PLAGIARISM IN ENGLISH ACADEMIC WRITING: BUILDING DEFINITIONS AND CLARIFYING TYPES

Nguyen Thi Van Lam [(1)], Filipi Anna [(2)]
[1]*Faculty of Education, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia;*
Department of Foreign Languages, Vinh University, Vinh City, Nghe An, Vietnam
[2]*Faculty of Education, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia*

Abstract: Plagiarism is a matter of serious concern in education worldwide in general and in Vietnam in particular. This problematic issue has not been carefully taught at any level of education in Vietnam. The article therefore focuses on the issue of plagiarism in English academic writing, discussing various classifications of plagiarism and proposing a synthesis which includes the forms of plagiarism committed in English academic writing. It is hoped that this synthesis will help educators and students better understand and identify types of plagiarism, raising awareness of the ways in which plagiarism can be avoided and thus improving the quality of academic writing in English.

1. Introduction

Plagiarism, 'the practice of taking someone else's work or ideas and passing them off as one's own' [33], has drawn the attention of numerous researchers and educators worldwide. A plethora of research pertains to diverse focuses such as teachers' and students' perceptions of plagiarism [2], plagiarism and the Internet [43], plagiarism and academic writing [37], plagiarism and its connection to skills as critical thinking [22], plagiarism and paraphrasing [5], and plagiarism detection software [7]. The findings demonstrate the increasing prevalence of plagiarism in many parts of the world, and continuous efforts to apply various pedagogical strategies to militate against that prevalence. When we turn our attention to higher education in Vietnam, plagiarism has also been widely reported in the public media and in informal social anecdotes; however, empirical research only has only been reported in a modest number of formal studies [12].

Furthermore, as far as we have been able to ascertain, there is a lack of clarity in defining and categorising plagiarism in a systematic way. Clarity in defining plagiarism is important in order for educators to develop practices and programs which can facilitate students in understanding this issue. Therefore, this paper will discuss the definitions and types of plagiarism related to English academic writing. This is important as a way of bringing attention to the need for agreed working definitions on which to build pedagogical practices that will assist students to avoid plagiarism and in so doing, improve their English Language writing.

In this article, features of English academic writing are reviewed first of all to provide a linguistic context for plagiarism and to detail the kinds of challenges that it creates for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writers. This provides a starting point for reviewing definitions of plagiarism put forward in

Email: nguyenthivanlam@gmail.com (N. T. V. Lam)

theoretical and research texts, and leads to a working definition useful for EFL university students. It will be argued that in delving more deeply into the nature of plagiarism requires an understanding of the various types that occur in academic writing. Those identified in the literature are reviewed, and a synthesis of 15 types is then proposed.

2. Academic Writing in English

Academic writing refers to the type of writing required at college level and in higher education, within the academic community. Writing in this context is thus part of academic literacy, which is defined as 'the ability to read and write the various texts assigned in college' [42, p. 4]. Regarding academic writing in English, students, especially postgraduate students who have learned English as a foreign language (EFL) encounter difficulties when writing academically in English [1; 40]. Typically, such students are not familiar with the various features of academic writing discussed by authors such as Gillett [14] and Paltridge et al. [34]. In preparing for entry into tertiary English language courses, these students generally practise for sitting the English language proficiency examinations such as the International English Language Testing System (IELTS), or Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) in which academic writing is limited to argumentative or discursive 'essays' of between 250 - 300 words. These are styles of writing that do not require providing citations or references. Therefore, given this limited exposure to text-types, academic writing is challenging for them when they begin their undergraduate or postgraduate courses because here they

are required to write longer academic texts such as a journal article, a literature review or a case study.

As described by Gillett [14], academic writing in English has at least eight features: *complexity*, *formality*, *precision*, *objectivity*, *explicitness*, *accuracy*, *hedging* and *responsibility*. *Complexity* refers to lexical and grammatical complexity. Academic texts are lexically dense and varied [10], containing infrequently used content words [27] and complex words formed by means of derivation and compounding [31]. Additionally, academic texts contain complex grammatical structures, including subordinate and complement clauses, passive verbs, participles, noun phrases, nominalisation, prepositional phrases, attributive adjectives and adjectival groups [14]. Gillett also describes the relative *formality* of academic texts in which formal language is utilised, while colloquial words and expressions, contracted forms and rhetorical questions are avoided. For example, the word *considerable* is more often used in academic texts than *many* or *a lot of*; and contracted forms of *aren't*, *don't* or *can't* are not used. In addition, He states that the academic writer should provide precise numbers and figures rather than a general quantifier such as *some* or *a small number of* to ensure the element of *precision* of academic writing. Moreover, the feature *hedging* or employing cautious language in academic texts, in Gillett's view, is very important for informing the writer's stance on an issue or argument. Academic writers can deploy different ways of hedging through 'that'-clauses, certain verbs, including modal verbs, nouns, adjectives, including

those followed by to-infinitive, and adverbs, including adverbs of frequency [14; 34].

