

A Reflection About Self-plagiarism¹

Una reflexión acerca del auto plagio

Sergio Alonso Lopera Medina^{2*}
Universidad de Antioquia, Colombia

Abstract

This paper explores self-plagiarism in three different articles that reported results of the same research project on reading in a foreign language. This article follows the qualitative research method and an exploratory case study was used. Results support that both inadequate paraphrasing and adequate paraphrasing were given. Regarding inadequate paraphrasing some similar words and ideas were found. On the other hand, using different authors in a specific idea, having different numbers of words in a common issue, and being versatile to present information might lead to adequate paraphrasing. Conclusions suggest that a dialog between editors and authors must be given in order to clear self-plagiarism up. Finally, conclusions also suggest that editors should consider the inclusion of some similar information in articles written by the same author or the same research members.

Key words: dialog; reading a foreign language; self-plagiarism.

Resumen

Este artículo explora el auto plagio en tres diferentes artículos que reportaron los resultados de un mismo proyecto en lectura en lengua extranjera. Este artículo sigue el método cualitativo de investigación y se utilizó el estudio de caso múltiple. Los resultados indican que se presentaron tanto parafraseo inadecuado como parafraseo adecuado. Con relación al parafraseo inadecuado se encontraron algunas palabras e ideas similares. En contraste y en relación con el parafraseo adecuado, se encontró que utilizar diferentes autores en una idea, utilizar diferentes números de palabras en un elemento común y ser versátil para presentar la información puede ayudar al parafraseo adecuado. Las conclusiones sugieren que debe existir un diálogo entre los autores y editores para aclarar el auto plagio. Finalmente, las conclusiones también sugieren que

¹ Received: September 29th 2017/ Accepted: May 25th 2018

² sergio.lopera@udea.edu.co

los editores deberían considerar la inclusión de información similar en artículos escritos por el mismo autor o los mismos miembros de investigación.

Palabras clave: auto plagio; diálogo; lectura como lengua extranjera.

Resumo

Este artigo explora o autoplágio em três diferentes artigos que reportaram os resultados de um mesmo projeto em leitura em língua estrangeira. Este artigo segue o método qualitativo de pesquisa e foi utilizado o estudo de caso múltiplo. Os resultados indicam que ocorreram tanto parafraseio inadequado como parafraseio adequado. Com relação ao parafraseio inadequado se encontraram algumas palavras e ideias similares. Em contraste e em relação com o parafraseio adequado, encontrou-se que utilizar diferentes autores em uma ideia, utilizar diferentes números de palavras em um elemento comum e ser versátil para apresentar a informação, pode ajudar ao parafraseio adequado. As conclusões sugerem que deve existir um diálogo entre os autores e editores para esclarecer o autoplágio. Finalmente, as conclusões também sugerem que os editores deveriam considerar a inclusão de informação similar em artigos escritos pelo mesmo autor ou os mesmos membros de pesquisa.

Palavras chave: autoplágio; diálogo; leitura como língua estrangeira

Introduction

After a lengthy process of reviewing, one of my articles was going to be published in a journal in Colombia. Suddenly, I received an e-mail from an editor stating that I self-plagiarized a paragraph of an article and therefore she made the decision to decline the article. She also mentioned that she would consider declining another article I had previously submitted. I then apologized and tried to explain that I did not do it on purpose and I proposed to correct a paragraph that contained 72 words of verbatim plagiarism to amend self-plagiarism. Moreover, I proposed to hold a meeting with the academic committee to have a talk and share our insights about this issue. Fortunately, she accepted and invited the committee to have a meeting. In that meeting she illustrated the reasons why she declined the article (self-plagiarism, reuse of information) and I, in turn, presented my reasons (not on purpose, small amount of information, self-plagiarism is debatably). A month later, I received a letter from the editor apologizing for her decision and she informed me that the article was going to start again the process of reviewing. She also mentioned that the other article would continue with the process of reviewing, too. This anecdote led me to reflect on self-plagiarism, feeling that this issue should be taken further. For this reason, I decided to analyze some information that I have used in different articles in order to explore self-plagiarism. This article begins with the review of literature and the methodology. Then, the results are presented and finally the conclusions and implications are given.

