

English Reading and Writing for General Academic Purposes

Reading and Writing for
Research Papers

英语研究论文 读写教程

丛书主编 张为民 张文霞
主 编 庞红梅

通用学术英语读写系列教材

清华大学出版社

Reading and Writing for
Research Papers

英语研究论文 读写教程

丛书主编 张为民 张文霞
主 编 庞红梅
编 者 杨 莉 张为民

通用学术英语读写系列教材

清华大学出版社
北京

内 容 简 介

本书是“通用学术英语读写系列教材”中的第四部。教材以提高学生英语学术论文读写能力为目标,精心挑选阅读素材,巧妙安排各单元的写作重点,循序渐进帮助学生了解研究论文的基本框架、写作原则和写作技巧,最终使学生能独立完成以IMRD格式为标准框架、以APA格式为基本要求的英语研究论文写作任务。

本教材根据研究论题进行分类,共包括四大主题:对剽窃的理解、语言学习中字典的使用、跨文化交际和EFL写作。每个主题包括主题导引、两篇相关论文和一个补充阅读。其中两篇论文是重点学习内容,每篇文章即为一个单元,各单元都设计了学习目标、论文阅读、词汇表、课后练习和写作重点五个部分。

版权所有,侵权必究。侵权举报电话:010-62782989 13701121933

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

英语研究论文读写教程/庞红梅主编. —北京:清华大学出版社, 2013

(通用学术英语读写系列教材)

ISBN 978-7-302-33227-5

I. ①英… II. ①庞… III. ①英语—论文—阅读教学—教材 ②英语—论文—写作—教材 IV. ①H31

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字(2013)第160402号

责任编辑:刘细珍

封面设计:傅瑞学

责任校对:王凤芝

责任印制:沈 露

出版发行:清华大学出版社

网 址: <http://www.tup.com.cn>, <http://www.wqbook.com>

地 址:北京清华大学学研大厦A座 邮 编:100084

社 总 机:010-62770175 邮 购:010-62786544

投稿与读者服务:010-62776969, c-service@tup.tsinghua.edu.cn

质量反馈:010-62772015, zhiliang@tup.tsinghua.edu.cn

印 装 者:北京嘉实印刷有限公司

经 销:全国新华书店

开 本:185mm×260mm 印 张:19 字 数:428千字

版 次:2013年9月第1版 印 次:2013年9月第1次印刷

印 数:1~4000

定 价:47.00元

产品编号:052607-01

“通用学术英语读写系列教材”编委会

丛书主编: 张为民 张文霞 (清华大学)

编 委: (按姓氏笔画排序)

王 哲 (中山大学)

刘宇慧 (北京工业大学)

刘泽华 (华中科技大学)

江桂英 (厦门大学)

余渭深 (重庆大学)

吴树敬 (北京理工大学)

张 莉 (华北电力大学)

张彩华 (中国农业大学)

李小红 (哈尔滨工业大学)

杨连瑞 (中国海洋大学)

汪火焰 (武汉大学)

战 菊 (吉林大学)

赵雪爱 (西北工业大学)

秦明利 (大连理工大学)

蒋学清 (北京交通大学)

谢小苑 (南京航空航天大学)

总序

学术英语学习旨在培养学生的学术交流能力, 满足学生使用英语进行专业学习和发展的需要。中小学阶段英语教学的重点一般是培养学生用英语进行一般交流的能力, 即侧重于一般英语教学。学术英语与一般英语既有联系, 又有自己的特点。学术英语的学习既可以提高学生专业发展所需的语言知识和技能, 同时也可以提高其一般英语的能力; 它很大程度上涵盖了一般英语的学习, 同时又可看作英语学习的更高阶段。学术英语学习包括两个层面的内容: 一是技能层面 (English for Academic Purposes) (如参加学术讲座、进行学术阅读需要的记笔记能力, 论文写作、学术发言需要的概括能力等); 二是语言层面 (Academic English) (如用学术语言写研究报告、研究论文的能力等)。学术英语是本科生、研究生用英语进行专业文献学习及研究交流所需要掌握的基本能力。