Yet another feature of English academic writing proposed by Gillett [14] is *objectivity*, which refers to a focus on information or arguments rather than a focus on the author. He suggests avoiding the use of *I*, *me*, or *you* in a personal manner in academic writing, although Paltridge et al. [34] note that the utilisation of these personal words depends on the type of written assignments required by the lecturer. The assignments may require students to write objective arguments for or against an issue with evidence from the literature or to write a critical reflection on that issue in which the use of the first person is necessary [34; 44]. Also, according to Gillett [14], academic texts should ensure the feature of *explicitness* in the organisation of ideas and sources of information, from which authors employ content as evidence for their arguments. The proper utilisation of transitional signals or cohesive devices and the consistent use of citations and references are necessary for explicit academic texts. This aspect of academic writing entails another feature, which is the academic writers' *responsibility* for evidencing and justifying their arguments, and showing their understanding of the original texts they use. Gillett suggests deploying such skills as paraphrasing, summarising, citing and referencing to ensure *responsibility*. Writers also need to use more topic knowledge from external resources than internal knowledge [34]. Therefore, they need to integrate information, examples, facts, ideas and theories from different sources, and utilise

the conventions for source acknowledgements.

Owing to these features of English academic writing, EFL students find it difficult to complete their academic writing tasks in English. Hence, they may come to rely on plagiarism, with or without intention and awareness, as evident in several studies [e.g. 2; 30; 36]. For example, Babaii and Nejadghanbar [2] investigated the perceptions of Iranian students of applied linguistics on the causes of plagiarism and found that the main causes were their unfamiliarity with plagiarism, low language proficiency, poor academic skills and insufficient knowledge of citation conventions. Mohd Habali and Fong [30] found similar factors contributing to plagiarism in English academic writing by a group of Malaysian students in a Master in Education in Teaching English as a Second Language program. Accordingly, in addition to improving their English language proficiency and academic writing skills, EFL students need to understand what plagiarism is to avoid committing it. In the following section, we turn to definitions of plagiarism and suggest a working definition to assist EFL undergraduate and postgraduate students to develop an awareness of plagiarism as the first step in avoiding it.

3. Plagiarism in English Academic Writing: Definitions

The literature provides us with various studies conducted on plagiarism at different levels of school, undergraduate and postgraduate education. Several definitions of plagiarism have been proposed, indicating that it is not an easy task for researchers and educators to

find a universally agreed to and applied definition of plagiarism. Liddell, for instance, conducted a review of the literature of the definitions of plagiarism that led her to conclude that it is any utilisation of others' creative work such as 'words, ideas, organisation, drawings, designs, illustrations, statistical data, computer programs, inventions or any creative work' and presenting it as something originally belonging to one's own work [23, p. 49]. She further elaborates that plagiarism is realised by purchasing papers, using cut and paste methods for works from the internet, with no quotation marks for direct quotes, paraphrasing without source citations, having papers or a large part of papers written by someone else, and submitting writing as one's own [23].

In most of the reviewed studies, plagiarism is negatively defined. For example, it is defined as a serious offence, intellectual theft, and cheating and use of words or ideas by another person without source acknowledgement [4; 8; 25; 35]. In the more extreme negative construals of plagiarism, it is characterised as an epidemic for college educators [13], a crime in academia [36], intellectual theft [3], cheating [8], and a grievous sin [46]. Because of the negative connotations associated with plagiarism, students appear to be afraid of exploring it seriously to see the value of intellectual property, creativity and individualism in a more positive way. In order to avoid the negative connotations of plagiarism and to facilitate students in understanding the issue, various terms have been employed in place of *plagiarism*. Howard [18], for example, utilises *patchwriting* to refer to the copy of text from a source with the

deletion of some words, the replacement of words with corresponding synonyms, or the modification of grammatical structures. In Howard's view, students' patchwriting is a way of developing their skills. This view is shared by Pecorari [36], who believes such plagiarism 'deserves a pedagogical, rather than a punitive, response' (p. 320). In several studies, the term *plagiarism* is substituted by *textual borrowing* [e.g., 39], or by *intertextuality*, both transgressive and non-transgressive, as in the study by Chandrasoma, Thompson, and Pennycook [9].

It is evident that the diversity and inconsistency of these definitions has the potential for confusing students and for making it difficult for them to understand the concept of plagiarism [35; 48]. There should be consistency in defining plagiarism so that students are able to differentiate plagiarism from other academic misconducts. For this purpose, we can define plagiarism in English academic writing as:

> the act of representing the work, ideas and words of others as one's own without acknowledging the originator.

