

PROGRAM BOOK

International Conference 2009

TEFLIN  **56th**

RESPONDING TO GLOBAL CHALLENGES *through* QUALITY ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING





TABLE OF CONTENT

- ACKNOWLEDGEMENT ~ 3
- TABLE OF CONTENT ~ 4
- VENUE MAP ~ 5
- TEFLIN IN BRIEF ~ 6
- TEFLIN BOARD 2008-2011 ~ 8
- THE COMMITTEE OF THE 56th TEFLIN ~ 11
- TIME TABLE TEACHER SESSION ~ 24
- TIME TABLE GENERAL SESSION ~ 25
- CONFERENCE PROGRAM TEACHER SESSION ~ 27
- CONFERENCE PROGRAM GENERAL SESSION ~ 31
- SUMMARIES AND BIO DATA OF INVITED SPEAKERS ~ 46
- CONFERENCE GUIDE ~ 58
- PROCEDURAL MATTERS ~ 60
- PRESENTERS of PARALLEL SESSIONS ~ 62
- SUMMARY PARALLEL SESSION ~ 69





TIME TABLE

TEACHER SESSION

Day 1: 8 December 2009

| Time | Events | Rooms |
|---------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| 07.00 - 09.30 | On site registration | Registration Desk |
| 09.30 - 10.00 | Opening Ceremony | Dendrobium |
| 10.00 - 10.15 | Procedural Matters | Dendrobium |
| 10.15 - 10.45 | Plenary session 1 | Dendrobium |
| 10.45 - 11.45 | Plenary session 2 | Dendrobium |
| 11.45 - 13.00 | Lunch | Hortensia & Melati* |
| 13.00 - 14.00 | Plenary session 3 | Amarilis 1 |
| 14.00 - 15.00 | Plenary session 4 | Amarilis 1 |
| 15.00 - 15.30 | Coffee Break | Amarilis 1 |
| 15.30 - 16.30 | Plenary session 5 | Amarilis 1 |
| 16.40 - 17.40 | Parallel Session 1 | All** |
| 19.00 - 21.00 | Dinner and Cultural Night | Dendrobium |

24

Day 2: 9 December 2009

| Time | Events | Rooms |
|---------------|--------------------|------------|
| 07.30 - 08.30 | Plenary session 6 | Dendrobium |
| 08.40 - 09.40 | Plenary session 7 | Amarilis 1 |
| 09.40 - 10.00 | Coffee Break | Amarilis 1 |
| 10.00 - 11.00 | Parallel Session 2 | All** |
| 11.10 - 11.30 | Closing Ceremony | Amarilis 1 |

*Voucher required, Please check the lunch Voucher attached to your name tag
** Ticket required, Please check the conference program to make your preference of speakers then go to the counter in front of Amarilis 1 for the ticket.



TIME TABLE



GENERAL SESSIONS

Day 1: 8 December 2009

| Time | Events | Rooms |
|---------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| 07.00 - 09.30 | On site registration | Registration Desk |
| 09.30 - 10.00 | Opening Ceremony | Dendrobium |
| 10.00 - 10.15 | Procedural Matters | Dendrobium |
| 10.15 - 10.45 | Plenary session 1 | Dendrobium |
| 10.45 - 11.45 | Plenary session 2 | Dendrobium |
| 11.45 - 13.00 | Lunch | Hortensia & Melati* |
| 13.00 - 14.00 | Plenary session 3 | Dendrobium |
| 14.00 - 15.00 | Plenary session 4 | Dendrobium |
| 15.00 - 15.30 | Coffee Break | Dendrobium |
| 15.30 - 16.30 | Plenary session 5 | Dendrobium |
| 16.40 - 17.40 | Parallel Session 1 | All** |
| 19.00 - 21.00 | Dinner and Cultural Night | Dendrobium |