“通用学术英语读写系列教材” (English Reading and Writing for General Academic Purposes) 针对教育部在《大学英语课程教学要求》(2007) 中提出的英语较高要求和更高要求而编写。根据较高要求和更高要求, 大学英语教学要注重培养学生的学术交流能力, 要求学生能阅读所学专业的英语文献和资料, 能用英语撰写所学专业的报告和论文。同时, 本系列教材的编写也迎合全球化国际大环境对大学英语教学由一般英语转向学术英语的需要。

本系列教材的设计与编写主要依据两大原则: 语言学习规律和高等教育特点。根据语言学习规律, 语言输入为语言产出的基础, 语言产出需与语言输入相结合, 外语学习尤其如此。因此, 本系列教材采用了以读促写、读写结合的编写理念。同时, 掌握一门语言的读写能力遵循一定的先后顺序, 如先学组词、造句、写段落, 然后是记叙文、说明文、议论文等。在此基础上, 进行更高层次的读写学习, 即综述读写、论文读写等。另外, 高等教育在很大程度上是专业教育, 培养与专业相关的学术素养 (如综述、议论、思辨、研究规范等) 对学生而言至关重要。因此, 大学英语教育应该顺应和符合学生的专业发展需求。具体而言, 本科和研究生英语教育均需培养学生用英语完成说明文、议论文、文献综述和研究论文等不同语体的读写能力。

鉴于此, 本系列教材 1~4 册分别围绕高等教育中最常用的四个学术语体进行设计与编写, 即说明文、议论文、文献综述、研究论文。同时, 这四册教材又针对高等教育对学生的学术素养要求, 专门就常用的学术读写能力进行训练, 包括学术阅读技能、学术词汇扩展、学术语言特点、学术文本特点、学术写作技巧 (如 paraphrasing) 等。这些能力的训练贯穿于整个 1~4 册教材系列。

本系列教材是在教育全球化的新形势下为满足我国高校人才培养需求而开发的。教材

旨在为学生用英语顺利进行专业学习提供帮助和支撑，帮助学生掌握学术规范，提高学生的批判性和创造性思维，培养和提高学生的英语学术交流能力和专业学术素养，适用于本科生和研究生学习。我们相信，通过本系列教材的学习，学生不仅会进一步提高一般的英语交流能力，更能提高学术英语交流能力和跨文化学术素养。

感谢本系列教材的每一位编委专家为教材进行全面细致的审读，并提出宝贵的意见和建议，使得教材的编写更加契合广大院校培养优秀的研究型人才之目标，更加符合各高校英语教学向学术英语转型的要求。

丛书主编

2013年7月

前言

《英语研究论文读写教程》是“通用学术英语读写系列教材”中的第四部。教材强调以项目为基础学习研究论文的阅读和写作，帮助学生做好英语研究论文读写的准备；试图让学生理解研究论文写作的框架和各部分的写作原则，同时跨越专业之间的界限，完成以 IMRD 格式为标准框架、以 APA 格式为基本要求的论文写作。本教材希望在提高学生学术英语读写能力的同时，能给不同专业学生提供相关的研究论文写作实践机会。

一、教材对象

本教材针对有较好学术英语基础、同时有完成学术论文读写需要的本科生和研究生。教材内容与教学实践的各个环节紧密结合，适合一个学期的完整教学。

二、教材特点

1. 本教材采用各学科通用的 IMRD 研究论文写作框架，让学生突破学科障碍完成真实的项目写作，同时可以让学生关注到各个学科之间写作实践中的细微差别。
2. 本教材阅读部分的研究论文选材于语言学和文化研究方面的国际性权威期刊，正文内容未经删改，体例和格式也保留了各自的风貌和特点，目的是尽可能让学生接触真实的研究论文。
3. 本教材论文选题接近学生的学术生活和英语学习，提高学生对研究论文的读写兴趣，同时与传统英语教学密切相关。
4. 本教材中论文选材注重多样化，既包括以英语为母语的学者所写作的论文，也包括以英语为第二语言写作的学者所著论文，让学生在了解以英语为通用语言写作规范的同时观察并提高写作中的文化意识。
5. 本教材安排注重写作过程。教材详细解释了研究论文写作的完整过程，包括从研究论文整体框架设计到讲述、展示论文各个环节。