An advantage of this working definition is that it is short and memorable, while at the same time encompassing all the three main contents of plagiarism discussed in the literature: work, ideas and words. The definition can then be expanded as follows:

> The plagiarised item can be a complete or partial work, either ideas or words or both. The originator can be the primary author(s) who creates the work or the secondary author(s) who first cites the work. This act of

representation is considered to be wrong-doing because the primary and/or secondary authors' credit is obliterated.

This expansion not only provides detail but clarifies the reason for the negative connotations of plagiarism. It also flags that there is a range of types of plagiarism.

4. Plagiarism in English Academic Writing: Types

Just as plagiarism is defined in many ways, it also has various classifications. Perhaps this is one reason why EFL writers, teachers and students are discouraged from seriously exploring it. However, in order to prevent the prevalence of plagiarism and improve academic writing, teachers and students should gain insights into types of plagiarism to work out different strategies against these types.

One classification of plagiarism types is direct and indirect plagiarism [15]. In Glatt and Haertel's classification, direct plagiarism is committed when students copy a sentence or a passage verbatim without acknowledging the author, while indirect plagiarism is done when students express the original work in their own words with no sources given. In both types, the sources are not cited; however, these types are different in that direct plagiarism is an exact copy while indirect plagiarism is the use of one's own words.

A classification of plagiarism based on intentional deception is proposed by Belter and du Pré [6]. Intentional plagiarism occurs when students are aware that source acknowledgement is absent or inadequate. This type is perpetrated by students paying ghost-writers, or downloading papers online, a

practice identified in both first and second language learners [38]. The other type, unintentional plagiarism, is the result of inadequate knowledge [6] including a lack of understanding about citation and referencing [26], differences in cultural backgrounds and difficulties in the academic writing process [38]. This inadvertent plagiarism is construed by many researchers as a pedagogical issue or development stage rather than as an ethical issue [19; 38].

In the context of Vietnam, where plagiarism has not generally been discussed across the various levels of education despite the fact that it is considered to be a crime if publically identified, examples of both intentional and unintentional plagiarism are commonplace. Many students and researchers may naturally employ the ideas and words of others without acknowledging the authors, and take pride in their work. Some may be aware that it is unacceptable in academic writing, but they nonetheless plagiarise for various reasons including the fact that controls over the practice are relaxed or not enforced. However, others may commit plagiarism unintentionally. As they are not taught about plagiarism and its various manifestations, they may not know that their writing product is a form of plagiarism. For example, students may not understand the importance and style for citation and referencing in academic writing; they write their assignments or articles using ideas and even words of others with no citations at all or with or without end-references. Some writers mistakenly think that the mere use of paraphrasing can help avoid plagiarism. However, paraphrasing alone is not a

sufficient solution to this problem. Paraphrasing should be employed with in-text citation and end-referencing, otherwise students are indeed committing plagiarism of ideas. It is therefore vital that students and educators become aware of what constitutes plagiarism. In order to develop such an awareness, it becomes important to understand how plagiarism types are categorised as we have done below.

The categorisation provided by iParadigms [20], as the creator of the *Turnitin* plagiarism detection software widely used in a large number of universities across the world, consists of ten types of plagiarism in order of seriousness, from the most serious to the least.

1. CLONE: An act of submitting another's work, word-for-word, as one's own.

2. CTRL-C: A written piece that contains significant portions of text from a single source without alterations.

3. FIND-REPLACE: The act of changing key words and phrases but retaining the essential content of the source in a paper.

4. REMIX: An act of paraphrasing from other sources and making the content fit together seamlessly.

5. RECYCLE: The act of borrowing generously from one's own previous work without citation; to self-plagiarise.

6. HYBRID: The act of combining perfectly cited sources with copied passages - without citation - in one paper.

7. MASHUP: A paper that represents a mix of copied material from several different sources without proper citation.

8. 404 ERROR: A written piece that includes citations to non-existent or inaccurate information about sources

9. AGGREGATOR: The 'Aggregator' includes proper citation, but the paper contains almost no original work.

10. RE-TWEET: This paper includes proper citation, but relies too closely on the text's original wording and/or structure.

[20, p. 4]

This classification covers key types of plagiarism; however, it is not an exhaustive list because a few examples of plagiarism discussed in the literature do not fall into any of the above types. 'Plagiarism of secondary sources' and 'plagiarism of ideas' [25, p. 27] are two. Also, other categories of plagiarism based on text, ideas, sources of text or ideas, and structure or organisation of ideas (see above), are absent from the iParadigms types.

5. A Synthesis of Plagiarism Types

With a view to helping EFL learners, teachers and researchers understand the issue of plagiarism clearly, we propose a classification of plagiarism types synthesised from the literature as originally proposed by Nguyen [32]. This synthesis is composed of ten types from the categorisation by iParadigms and five from other classifications, making up 15 types based on text, ideas, structure, sources and citations (Table 1). These types are numbered for convenience, but are not specifically ranked.