25

Day 2: 9 December 2009

| Time | Events | Rooms |
|---------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| 07.30 - 08.30 | Plenary session 6 | Dendrobium |
| 08.35 - 09.40 | Plenary session 7 | Dendrobium |
| 09.40 - 10.00 | Coffee Break | Dendrobium |
| 10.00 - 11.00 | Parallel Session 2 | All** |
| 11.10 - 12.10 | Parallel Session 3 | All** |
| 12.10 - 13.00 | Lunch | Hortensia & Melati* |
| 13.00 - 14.00 | Parallel Session 4 | All** |
| 14.10 - 15.10 | Parallel Session 5 | All** |
| 15.10 - 15.40 | Coffee Break | All |
| 15.40 - 16.40 | Parallel Session 6 | All** |
| 16.50 - 17.50 | Parallel Session 7 | All** |
| 19.00 - 21.00 | Business Meeting | Anthurium 1 |



Day 3: 10 December 2009

| Time | Events | Rooms |
|---------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 07.30 – 08.30 | Parallel Session 8 | All** |
| 08.40 – 09.40 | Plenary session 8 | Dendrobium & Amaranis 1 |
| 09.40 – 10.00 | Coffee Break | Dendrobium & Amaranis |
| 10.00 - 11.00 | Panel Discussion | Dendrobium |
| 11.00 – 11.30 | Closing Ceremony | Dendrobium |

*Voucher required, Please check the lunch Voucher attached to your name tag.
** Ticket required, Please check the conference program to make your preference of speakers then go to the counter in front of Amaranis 1 for the ticket.





Yugianingrum

Block Quotations in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Journal Articles

This study investigated the use of block quotations (BQs) in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) journal articles. The investigation was conducted to find out (1) the use of BQs as a whole in the English Literature (EL) and Applied Linguistics (AL) articles, (2) the frequency of BQs in the sections of the articles, and (3) the appropriateness of the use of the BQs. The results are expected to support the argument that although borrowing others' ideas is mandatory in academic writing, the ways of integrating the borrowed words in the writers' own texts may vary depending predominantly on the writers' backgrounds, and their knowledge and skills of producing an academic text.

The analysis was limited to the BQs in 25 articles belonging to two disciplinary groups: EL and AL. The articles were published in an EFL journal that was first issued in 2001 in Bandung. The journal had published articles by Indonesian writers from several universities in Indonesia and non-Indonesian writers from Malaysia, Cambodia, and the Philippines. The analyzed articles were purposively all the articles in the five latest issues in 2007-2009 in order to represent the current description of the journal. The BQs were collected and counted to get the total number of BQs in each article and in its sections. Then the BQs were categorized according to the citing appropriateness adopted from Gibaldi (2003), American Psychological Association (2003) and some previous studies (e.g. Keck, 2006; Okamura, 2007, 2008; Yugianingrum, 2008). The discussion on the constraints of using BQs appropriately was based on Jakobs' theory (2000).

The findings of the research show that BQs are similarly used and not used in both groups. However, the EL articles significantly use more BQs. BQs are integrated in the texts in various ways and in some articles the writers do not follow the standard citing conventions. An AL article specifically uses excessive BQs; conversely, certain articles that contain no BQs seem to have more effective ways of presenting others' ideas.

The above results show that the EL and AL groups use BQs differently, which confirms the different characteristics of literary and linguistics studies (Beaugrande, 1993; Georgas & Cullars, 2005). However, the fact that some articles have used BQs inappropriately may lead to the supposition that not all of the writers of the investigated articles are professional. On the other hand, the articles containing no BQs seem to demonstrate that reproducing others' ideas by using more words of the writers' is more appropriate than retelling others' entire words by using BQs. Since the data of this study is limited, it is recommended that future studies on this topic use significantly more data to be able to generalize the conclusions.

Yugianingrum is a lecturer at the English Department, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Kristen Maranatha, Bandung.