三、内容安排

1. 全书根据研究论题进行分类，共包括 4 大主题，分别是对剽窃的理解、语言学习中字典的使用、跨文化交际和 EFL 写作，选题紧贴学生的英语学习和学术要求。
2. 每个主题包括主题导引、两篇相关论文和一个补充阅读。主题导引帮助学生了解主

题,引入相关论文的阅读。两篇论文是重点学习内容,学生在了解相关主题的同时熟悉研究论文写作的基本规律和技巧。补充阅读旨在让学生更好地了解这一主题,也可以为学生自己的项目实践提供参考文献。

3. 同时,全书又按写作重心,共分8个单元,每单元包括以下4个部分。

A. 本单元学习目标展望。帮助学生树立明确、可行的目标,使学习更有针对性。

B. 论文阅读以及相关词汇表。

C. 课后练习。包括两大部分: Discussion Ideas (针对论文中的内容); Vocabulary and Language Learning Skills (针对论文中的词汇)。其中词汇部分的练习包括两个重点方向:第一个习题强调学生对词汇意义的认知,旨在提高学生研究论文的阅读能力;第二个习题强调对词汇常见搭配的使用,旨在提高学生研究论文的写作水平。

D. 写作重点。按照研究论文写作的规范,每个单元分别详尽介绍了研究论文写作和展示的各个组成部分,包括研究论文框架、绪论、文献综述、研究方法、研究结果、讨论、标题页、摘要、展示等。每单元写作讲解后,安排了针对本单元的写作重点训练。

本教材是清华大学外文系教学团队在多年教学科研实践的基础上不断积累经验所进行的大胆尝试。因时间仓促,书中难免会有错误和不当之处,热忱欢迎读者批评指正。

编者

2013年3月于清华园

Contents

Topic One	Plagiarism	1
Unit 1	Exploring University Students' Perceptions of Plagiarism: A Focus Group Study	3
	Writing Focus: Overview of the Research Paper	29
Unit 2	Exploring Staff Perceptions of Student Plagiarism	34
	Writing Focus: Introduction	49
Supplementary Reading		53
	How College Freshmen View Plagiarism?	53
Topic Two	Dictionary Use in English Learning	69
Unit 3	Dictionary Use and Vocabulary Choices in L2 Writing	71
	Writing Focus: Literature Review	91
Unit 4	The Effect of the Computer Dictionary and the Paper Dictionary on L2 Learners' Vocabulary Acquisition	99
	Writing Focus: Methods	116
Supplementary Reading		120
	Dictionary Use by EFL Writers: What Really Happens?	120
Topic Three	Culture Adaptation	143
Unit 5	Home-School Communication and Expectations of Recent Chinese Immigrants	144
	Writing Focus: Results and Discussion	166
Unit 6	An Exploratory Investigation of the Effects of a Cultural Orientation Programme on the Psychological Well-being of International University Students	171
	Writing Focus: Title Page and Abstract	191
Supplementary Reading		197
	The Relationship Between International Students' Cross-Cultural Adaptation and Dominant Language in Taiwan	197

Topic Four	EFL Writing	213
Unit 7	EFL Writers' Perceptions of Portfolio Keeping	214
	Writing Focus: References	229
Unit 8	Writing in an Electronic Age: A Case Study of L2 Composing Processes	238
	Writing Focus: Presentation	264
Supplementary Reading		267
	Integration of Process and Product Orientations in EFL Writing Instruction	267

Appendix	Glossary	287
-----------------	-----------------	------------

Anticipating the Issue

Discuss your answers to the following questions.

1. What is your definition of plagiarism? What should you do to avoid plagiarism?
2. Which of the following would be considered as plagiarism?
 - a) Not providing a reference when you have used somebody's idea.
 - b) Giving the reference but not using quotation marks when you take a sentence from another writer's article.
 - c) Presenting the results of your own research.
 - d) Copying a few sentences from an article on the Internet without giving a reference.
 - e) Not giving a reference when you use commonly accepted ideas.
3. Here's the ORIGINAL text, from page 1 of *Lizzie Borden: A Case Book of Family and Crime in the 1890s* by Joyce Williams et al.:

The rise of industry, the growth of cities, and the expansion of the population were the three great developments of late nineteenth century American history. As new, larger, steam-powered factories became a feature of the American landscape in the East, they transformed farm hands into industrial laborers, and provided jobs for a rising tide of immigrants. With industry came urbanization the growth of large cities (like Fall River, Massachusetts, where the Borden family lived) which became the centers of production as well as of commerce and trade.