Plagiarism

In the academic world to give proper credit to the source is a must and authors' ideas need to be protected in order to avoid plagiarism. The Oxford online dictionary defines plagiarism as "the practice of taking someone else's work or ideas and passing them off as one's own". Many journals have in their policies the call to avoid plagiarism and editors play a pivotal role in order to control ownership of articles (GIST Education and Learning Research Journal; IKALA *Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura*; PROFILE Issues in Teachers' Professional Development; Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal; HOW). Different cases of plagiarism have been found in medicine and chemistry (Bloemenkamp, Walvoort & Hart, 1999; Schein & Paladugu, 2001; Schulz, 2008). In fact, Shahabuddin (2009) reports that a PhD student was fired due to the fact that she took extensive verbatim appropriations of a book. Masic (2012) also exemplifies a young researcher who published different

articles in clinical cardiology and involved faculty colleagues but were not or minimally included in the research project.

On the other hand, there is no any official guide or regulation to control plagiarism and situations may vary depending on the case and field. In fact, Enders and Hoover (2004, cited in Shahabuddin, 2009:355) state that editors do not have a formal policy when they find cases of plagiarism such as unattributed sentences, unattributed proof from published paper, privately collected data, among others. Editors have to make difficult decisions and they sometimes question if they have made the right decision to decline an article.

Types of plagiarism

The Harvard Guide to Using Sources³ divides plagiarism into six categories:

1. Verbatim plagiarism: this is given when the writer copies word by word in an academic paper.
2. Mosaic plagiarism: that occurs when the writer copies pieces of information from a source or different sources and changes some words of the original one without paraphrasing or quoting properly.
3. Inadequate paraphrase: this is given when the writer does not use his/her own words to relate the information or when his/her words are very similar to the original source.
4. Uncited paraphrase: this occurs when the writer uses his/her own words to describe another writer's ideas, but the former does not cite the latter.
5. Uncited quotation: this happens when the writer uses quotation marks but does not credit the author of that source.
6. Using material from another student's work: this occurs when a student uses ideas that were given in discussions in groups and does not cite the group or classmate in a foot note.

For the purpose of this paper, inadequate paraphrase will be considered. Although some researchers (Kumar & Tripathi, 2009; Rojas, 2012; Soto, 2012) use other types of plagiarism such as false authorship, double submission to different journals, unauthorized

³ <https://usingsources.fas.harvard.edu/what-constitutes-plagiarism>.

copying, direct plagiarism, incorrect paraphrasing, complex plagiarism using a reference, plagiarism with loose quotation marks, self-recycling, sources not cited, sources cited but still plagiarized, and other types of plagiarism (copy and paste, word switching, data plagiarism, among others) the previous guide encompasses all of them. The Harvard Guide to Using Resources is a good option to take into as it gives examples of plagiarism and how to avoid it.

Self-plagiarism

Another kind of plagiarism is self-plagiarism. Spinak (2013) defines self-plagiarism as “using a previous piece of one’s own research and presenting it for publication as something new and original.” The author suggests that there are different reasons why self-plagiarism happens but not all are unethical. One of the reasons is that a research project may have different phases and old and new information is combined, and this leads to intermingle the same information in different articles. Another reason has to do when the results of a research project are divided into small parts (salami publishing) and sent to different journals. It can happen that these parts repeat important information of the research project. A third reason involves the awareness of self-plagiarism presented in the policy of journals. The instructions should contain some explicit restrictions about self-plagiarism as well as self-citing. Finally, self-plagiarism may occur when a person uses information from his/her thesis and publish it in articles. However, the writer can use an entry of a foot-note to explain this.

On the other hand, self-plagiarism is debatable as authors can use their own ideas in different published materials. Samuelson (1994) mentions some factors that support the use of previous published words: the new contribution has to do with the previous work as it is the basis of the topic; the new evidence or the new arguments are based on previous work and substantial information needs to be repeated; the audiences are different; the previous information is well developed and it is not worth telling that information in a different way. Samuelson (1994) suggests a rule of thumb in which self-plagiarism could be acceptable up to 30% but this could vary from area to area. The author also states that it is not possible to establish a legal maximum limit. In fact, Balbuena (2003) and Akst (2010) report that a person cannot plagiarize himself/herself due to the fact that the same author is involved. Finally, the American Psychological Association (APA, 2010) indicates that a limited scope could be possible to repeat words but the acceptable limit is difficult to determine.