Type 1: Submission of the complete work of others as one's own

This type consists of CLONE in the iParadigms's classification [20]; plagiarism of authorship [25]; cheating

described as handing in a paper borrowed or bought from someone else as one's own [19]; ghost writing or purloining [47]; downloading a free research paper, buying a paper from a commercial paper mill, copying an article from the web or an online or electronic database, and copying a paper from a local source [16]; and illegally using the papers written by someone else, and representing the papers from a peer or relative as one's own [35].

These forms of plagiarism share the feature of using the whole text produced by others. This is a type of intentional plagiarism as the text users know that it is not academically and socially acceptable. The plagiarists may take the papers from an electronic database or e-database, from which the text can be searched and retrieved; thus, plagiarism can be easily detected. Alternatively, they may take from unpublished papers with or without permission of the authors. In this case, only the authors and those who have read and remembered the content of the papers can identify the violation. However, because the original papers are not in a public space, the plagiarised paper will most likely be accepted.

Type 2: Considerable verbatim copying from one source

This type bears a similarity to the type of plagiarism named CTRL-C [20], verbatim copying [47], and substantial copy-paste [11]. Many parts of an article or a paper are copied with no change in words and meanings or structures. Students may think that they will be penalised for copying if they take the entire paper, less likely if they only use parts of the paper. As with Type 1, this is another example of intentional plagiarism which may or may not be identified due to

the availability of the original work in the database.

Type 3: Copying with original content and minor changes in key vocabulary

This covers the subtypes of FIND-REPLACE [20], paraphrasing plagiarism [25], patchwriting [19], changing some words but copying whole phrases [16], and plagiarism of text with a few changes [29; 41]. This type is commonly committed due to writers' difficulty in understanding the meaning of the original sentence and lack of academic writing skills such as paraphrasing and/or summarising. Some writers mistakenly believe that paraphrasing simply means a replacement of some words and that by paraphrasing in that way without citing the sources they can avoid plagiarism. This type of plagiarism is easily detected in *Turnitin* software or through a Google search if the sources are available in the *Turnitin* database or online. Teachers do not encounter any difficulties in identifying this type due to the irrelevant vocabulary and structures used as well as the mistakes and errors made by students.

Type 4: Paraphrasing from multiple sources with an all-fit-together arrangement

This type shares the features of REMIX [20], paraphrasing plagiarism [25], illicit paraphrasing [47], and paraphrasing from different sources without citation and reference [35]. The writers paraphrase words and ideas taken from different sources without citing the sources, and then rearrange all the paraphrasing in paragraphs across their papers. This may bring about a mixture of ideas which are not relevant to each other, probably resulting in incoherence. A lack of originality in research is another problem caused by this type of plagiarism.

Regarding the identification of this type, if the paraphrasing is poor, plagiarism detection software such as *Turnitin* can identify it; however, if the paraphrasing is very good, the software cannot detect it. The former case can also be detected by the teacher due to the language errors, while the latter case is often praised by the teachers for being well expressed in English and given good marks.

Type 5: Self-plagiarism

This type is similar to RECYCLE [20], recycling [47], and text recycling [11]. It is also referred to in many reviews [e.g., 21; 29]. Students may take a whole paper previously written and submitted, and then use it for the new submission, or they may take parts of the paper, or words and ideas from the paper without citing the sources. It is not easy to detect this type if the papers are not electronically available or if they have not been previously read and remembered by the reviewers. Explicit rules about self-plagiarism and building academic integrity are important pathways to addressing this type of plagiarism.

Type 6: Combination of properly cited texts with uncited ones

This type is similar to HYBRID [20]. The writers employ the words or ideas of others both with and without acknowledgement. It can be an intentional act of plagiarising. In the case of not citing the sources, the authors use the paraphrasing or direct quotation as their own. This type is frequently committed by students who believe that the teachers would have no time to read students' writing [32].

Type 7: Improperly cited copying from multiple sources

This type consists of the following subtypes: MASHUP [20]; non-attribution [19]; sham plagiarism [47]; cutting and pasting to create a paper from several sources, and quoting less than all the words copied [16]; the use of different parts of the papers from different sources with correct citation and reference but no quotation marks [35]; and plagiarism of text with no alterations [41]. The writer commits this type of plagiarism due to insufficient knowledge of citation conventions. This type is easily detected by the teacher because the information about the sources is correct; however, the students do not apply the required citation and reference styles. A mixture of different styles for citing and referencing is often found, and a simple check of the original work can help the readers identify plagiarism.

Type 8: Invented citation

This type is similar to 404 ERROR [20], faking a citation [16], and providing incorrect references with the intention of cheating [24]. The writers can produce a statement but provide a source that does not exist. It is invented by the writer due to dishonesty or it is irretrievable due to the creator's action of withdrawing the source. The irretrievable source is considered to be plagiarism if no evidence of the access date of its retrievable source is given.