Y

238



BLOCK QUOTATIONS IN ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE (EFL)

JOURNAL ARTICLES

Yugianingrum

Universitas Kristen Maranatha

(Seminar TEFLIN Internasional, Batu, Malang, 2009)

Abstract

This study investigated the use of block quotations (BQs) in 25 English Literature (EL) and Applied Linguistics (AL) articles published in 2007-2009 in five volumes of an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) academic journal. A block quotation is a direct quotation that consists of four or more lines, presented in a text by indenting its beginning on the left side of the text and without using quotation marks. Findings show (a) the use of BQs as a whole in the EL and AL articles; (b) the frequency of BQs in the sections of the articles; and (c) the appropriateness of the use of the BQs in the articles. This study is significant to support the argument that the ways of integrating the borrowed words and ideas in the texts of the borrowers may vary depending on the borrowers' backgrounds and their knowledge and skills of producing academic texts.

Key words: Block quotations, English Literature, Applied Linguistics, EFL
academic articles

Introduction

Borrowing others' ideas is mandatory in academic writing because the ideas presented in an academic text must be based on previous literature, which is also necessary to support the "current claims" (Hyland, 1999). However, the ways an author integrates the borrowed ideas or words into his/her own writing may vary depending on his/her (a) disciplinary and academic culture background, and (b) knowledge and skills of producing an academic text. At least a study (Hyland, 2000) has been done to describe disciplinary differences on the ways the writers of academic papers use others' work to support their arguments and represent the work in their own writing.

Writers of academic papers can find several guidelines concerning how to write from sources, which are commonly prepared in the form of guidebooks or handouts by the writing centers of academic institutions. Despite the dissimilar citing styles suggested by different writing guidelines, it is apparent that all of them have been produced to help novice writers avoid plagiarism by providing them with appropriate ways and examples of presenting others' ideas or words. In reality, however, some novice writers seem to prefer the easiest way of avoiding plagiarism when presenting borrowed information, which is by using direct quotes or even block quotes (quotations of more than four lines). Nonetheless, this way is apparently chosen not only to avoid plagiarism but also to escape from the difficulties of paraphrasing others' words. Problems like this often occur in EFL undergraduate students' academic writing but they can also be found in EFL journal articles. This present study thus investigates how block quotations (BQs) are used

in a number of EFL journal articles, which consist of English Literature (EL) and Applied Linguistics (AL) academic texts.

Borrowing Words and Block Quotations

When a writer borrows words or ideas from sources, s/he is expected to conform to international standard writing conventions in order to be recognized by international audience. S/he may choose to use summary, paraphrase or direct quotation. The three of them can be used to present others' published information in a writer's text but they have different ways of borrowing: (a) summarizing is using as few sentences as possible to present the global idea of the borrowed text; (b) paraphrasing is using the writer's own words; and (c) direct quotation is using others' exact words (Oshima & Hogue, 1991, p. 144). In addition, Gibaldi (2003) classifies direct quotations into *short quotation*, which is inserted in the paragraph and placed within quotation marks; *extended or long quotation*, which consists of four or more lines, and *quotation of two or more paragraphs*, which can be found in texts of literary studies (p. 101). The quotations that are more than four lines should be indented on the left and use no initial and final quotation marks as that in the following example, which is in American Psychological Association (APA) style (2003, p. 118):

Miele (1993) found the following:

The "placebo effect," which had been verified in previous studies, disappeared when behaviors were studied in this manner. Furthermore, the behaviors were never exhibited again [italics added], even when reel [*sic*] drugs were ad-

ministered. Earlier studies (e.g., Abdullah, 1984; Fox, 1979) were clearly premature in attributing the results to a placebo effect. (p. 276)

The example is presented in exactly the same form as the original text and it demonstrates the application of the guidelines for writing an extended quotation, which is also called block quotation (BQ).

According to Hardstorm (2006), BQs “should be used rarely and only when omitting part of the quote would hurt its power” (para 9). The same source also states that a BQ should always be fitted into the text by *framing*, which uses *speaker tags* at the beginning, middle, or end of a quote, and never be left without analyzing it. From this information it is perceptible that the use of dropped quotations, which are not preceded or followed by the writer’s stance on the quoted idea, is not considered to be appropriate.