Methodology

This inquiry is based on qualitative analysis, as I explored self-plagiarism. It is also an exploratory case study (Creswell, 2007; Yin, 2003) due to the fact that I analyzed different articles that reported results of the same research project. Three articles are taken as source to verify self-plagiarism: Motivation Conditions in a Foreign Language Reading Comprehension Course Offering Both a Web-based Modality and a Face-to-face Modality (Lopera, 2014), Diary Insights of an EFL Reading Teacher (Lopera, 2013), and Interaction in an EFL Reading Comprehension Distance Web-based Course (Osorno & Lopera, 2012).

Context

EALE (*Enseñanza y Aprendizaje de Lenguas Extranjeras*) research group carried out a project titled the “Effects of web-based and face-to-face instruction modalities in the reading comprehension of graduate students at Universidad de Antioquia”. The project began in 2009 and finished in 2011 and the main objective was to compare the effects of each modality. Two reading comprehension courses were offered to graduate students at the School of Law: a web-based course and a face-to-face course. It is worth noting that the same teacher taught both courses and was part of the research group, and the academic content of the foreign reading course was the same. The course was divided into five units (word and their meanings, reading strategies, development of reading skills, text organization methods, and critical reading). The web-based course was designed using a MOODLE based platform. There were a total of 38 students registered in this course and 27 in the face-to-face course.

Results

The common parts of the three articles were only taken into account in order to analyze self-plagiarism. Literature review about reading, the methodology and instruments described, and the introduction of findings were analyzed. In the next sections are the analyses of each part:

Literature about reading

The three articles contain the concept of reading:

Table 1: Concept of Reading

1. Motivation conditions...	2. Diary insights...	3. Interaction in an...
<p>Reading is an interactive process between the writer and the reader. Alyousef (2005) defines reading as “an interactive process between a reader and a text. The reader should interact dynamically with the text with the intention to understand its message” (p. 144). This author also states that the reader must possess two important elements in order to interact with the text: linguistic knowledge and background knowledge. The former involves awareness about the language, including vocabulary, grammatical structures, and tenses. The latter is linked to the familiarity the reader has with the text.</p>	<p>Reading is a complex process in which the reader has to comprehend the text. Alyousef (2005) states that reading is an “interactive process between a reader and a text which leads to automaticity or (reading fluency). In this process, the reader interacts dynamically with the text as he/she tries to elicit the meaning” (p. 144). However, there are two important elements that the reader needs to possess: linguistic knowledge and background knowledge. The former refers to the awareness about the language, such as grammar or vocabulary structure. The latter involves the familiarity the reader has with the reading content.</p>	<p>Dubin and Bycina (1984) argue that reading is a selective process that occurs between the reader and the text where background knowledge and language knowledge play a very important role for comprehension.</p>

Articles one and two have about the same amount of words (92 and 99 accordingly) and the same author is cited (Alyousef, 2005). However, the introduction of the concept of reading is different as article one states that the process of reading interactive and it involves the words *writer* and *reader*. In contrast, article two involves just the role of the reader. The definition of reading in article one is shorter than article two and was deleted regarding the original source that is presented in article two. At the end of the definition, articles one and two give the same information but it is paraphrased in a different form. However, they contain many similar words (linguistic knowledge; background knowledge; about the language; the former; the latter). Finally, article

three is totally different from one and two as the definition of reading is shorter (32 words) and the authors are different.

Regarding the reading process in foreign languages, the three articles provide the following information:

Table 2: the Reading Process in Foreign Language

1. Motivation conditions...	2. Diary insights...	3. Interaction in an...
<p>Other authors also support that reading involves a cognitive process (Cassany, 2006; González, 2000; Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Weir, 1993). Students must predict, memorize information for, interpret, pay attention to, and make hypotheses when they decode a written message. Cassany (2006) argues that reading processes are more complex in a foreign language because students may face difficulties with syntax, grammar, vocabulary, or culture; additionally, they usually have to make a greater effort when they are trying to interact with the reading. As a result, it is very important to guide students with reading strategies. Thus, developing a set of reading strategies is very important for learners.</p>	<p>Foreign language readers have to make a bigger effort to interact with texts because they might face grammar or vocabulary difficulties (Cassany, 2006). Thus, the role of the teacher becomes crucial, as foreign language readers need to be guided to overcome those difficulties.</p>	<p>Cassany (2006), González (2000), Grabe and Stoller (2002), and Weir (1993) see reading from a cognitive view, where prediction, interpretation, hypothesis statement, attention, memory, and perceptual processes are very important when decoding a written message. Cassany (2006) reports that these processes are more complex in a foreign language because the reader is not familiarized with syntax, vocabulary or culture, which implies a bigger effort when trying to develop this competence. Thus, a set of reading strategies is very important for learners.</p>