Type 9: Properly cited copying without presenting one's own original ideas

This type is the same as AGGREGATOR [20]. The writers have a good knowledge of citations and references, thus acknowledging the sources properly. However, they only paraphrase or summarise the words and ideas of other authors without presenting any of their own ideas. As a result, the paper contains only borrowed words or ideas.

Type 10: Properly cited copying with minor changes in original wording and/or structure

This type is similar to RE-TWEET [20] and inappropriate paraphrasing [41]. Like Type 9, Type 10 shows that the writers are good at citing and referencing, and give due credit to the original authors. They cite the sources properly; however, they only make few changes in the vocabulary and grammatical structure of the original sentences. This type is committed possibly due to the writers' low language proficiency, poor academic skills such as paraphrasing and summarising, or insufficient time.

Type 11: Plagiarism of ideas

This is discussed by Martin [25] as a type of plagiarism in which the ideas come from other people and the sources are not cited, but the words are not copied verbatim. This type of plagiarism is discussed in several other studies [11; 25; 29; 41]. It is similar to paraphrasing from one or different sources without citation and reference [35], and paraphrasing or summarising without attribution [16].

Type 12: Plagiarism of sources

This includes plagiarism of secondary sources, in which the plagiarists cite the primary sources from the unacknowledged secondary ones without reading the primary [25]. The primary source is the original author of the paper, while the secondary source is the writer who cites the primary source. Plagiarism of sources can also be plagiarism of both primary and secondary sources, in which the primary and secondary sources are not cited, as well as plagiarism of a plagiarised source, which is related to sources but not mentioned in the literature.

Type 13: Plagiarism of structure

This is similar to plagiarism of the form of a source, which refers to copying the argument structure from a primary source cited in a secondary one, with improper citation of the primary and no acknowledgement of the secondary [25].

Type 14: Collusion

This is categorised as another type of plagiarism, unauthorised collaboration for one's own work without acknowledging the collaborator(s) [8; 21; 24; 45] although other researchers and universities classify it as a type of academic misconduct, separate from plagiarism [3; 17]. This type can be intentional when the writer knows it is wrong, while it can be unintentional when the writers are unaware of their wrong-doing; for example, using the group members' ideas or words as one's own without giving due credit to the originators.

Type 15: Copying during exams

This is copying from the exam papers of other students or employing unauthorised materials such as books or notes or any aids during exams [21]. Copying of this type is either without citations or with improper citations. However, this type is considered to be a form of cheating prohibited and warned against before the start of all examinations conducted in Vietnam [28].

As mentioned earlier, in the above synthesis of the 15 plagiarism types, the types of plagiarism are specifically characterised according to five distinct categories of features: text, ideas, sources of text or ideas, quality of citations and structure of text or ideas. Table 2 lists their specific features of each category and identifies which plagiarism types are characterised by one or more of these

features. (Note there is a key to the plagiarism types below the table for easy reference).

Each type of plagiarism in the table has at least one distinguishing feature while some types share several features. For example, Type 1 shares all the features of Type 2 except one: in Type 1 students copy the whole paper and replace the author's name, while in Type 2, they copy many parts of the paper. Types 3 and 4 share all features but one: in Type 3, students copy with replacement of few words, but in Type 4, students can paraphrase or use their own words and grammatical structure to rephrase the original statement. Type 15 specifically applies to examinations, and involves copying unauthorised materials or writing from memory. It therefore shares several features of other types. In addition, some aspects of quality of citations are a feature of every single type, while some aspects of sources are a feature of all but Type 8. Features of text and ideas occur in just over half the plagiarism types, while the structure feature is limited to two types only, Types 1 and 13.

Table 1: *Types of plagiarism synthesised from the literature*

TYPE	TYPES OF PLAGIARISM
Type 1	Submission of the complete work of others as one's own
Type 2	Considerable verbatim copying from one source
Type 3	Copying with original content and minor changes in key vocabulary
Type 4	Paraphrasing from multiple sources with an all-fit-together arrangement
Type 5	Self-plagiarism
Type 6	Combination of properly cited texts with uncited ones
Type 7	Improperly cited copying from multiple sources
Type 8	Invented citation
Type 9	Properly cited copying without presenting one's own original ideas
Type 10	Properly cited copying with minor changes in original wording and/or structure
Type 11	Plagiarism of ideas
Type 12	Plagiarism of sources
Type 13	Plagiarism of structure
Type 14	Collusion
Type 15	Copying during exams