Following are three paraphrases. Are they acceptable or unacceptable? What makes it/them plagiarism?

- a) The increase of industry, the growth of cities, and the explosion of the population were three large factors of nineteenth century America. As steam-driven companies became more visible in the eastern part of the country, they changed farm hands into factory workers and provided jobs for the large wave of immigrants. With industry came the growth of large cities like Fall River where the Borden family lived which turned into centers of commerce and trade as well as production.
- b) Fall River, where the Borden family lived, was typical of northeastern industrial cities of the nineteenth century. Steam-powered production had shifted labor from agriculture to manufacturing, and as immigrants arrived in the US, they found work in these new factories. As a result, populations

grew, and large urban areas arose. Fall River was one of these manufacturing and commercial centers (Williams, 1).

- c) Fall River, where the Borden family lived, was typical of northeastern industrial cities of the nineteenth century. As steam-powered production shifted labor from agriculture to manufacturing, the demand for workers “transformed farm hands into industrial laborers”, and created jobs for immigrants. In turn, growing populations increased the size of urban areas. Fall River was one of these hubs “which became the centers of production as well as of commerce and trade” (Williams, 1).

Selections

Unit 1 Exploring University Students' Perceptions of Plagiarism: A Focus Group Study

Unit 2 Exploring Staff Perceptions of Student Plagiarism

Supplementary Reading How College Freshmen View Plagiarism?

Unit 1

Exploring University Students' Perceptions of Plagiarism: A Focus Group Study

Learning Objectives

- What is a research paper?
- How to read a research paper?
- Features of academic language

Exploring University Students' Perceptions of Plagiarism: A Focus Group Study

Judith Gullifer* and Graham A. Tyson

School of Social Sciences and Liberal Studies, Charles Sturt University, NSW, Australia

Plagiarism is perceived to be a growing problem and universities are being required to devote increasing time and resources to combating it. Theory and research in psychology show that a thorough understanding of an individual's view of an issue or problem is an essential requirement for successful change of that person's attitudes and behaviour. This pilot study explores students' perceptions of a number of issues relating to plagiarism in an Australian university. In the pilot study, focus groups were held with students across discipline areas, year and mode of study. A thematic analysis revealed six themes of perceptions of plagiarism: confusion, fear, perceived **sanctions**, perceived seriousness, academic consequences and resentment.

Keywords:

academic integrity; college students; plagiarism; student ethics; university student

Introduction

Since the 1960s, and particularly in today's technologically advanced society, academic dishonesty (for example, cheating, **collusion** and plagiarism) continues to attract considerable attention from the media, academics, administrators and students (Ashworth, Bannister, and Thorne, 1997; Ashworth, Freewood, and Macdonald, 2003;

* Corresponding author. Email: jgullifer@csu.edu.au

Franklyn-Stokes and Newstead, 1995; McCabe, Trevino, and Butterfield, 2001; Petress, 2003). Plagiarism, a type of academic dishonesty, is often conceived as fraudulent behaviour that diminishes the intellectual property of the original author and rewards plagiarists for their work. Indeed, Petress (2003) describes plagiarism as a 'plague on our profession' (624) that, arguably, **obliterates** rewarding the ethic of hard work, eroding the moral value of honesty, whilst devaluing the role of assessment items within our educational establishments.

This characterisation of plagiarism is partly due to its historical roots, positioning plagiarism within a legal discourse, suggesting that plagiarism refers to an act of theft of the individual ownership of intellectual work (Ashworth, Freewood, and Macdonald, 2003; Steams, 1992; Sutherland-Smith, 2005). This construction of plagiarism assumes that knowledge has a history and that past authors must be acknowledged. Without due acknowledgement, it has been argued that one severs the ties between the creator of the work and the creation (Stearns, 1992). Indeed, Athanasou and Olasehinde (2002, 2) assert that 'The essence of cheating is fraud and deception', arguably a simple and direct characterisation of plagiarism.

