



Students' Paraphrased Texts and Their Perceptions of Paraphrasing in Academic Writing

Teks Parafrase Mahasiswa Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris dan Persepsi Mereka terhadap Parafrase dalam Konteks Penulisan Akademis

Asri Sekar Mira¹, Sitti Fatimah²

English Language and Literature Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts,
State University of Padang

Jl. Belibis No.21A, Air Tawar Barat, Padang, Sumatera Barat, 25132, Indonesia

1asrisekarm@gmail.com

2sitti.fatimah@fbs.unp.ac.id

Permalink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24036/ld.v14i1.42494>

Submitted: 28-05-2020

Accepted: 11-07-2020

DOI: 10.24036/ld.v14i1.42494

Published: 13-07-2020

Abstract

This descriptive qualitative study aims to investigate students' paraphrased texts based on Keck's Paraphrase Taxonomy (2006) and on McInnis' level of paraphrase appropriateness (2009), and to explore their perceptions toward paraphrasing. Fifty nine students from English Language Education Study Program of UNP academic year 2017 participated in this study and were assigned to do a paraphrasing task in which they paraphrased four separate sentences of one author. The finding shows that 49% of student' paraphrases were categorized as minimal revision signifying that, in general, twelve author's words were plagiarized in students' typical 32-word paraphrases. Besides, 59% of students' paraphrases are classified as somewhat inappropriate indicating that three to four criteria of an appropriate paraphrase are not able to be fulfilled by these paraphrases. Verbal reports from an interview session with four respondents also reveal that students did not have a clear understanding of the concept of paraphrase since most of their knowledge about paraphrase was conjectural.

Keywords: *academic writing, plagiarism, paraphrasing, perceptions*

Abstrak

Penelitian deskriptif kualitatif ini bertujuan untuk menyelidiki teks parafrase mahasiswa dengan menggunakan teori taksonomi parafrase Keck (2006) dan teori tingkat kelayakan parafrase McInnis (2009) serta menganalisa persepsi mahasiswa terhadap konsep parafrase. Sebanyak lima puluh sembilan mahasiswa dari Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris UNP 2017 berpartisipasi dalam penelitian ini dan bersedia untuk menyelesaikan tugas parafrase dimana mereka diminta untuk mengungkapkan kembali 4 kalimat terpisah dari satu penulis. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa 49% dari parafrase mahasiswa dikategorikan sebagai "minimal revision" mengindikasikan bahwa secara umum, mahasiswa cenderung menjiplak 12 kata dari

teks asli ke dalam teks paraphrase yang berisi 32 kata. Tidak hanya itu, 59% dari paraphrase mereka juga dikategorikan sebagai “somewhat inappropriate” mengindikasikan bahwa paraphrase mereka belum memenuhi 3 sampai 4 kriteria untuk bisa dikatakan sebagai paraphrase yang layak/diterima. Laporan hasil wawancara dengan 4 responden juga mengungkapkan bahwa mahasiswa masih belum memiliki pemahaman yang jelas terhadap konsep parafrase disebabkan sebagian besar pengetahuan mereka mengenai parafrase masih berlandaskan pada penafsiran pribadi mereka.

Kata kunci: *penulisan akademis, plagiarisme, parafrase, persepsi*

INTRODUCTION

Since the number of international open access academic publications and internet websites are continually growing every year, there comes a bigger challenge for students and researchers to hold academic responsibilities and honesty in appropriating someone else's ideas into their academic writing manuscripts. These academic responsibilities are then manifested in ethical principles which academic communities should follow. One of the ethical principles is that they are in charge of their own work signifying that they agree to and hold consequences of their own conducts in creating their work. Ethical principles further emphasize that students and researchers are supposed to show respect and recognition to others' works. If they do not follow these ethics, they automatically perform an academic dishonesty in which cheating and plagiarism are included. Vandermeij, Meyer, Rys, and Sebranek (2012, p. 474) define plagiarism as "... using someone else's words, ideas, or images (what is called intellectual property) so they appear to be your own." Wallwork (2011) further describe that if one's work is officially accused of plagiarism, the authorities can impose a sanction of dismissal of the charged work or even removal of the suspect. Thus, the practices of respecting and acknowledging original sources are vital; they are undertaken through proper note taking strategies (e.g., quotation, paraphrases, and summaries) along with appropriate citations in the context of writing from sources.