In this occasion, the number of words are different in all three articles (106, 43, 81, accordingly). Articles one and three have the same authors cited but are presented in different moments: article one introduces the idea that reading involves a cognitive process and then the authors, whereas the third article presents the authors of reading first and then the idea that reading involves a cognitive process. Another difference has to do with parts of speech. Article one uses verbs to describe the cognitive process: predict, memorize, interpret, pay attention to, and make. In contrast, article three uses nouns: prediction, interpretation, attention, memory. Moreover, both articles one and three have the same idea that Cassany presents at the end, but the information was paraphrased and some words were different: Cassany (2006) argues (article 1), Cassany (2006) reports (article three); students, reader (one and three accordingly); reading processes, these processes. However, some words or ideas are the same: processes are more complex in a foreign language because; thus, very important. It is worth noting a better paraphrasing would have been used to avoid repetition of words. On the other hand, article two is totally different from one and three as only one author is presented, and the cognitive view is not given.

Regarding the part of reading strategies, almost the same analysis is given:

Table 3: Reading Strategies

1. Motivation conditions...	2. Diary insights...	3. Interaction in an...
<p>Chamot, Barnhardt, El-Dinary, and Robbins (1999) and Janzen (2001) highlight the importance of teaching explicit reading strategies to students in order to improve their interactions with the text. Reading strategies help learners pay attention to textual cues, overcome difficult situations while reading, and integrate information from the text (Block, 1986). These reading strategies may range from basic (e.g., previewing or scanning) to complex (e.g., inference or summarizing).</p>	<p>Reading strategies help learners interact with the readings and different authors highlight the importance of applying them in language learning settings (Chamot, Barnhardt, El-Dinary, & Robbins, 1999; Hosenfeld, 1979; Janzen, 2001; Lopera, 2012; Mikulecky & Jeffries, 2004; Osorno & Lopera, 2012). When students are trained to use reading strategies they know what to do when facing troubles with readings (Block, 1986). Language teachers can use simple reading strategies such as previewing, predicting, guessing word meanings; or complex ones such as inference and summarizing.</p>	<p>Reading strategies help learners conceive a task, identify what textual cues they have to pay attention to, make sense of what they read, and decide what to do when they have troubles understanding the text (Block, 1986). These reading strategies range from the simple ones (e.g., scanning, guessing word meaning, previewing) to the complex ones (e.g., summarizing, inference, tone).</p>

The number of words in articles one and three are not quite different (67 and 59 accordingly). In contrast, article two contains more words than articles one and three (83). The articles also present different authors cited (article one: Chamot, Barnhardt, El-Dinary, and Robbins (1999), Janzen (2001); article two: (Chamot, Barnhardt, El-Dinary, & Robbins, 1999; Hosenfeld, 1979; Janzen, 2001; Lopera, 2012; Mikulecky & Jeffries, 2004; Osorno & Lopera, 2012); article three: (Block, 1986) but I appear in article two and this helps avoid self-plagiarism. Nonetheless, articles one and three are not well paraphrased at the end, due to the fact that the idea as well as words are quite similar (reading strategies, range, from, eg, scanning, complex, inference) leading to inadequate paraphrasing.

