The Relationship between Students' Paraphrasing Ability, Reading Comprehension, and Vocabulary Mastery

Adek Enggar Rinjani[1] and Ririn Ovilia[2]
[12]Universitas Negeri Padang
Correspondence Email: adekenggarr@gmail.com

Abstract

To complete academic papers, students are expected to write it based on ideas obtained in reading various sources. While doing so, paraphrasing can be done and it is considered as a higher academic skill than quoting. However, in practice, most of students still find it difficult to paraphrase and their ability in paraphrasing is still low. Several studies investigated the problems experienced by students when paraphrasing and it showed that vocabulary and text comprehension are the most frequent problems in this regard. This correlational study aims to identify the relationship and to measure the contribution of students' reading comprehension and vocabulary mastery to their paraphrasing ability. The population of this study is eight classes of second-year English Language Education students enrolled in the Academic Writing course in English Language Education study program at Universitas Negeri Padang. By using cluster random sampling, two classes were chosen as the sample of this study. The instruments used were in the form of tests which are reading comprehension test, vocabulary level test, and paraphrasing test. This study used quantitative research methods with multivariate and bivariate correlation analysis technique. The findings show that students' reading comprehension and vocabulary mastery, both separately and simultaneously, are correlated positively with students' paraphrasing ability. The results also indicate that reading comprehension contributed 10.1% to paraphrasing ability and vocabulary mastery contributed 22.5%.

INTRODUCTION

Book and journal article have been widely used to complete academic research and studies. Students are expected to write academic papers based on ideas obtained from various sources. Ideas are regarded as private property of the person who first thought or published them in academic work, so providing proper acknowledgement

is required when using or referring to the work of another individual (Bailey, 2018). According to Oshima & Hogue, (2006), quoting; both direct and indirect, paraphrasing, and summarizing are method that can be applied to use ideas from sources. However, not everything taken from other sources can be adopted by quoting. In order to avoid overusing quotation, the best ways to incorporate the thoughts of other authors are through summarizing and paraphrasing (Bailey, 2018). Aside from the fact that quoting should not be used frequently in academic writing, paraphrasing is also valued as a higher academic skill than quoting (Geyte, 2013).

However, in practice, some students still find it difficult to paraphrase. Several studies have also been carried out in looking at students' ability to paraphrase texts. A qualitative descriptive study was conducted by Mira and Fatimah (2020) to measure the level of undergraduate students' acceptance of paraphrased text. The results of this study show that, in general, 12 of the 32 words written by students are the same word as the source text, so that 49% of the student's paraphrased text is categorized as a minimal revision which is referring to the taxonomy of paraphrase developed by Keck (2006). Furthermore, based on paraphrase appropriateness level by McInnis (2009), 59% of students' paraphrasing results were categorized as somewhat inappropriate. Another research carried out by Rusdianto and Fitrawati (2022) which entitled An Analysis of Students' Ability in Paraphrasing a Paragraph at the English Department Universitas Negeri Padang also investigated that students' ability to paraphrase was still in the unsatisfactory category. The results showed that the average score of the students in the paraphrasing test was 51.9 and some issues related to students' paraphrasing were discovered.

In regard to the problems experienced by students when paraphrasing, a number of studies have been conducted to investigate this issue, particularly those that focus on the challenges that students encounter while paraphrasing. A study conducted by Thadphoothon (2017) in Bangkok investigated students' perception about paraphrasing skill and their paraphrasing difficulties. It was found that students encountered several issues when paraphrasing. The study's findings indicate that reading comprehension, syntactic proficiency, and vocabulary abilities were the top three difficulties that students encountered. Although the students often understood the original text, their paraphrased version often had a different meaning. In terms of vocabulary, they don't know the correct replacement word for a particular context. A similar work was also conducted by Ovilia et al. (2022). This research investigated the most common paraphrasing approaches utilized by students as well as their challenges in paraphrasing. In regards to the issues in paraphrasing, the result showed that the most common challenges addressed by participants are reading, lexical, and grammatical issues.