Paraphrasing, as one of note-taking strategies in academic writing, provides several benefits which directly impact on the reliability of one's academic paper. First, paraphrasing escalates the originality of one's work since this strategy allows a writer to present authors' arguments in a new and different way as opposed to quotation which borrows the exact authors' languages. Spatt (2011) affirmed that the extensive use of quotation arises the reader's suspicion that one academic paper lacks of ideas and knowledge of the writer. Second, paraphrasing sustains the points of an original text compared to summary which leaves out much of the details from the original. As mentioned by Howard, Serviss, and Rodrigue (2010), paraphrasing strategy is a strategy of preserving the context and meaning of words while restating ideas and information from other sources in an innovative language. Through paraphrasing, one is able to carefully look into the structure of a sentence and grasp the meaning and message that is carried within the text and this comprehension assists his/her to adjust and amend the sentence in different ways (Bazerman, 1994). Paraphrases, thus, can serve as a way to monitor someone's understanding toward the text (Dollahite & Haun, 2012). Winkler and Metherell (2012) also describe that paraphrasing can promote consistency in one's writing since the authors' words can be adjusted and transformed to fit into one's writing style. All these significances

make paraphrasing become a deserving topic to be progressively discussed in more and more studies.

There have been various international studies which explore particular aspects of paraphrasing from both students' and teachers' points of views in the context of native and non-native circumstances. Some studies in the context of the United States and European universities focused on investigating international undergraduate students' paraphrasing strategies (Keck, 2006; McInnis, 2009; Pecorari, 2003; Qian Du, 2013). Meanwhile, in the regions of Asia, several studies concentrating in China and Taiwan (e.g., Chien, 2014; Hu & Lei, 2015, 2016; Liao & Tseng, 2010) rhetorically examined students' behaviors and perceptions of paraphrasing through socio-cultural perspectives. Further studies examining how paraphrasing inventions affected non-native students' paraphrasing performances and understanding were situated in Korea (e.g., Choi, 2012) and Japan (e.g., Harshbarger, 2012) resulting in the positive end results on those aspects. In the context of EFL South East Asian countries, studies examining students' abilities, strategies and perceptions of paraphrasing were situated in Vietnam (e.g., Dung, 2010; Na & Nhat Chi Mai, 2018), Thailand (Thadphoothon, 2019), Malaysia (Fatimawati & Badiozaman, 2014) and Indonesia (Hayuningrum & Yulia, 2017; Irmadamayanti, 2018; Khairunnisa, Sutapa, & Surmiyati, 2014; Khristawan & Widiati, 2013).

However, only few studies in the context of Indonesia addressed the subject of paraphrasing in Academic Writing which implicitly showcased that the topic of paraphrasing is relatively new and under-discussed. These studies mostly concern about students' weak performances and challenging exposures toward paraphrasing. For instance, Hayuningrum and Yulia (2017) highlighted mainly on the problems/drawbacks existing in students' paraphrases. Meanwhile, Khairunnisa et al. (2014) focused on rating students' paraphrasing performances and found that 76,92 % of seventh semester English Department students in Tanjungpura University did an unsatisfactory level of paraphrasing performance where they were prone to imitate the logical order of the source paragraph in their paraphrases. Data collected by Khristawan and Widiati (2013) also showed that there was a contradiction between students' knowledge and practices of paraphrasing. The interview data showed positive results of students' understanding of paraphrases; however, the paraphrasing task showed a negative result where 13 out of 18 paraphrased texts still contained copied/imitated words from the original.