Table 2: *Types of plagiarism and their features*

N0	FEATURES OF PLAGIARISM	TYPES OF PLAGIARISM														
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	**TEXT**															
1.1	Wholly verbatim copying	√				√			√				√		√	√
1.2	Considerable verbatim copying		√			√			√				√		√	√
1.3	Replacement of few words			√		√			√		√		√		√	√
2	**IDEAS**															
2.1	Paraphrasing				√	√			√				√		√	√
2.2	Paraphrasing, summarising, synthesising					√			√	√		√	√		√	√
3	**SOURCES**															
3.1	One source	√	√			√						√		√	√	√
3.2	Multiple sources			√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√			√	√
3.3	Primary sources	√	√	√	√	√				√	√		√			√
3.4	Secondary sources	√	√	√	√	√				√	√		√			√
4	**QUALITY OF CITATIONS**															
4.1	Proper citations						√			√	√					
4.2	Improper citations	√	√	√	√	√		√						√	√	√
4.3	No citations	√	√	√	√	√	√					√		√	√	√
4.4	Incorrect citations								√							
4.5	Proper citations of primary sources						√			√	√		√			
4.6	No citations of primary sources	√	√	√	√	√	√					√	√	√		√
4.7	Proper citations of secondary sources						√			√	√		√			
4.8	No citations of secondary sources	√	√	√	√	√	√					√	√	√		√
5	**STRUCTURE**	√												√		

Key: *√ = This is a feature of this type of plagiarism.*
Type 1: *Submission of the complete work of others as one's own*
Type 2: *Considerable verbatim copying from one source*
Type 3: *Copying with original content and minor changes in key vocabulary*
Type 4: *Paraphrasing from multiple sources with an all-fit-together arrangement*
Type 5: *Self-plagiarism*
Type 6: *Combination of properly cited texts with uncited ones*
Type 7: *Improperly cited copying from multiple sources*
Type 8: *Invented citation*
Type 9: *Properly cited copying without presenting one's own original ideas*
Type 10: *Properly cited copying with minor changes in original wording and/or structure*
Type 11: *Plagiarism of ideas*
Type 12: *Plagiarism of sources*
Type 13: *Plagiarism of structure*
Type 14: *Collusion*
Type 15: *Copying during exams*

6. Conclusion

The definitions and categorisations of plagiarism are complex, and the identification of plagiarism is challenging for students, especially EFL learners undertaking academic writing in English. This paper has attempted to discuss different definitions and identify types of plagiarism in the literature. We have also proposed a working definition of plagiarism together with a synthesis consisting of 15 types of plagiarism based on an extensive review of the literature. Although these types all have their own distinctive features, they share at least one specific feature with other types.

The synthesis of plagiarism types could be used by EFL writers (not just students) when producing academic texts. By paying attention to these types, the writers will be able to identify and avoid them. It is hoped that this in turn can assist them to produce academic texts that are free from plagiarism. Regarding teaching academic writing, teachers could help EFL students identify these types gradually. This can be done by building a data-base of examples for each one and by developing strategies through interaction with students and between students of ways to avoid them. Techniques for improving academic language proficiency, academic skills including paraphrasing, summarising and critical thinking, and knowledge of subject matter, as well as knowledge of citation conventions are essential in helping students avoid all types of plagiarism.

The status of English as an international language has meant that increasingly English academic writing needs to reach standards that are regionally and internationally accepted. Therefore, clarification about what plagiarism is and what constitutes it is essential for students who are writing in an academic setting. Importantly, to reach an understanding of what it means to write well academically needs to be sensitive to both local as well as international context, and it needs to be a dynamic process that involves students working with each other as well as their lecturers to shape their understanding about the place that avoidance of plagiarism has in quality academic writing.

REFERENCES

[1] H. Al Fadda, *Difficulties in academic writing: From the perspective of King Saud University postgraduate students*, English Language Teaching, Vol. 5, No. 3, 2012, pp. 123-130, doi: 10.5539/elt.v5n 3p123.

[2] E. Babaii and H. Nejadghanbar, *Plagiarism among Iranian graduate students of language studies: Perspectives and causes,* Ethics & Behavior, 2016, pp. 1-19, doi: 10.1080/10508 422.2016.1138864.

[3] R. Barrett and A. L. Cox, *'At least they're learning something': The hazy line between collaboration and collusion*, Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, Vol. 30, No. 2, 2005, pp. 107-122, doi: 10.1080/0260293042000264226.

[4] R. Barrett and J. Malcolm, *Embedding plagiarism education in the assessment process*, International Journal for Educational Integrity, Vol. 2, No. 1, 2006, pp. 38-45, doi: http://dx. doi.org/10.21913/IJEI.v2i1.23.

[5] E. S. Barry, *Can paraphrasing practice help students define plagiarism?* College Student Journal, Vol. 40, No. 2, 2006, pp. 377-384.

[6] R. W. Belter and A. du Pré, *A strategy to reduce plagiarism in an undergraduate course,* Teaching of Psychology, Vol. 36, No. 4, 2009, pp. 257-261, doi: 10.1080/00986280903173 165.