From the results of previous studies (Mira & Fatimah, 2020; Ovilia et al., 2022; Rusdianto & Fitrawati, 2022; Thadphoothon, 2017), it can be concluded that the ability of students to paraphrase is relatively low. Several problems have also been identified that can be a factor causing the low paraphrasing ability of students. Among several problems mentioned, vocabulary and text comprehension are the most frequent problems in this regard. Some studies have also been conducted in reviewing this matter. Arifah et al. (2013) analyzed the contribution of reading comprehension and sentence structure knowledge in paraphrasing. The findings

show that reading comprehension and sentence structure mastery contribute significantly to paraphrasing skill, both separately and simultaneously. Swarini et al. (2017) also investigated the influence of students' reading comprehension ability in narrative text and their paraphrasing ability. The results show that there is a significant positive relationship.

Based on previous research related to paraphrasing ability, there has not been much research measuring the contribution of university students' reading comprehension and vocabulary mastery to their paraphrasing ability. Therefore, in addition to identify the relationship between students' paraphrasing ability, their reading comprehension, and their vocabulary mastery, this study also aims to measure the contribution of reading comprehension and vocabulary mastery to students' paraphrasing ability. Eventually, by knowing the relationship and contributions among those matters, it is possible to find out how reading comprehension and vocabulary mastery are related to students' paraphrasing ability.

The researchers formulated hypotheses based on the previous theories and relevant research as follows:
Ho (Null Hypothesis)
1) there is no correlation between reading comprehension skill, vocabulary mastery, and paraphrasing ability
2) there is no correlation between reading comprehension skill and paraphrasing ability
3) there is no correlation between vocabulary mastery and paraphrasing ability
Ha (Alternate Hypothesis)
1) there is a correlation between reading comprehension skill, vocabulary mastery, and paraphrasing ability
2) there is a correlation between reading comprehension skill and paraphrasing ability
3) there is a correlation between vocabulary mastery and paraphrasing ability

METHOD

The aims of this research are to identify the relationships and to measure the contributions of students' reading comprehension and vocabulary mastery to their paraphrasing ability. Due to this purpose, the correlational research design is deemed suitable. The population of this study was eight classes of second-year English Language Education students enrolled in the Academic Writing course in the English Language Education Study Program at Universitas Negeri Padang. By using cluster random sampling, two classes, which are K4-2020 and K5-2020, were selected as samples of this study. In these two classes, there are 41 students who participated in the study.

The instrument that researcher used in this study was tests. The tests were divided into three parts which were vocabulary test, reading comprehension test, and paraphrasing test. The time allocation for each test was 60 minutes and those three tests were conducted in three different days. In validating the instruments used in this study, researcher used content validation. Researcher investigated reliability using inter-rater reliability.

To analyze the data from this study, researcher used IBM SPSS Statistics 25 Program. Because this study aims to determine the correlation between variables, the analysis method that was used was correlation analysis. In doing so, the researcher used multivariate correlation and bivariate correlation (Spearman's Rank Correlation). Because correlation is part of parametric statistics, it is necessary to test the normality and linearity of the data before conducting correlation analysis

RESULT AND DISCUSSION
Research Finding

Researchers conducted the study at the Department of English Language and Literature in Universitas Negeri Padang. This study involved students who enrolled in academic writing courses. By using cluster random sampling, two classes were chosen as the samples. The number of students from both classes is 41. There were three different sorts of tests as part of the data collection process. Those three tests were vocabulary tests, reading tests, and paraphrasing tests. The table below shows the results of those three tests taken by the students.