Despite the potential differences in the existing guidelines for borrowing others’ work, all of them are meant to help avoid the practice of plagiarism. Besides, they are also useful for writers to keep away from “patchwork writing”, which refers to a text that only displays several pieces of others’ information in the forms of block quotations without revealing clearly the writer’s own ideas. This poor writing strategy is thus contradictory to the purpose of using quotations in a text: to provide a backing for the writer’s ideas, not just to retell others’.

Novice writers should be informed that quoting patterns could be different in different disciplines. Experts in natural sciences and life sciences, for instance, are reported to commonly use more limited quotations than those in linguistics,

psychology or education (Jakob, 2003, p.899). Dubois (1988, cited in Jakob, 2003, p. 899), reminds writers of academic texts that quotations are not acceptable in biology. Moreover, some linguists and psychologists interviewed by Jacob (2003) reported that the content focus of the texts they borrowed in their writing referred more to concepts than to data. Differences are also apparent in a study by Rinnert and Kobayashi (2005), who found that students majoring in liberal arts (humanities and social science) showed more awareness of borrowing words or ideas than those majoring in science (computer science, engineering and physical science).

Previous Studies

In Applied Linguistics, studies on how to present borrowed ideas or words in one's own writing can be classified into the studies concerning *discourse analysis*, *English for research purposes* and *genre analysis* (White, 2004, p. 90). This present study is concerned with presenting borrowed ideas/words in academic papers.

Previous studies on this topic have at least analyzed integral and non-integral citations (Swales, 1990), citation practices of expert writers (Pickard, 1995), the choices of tense, aspect and voice in the reporting verbs (Hawes & Thomas, 1997), citation choices of expert and novice writers (Buckingham & Neville, 1997) and the problems of students' paraphrasing (Keck, 2006).

In Japan, researchers have conducted citation studies with various topics, some of them are students' skills of paraphrasing (Oda & Yamamoto, 2007), writers' intention behind the citation forms (Akiko, 2007), and the use of citation forms in L1 and L2 contexts (Akiko, 2008). Similarly, Indonesian researchers have also conducted citation studies. Adnan (2004) compared the citation behaviors of

Australian and Indonesian. Yugianingrum (2008) found that EFL undergraduate theses in an English department used significantly more quotations than paraphrases although according to Gibaldi (2003), a writer is expected to primarily use paraphrases to present borrowed ideas or words. Moreover, the researcher noticed that in the study, the students of linguistics had imitated the ways the EL students presented others' words as BQs and would avoid paraphrasing in their linguistics papers. According to Beaugrande (1993), this tendency is not appropriate.

Yugianingrum's findings (2008) seem to support Oda and Yamamoto (2007), who suggest that the "teaching of paraphrasing seems to have improved [Japanese] students' skills but not increased their awareness of the importance of acquiring appropriate text borrowing skills" (p. 1). As paraphrasing borrowed words can be problematic, some novice writers, specifically in this present study, may have conveniently used BQs in their texts, which is a simpler way for them to present others' words. Unfortunately, conducting this poor practice in an academic journal will negatively affect the authoritative audience's recognition of the journal.

Research Questions

Based on the background of the problem, the previous studies and the relevant literature, the research questions of this study are formulated as follows:

- (1) How do the EFL writers use BQs in their EL and AL journal articles?
- (2) What is the frequency of BQs in the sections of the articles?
- (3) How appropriate is the use of BQs in the articles according to the international academic writing conventions?

Data Collection

The data sources of this study are all the 25 EL and AL articles in five volumes (in this study they are named volume I, II, III, IV and V) of an EFL journal that was first published in 2001 in Bandung. The journal has published articles on EL and AL by Indonesian writers from several academic institutions in Indonesia and non-Indonesian writers from Malaysia, Cambodia, and the Philippines. The analyzed texts are all the articles in the five latest volumes published in 2007-2009; they are chosen in order to represent the current description of the journal. The BQs were collected and counted to get the total number of BQs in each article and its sections. Then they were classified based on the citing theories adopted from Gibaldi (2003), American Psychological Association (2003), and other standard writing guidelines. Some previous literature is presented to support the discussion of the findings. To explain the writers' constraints on using BQs appropriately, this study refers to Jakob's theories (2003).