At a broader social level, Marsden, Carroll, and Neil (2005) stress that the costs to the public through inadequately trained graduates could pose a threat to public safety, welfare and financial decisions through inaccurate advice, the **ramifications** of which **tarnish** universities' reputations and increase media scrutiny. Moreover, it has been suggested that academic dishonesty is growing, requiring universities to devote increasing time and resources to combat it (Carroll, 2005a; Franklyn-Stokes and Newstead, 1995; James, McInnis, and Devlin, 2002; Johnston, 1991; O'Connor, 2003; Park, 2003). In particular, the **onus** is on the academic managing the subject to correctly identify plagiarism and refer the matter to appropriate university processes (Sutherland-Smith, 2005).

My (Gullifer's) experience of identifying and managing instances of plagiarism occurred in the first semester of my appointment as an associate lecturer. Whilst the number of cases was low, I felt an overwhelming sense of disappointment and frustration. Two issues were evident: firstly, investigating an **allegation** of plagiarism requires time and effort that can take a few hours of work to locate the original sources and cross-reference with the student assignment, and longer to process the allegation and any subsequent misconduct **panel** and/or appeals. Secondly, and more importantly, good academic writing is **contingent** on developing sound skills in both research and writing, critically reading and comprehending appropriate sources, careful note-taking, paraphrasing, **judicious** use of quotations and **giving credit to** authors for their ideas and writing (Burton, 2007). As a consequence of plagiarism, students deny themselves an

opportunity to master these skills, making academic writing increasingly difficult as they progress through their degree.

As psychologists, we are aware that, when attempting to modify people's attitudes or behaviours, it is necessary to have a good understanding of the target person's perceptions of, and attitudes towards, the issue. In therapeutic situations, for instance, it is regarded as essential to obtain the client's perception and understanding of the issue or problem before **commencing** therapy. This insight, or lack of, is likely to influence the individual's responsiveness to different therapeutic approaches (Cochran and Cochran, 2005; Egan, 2007; Kanfer and Schefft, 1988; Prochaska and Norcross, 2007). Similarly, when exploring attitudes and beliefs towards plagiarism, we can apply the same principles to gain a better understanding of student perceptions, and then develop appropriate strategies with an increased probability of effectiveness.

Likewise, literature from **forensic** psychology suggests that having some understanding of an offender's perspective and motivation is important in order for positive change to occur, and **recidivism** to decrease. For example, Byrne and Trew (2005) argue, 'to be effective, interventions that aim to reduce or prevent offending behaviour need to be based on a sound understanding of what leads people to offend, and what leads people to stop offending' (185). Comparable sentiments are expressed by Ashworth, Bannister, and Thorne (1997) in relation to plagiarism. They argue that 'understanding the student perspective on...plagiarism can significantly assist academics in their efforts to communicate appropriate norms' (187).

From this, we argue that there is merit in understanding students' perspectives regarding plagiarism in order to develop successful strategies to promote academic integrity and thereby prevent plagiarism. McCabe and Trevino (1993) identified a significant relationship between academic dishonesty and how students perceived both student and faculty understanding of institutional policy. Higher levels of dishonesty were associated with lower levels of understanding. Another study by Roig (1997) clearly demonstrated that more than half of the students in their study could not identify clear examples of plagiarism, indicating that, whilst policy may exist, students have little knowledge or understanding of it.

It is apparent, therefore, that universities can benefit from learning about their own students' perceptions of plagiarism in order to develop appropriate strategies to promote academic integrity. In the light of this, the aim of our research program is to systematically examine students' understandings of, and attitudes towards, plagiarism, with the intention of informing the institution on approaches that might promote a greater awareness of plagiarism and, therefore, prevent its occurrence. This study is exploratory

in nature and will form part of a larger investigation.