Table 1. Students' Test Result

No	Students' Number	Tests Score			
		Reading Score	Vocabulary Score	Paraphrase	
				Score	Description
1	1	42.5	54.7	2	Somewhat Inappropriate
2	2	62.5	73.3	1	Inappropriate
3	3	57.5	67.3	2	Somewhat Inappropriate
4	4	47.5	87	3	Somewhat Appropriate
5	5	27.5	65.3	1	Inappropriate
6	6	20	62	1	Inappropriate
7	7	55	87	2	Somewhat Appropriate
8	8	52.5	65	1	Inappropriate
9	9	17.5	92	3	Somewhat Appropriate
10	10	52.5	65.3	1	Inappropriate
11	11	22.5	55.3	1	Inappropriate
12	12	57.5	80	3	Somewhat Appropriate
13	13	42.5	76	2	Somewhat Inappropriate
14	14	52.5	71	2	Somewhat Inappropriate
15	15	25	56	1	Inappropriate
16	16	47.5	78	2	Somewhat Inappropriate
17	17	55	88.7	2	Somewhat Inappropriate
18	18	72.5	90.7	3	Somewhat Appropriate
19	19	35	56	1	Inappropriate
20	20	40	90	1	Inappropriate
21	21	45	46.7	1	Inappropriate
22	22	50	65	2	Somewhat Inappropriate
23	23	42.5	71.3	2	Somewhat Inappropriate
24	24	57.5	87.3	1	Inappropriate

25	25	22.5	37.3	1	Inappropriate
26	26	40	86	1	Inappropriate
27	27	22.5	38	2	Somewhat Inappropriate
28	28	32.5	84	2	Somewhat Inappropriate
29	29	45	85.3	3	Somewhat Appropriate
30	30	35	73.3	1	Inappropriate
31	31	35	67.3	1	Inappropriate
32	32	32.5	67.3	1	Inappropriate
33	33	27.5	66.7	3	Somewhat Appropriate
34	34	65	96	3	Somewhat Appropriate
35	35	45	77	3	Somewhat Appropriate
36	36	35	63.3	1	Inappropriate
37	37	37.5	63.3	3	Somewhat Appropriate
38	38	45	69.3	2	Somewhat Inappropriate
39	39	32.5	56	1	Inappropriate
40	40	37.5	36	1	Inappropriate
41	41	42.5	70	2	Somewhat Inappropriate

Normality Test

The normality test was used to assess whether or not the residual value is regularly distributed. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to identify the residual value's normality. If the significance value is more than 0.05 (Sig. > 0.05), the residual value is considered to be normally distributed. The result of the normality test is shown in the following table.

Table 2. The Result of Normality Test using Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test			Reading Comprehension	Vocabulary Mastery	Paraphrasing Ability	Unstandardized Residual
N			41	41	41	41
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean		41.768	69.927	1.76	.0000000
	Std. Deviation		13.1130	15.2368	.799	.70376971
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute		.063	.090	.291	.078
	Positive		.063	.056	.291	.078
	Negative		-.062	-.090	-.172	-.076
Test Statistic			.063	.090	.291	.078
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)			.200[c,d]	.200[c,d]	.000[c]	.200[c,d]
a. Test distribution is Normal.						
b. Calculated from data.						
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.						
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.						

As can be seen from the table above, the residual significance value was 0.200, which is more than 0.05 (Sig. > 0.05). It indicated that the residual value was normally distributed and the normality prerequisite test has been fulfilled.

Linearity Tests

The linearity test was used to determine whether or not the variables under consideration have a linear relationship. If the significance value of deviation from linearity is more than 0.05 (Sig. > 0.05), then there is a linear relationship between the variables. The results of the linearity test can be seen in the following tables.

Table 3. The Result of Linearity Test between Paraphrasing Ability and Reading Comprehension

ANOVA Table							
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Paraphrasing Ability * Reading Comprehension	Between Groups	(Combined)	14.311	18	.795	1.555	.162
		Linearity	2.188	1	2.188	4.279	.051
		Deviation from Linearity	12.123	17	.713	1.395	.229
	Within Groups		11.250	22	.511		
	Total		25.561	40			

As can be seen from the table above, the significance value of the deviation from linearity was 0.229, which is more than 0.05. It indicated that the two variables, which are paraphrasing ability and reading comprehension, had a linear relationship.