[7] S. Bruton and D. Childers, *The ethics and politics of policing plagiarism: A qualitative study of faculty views on student plagiarism and Turnitin®*, Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, Vol. 41, No. 2, 2016, pp. 316-330, doi:10.1080/02602938.2015.1008981.

[8] J. Carroll, *A handbook for deterring plagiarism in higher education*, Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, 2002.

[9] R. Chandrasoma, C. Thompson and A. Pennycook, *Beyond plagiarism: Transgressive and nontransgressive intertextuality*, Journal of Language, Identity & Education, Vol. 3, No. 3, 2004, pp. 171-193, doi: 10.1207/s15327701jlie0303_1.

[10] S. A. Crossley, K. Kyle, and D. S. McNamara, *The development and use of cohesive devices in L2 writing and their relations to judgments of essay quality*, Journal of Second Language Writing, Vol. 32, 2016, pp. 1-16, doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.01.0 03.

[11] J. Debnath, *Plagiarism: A silent epidemic in scientific writing - Reasons, recognition and remedies*, Medical Journal Armed Forces India, Vol. 72, No. 2, 2016, pp. 164-167, doi: htt p://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mjafi.2016.03.010.

[12] Do Ba Khang, Do Ba Khai, Lam Quoc Dzung, Le Dao Thanh Binh An, Nguyen Phuong Lien, Nguyen Phuong Quynh and Pham Quoc Loc, *Student plagiarism in higher education in Vietnam: An empirical study,* Higher Education Research & Development, Vol. 36, No. 5, 2016, pp. 934-946, doi: 10.1080/07294360.2016.1263 829.

[13] A. Drum, *Responding to plagiarism*, College Composition and Communication, Vol. 37, No. 2, 1986, pp. 241-243, doi: 10.2307/357525.

[14] A. Gillett, *Academic writing: Features of academic writing*, Using English for academic purposes for students in higher education. Academic writing*, 2017, Retrieved from http://w ww.uefap.com/writing/writfram.htm.

[15] B. S. Glatt and E. H. Haertel, *The use of the cloze testing procedure for detecting plagiarism,* The Journal of Experimental Education*, Vol. 50, No. 3, 1982, pp. 127-136, doi: 10.2307/20151445.

[16] R. Harris, *The plagiarism handbook: Strategies for preventing, detecting, and dealing with plagiarism*, Pyrczak Publishing, Los Angeles, 2001.

[17] Hoa Sen University, *Quy định về liêm chính học thuật (Regulations on academic integrity),* 2013, Retrieved from http://sinhvien.hoasen.edu.vn/vi/van-ban-quy-dinh/quy-dinh-cua-truong/quy-che-quy-dinh-khac/quy-dinh-ve-liem-chinh-hoc-thuat.

[18] R. M. Howard, *A plagiarism pentimento,* Journal of Teaching Writing, Vol. 11, No. 2, 1992, pp. 233-246.

[19] R. M. Howard, *Plagiarisms, authorships, and the academic death penalty*, College English, Vol. 57, No. 7, 1995, pp. 788-806.

[20] iParadigms, *White paper: The plagiarism spectrum*, 2012, Retrieved from http://www.griffith.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/559996/Turnitin_WhitePaper _PlagiarismSpectrum.pdf

[21] R. James, C. McInnis and M. Devlin, *Assessing learning in Australian universities: Ideas, strategies and resources for quality in assessment,* Centre for the Study of Higher Education and the Australian Universities Teaching Committee Training (DEST) Meblourne, 2002.

[22] F. Johari, M. H. Alias, A. A. Rahman and M. F. Ibrahim, *The usage of 'Turnitin' as an innovative educational tool: Inculcating critical thinking in integrating Naqli and Aqli for subject of Malaysian economy,* Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, No. 195, 2015, pp. 821-827, doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro. 2015.06.186.

[23] J. Liddell, *A comprehensive definition of plagiarism*, Community & Junior College Libraries, Vol. 11, No. 3, 2003, pp. 43-52, doi: 10.1300/J107v11n03_07.

[24] Z. Mahmood, *Students' understanding of plagiarism and collusion and recommendations for academics,* WSEAS Transactions on Information Science and Applications, Vol. 6, No. 8, 2009, pp. 1349-1358.

[25] B. Martin, *Plagiarism: A misplaced emphasis,* Journal of Information Ethics, Vol. 3, No. 2, 1994, pp. 36-47.

[26] S. H. McLeod, Responding to plagiarism: The role of the WPA, *WPA: Writing Program Administration,* Vol. 15, No. 3, 1992, pp. 7-16.

[27] D. S. McNamara, S. A. Crossley and R. Roscoe *Natural language processing in an intelligent writing strategy tutoring system*, Behavior Research Methods, Vol. 45, No. 2, 2013, pp. 499-515, doi: 10.3758/s13428-012-0258-1.

