

---

**SEMINAR 9 - HOW TO PARAPHRASE AND NEVER BE PENALISED FOR PLAGIARISM**

11 June 2020

**Welcome to the ninth week of your Academic Skills course!**

**Every week on Monday, you will be given an exercise to complete before the Thursday online seminars. Please complete this exercise by Thursday 9 AM so we can include some of your responses in the class discussions. Please send your responses directly to me (alexandra@academiaone.co.uk).**

**The key learning outcome of Seminar 9 is perfecting the balance between original thoughts and paraphrasing from others' writing.**

### **Home exercise instructions**

Please write your answers to both Part A and Part B in a word document.

#### **Part A - Reflection: identifying plagiarism**

1. How would you define plagiarism in your own words?
2. How can one tell if a portion of a text involves plagiarism?
3. Read **Text 1** from the next page. This is a paragraph from a Turnitin student dissertation originality report. Should anything be changed in this paragraph and if yes, why?

#### **Part B - Practice: improving the balance between original thoughts and using other sources in your writing**

1. Read **Text 2** from the next page.
2. Copy the original text provided in your answers document.
3. Try to improve the paraphrasing in this paragraph, reducing the reliance on direct quotes.
4. Can you add any original thoughts to balance the information from the academic sources used?
5. Write your improved version of the paragraph in the document.

*Seminar 9 will start with this home exercise discussion. As last week, we'll try to hear from all of you about the challenges you find in your own work when balancing your original ideas with information from other sources. The theory part will explore the different types of plagiarism in academic writing and some tips on how to paraphrase well. The last part of the seminar will analyse in detail some paragraphs from a Master's dissertation, trying to reduce the similarity of the work to other sources.*

See you on Zoom on Thursday 2pm!

*Alexandra, AcademiaOne Academic Skills Course Director*

## Text 1

Under US law, a shipbuilding contract is considered as having no maritime nature, and a vessel under construction is not viewed as a ship. Moreover, a shipyard employee who is assisting in the commissioning of a launched but incomplete vessel lying in navigable waters is not a seaman within the meaning of the Jones Act, 46 U.S.C. 688<sup>47</sup>. In *Frankel v Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard Inc*<sup>48</sup>, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit observed that a contract to build a ship was non-maritime in character, and the tort arising out of work on a launched but incomplete vessel also lacked a maritime flavor, despite the fact that the vessel was lying in navigable waters. As such, the said court held that the plaintiff was not a seaman within the meaning of the Jones Act, since he was not a member of the crew and his duties had no direct relation to navigation. He was merely working on an incomplete structure, which was being erected under a non-maritime contract. This structure had not yet been identified as a part of commerce and navigation. In *Williams v Avondale Shipyards Inc*<sup>49</sup>, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit also held that:

"For there to be a seaman, there must first be a ship. And an incomplete vessel not yet delivered by the builder is not such a ship. Ship and seaman, ship and seaworthiness are mutual reflexes."

## Text 2

According to Pettigrew (1998), Allport (1954) "held that positive effects of intergroup contact occur only in situations marked by four key conditions: equal group status within the situation; common goals; intergroup cooperation; and the support of authorities, law, or custom." Pettigrew (1998) proposes the inverse contact theory, meaning that prejudiced people avoid contact with out groups, thus "instead of optimal contact reducing prejudice, the opposite causal sequence could be operating". Prejudiced people may avoid contact with out-groups." Pettigrew (1998) concludes that "both individual differences and societal norms shape intergroup contact effects. The deeply prejudiced both avoid intergroup contact and resist positive effects from it."