Table 4. The Result of Linearity Test between Paraphrasing Ability and Vocabulary Mastery

ANOVA Table							
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Paraphrasing Ability * Vocabulary Mastery	Between Groups	(Combined)	21.894	31	.706	1.734	.194
		Linearity	5.626	1	5.626	13.809	.005
		Deviation from Linearity	16.268	30	.542	1.331	.340
	Within Groups		3.667	9	.407		
	Total		25.561	40			

As can be seen from the table above, the significance value of the deviation from linearity was 0.340, which is more than 0.05. It also indicated that the two variables, which are paraphrasing ability and vocabulary mastery, had a linear relationship and the linearity prerequisite test has been fulfilled.

Multivariate Correlation Analysis
Table 5. The Result of Multivariate Correlation Analysis

Model Summary							
Model	R	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
			R Square	F	df1	df2	Sig. F

			Change	Change			Change
1	.474ᵃ	.722	.225	5.514	2	38	.008

a. Predictors: (Constant), Vocabulary Mastery, Reading Comprehension

According to the results of the multivariate correlation analysis, the value of significance F change was 0.008 which is less than 0.05 (Sig. F Change < 0.05). It can be concluded that the reading comprehension variable and vocabulary mastery variable, simultaneously, are correlated to the paraphrasing ability variable. As a result, the first null hypothesis (Ho 1) was rejected, while the first alternative hypothesis (Ha 1) was accepted.

The correlation coefficient (r), which is 0.474, indicated two things. First, the relationship between the three variables was positive correlation (unidirectional) because the value of r is positive. This positive correlation showed that as students' reading comprehension and vocabulary knowledge increase, so does their paraphrase ability. Second, the level of correlation between these variables was rated as moderate correlation.

Bivariate Correlation Analysis

Table 6. The Result of Bivariate Correlation Analysis

Correlations

			Paraphrasing Ability
Spearman's rho	Reading Comprehension	Correlation Coefficient	.318*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.043
		N	41
	Vocabulary Mastery	Correlation Coefficient	.475**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.002
		N	41

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

According to the results of the bivariate correlation analysis, the value of significance between reading comprehension variable and paraphrasing ability variable was 0.043 which indicating that it is less than 0.05 (Sig. (2-tailed) < 0.05). It can be concluded that the reading comprehension variable is correlated to the paraphrasing ability variable. Thus, the second null hypothesis (Ho 2) was rejected, whereas the second alternative hypothesis (Ha 2) was accepted.

The correlation coefficient (r), which is 0.318, indicated three things. First, the relationship between reading comprehension variable and paraphrasing ability variable was positive correlation (unidirectional) because the value of r was positive. Second, the level of correlation between these variables was categorized as moderate correlation. Third, the coefficient determination value (R^2) was 0.101 which indicates that the percentage contribution given by the reading comprehension variable to the paraphrasing ability variable was 10.1%.

Regarding the bivariate correlation between vocabulary mastery and paraphrasing ability, the value of significance between those two variables was 0.002 which indicates that it is less than 0.05 (Sig. (2-tailed) < 0.05). It can be concluded that the vocabulary mastery variable was correlated to the paraphrasing ability

variable. As a result, the last alternative hypothesis (Ha 3) was accepted, while the last null hypothesis (Ho 3) is refused.

The correlation coefficient (r), which was 0.475, indicated three things. First, the relationship between vocabulary mastery variable and paraphrasing ability variable was positive correlation (unidirectional) because the value of r was positive. Second, the level of correlation between these variables was classified as moderate correlation. Third, the coefficient determination value (R^2) is 0.225 which indicates that the percentage contribution given by the vocabulary mastery variable to the paraphrasing ability variable was 22.5%.