Literature review

There is abundant literature on academic misconduct, most of which has been published during the last two decades. The literature on plagiarism offers many different reasons for student plagiarism. These include, but are not limited to, time to complete tasks (poor time management), perceived **disjuncture** between award (grade) and effort required, too much work to complete over too many subjects, pressure to do well, perceptions that students will not get caught, **anomie**, motivation, and individual factors (age, grade point average, gender, personality type) (Anderman, Griesinger, and Westerfield, 1998; Anderman and Midgley, 1997; Calabrese and Cochran, 1990; Caruana, Ramaseshan, and Ewing, 2000; Davis, Grover, and Becker, 1992; Kibler, 1993; Love and Simmons, 1998; Newstead, Franklyn-Stokes, and Armstead, 1996; Park, 2003; Perry et al., 1990; Roig and Caso, 2005; Sheard, Carbone, and Dick, 2003; Whitley, 1998). These studies tend to focus on individual student characteristics.

Focusing on individual student characteristics can be problematic, as the emphasis is then placed on the individual behaviour change process, with little attention to socio-cultural and physical environmental influences on behaviour. McCabe and Trevino (1997) examined both individual characteristics and contextual influences on academic dishonesty. Their results indicated that decision-making relating to academic dishonest behaviour is not only influenced by individual characteristics (e.g. age, gender and grade point average), but also contextual influences (e.g. the level of cheating among peers, peer disapproval of cheating, membership of societies for male and female students [**fraternity/sorority**], and the perceived severity of penalties for cheating). Therefore, to better understand student perceptions of plagiarism, we need to **take into account** not only individual student characteristics but also broader contextual factors.

Only a few studies have been conducted to explore students' perceptions of plagiarism, and these tend to focus on the reasons why students **plagiarise** (Ashworth, Bannister, and Thorne, 1997; Devlin and Gray, 2007; Marsden, Carroll, and Neill, 2005), or **utilise** attitude scales that are developed with the assumption that all relevant stakeholders share the same meaning frame of how plagiarism is understood (Brimble and Stevenson-Clarke, 2005; Franklyn-Stokes and Newstead, 1995; Hasen and Huppert, 2005; Lim and See, 2001). The assumption that the term plagiarism has shared meaning is due to the institution's reliance on university policy to be an instrument to both define what plagiarism is and the possible consequences if **breached**.

It has been argued, therefore, that having a good understanding of institutional policy

reduces the risk of engaging in plagiarism. Jordan (2001) found that students classified as non-cheaters reported greater understanding of institutional policy than did cheaters. The apparent lack of knowledge of institutional policy is further compounded by contradictory and often ambiguous information delivered by academic staff, as they also struggle to enforce an accepted and clear definition of plagiarism (McCabe, Butterfield, and Trevino, 2003). For instance, in a study conducted by Burke (1997), over half of the academics surveyed not only reported a lack of familiarity with the university's policy on plagiarism, but also did not refer to the policy when dealing with incidents. As Carroll (2005a) suggests, it is this lack of clarity about plagiarism that influences how students perceive plagiarism.

In order to both understand how students perceive plagiarism, and develop and evaluate learning materials aimed at educating students about plagiarism, Breen and Maassen (2005) conducted a two-phase research project, that firstly explored student perceptions of plagiarism and then developed learning materials to be embedded within courses. This was done by utilising four focus groups, consisting of 13 undergraduate psychology students across the first, second and third years. Their findings suggest that, apart from a clear understanding of **verbatim** use of other people's work without referencing, students had difficulty comprehending 'grey' areas (e.g. ability to comprehend and paraphrase work with due citation). The lack of familiarity with what required citation was, in part, due to the inability to source adequate 'information regarding the subtlety of paraphrasing, inconsistency between staff and the fear of **inadvertent** plagiarism. They also found that students reported an increasing understanding of plagiarism as a function of year level, with the associated skill development to complete assignments. Students also made suggestions for course improvement to focus on proactive strategies, **as opposed to** the reactive nature of dealing with plagiarism once discovered.

Whilst Breen and Maassen (2005) aimed to explore students' understanding of plagiarism, their main focus was to develop resource material to embed within their courses. Consequently, only a small sample pool of 13 psychology students was utilised, and questions centred specifically on students' ability to define and avoid plagiarism. Though Breen and Maassen were able to elicit some understanding of student perceptions, based on how students define plagiarism and then avoid it, the current study aims to extend and build upon their work. It is proposed in this study to sample across disciplines and **delve** deeper into student understandings of plagiarism.

McCabe and Trevino (1993) argued for a shift in our conceptualisation and examination of plagiarism, from one focused on individual factors that may inform an