Methodology

All three articles contain the same information about methodology but paraphrasing is more accurate in all of them. Article one describes a research design, exploratory case study, and mentions the comparison of two modalities. It also describes that participants had to sign a consent form. Article two begins by describing the principles of the methodology, mentions the reason to use this methodology (support the teacher's diary insights), and the grounded approach. It finishes with the guided question to analyze data. Finally, article three describes in detail the methodology used and gives the reasons why researchers followed this methodology: to do deepen exploration, real-life events, and personal insights. In short, being versatile in presenting information might lead to adequate paraphrasing, as the information was presented in different order. Regarding numbers of words, article one has 77 and article two has 74. Article 3 has the highest number of words 189. It is worth noting that all three articles contain the same authors. The following table depicts the information:

Table 4: Description of Methodology

1. Motivation conditions...	2. Diary insights...	3. Interaction in an...
A case study was followed as a research design (Creswell, 2007; Yin, 2003). The research involved the methodology of an exploratory multiple case study, as the researchers wanted to further compare and contrast the motivations of the face-to-face course and of the web-based course using different instruments to gather data (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998; Tellis, 1997; Yin 2003). Participants were asked to sign a consent form stating that their participation was voluntary, and their identities were protected.	This study followed the principles methodology of a multiple case study (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998; Tellis, 1997; Yin, 2003) as the team of researchersI wanted to support the teacher's diary insights in a foreign language reading comprehension course. Researchers used the grounded approach when they categorized the data (Freeman, 1998). The following research question guided their inquiry: What do the diary insights really evidence about the teaching practices of a foreign language reading teacher?	This project follows the methodology of an exploratory multiple case study as we wanted to do a deep exploration of the web-based distance course using different instruments to gather data (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998; Tellis, 1997; Yin, 2003). We adopted the multiple case design because we analyzed real-life events that showed numerous sources of evidence through replication in the course. We also followed a case study because it allowed us to analyze personal insights from the teacher and students as well as data

		<p>MOODLE. We tallied and then grouped the events of interaction in the different instruments according to our opinions. We first had an individual reading to consider relevant issues and then shared our patterns in the research group meetings. We named and coded issues of interactions and we constructed categories through our discussions (Freeman, 1998). Then, we analyzed the data according to the existing theory of interaction and validated our findings. Finally, participants signed a consent form stating that their participation was voluntary and their identity was protected. The form also stated that data gathered were going to be used for archival purposes.</p>
--	--	--

On the other hand, all three articles describe the information about the teacher in a very similar form in articles one and three (title of the teacher, experience in teaching, first experience in web-based education, and motivation). Conversely, article two is different, since it just gives information about the face-to-face course and it mentions the place the teacher works for. The number of words in article one is 77, number two is 42, and number three is 70.

Table 5: Description of the Teacher

1. Motivation conditions...	2. Diary insights...	3. Interaction in an...
The teacher held a masters degree in teaching foreign languages and had more than ten years of experience teaching face-to-face reading comprehension courses in graduate and undergraduate programs. However, it was his first experience teaching web-based courses, although he was quite motivated to have this experience. The teacher had computer skills and was part of the team who designed the web-course for the research project. For the purpose of this project, the same teacher taught both courses.	The teacher was part of the research team and as well as a full-time professor at <i>Sección Servicios, Escuela de Idiomas</i> (School of Languages). He had ten years of experience teaching foreign language reading comprehension courses for both graduate and undergraduate students.	The teacher holds a Master degree in Language Teaching and has a lot of experience teaching face-to-face EFL reading comprehension courses for both graduate and undergraduate students. Nevertheless, it was his first experience teaching a web-based reading comprehension course and he was quite motivated to teach this course. He also had computer skills and was part of the team who designed the course making him confident to teach this course.

All three articles have the same information about the program of the reading comprehension course:

Table 6: the Reading Comprehension Program

Unit	Name	Topics
1	Word and their meanings	Dictionary use, parts of speech, cognates, affixes, word meaning in context.
2	Reading strategies	Prediction, skimming, scanning, and graph interpretation.
3	Development of reading skills	Sentence structure, topic, main idea, and referents
4	Text organization methods	cause and effect, comparison and contrasts, description, narration, argumentation , and classification and categorization
5	Critical reading	Fact and opinions, tone, and arguments

It is important to consider that the three articles contain the same information, due to the fact that it is an institutionalized program and it is shown in the same way.