Discussion

Based on the results of research data analysis using multivariate correlation test, it is found that reading comprehension and vocabulary mastery, simultaneously, were correlated positively with students' paraphrasing ability. This indicates that the first alternative hypothesis stating that there is a correlation between reading comprehension skill, vocabulary mastery, and paraphrasing ability was accepted and the first null hypothesis was rejected. In addition, a positive correlation indicates that an increase in reading comprehension and vocabulary mastery value is followed by an increase in value on paraphrasing ability.

The finding of this research, which is positive correlation between these three variables, indicates that good paraphrasing requires text comprehension and vocabulary knowledge so that the message or key points in the original text can be conveyed using different words while still paying attention to appropriate synonyms. This finding is also corroborated with the research-based theory proposed by Ovilia et al. (2022) that knowing source texts and understanding vocabulary, particularly words used in academic contexts, are necessary in producing good paraphrase.

This study finding is also strengthens up the findings of various studies on the challenges and problems that students confront when doing paraphrases. Hayuningrum & Yulia (2017) investigated that the main causes of students' low paraphrasing ability were low vocabulary knowledge and lack of ability to understand the content of the original text. Regala-Flores & Lopez (2019) also discovered that two of the four primary areas of students' challenges in paraphrasing are a lack of reading comprehension skills and a lack of vocabulary.

According to Regala-Flores & Lopez (2019), in general, students' ability to interpret sources is directly related to their ability to produce paraphrases. This is due to the fact that students must first fully comprehend the source text before they can recognize any important information and rewrite it as a paraphrase using appropriate words and sentences (Regala-Flores & Lopez, 2019). Moreover, appropriateness of word selection and sentences are the reasons why vocabulary knowledge is needed in paraphrasing (Regala-Flores & Lopez, 2019). Regarding reading comprehension and vocabulary mastery problems, Alaofi (2020) and Ovilia et al. (2022) also identified them as the most prominent problems among the difficulties underlying students' low paraphrasing ability. Therefore, the results of those studies mentioned are in line with the results of this study which found that there is a positive correlation between reading comprehension and vocabulary mastery with students' paraphrasing ability.

In addition to the results of multivariate correlation analysis, one of bivariate correlation analysis result also showed that there is a positive correlation between reading comprehension and students' paraphrasing ability. Regarding the results of the correlation test between reading comprehension and students' paraphrasing ability, Arifah et al. (2013) also found that reading comprehension, along with sentence structure mastery, had a relationship with students' paraphrasing ability. Lane in Arifah et al. (2013) states that good reading comprehension help in paraphrase a text because the key activity of paraphrasing is determining the author's exact meaning and rewording concepts from the text.

Regarding other bivariate correlation analysis result, vocabulary mastery is also correlated positively with students' paraphrasing ability. It is supported by another study conducted by Muslih (2021) which shows that there is a positive relationship between students' mastery of vocabulary and their paraphrasing ability. In paraphrasing a text, after determining the sentence to be paraphrased, students must determine the equivalent way of writing and selecting words to maintain the meaning of the original text (Ovilia et al., 2022). In doing so, vocabulary mastery is needed to write the correct paraphrase.

Furthermore, it is found that reading comprehension gives 10.1% contribution to paraphrasing ability while vocabulary mastery gives 22.5% contribution to paraphrasing ability. It is possible to conclude that vocabulary mastery has a higher contribution than reading comprehension. This outcome lines up with the findings of Alaofi's study in 2020 on areas of difficulty in summarizing and paraphrasing. According to Alaofi (2020) 90% of interviewees have language-related issues. Meanwhile, 22% of respondents raised the issue of reading comprehension. More precisely, in the part on language-related problems, Alaofi (2020) discovered that vocabulary had a higher percentage, 87%, compared to other areas of difficulty such as expressing ideas clearly (37%), and grammar (25%).