[28] Ministry of Education and Training, *Regulations on national university entrance examination*, Hanoi, Vietnam, 2012.

[29] R. A. A. Mohammed, O. M. Shaaban, D. G. Mahran, H. N. Attellawy, A. Makhlof and A. Albasri, *Plagiarism in medical scientific research*, Journal of Taibah University Medical Sciences, Vol. 10, No. 1, 2016, pp. 6-11. doi: http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1016/j.jtumed.2015.01. 007

[30] A. H. Mohd Habali and L. L. Fong, *Plagiarism in academic writing among TESL postgraduate students: A case study*. In Y. C. Fook, K. G. Sidhu, S. Narasuman, L. L. Fong, & B. S. Abdul Rahman (Eds.), *7th International Conference on University Learning and Teaching (InCULT 2014) Proceedings: Educate to Innovate*, Springer Singapore, Singapore, 2016, pp. 729-740.

[31] Nguyen Thi Van Lam, *English words: Word-classes and word-formation,* Vinh University Journal of Science, Vol. 35, No. 2B, 2006, pp. 27-34.

[32] Nguyen Thi Van Lam, *Towards developing a pedagogy to help postgraduate students avoid plagiarism in English academic writing in Vietnam: A case study in Vietnam*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Monash University, Australia, 2017.

[33] Oxford Dictionaries Online, *Plagiarism,* Retrieved from http://www.oxford dictionaries.com/definition/english/plagiarism, 2014.

[34] B. Paltridge, L. Harbon, D. Hirsh, H. Shen, M. Stevenson, A. Phakiti and L. Woodrow, *Teaching academic writing*, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 2009.

[35] C. Park, *In other (people's) words: Plagiarism by university students – Literature and lessons,* Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, Vol. 28, No. 5, 2003, pp. 471-488, doi: 10.1080/02602930301677.

[36] D. Pecorari, *Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second-language writing,* Journal of Second Language Writing, Vol. 12, No. 4, 2003, pp. 317-345, doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2003.08.004.

[37] D. Pecorari, *Academic writing and plagiarism: A linguistic analysis*, Continuum, London, 2008.

[38] D. Pecorari and B. Petrić, *Plagiarism in second-language writing,* Language Teaching, Vol. 47, No. 3, 2014, pp. 269-302, doi: 10.1017/S0261444814000056.

[39] A. Pennycook, *Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism*, TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 30, No. 2, 1996, pp. 201-230, doi: 10.2307/3588141.

[40] A. Phakiti and L. Li, *General academic difficulties and reading and writing difficulties among Asian ESL postgraduate students in TESOL at an Australian university*, RELC Journal, Vol. 42, No. 3, 2011, pp. 227-264, doi: 10.1177/003368 8211421417.

[41] M. Roig, Avoiding plagiarism, self-plagiarism, and other questionable writing practices: A guide to ethical writing, 2006, Retrieved from http://www.cse.msu.edu/~alexliu/ plagiarism.pdf.

[42] R. Spack, *The acquisition of academic literacy in a second language: A longitudinal case study*, Written Communication, Vol. 14, No. 1, 1997, pp. 3-62, doi: 10.1177/07410883970 14001001.

[43] W. Sutherland-Smith, *The tangled web: Internet plagiarism and international students' academic writing*, Journal of Asia-Pacific Communication, Vol. 15, No. 1, 2005, pp. 15-29.

[44] J. M. Swales and C. B. Feak, *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills* (3rd ed.), University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, Mich., 2012.

[45] University of New South Wales, *Plagiarism and academic integrity,* Academic Skills, 2014, Retrieved from https://student.unsw.edu.au/plagiarism.

[46] P. A. Vesilind, *Public speaking and technical writing skills for engineering students* (2nd ed.), Lakeshore Press, Woodsville, NH., 2007.

[47] J. Walker, *Student plagiarism in universities: What are we doing about it?* Higher Education Research & Development, Vol. 17, No. 1, 1998, pp. 89-106, doi:10.1080/072 9436980170105.

[48] S. Yeo, *First-year university science and engineering students' understanding of plagiarism.* Higher Education Research & Development, Vol. 26, No. 2, 2007, pp. 199-216, doi: 10.1080/07294360701310813.

TÓM TẮT

ĐẠO VĂN TRONG VIẾT KHOA HỌC TIẾNG ANH: ĐỊNH NGHĨA VÀ PHÂN LOẠI

Đạo văn là một vấn đề nghiêm trọng trong giáo dục trên thế giới nói chung và Việt Nam nói riêng. Vấn đề đạo văn chưa được giảng dạy một cách cẩn thận trong các cấp học ở Việt Nam. Bài báo này đề cập đến vấn đề đạo văn, bàn về các cách phân loại đạo văn và đề xuất tổng hợp các loại đạo văn đã gặp trong văn viết khoa học bằng tiếng Anh.