Analysis Findings

This part presents three tables containing the findings of this study and some examples of BQs from the analyzed data to present appropriate and inappropriate ways of presenting BQs in the articles.

Use of BQs in the articles

Table 1 shows the basic findings, which include the number of journals and articles used as the data source, the number of EL and AL articles and the number of BQs in the EL and AL articles.

Table 1: EL and AL articles in an EFL academic journal

| | |
|--|------|
| Number of journal volume | : 5 |
| Number of article per volume | : 5 |
| Number of EL article in the 5 volumes | : 10 |
| Number of AL articles in the 5 volumes | : 15 |
| Number of BQs in 10 EL articles | : 67 |
| Number of BQs in 15 AL articles | : 37 |

It is apparent in the table that the number of articles in each journal volume is consistent, which is five articles per volume. In the five volumes, the journal has published more AL articles (15) than EL articles (10). This has happened because the AL articles contain not only linguistic analyses of English texts, but also topics on English teaching and learning, whereas the EL articles contain only topics on English literature. Moreover, the EL articles have used significantly more BQs (67 BQs in 10 articles) than the AL articles (37 BQs in 15 articles).

Table 2 presents the number of pages and the number of BQs in the data. The analysis findings show that each of the articles contains 8-22 pages and 0-23 BQs. It is interesting to see that the EL articles contain 10-22 pages and 0-16 BQs, whereas AL articles contain 8-22 pages and 0-4 BQs, except for Article 2 in Journal Volume II, which uses 23 BQs in 19 pages, significantly more than the BQs in other articles.

Table 2: Number of pages and BQs in each of the 25 articles

| <i>Journal Volume</i> | <i>Article/ Discipline/ Pages/ BQs</i> | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| I | 1/EL/17/7 | 2/EL/10/0 | 3/AL/22/3 | 4/EL/10/6 | 5/AL/15/4 |
| II | 1/AL/8/1 | 2/AL/19/23 | 3/AL/14/1 | 4/AL/10/1 | 5/EL/15/4 |
| III | 1/AL/21/1 | 2/AL/16/1 | 3/EL/13/5 | 4/EL/10/4 | 5/AL/15/2 |
| IV | 1/AL/14/0 | 2/AL/22/1 | 3/EL/11/5 | 4/EL/18/12 | 5/EL/22/16 |
| V | 1/AL/17/0 | 2/AL/18/0 | 3/AL/16/0 | 4/EL/14/8 | 5/AL/15/0 |

The findings also show that one of the 10 EL articles and five of the 15 AL articles use no BQ at all. The 10 EL articles respectively present 7, 0, 6, 4, 5, 4, 5, 12, 16, and 18 BQs, whereas the 15 AL articles contain 3, 4, 1, 23, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0 BQs. Exceptional cases of the use of BQs occur in Journal Volume I EL article no. 2 (0 BQ) and Journal Volume II AL article no. 2 (23 BQs). Both of them have specifically used uncommon number of BQs. EL articles commonly use one BQ or more, whereas AL articles tend to use limited a number of BQs.

Frequency of BQ in the sections of the articles

In this study, the frequency of BQs in the sections of the articles is investigated to present a description of the pattern of the use of BQs in EL and AL articles. The findings are displayed in Table 3. The table shows that the analysis sections in all the EL and AL articles have most frequently used BQs (50), the sections of theories have used 31 BQs, the introductory sections 17 BQs, and the conclusions 6 BQs.

