommendation system.” This tendency is also reported by Kobayashi and Rinnert (2002, p. 101). Paraphrasing appears to be a neglected skill in both Japanese and English writing in the current study. These results are again in accordance with those of Rinnert and Kobayashi’s study (2005, p. 38). Recently, the importance of paraphrasing has been emphasized not only to avoid plagiarism (e.g., Roig, 2006) but also to serve important rhetorical functions (e.g., Bazerman, 1995; Hirvela & Du, 2013). It has also been discussed in a broader context of “source use” (e.g., Shaw & Pecorari, 2013). Therefore, Japanese university professors should recognize the importance of teaching the skill.

Japanese university students’ perceptions of appropriateness in different citation behaviors reveal that the students do perceive some textual borrowing as an academic misconduct as is shown by Wheeler (2009) and Rinnert and Kobayashi (2005), though their perceptions may be relatively lenient. The Japanese students perceive both borrowing for ideas and borrowing for language as inappropriate. In judging the appropriateness of different idea plagiarism cases, their perceptions depend on various factors. However, their most important criteria seems to be whether the sources are credited or not rather than other factors. This is in line with what is reported about Brazilian faculty members who were concerned about a lack of acknowledgement rather than textual copying (Heitman & Litewka, 2011, p. 105). However, students’ knowledge of the proper way to acknowledge a source appears to be inaccurate, because many of them believe that some citation behaviors are appropri-
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ate even if they lack in-text citations. Students should learn the importance of accurate citations, as is stated as follows: “It is essential for academic authors to identify who said what, where and when, and to do this as their discussion develops, in the body of their writing, not only in the reference list supplied for the reader’s convenience” (Chanock, 2008, p. 8).

While students tend to show somewhat tolerant attitudes toward the citation behaviors in general, some students (25%) disapprove of behavior 16 in which contributions of others are credited and synthesized appropriately by using the writer’s own words. These students’ contradictory attitudes toward the citation behaviors may have come from their lack of experience in writing a paper with citations. They may have learned that they should avoid plagiarism as declarative knowledge in some university class and may have given their judgments without really considering the actual situations. Many students disapprove of borrowing language even if it is done to support the text writer’s own meaning. This finding is in contrast with the results of Shi’s (2006) study, where students demonstrated the belief that language is shared (p. 272). However, the percentages of students from the present study who perceive the behaviors as inappropriate change according to the amount of language borrowed.

Based on the findings, some suggestions can be made. First, the importance of writing skills should be emphasized much more in all stages of Japanese education, as in America where it is promoted by National Writing Project (NWP, n.d.), the Writing across the curriculums movement (Wells, n.d.), and in First-year composition classrooms (Council of Writing Program Administrator [WPA], 2008).

Secondly, the importance of academic writing as an important element of knowledge construction should be taught in Japan. The inherent nature of “intertextuality” in academic writing, as suggested in the comment, “A text which made no use of any sources would be free of plagiarism but would be fundamentally unacademic” (Shaw & Pecorari, 2013, p. A1), should be recognized. The importance of following citation rules may be understood more easily if this recognition is achieved.
Japanese students’ relatively tolerant attitudes toward some citation behaviors which are considered as plagiarism in English-speaking countries may lead to inadvertent plagiarism. It is the responsibility of universities to provide students with information about plagiarism that includes a clear definitions, guidelines for avoidance, and policies on how plagiarism is treated by the university. Yoshimura’s survey on university professors’ perceptions (2012) reveals that while 83% of the professors who responded to the survey felt the need for creating plagiarism policies or guidelines, only 10% of them had actually done so. It is very obvious that measures should be taken to change this situation.

In addition, since the skill of writing with citations is difficult to acquire, students should be given ample practice opportunities and be given guidance and feedback at different stages of their writing. Though it does not take a great deal of time to gain explicit knowledge about citation rules, it does take extensive time, practice, and support for students to apply the knowledge effectively. Therefore, teachers should devote more time and effort to make sure students learn this important skill.

Conclusion

The current study was conducted to investigate Japanese university students’ experience with and perceptions of citations. The main findings from the survey are Japanese university students’ lack of knowledge about citation rules and experience in writing with citations. In addition, they have relatively lenient attitudes toward inappropriate citation behaviors, which may result in unintentional plagiarism. Therefore, Japanese university professors should teach the importance of following citation rules, and avoiding plagiarism. Furthermore, writing with citations should be assigned more frequently and with careful guidance.

This study is preliminary and has numerous limitations. For example, the data were collected only from freshmen in one department in one university. Therefore, the sample size is small and may not represent the whole uni-
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versity student population. Secondly, descriptions of citation behaviors could have included behaviors of borrowing a shorter string of words such as 2-4 words, 5-7 words, or 8-10 words in the descriptions of behaviors in which language is borrowed to convey the writer's own meaning.