The instruments

The description of the instruments was different as the author used third person (article two), first person (article three), and passive voice (article one) in the articles. Also, the authors cited are different. Besides, the number of words is totally different: article one contains 144 words, article two contains 182, and article three contains 221. Finally, the instruments are displayed in different form:

Table 7: Description of the Instruments

1. Motivation conditions...	2. Diary insights...	3. Interaction in an...
<p>Questionnaires. Three questionnaires were administered to evaluate the course and teacher, the students' motivations and reading strategies, and the students themselves. These instruments were analyzed to verify the motivations.</p> <p>Observations. This technique allows investigators to examine issues, such as behavioral interactions and participation, among others (Brown, 2001). Researchers observed different sessions of classes in the face-to-face course. The chats, forums, e-mails, and exercises of each unit were analyzed in the web-based course.</p> <p>Focus groups. When the courses finished, the students were invited to participate in focus groups to discuss their academic experiences in a deeper way. Researchers programmed four sessions (two per modality).</p>	<p>Diary of the Teacher The teacher recorded all his reflections and observation about the teaching process of each class session in order to construct a critical view (Bailey, 1990; Jeffrey & Hadley, 2002). The teacher kept the diary in English and took about two hours for each class to write each entry electronically. It took him about five months to finish the diary. It is worth stating that he was aware of and had experience writing the diary for research purposes.</p> <p>Questionnaires Students completed three questionnaires: evaluation of the course and the teacher, reading strategies and motivation, and self-evaluation. There were multiple choice questions and open questions for completing each questionnaire.</p>	<p>Questionnaires: We used four questionnaires to evidence interaction: self-assessment, motivation, evaluation of the teacher, and the evaluation of the platform MOODLE. Students ranked their learning process from a scale of 1 to 4 (4 the highest). They also had to select multiple choice questions in two of the questionnaires and had to answer some open questions. The objective of these questionnaires was to ask the students to self-verify the process of learning. We designed all questionnaires.</p> <p>Observations: Observation is a technique that allows the researchers to assess issues such as teaching, behaviors, materials, and interactions (Brown, 1994). We analyzed the web-based course content, evaluations of each unit, exercises, forums and chat sessions. We also analyzed the e-mail</p>

<p>Teacher diary. The teacher kept a diary for each modality in English. He recorded all of his observations, thoughts, and reflections about the teaching process. The objective was to build an academic view of the two modalities (Jeffrey & Hadley, 2002).</p>	<p>Observations Researchers observed ten class sessions. They examined issues such as teaching, behaviors, learning strategies, interaction, and participation in the classroom (Brown, 2001).</p> <p>Focus group Students had a focus group session (Dendinger, 2000) at the end of the course in order to discuss their learning experience. Researchers prepared some open questions regarding interaction, application of reading strategies, vocabulary improvement, and positive and negative aspects of this course. The session was audio-taped.</p>	<p>exchanges that occurred between the teacher and the students.</p> <p>The teacher's journal: The teacher kept a journal in order to record his observations as well as reflections along the course (Jeffrey & Hadley, 2002). We analyzed this instrument to get insights from the teacher.</p> <p>Focus group: We asked students to participate in focus group sessions in order to comment about their learning process during the web-based distance course. Kamberelis and Dimitriadis (2005) state that this technique helps researchers verify students' perceptions, opinions, beliefs and attitudes about an issue, in this case, about the course. We also audiotaped and transcribed these sessions using regular orthography.</p>
--	--	--

Introduction of findings

The introduction of findings differs in all articles. First, the number of words is different: article one has 82, article two has 107, and article three has 36. Second, authors cited are also different in the articles, except Freeman (1998) that is mentioned in articles one and two. Third, each introduction involves its scope: article one motivation, article two diary, and article three interaction. On the other hand, articles one and two share some common information such as the procedure of analyzing data, but adequate paraphrasing was given, as article one gives in detail the people involved in the research (ten researchers: six teachers, three undergraduate students, and an advisor). It also mentions how the analysis was made and how researchers obtained the categories. In contrast, article two begins describing the combination of data reading processes and the transcription part. After, it mentions the individual reading of researchers and how they then shared ideas in groups. These differences might lead to present information in a

versatile form. Finally, the paragraphs finish with different as well as specific information of each article, as it is shown in the following table:

Table 8: Introduction of Findings

1. Motivation conditions...	2. Diary insights...	3. Interaction in an...
<p>Ten researchers participated in the data analysis (six teachers, three undergraduate students, and an advisor). All researchers examined the data individually in order to find patterns in the different instruments. Then, they labeled and compared some important ideas in order to code and categorize the data. Finally, the researchers used triangulation to validate the data (Freeman, 1998) and translated certain excerpts from Spanish to English.</p> <p>Based on the macro-strategies proposed by Dörnyei and Csizér (1998), the researchers found several issues concerning motivation.</p>	<p>Researchers mixed both primary processes and secondary processes to read the diary (Curtis & Bailey, 2009). All the data were transcribed and researchers read and labeled the data individually. They then shared and discussed some important ideas in groups and coded the data in order to have categories. Finally, consensus was obtained through data triangulation (Freeman, 1998). Researchers translated some excerpts from Spanish to English in order to use them as support. Researchers validated some diary entries made by the teacher in order to support objectivity. Four main topics emerged from the diary: motivation, interaction, improvement, and the application of reading strategies. The findings are explained below.</p>	<p>Based on Moore (1989), Bouhnik and Marcus (2006) we concentrated our attention on observing the effects of the four types of interaction identified in this distance web-based reading foreign language course. The results are the following:</p>

Conclusions

In this article an effort to analyze self-plagiarism has been made. The author analyzed three different articles that were a product of the same research project in reading as a foreign language. Results support that both inadequate paraphrasing and adequate paraphrasing were given. Regarding inadequate paraphrasing some similar words and ideas were found. On the other hand, using different authors in a specific idea, having different numbers of words in a common issue, and being versatile to present information might lead to adequate paraphrasing. It is important to take into account that the results could be subjective as the author analyzes himself.

The objective of this paper is to cause awareness of self-plagiarism and to generate discussion about the same information used in different articles. In my case, it was really difficult to paraphrase some similar parts of the articles and I sometimes committed inadequate paraphrasing. Due to the fact that some authors argue that you cannot self-plagiarize yourself (Akst, 2010; Balbuena, 2003; Samuelson, 1994; Spinak, 2013), this paper is opened to be criticized by the academic community. It is worth noting that some articles emerge from the same research project and it is inevitable to repeat some information. My proposal for editors is to permit include the same information in the following sections of the article: part of the theoretical framework, methodology, and instruments. Regarding the results, I also propose to report just the ones that are being developed under the topic of analysis.

When reporting results of the same research project in different articles a dialog between editors and authors must be given to clarify this issue. It is not a matter of declining or just accepting an article, but a way of constructing academic discussions in publications. In fact, when different articles contain some similar information, this has to be explained to editors. Even if journals do not have the policy of self-plagiarism, authors themselves should clarify this upfront. As I did not do this, this caused a debate with the editor.

Finally and based on my case presented here and the production of different articles from the same research project, editors should consider the use of the same information when other members of the research project produce other articles. This interjection is common in all reports and it may show fairness in publications. But now a difficult question emerges: how much similar information could be acceptable?

Bibliography

- Akst, J. (2010). When is self-plagiarism ok? Retrieved from <http://www.the-scientist.com/?articles.view/articleNo/29245/title/When-is-self-plagiarism-ok/>
- Alyousef, H. S. (2005). Teaching reading comprehension to ESL/EFL learners. *The Reading Matrix*, 5(2), 143-154.
- Balbuena P. (2003). El plagio como ilícito legal. *Revista Ventana Legal* (en línea) Retrieved from http://www.ventanalegal.com/revista_ventanalegal/plagio_ilicito.htm
- Bailey, K. M. (1990). The use of diaries in teacher education programs. In J. Richards, & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 215-226). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bloemenkamp, D. G. M., Walvoort, H. C., Hart, W. (1999). Duplicate publication of articles in the Dutch Journal of Medicine in 1996. *Nederlands Tijdschrift voor eneskunde* 143(43), 2150-2153.
- Block, E. (1986). The comprehension strategies of second language readers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 463-494.
- Bouhnik, D., & Marcus, T. (2006). Interaction in distance learning courses. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 57(3), 299-305.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Longman.
- Brown, D. (1994). *Teaching by principles*. New Jersey, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Cassany, D. (2006). *Tras las líneas*. Barcelona, Spain: Editorial Anagrama.
- Chamot, A., Barnhardt, S., El-Dinary, P., & Robbins, J. (1999). *The learning strategies handbook*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design. Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Curtis, A., & Bailey, K. (2009). Diary studies. *OnCue Journal*, 3(1), 67-85.
- Dendinger, M. (2000). *How to organize a focus group. Meetings and conventions*. Retrieved from <http://www.meetings-conventions.com/articles/how-to-organizea-focus-roup/c10136.aspx>

- Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research*, 2(3), 203-229.
- Dubin, F., & Bycina, D. (1984). Academic reading and the ESL/EFL teacher. In Celce-Murcia, M. *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 195-216). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Freeman, D. (1998). *Doing teacher research: From inquiry to understanding*. Boston, MA: Newbury House.
- González, M. (2000). La habilidad de la lectura: sus implicaciones en la enseñanza del inglés como lengua extranjera o como segunda lengua. *Revista de Ciencias Humanas*, 19. Retrieved from <http://www.utp.edu.co/~chumanas/revistas/revistas/rev19/gonzalez.htm>
- Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. (2002). *Teaching and researching reading*. London, England: Pearson Education.
- Harvard Guide to Using Sources. University of Harvard. retrieved from <https://usingsources.fas.harvard.edu/what-constitutes-plagiarism>
- Hosenfeld, C. (1979). A learning-teaching view of second language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 12(1), 51-54.
- Janzen, J. (2001). Strategic reading on a sustained content theme. In J. Murphy & P. Byrd (Eds.), *Understanding the courses we teach: Local perspectives on English language teaching* (pp. 369-389). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Jeffrey, D., & Hadley, G. (2002). Balancing intuition with insight: Reflective teaching through diary studies. *The Language Teacher Online*, 26(5), 209-212.
- Kamberelis, G., & Dimitriadis, G. (2005). Focus groups: Strategic articulations of pedagogy, politics and inquiry. In Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.). *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd edition) (pp. 887-907). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications
- Kumar, S. y R. Tripathi. 2009. "Plagiarism: A Plague". *7th International CALIBER-2009*, retrieved from <http://www.inflibnet.ac.in/caliber2009/CaliberPDF/64.pdf>
- Lopera, S. (2014). Motivation conditions in a foreign language reading comprehension course offering both a web-based modality and a face-to-face modality. *Profile* 16(1), 89-104.
- Lopera, S. (2013). Diary insights of an EFL reading teacher. *Profile* 15(2), 115-126.

- Masic, I. (2012). Plagiarism in scientific publishing. *Acta Informática Médica* 20(4), 208-213.
- Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mikulecky, B., & Jeffries, L. (2004). *Reading power*. United States: Pearson, Longman.
- Moore, M. (1989). Three types of interaction. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 3(2), 1–6.
- Osorno, J. A., & Lopera, S. (2012). Interaction in an EFL reading comprehension distance web-based course. *Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura*, 17(1), 41-54.
- Rojas, M. (2012). Plagio en textos académicos. *Revista Electrónica Educare*, 16(2), 55-66
- Samuelson, P. (1994). Self-plagiarism or fair use?. Retrived from <http://people.ischool.berkeley.edu/~pam/papers/SelfPlagiarism.pdf>
- Schein, M. & Paladugu, R. (2001). Redundant surgical publications: tip of the iceberg? *Surgery*, 129(6), 655–661. Twomey, T. White, H. & Sagendorf, K. (eds). (2009). *Pedagogy, not policing: Positive approaches to academic integrity at the University*. New York: The Graduate School Press, Syracuse University.
- Schultz, W. G. (2008). A massive case of fraud. *Chemical and Engineering News*, 86(7), 37.
- Shahabuddin, S. (2009). Plagiarism in academia. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 21(3), 353-359.
- Soto, A. (2012). El plagio y su impacto a nivel académico y profesional. *E-Ciencias de la Información*, 2(1), 1-13.
- Spinak, E. (2013). Ethical editing practices and the problem of self-plagiarism. Retrieved from <http://blog.scielo.org/en/2013/11/11/ethical-editing-practices-and-the-problem-of-self-plagiarism/>
- Tellis, W. (1997). Introduction to case study. *The Qualitative Report*, 3(2). Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR32/tellis1.html>
- Weir, C. (1993). *Understanding and developing language tests*. Hemel Hempstead, England: Prentice Hall.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research. Design and methods*. (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Author

***Sergio Lopera Medina**, PhD and MA in linguistics; specialist in teaching foreign languages. His research interests involve teaching EFL reading comprehension and pragmatics. He is a member of the research group EALE (Enseñanza y Aprendizaje en Lenguas Extranjeras) and a full time professor at Universidad de Antioquia (Medellín - Colombia).