CONCLUSION

This correlational study is aimed to identify the relationship between students' paraphrasing ability, reading comprehension, and vocabulary mastery. This study was conducted at Padang State University's English Language Education Study Program and involved second-year students enrolled in the academic writing course. After conducting research and processing the data using the IBM SPSS Statistics 25 program, the significance value results were less than 0.05 (Sig. < 0.05) indicating that students' reading comprehension and vocabulary mastery, both separately and simultaneously, are correlated positively with students' paraphrasing ability. The findings also indicated that reading comprehension contributed 10.1% to paraphrasing ability and vocabulary mastery contributed 22.5%. As a result, the alternate hypotheses are accepted, whereas null hypotheses are refused.

Based on the results obtained in this study, there are several suggestions that can be considered. Future researchers are expected to find more variables that may be correlated with paraphrasing ability. Future researchers are also expected to identify the contribution provided by each component to paraphrasing abilities so that it may be determined which variable has a higher influence on paraphrasing. Educators are also expected to consider the results of this study as a reference to

improve paraphrasing ability by improving supporting abilities such as reading comprehension and vocabulary mastery.

REFERENCES

Alaofi, A. O. (2020). Difficulties of Summarizing and Paraphrasing in English as a Foreign Language (EFL): Saudi Graduate Students' Perspectives. *International Journal of English Language Education*, *8*(2), 193. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijele.v8i2.17788

Arifah, U. P., Suparno, & Setyaningsih, E. (2013). *A Correlational Study Between Reading Comprehension, Sentence Structure Mastery, and Paraphrasing Skill*.

Bailey, S. (2018). *Academic Writing: A Handbook for International Students* (Fifth). Routledge.

Geyte, E. van. (2013). *Writing: Learn to Write Better Academic Essays* (First). HarperCollins.

Hayuningrum, H., & Yulia, M. F. (2017). Students Problems in Writing Paraphrases in Research Paper Writing Class. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, *15*(1), 133–148. https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v15i1.296

Keck, C. (2006). The use of paraphrase in summary writing: A comparison of L1 and L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *15*(4), 261–278. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.09.006

McInnis, L. (2009). *Analyzing English L1 and L2 Paraphrasing Strategies through Concurrent Verbal Report and Stimulated Recall Protocols*.

Mira, A. S., & Fatimah, S. (2020). Students' Paraphrased Texts and Their Perceptions of Paraphrasing in Academic Writing. *Lingua Didaktika*, *14*(1). https://doi.org/10.24036/ld.v14i1.42494

Muslih, M. (2021). The Influence of Students' Mastery of Vocabulary on Paraphrasing Ability. *Indonesian Journal of Instructional Media and Model*, *3*(1), 9. https://doi.org/10.32585/ijimm.v3i1.925

Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2006). *Writing Academic English* (Fourth). Pearson Longman.

Ovilia, R., Addina, A., & Oktoviandry, R. (2022). Students' Paraphrasing Ability in Academic Writing; Techniques and Challenges. *Komposisi: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Seni*, *23*.

Regala-Flores, E., & Lopez, M. (2019). Self-reported summarizing and paraphrasing difficulties in L2 writing contexts: Some pedagogical interventions. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *9*(2), 286–296. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i2.20219

Rusdianto, G., & Fitrawati. (2022). Journal of English Language Teaching an Analysis of Students' Ability in Paraphrasing a Paragraph at the English Department Universitas Negeri Padang. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, *11*, 314–323. https://doi.org/10.24036/jelt.v11i3.119178

Swarini, A. R., Anggani, D., Bharati, L., Sutopo, D., Swarini, A. R., Bharati, D. A. L., Sutopo, D., & Journal, /. (2017). The Correlation between Students' Reading Comprehension and their Paraphrasing Ability in Narrative Text. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, *6*(1). http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/elt

Thadphoothon, J. (2017). *EFL Students' Perceptions of Paraphrasing Skills and their Paraphrasing Challenges*.