Despite these limitations, the findings from the study are significant in that they reveal more about Japanese context regarding the issues of citations and plagiarism in academic writing and perceptions of appropriate textual borrowing. Additional research should be conducted so that more is known about these issues in Japan.
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Appendix A
他人の文章の使用についてのアンケート調査

I. あなたについて教えてください。
1. 学科、学年、性別について教えてください。

   （ ）学科（ ）年（ 男・女 ）

経験・知識
2. あなたは「統合文」（他人の書いた文献を読み、その内容や文章を織込みながら書く文章）や「（文献）研究レポート」（他人の書いた文献を探して読み、その内容や文章を自分の文章に織込みながら書く文章）を書いたことがありますか。（ある・ない）
   —＞あると答えた場合は、いつ、何の授業で書いたのか教えてください。

   （ ）

3. 他人の文章を自分のレポートに使用する場合、引用のルールがあることを知ってい
   ますか。

   （知っている・知らない）
   —＞知っていると答えた場合は、いつ、何の授業でまたはどのようにして学んだのか教
   えてください。

   （ ）

日本語の文
4. 日本語の文において、他人の文章を自分のレポートに使用する場合の引用のしかた
   について習ったことがありますか。（ある・ない）
   —＞あると答えた場合は、いつ、何の授業で習ったのか教えてください。（ ）

5. 日本語の文章において、他人の文章を要約する方法について習ったことがありますか。（ある・ない）
   —＞あると答えた場合は、いつ、何の授業で習ったのか教えてください。（ ）

6. 日本語の文章において、他人の文章のパラフレーズ（自分の言葉での言い換え）の
   方法について習ったことがありますか。（ある・ない）
   —＞あると答えた場合は、いつ、何の授業で習ったのか教えてください。（ ）

7. あなたは、日本語のレポートにおける参考文献表のつけかたを知っていますか。

   （知っている・知らない）
   —＞知っていると答えた場合は、いつ、何の授業でまたはどのようにして学んだのか
   教えてください。

   （ ）
日本大学学生の学術論文の引用体験と感想

英語の文

8. 英語の文において、他人の文章を自分のレポートに使用する場合の引用のしかたについて習ったことがありますか。（ある・ない）
   ———＞あると答えた場合は、いつ、何の授業で習ったのか教えてください。（　）

9. 英語の文において、他人の文章を要約する方法について習ったことがありますか。（ある・ない）
   ———＞あると答えた場合は、いつ、何の授業で習ったのか教えてください。（　）

10. 英語の文において、他人の文章のパラフレーズ（自分の言葉での言い換え）の方法について習ったことがありますか。（ある・ない）
    ———＞あると答えた場合は、いつ、何の授業で習ったのか教えてください。（　）

11. あなたは、英語のレポートにおける参考文献表のつけかたを知っていますか。（知っている・知らない）
    ———＞知っていると答えた場合は、いつ、何の授業でまたはどのようにして学んだのか教えてください。（　）

※裏にも質問があります。次は、裏の質問に答えてください。わからないなくても、今のところ自分がどう思うかを答えてください。

II. レポート提出に際して下の記述の行為が大学の1〜4年生によって行われた場合、1〜23の記述について大学生の行為として適切（問題ない）か不適切（問題がある）かを判断してどちらかに✔をつけて下さい。もし場合によって思った場合は、どういう場合に適切でどういう場合に不適切か余白に書いて下さい。

※出典とは、その文章がどこから来たのかや誰が書いたのかについての情報を言います。
※※二次情報源とは、他の人が他の人の文章（一次情報源）をまとめたり解釈して書いた文章のことです。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>適切だ</th>
<th>不適切だ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. インターネット上でみつけた他の人が書いたレポートや友達や先輩から買ったりもらったりしたレポートを、そのまま全部自分で書いたレポートとして提出する。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. インターネット上で見つけた他の人が書いたレポートや友達や先輩から買ったりもらったりしたレポートを、少し表現を変えて自分で書いたレポートとして提出する。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. インターネット上で見つけた他の人が書いたレポートや友達や先輩からもらったリポートを複数コピー＆ベーストしたり書き写したりしながら組み合わせて自分のレポートを書き、それを提出する。出典は全く示さない。

4. インターネット上で見つけたレポートや友達や先輩からもらったリポートを複数組み合わせ、少し表現を変えながら自分のレポートを書き、それを提出する。出典は全く示さない。