Table 3: Frequency of BQs in the sections of the journal articles

| <i>Journal Volume</i> | <i>Introduction</i> | <i>Theories</i> | <i>Analysis</i> | <i>Conclusion</i> | <i>Total</i> |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|
| I | 1 | 9 | 9 | 1 | 20 |
| II | 7 | 20 | 0 | 3 | 30 |
| III | 3 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 12 |
| IV | 6 | 0 | 26 | 2 | 34 |
| V | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| <i>Total</i> | 17 | 31 | 50 | 6 | 104 |

Another finding reveals that the sections of analysis contain 0-26 BQs, theories 0-20 BQs, introduction 0-7 BQs, and conclusion 0-6 BQs. Journal Volume II has no BQs in the analysis sections although it contains one EL article. On the other hand, Journal Volume IV, which contains 3 EL articles, has most frequently used BQs (26) in the analysis sections.

Appropriateness of the use of BQs in the articles

The analysis of the appropriateness of the use of BQs is conducted by highlighting some specific findings in this study. The first specific finding is apparent in the absence of BQ in (EL) Article number 2 in Journal Volume I, although using BQs is acceptable and common in literary analyses. This finding shows that the writer has skillfully avoided using lengthy quotations, which results in a more concise and respectful text.

The second specific finding is evident in (AL) Article number 2, Journal Volume II. This AL article has unconventionally presented an excessive number of BQs: 23 BQs in an article of 19 pages. This presentation is not considered to be appropriate in AL academic writing, which prioritizes the use of paraphrases. Moreover, of the 23 BQs in this article, two BQs contain only two lines, five contain three lines, and six contain four lines. If each of these BQs is inserted in the paragraph, it will take less than four lines. Thus, these BQs do not conform to the standard writing conventions (see e. g. Gibaldi, 2003, American Psychological Association, 2003 and other standard writing guidelines). The writer of this AL article has also presented 16 (out of 23) BQs by using unfinished introductory sentence, one of which can be seen in the first BQ of the article:

Therefore, I agree with Nunan that

...mastery of the sounds and pronunciation of the target language is a high priority for most learners.

(Nunan 1991: 104)

If inserted in the paragraph, the BQ could be presented in less than four lines and the introductory part could be made more appropriate by using a complete sentence, like in the following: *Therefore, I agree with Nunan (1991) when he says that “mastery of the sounds and pronunciation of the target language is a high priority for most learners” (p. 104).*

The third specific finding presented in this analysis is the number of lines of the BQs in (EL) Article number 5, Journal Volume IV. This EL article has most frequently used BQs; moreover, of the 16 BQs in the article containing 21 pages,

nine BQs are presented within 10-21 lines and seven within 5-9 lines. The following is an example of the nine BQs using an excessive number of lines from the article: *China is used as the presence meaning/concept of the word while Chink is used as the absence concept.*

*The word used here in Indonesian is the frequently derogatory term, **Cina**, a term which gained common currency during the New Order period. Previously, a more polite, more neutral term, **Tionghoa**, was used. The term *cina* is repeated in this story in the narrated thought of the Chinese-Indonesian protagonist, Clara, which, given its often derogatory tenor, strikes Benedict Anderson as highly unlikely and the sign of possible failure in characterization by the author—unless the author indeed intended to show the internalization of the regime’s language among Indonesians of Chinese ancestry. I feel that there is a third possibility which emerges from the internalization of the predominantly negative term, coupled with the intentional effacing of the previous term, **Tionghoa** (to the extent that younger generation Indonesians find it a peculiar term—when they are even aware of its existence). (Bodden, 1999).*

As the number of the lines on each page of the journal is not more than 40, the presentation of a significant number of BQs like the one above is considered to be inappropriate. To overcome this problem, the writer is expected to use quoting techniques that can result in a more concise and respectful text. The techniques can also avoid the use of so many long BQs, which will make the text lengthy and ineffective.

Discussion

This study has investigated the use of BQs in 25 articles in five volumes of an EFL academic journal. The results show that a) in general, the EL articles have used significantly more BQs than the AL articles; b) the sections in the 25 journal articles that most frequently use BQs are the analysis sections; and c) there are some specific findings reflecting the inappropriate use of BQs in the data. All of these findings will be discussed in the following sections.