5. インターネット上で見つけたレポートや友達や先輩からもらったリポートを複数組み合わせ、自分の言葉に直してレポートを書き、それを提出する。出典は全く示さない。

6. 自分の目的にあう情報をインターネット上のウィキペディアや図書館で探した本や学術雑誌等から見つけ、それをそのまま全部自分のレポートとして提出する。

7. 自分の目的にあう情報をインターネット上のウィキペディアや図書館で探した本や学術雑誌等から見つけ、その表現を少し変えて自分で書いたレポートとして提出する。

8. 自分の目的にあう情報をインターネット上のウィキペディアや図書館で探した本や学術雑誌等から見つけ、それを複数コピー＆ベーストしたり書き写したりしながら組み合わせて自分のレポートを書き、それを提出する。出典は全く示さない。

9. 自分の目的にあう情報をインターネット上のウィキペディアや図書館で探した本や学術雑誌等から見つけ、それらを複数組み合わせ、少し表現を変えながら自分のレポートを書き、それを提出する。出典は全く示さない。

10. 自分の目的にあう情報をインターネット上のウィキペディアや図書館で探した本や学術雑誌等から見つけ、それらを複数組み合わせ、自分の言葉に直して自分のレポートを書き、それを提出する。出典は全く示さない。

11. 自分の目的にあう情報をインターネット上のウィキペディアや図書館で探した本や学術雑誌等から見つけ、それを複数コピー＆ベーストしたり書き写したりしながら組み合わせて自分のレポートを書き、それを提出する。文中では出典を示さないが、参考文献表には出典を書く。

12. 自分の目的にあう情報をインターネット上のウィキペディアや図書館で探した本や学術雑誌等から見つけ、それらを複数組み合わせ、少し表現を変えながら自分のレポートを書き、それを提出する。文中では出典を示さないが、参考文献表には出典を書く。
13. 自分の目的にあう情報をインターネット上のウィキペディアや図書館で探した本や学術雑誌等から見つけ、それらを複数組み合わせ、自分の言葉に直して自分のレポートを書き、それを提出する。文中では出典を示さないが、参考文献表には出典を書く。

14. 自分の目的にあう情報をインターネット上のウィキペディアや図書館で探した本や学術雑誌等から見つけ、それを複数コピー＆ペーストしたり書き写したりして自分のレポートを書き、それを提出する。文中でも参考文献表でも出典を示す。

15. 自分の目的にあう情報をインターネット上のウィキペディアや図書館で探した本や学術雑誌等から見つけ、それらを複数組み合わせ、自分の言葉に直して自分のレポートを書き、それを提出する。文中でも参考文献表でも出典を示す。

16. 他人の文章からの引用（第一次情報源）の入った他人の文章（第二次情報源）を文中に使う場合、第一次情報源の引用の表示はするが、第二次情報源の引用の表示はしないで、第二次情報源の文章をそのまま写しその部分の文章を自分の文章として提出する。（例えば、AさんがB~Dさんの書いた文章を引用しながら書いた文章の部分を自分のレポートにそのまま入れ、それがAさんの書いた文章であることを示さない等。）

17. 他人の文章からの引用（第一次情報源）の入った他人の文章（第二次情報源）を文中に使う場合、第二次情報源の引用の表示はするが、第二次情報源の引用の表示はしないで、第二次情報源の文章を少し表現を変えながらその部分の文章を自分の文章として提出する。（例えば、AさんがB~Dさんの書いた文章を引用しながら書いた文章の部分を自分のレポートに少し表現を変え入れ、それがAさんの書いた文章であることを示さない等。）

18. 引用の表示を全くせずに自分の言いたいことを伝える表現を他人の文章から1文借りて文章を書く。

19. 引用の表示を全くせずに自分の言いたいことを伝える表現を他人の文章から2文借りて文章を書く。

20. 引用の表示を全くせずに自分の言いたいことを伝える表現を他人の文章から2~3文借りて文章を書く。

21. 引用の表示を全くせずに自分の言いたいことを伝える表現を他人の文章から1パラグラフ借りて文章を書く。

22. 引用の表示を全くせずに自分の言いたいことを伝える表現を他人の文章から2~3パラグラフ借りて文章を書く。
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23. 自分のアイディアを外国語で書く場合、自分で文章を書いてその言語のネイティブの人と語の間違いを直してもらい、訂正された文章を自分の文章として提出する。

*Appendix A is the version which was actually used in this study.

Appendix B

Questionnaire 1: Please write your responses to the following questions.
Q1. Background information: year in school and gender
Q2. Have you ever written a paper with citations? If your answer is yes, in what occasion did you write one?
Q3. Have you heard about citation rules? If your answer is yes, in what occasion did you hear about them?
Q4. Have you learned how to cite in Japanese writing? If your answer is yes, in what occasion did you learn it?
Q5. Have you learned how to summarize in Japanese writing? If your answer is yes, in what occasion did you learn it?
Q6. Have you learned how to paraphrase in Japanese writing? If your answer is yes, in what occasion did you learn it?
Q7. Have you learned how to write references in Japanese writing? If your answer is yes, in what occasion did you learn it?
Q8. Have you learned how to cite in English writing? If your answer is yes, in what occasion did you learn it?
Q9. Have you learned how to summarize in English writing? If your answer is yes, in what occasion did you learn it?
Q10. Have you learned how to paraphrase in English writing? If your answer is yes, in what occasion did you learn it?
Q11. Have you learned how to write references in English writing? If your answer is yes, in what occasion did you learn it?