Literary and linguistics studies

The first research finding, showing that the EL articles use significantly more BQs than the AL articles, is in line with the statement that EL and AL belong to two disciplines with different characteristics. At least Furlong (2003) has argued that linguistics theories are scientific, while literary theories are interpretive. Consequently, research papers in linguistics studies should show differences in their structures and contents from essays in literary studies (see, e.g. Beaugrande, 1993; Georgas & Cullars, 2005). Moreover, Handley and Oaks (n.d.) explain that an essay is commonly based only on what the writer knows, while a research paper should be

based on what the writer knows plus what experts know. In this respect, authors of EL essays and AL research papers are required to realize the contrast so that they can avoid writing academic papers with incorrect disciplinary characteristics.

The different uses of BQs in the EL and AL articles may lead to the conclusion that most of the authors in the data have realized the disciplinary differences between literary and linguistics studies. This conclusion is somewhat relevant with the second finding, which demonstrates that the sections in the journals (except journal II) that have the highest percentage of BQs are the analysis sections. In literary essays, BQs are commonly borrowed from the analyzed literary work and presented to support the analysis. Yet, this practice cannot be applied to linguistics research papers because of the different contents of their analysis sections.

Academic culture and individual factors

Despite the first and the second findings, not all the journal articles in the data show the realization of the disciplinary differences. Journal II article 2 (AL) has used 23 BQs in its 19 pages. This finding indicates that the author does not apply the required academic writing conventions in his/her text. Journal IV article 5 (EL) also contradicts the principle that BQ should be used sparingly, as the article presents numerous BQs with excessive lines. From these findings, it can be said that the authors of the two articles require to improve their academic writing knowledge and skills.

In Indonesia, academic journals are not as established as those in developed countries. Many academic journals are published without professional preparation,

including the necessary professional peer-review service. This situation is specifically evident when necessary elements of a research report are missing in their articles and the journals exhibit inconsistent text organization and presentation.

In a study on the citing behaviors in undergraduate theses (Yugianingrum, 2008), the researcher describes the academic culture in the research site of the study, which did not successfully support the students' understanding of standard academic writing conventions. The syllabus of academic writing, the guidelines for thesis writing, the supervisors' attitudes, and the institution's academic policy can be said to be inadequate for good academic culture. Consequently, the academic papers produced by this institution will not meet the standard required by standard international academic audience.

Uses of BQs may also be caused by individual factors. According to Jakob (2003), the poor use of BQs could be caused by the writer's lack of expertise in "both contextual and cotextual integration actions. Contextual integration is the adaptation of others' formulations to the present communication context; cotextual integration is the adaptation of text passages to the linguistic cotext" (p. 898). Jakob also mentions some individual constraints in integrating the borrowed information in a text: The nature of the author's abilities and preferences in handling scientific literature is influenced by various autobiographical factors. These include "the writer's academic socialization, social and academic status, and culture-specific socialization" (p. 901). In sum, novice writers with limited academic writing knowledge and practices will have more reasons to use BQs inappropriately in their texts.

Conclusion

This study has described the use of BQs in some articles of an EFL journal. The results are expected to remind all members of academic communities in Indonesia that not many Indonesian academic authors are familiar with standard international academic writing conventions and the disciplinary differences in using the conventions. Consequently, the ways many authors present borrowed ideas in their academic texts still require some improvement. This situation can be seen as the reflection of the academic culture in many higher education institutions in Indonesia that are not familiar with the norms of academic writing valued by international academic discourse communities. In conclusion, to set up authors that are able to integrate borrowed ideas in their texts appropriately, the institutions are required to improve their academic culture.

Although this study has only analyzed a small number of data, the findings can be regarded as a sign of the use of BQs in general EFL journal articles in Indonesia. The inappropriate use of BQs found in the data may lead to the supposition that not all the writers of the investigated articles are professional. This fact may become a challenge for EFL academic journal publishers in Indonesia in promoting their journals. As this study has investigated a limited number of data, future studies on similar topics are recommended to use significantly more data to be able to generalize the conclusions.