Questionnaire 2: Suppose the citation behaviors below were exhibited by a university undergraduate student. Put a check mark in either “appropriate” or “inappropriate” slot for each citation behavior described in Behaviors 1–23.
Behavior 1. The writer finds a student paper online, or buys or receives one from his or her friends, and turns it in as his or her own work.
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Behavior 2. The writer finds a student paper online, or buys or receives one from his or her friends, change the language form slightly, and turns it in as his or her own work.

Behavior 3. The writer finds some student papers online, or buys or receives some from his or her friends, writes a paper by combining texts from the multiple student papers, and turns it in without crediting the sources.

Behavior 4. The writer finds some student papers online, or buys or receives some from his or her friends, writes a paper by combining texts from the multiple student papers and changing the language form slightly, and turns it in without crediting the sources.

Behavior 5. The writer finds some student papers online, or buys or receives some from his or her friends, writes a paper by combining texts from the multiple student papers and paraphrasing them in his or her own words, and turns it in without crediting the sources.

Behavior 6. The writer finds a text which suits his or her purpose on a credible website or in a book or article in the library, and turns it in as his or her own work.

Behavior 7. The writer finds a text which suits his or her purpose on a credible website or in a book or article in the library, changes the language form slightly, and turns it in as his or her own work.

Behavior 8. The writer finds some texts which suit his or her purpose on credible websites or in books or articles in the library, writes a paper by combining texts from the multiple sources, and turns it in without crediting the sources.

Behavior 9. The writer finds some texts which suit his or her purpose on credible websites or in books or articles in the library, writes a paper by combining texts from the multiple sources and changing the language form slightly, and turns it in without crediting the sources.

Behavior 10. The writer finds some texts which suit his or her purpose on credible websites or in books or articles in the library, writes a paper by combining texts from the multiple sources and paraphrasing them in his or her own words, and turns it in without crediting the sources.

Behavior 11. The writer finds some texts which suit his or her purpose on credible websites or in books or articles in the library, writes a paper by combining texts from the multiple sources, and turns it in with crediting the sources only in the reference list.

Behavior 12. The writer finds some texts which suit his or her purpose on credible websites or in books or articles in the library, writes a paper by combining texts from the multiple sources and changing the language form slightly, and turns it in with crediting the sources only in the reference list.

Behavior 13. The writer finds some texts which suit his or her purpose on credible websites or in books or articles in the library, writes a paper by combining texts from the multiple sources, and turns it in with crediting the sources only in the reference list.
sources and paraphrasing them in his or her own words, and turns it in with crediting the sources only in the reference list.

Behavior 14. The writer finds some texts which suit his or her purpose on credible websites or in books or articles in the library, writes a paper by combining texts from the multiple sources, and turns it in with crediting the sources in the text and the reference list.

Behavior 15. The writer finds some texts which suit his or her purpose on credible websites or in books or articles in the library, writes a paper by combining texts from the multiple sources and changing the language form slightly, and turns it in with crediting the sources in the text and the reference list.

Behavior 16. The writer finds some texts which suit his or her purpose on credible websites or in books or articles in the library, writes a paper by combining texts from the multiple sources and paraphrasing them in his or her own words, and turns it in with crediting the sources in the text and the reference list.

Behavior 17. The writer writes a paper which contains a copied secondary source with multiple primary sources without acknowledging the secondary source.

Behavior 18. The writer writes a paper by slightly changing the language form of a copied secondary source with multiple primary sources without acknowledging the secondary source.

Behavior 19. The writer borrows a sentence from someone else’s text without crediting the source. His or her purpose of borrowing it is to express his or her own ideas.

Behavior 20. The writer borrows a few sentences from someone else’s text without crediting the source. His or her purpose of borrowing them is to express his or her own ideas.

Behavior 21. The writer borrows a paragraph from someone else’s text without crediting the source. His or her purpose of borrowing it is to express his or her own ideas.

Behavior 22. The writer borrows a few paragraphs from someone else’s text without crediting the source. His or her purpose of borrowing them is to express his or her own ideas.

Behavior 23. The writer writes a paper in a foreign language and asks the native speaker of the language to proofread it, and turns it in without acknowledging the proofreader.

*Appendix B is the English translation of the questionnaires used in this study.