References

- Adnan, Z. (2004). Citing behaviours in Indonesian humanities articles. *ASAA e-journal of Asian Linguistics & Language Teaching*. Issue 6 (June 2004) SSN 14450992, 1-22. Retrieved May 19, 2005, from <http://www.arts.msw.edu.au /languages/asaa-ejournal>
- American Psychological Association. (2003). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association*. Washington D. C.: Author.
- Akiko, A. (2007). Writers' intention behind the citation forms in academic texts. *The Economic Journal of Takasaki City University of Economics*. 49 (3,4) 57-70.
- Akiko, A. (2008). Use of citation forms in academic texts by writers in the L1 & L2 contexts. *The Economic Journal of Takasaki City University of Economics*. 51 (1) 29-44.
- Beaugrande, R. (1993). *Discourse analysis and literary theory: closing the gap* [Electronic version]. *JAC* 13.2 (1993). Retrieved February 22, 2006, from <http://jac.edu/jac/13.2/Articles/8.htm>
- Buckingham, J. & M. Nevile (1997). Comparing the citation choices of experienced academic writers and first year students. In Zofia Golebiowski (Ed.), *Policy and Practice of Tertiary Literacy*. Vol. 1. pp. 96-108. Melbourne: Victoria University of Technology.
- Furlong, A. (2002). A modest proposal: Linguistics and literary studies. Paper presented to the 26th ANNUal Meeting of the Atlantic Provinces Linguistics Association, Memorial University, St. John's, Newfoundland, November 8, 2002
- Gibaldi, J. (2003). *MLA handbook for writers of research papers*. Sixth edition New York: The Modern Language Association of America.
- Handley, E. & S. Oaks. (n.d.). What Is a Research Paper? Retrieved January 12, 2010 from [<www.esc.edu/esconline/across_esc/writerscomplex.nsf/wholeshortlinks2/Research+Room+Menu?>](http://www.esc.edu/esconline/across_esc/writerscomplex.nsf/wholeshortlinks2/Research+Room+Menu?>)
- Hawes, T. and S. Thomas. (1997). Tense choices in citations. *Research in the Teaching of English* 31 (3) 393-414.
- Hedstrom, M. (2006). *Using and framing direct quotations*. Undergraduate Writing Center of the University of Texas at Austin . Retrieved August 3, 2009 from uwc.fac.utexas.edu

- Hyland, K. (1999). Academic attribution: citation and the construction of disciplinary knowledge [Abstract]. *Applied Linguistics* 20 (3) 341-67. Retrieved November 4, 2006, from <http://appliedjournals.org/cgi/content/abstract/20/3/341>
- Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: social interactions in academic writing*. New York: Longman.
- Keck, C. (2006). The use of paraphrase in summary writing: A comparison of L1 and L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 15, 261-278.
- Oda, S. & Y. Yamamoto. (2007). Paraphrasing: An essential tool for EAP. *Language Research Bulletin*, ICU, Tokyo.
- Oshima, A. & A. Hogue (1991). *Writing academic English*. Second Edition. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Pickard, V. (1995). Citing previous writers: what can we say instead of 'say'? *Hong Kong papers in Linguistics and Language Teaching* 18, 1995, 89-102. Retrieved May 22, 2005, from <http://sunzi1.lib.hku.hk/hkjo/view/4/400120.pdf>
- Rinnert, C. & H. Kobayashi. (2005). *Borrowing words and ideas: Insights from Japanese L1 writers* [Abstract]. In Li, X. & Casanave, C. P. (Eds.) 2005 pp. 15-29. Retrieved September 28, 2006, from <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/jbp/japc/00000015/00000001/art00003>
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis. English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- The Writing Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. (2006). *Chicago/Turabian Style*. Retrieved June 11, 2007, from www.unc.edu/depts/wcweb/1998-2005
- White, H. D. (2004). Citation analysis and discourse analysis revisited. *Applied Linguistics* 25 (1) 89-116. Oxford University Press 2004.
- Yugianingrum. (2008). *Citations and citing behaviors in English as a foreign language undergraduate theses*. Unpublished dissertation. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.