Still, all these explanations are insufficient to facilitate EFL students, as novice writers, and instructors to inspect the degree of plagiarism and the level of appropriateness or inappropriateness that students frequently commit in their paraphrases. This study, thus, arises in the similar fashions as Keck (2006) and McInnis (2009) proposed in judging students' paraphrased texts, but with different purposes and in a different context (EFL context). In an attempt to examine to what extent plagiarism interferes students' paraphrases, to present the category of paraphrase most frequently used by students and to reveal how students' perceptions affect their paraphrases, this study investigates students' paraphrased texts based on paraphrase categories proposed by Keck (2006) and McInnis (2009) as well as their perceptions of paraphrasing.

Keck's Taxonomy of Paraphrases

In his study, Keck (2006) established a method to categorize students' paraphrase results according to the number of copied words made by the students in their paraphrases. Keck (2006, p. 266) formulated the term "lexical characteristics" to

examine the number of total words (“length of paraphrases”), the number of plagiarized/copied words (“unique links”), and also the number of “general links” contained in students’ attempted paraphrases. Within this framework, Keck (2006, p. 266) associates “unique links” with “individual lexical words (i.e., nouns, verbs, adjectives, or adverbs), or exactly copied strings of words used in the paraphrase that (a) also occurred in the original excerpt but, (b) occurred in no other place in the original text.” Meanwhile, “general links” are characterized as “lexical words used in the paraphrase that occurred in the original excerpt but that also occurred elsewhere in the original text” (Keck, 2006, p. 266). In other words, “general links” are described as a word or a group of words which function as the topic of the text and technical terms or scientific jargons. The existence of these words must be maintained in one’s paraphrase.

The lexical characteristics stated earlier are capable of serving as criteria and characterizations for determining and classifying students’ attempted paraphrases into 4 paraphrase types which are arranged by Keck (2006) in his *Taxonomy of Paraphrases*, as follows:

1) Near Copy

This type of paraphrase comprises 50% and above of unique links.

2) Minimal Revision

This type contains 20-49% of unique links.

3) Moderate Revision

This type contains 1-19% of unique links.

4) Substantial Revision

No unique link is found in Substantial Revision, and the change of lexical and syntactical structure is already substantial.

McInnis’ Level of Paraphrase Appropriateness (2009)

A paraphrase is sometimes free from plagiarism; at the same time, it is potentially not satisfactory to be called as a proper/appropriate paraphrase. Therefore, McInnis in her study (2009) produced a list of definite criteria after her synthesis attempt of previous paraphrasing basic rules suggested by Shirley and Purdue University Online Writing Lab (see McInnis (2009, p. 48). This list of criteria will assist everyone to monitor, measure, and categorize their paraphrased text beyond the categorization of copying or not copying. Instead, the categorization is further away looking into what McInnis (2009, p. 46) considers as an “appropriate” and “inappropriate” paraphrase. Below is the set of criteria of an appropriate paraphrase which needs to be fulfilled according to McInnis (2009, p.48):

1) Attributed source to original author

2) Appropriate/sufficient use of synonyms for terminology

3) All key points of the original are retained

4) Sufficient syntactical shift (word order, active to passive, etc.)

5) It is not a summary

6) Word form changed

7) Participant’s opinion is not reflected.

In addition, below is the level/category of students’ paraphrase appropriateness according to McInnis (2009, p.48):

1) Appropriate (meets all criteria)

2) Somewhat appropriate (meets 5-6 criteria)

3) Somewhat inappropriate (meets 3-4 criteria)

- 4) Inappropriate (meets fewer than 3 criteria).

RESEARCH METHOD

To investigate students' paraphrased texts and to explore EFL students' perceptions toward paraphrasing in the context of English Language Education Program at UNP, the researcher employed a descriptive-qualitative study where the data were collected both quantitatively and qualitatively. For the quantitative data, the researcher presented the average number of student's total paraphrase length, unique links, and general links per one paraphrase. The total numbers of each paraphrase category according to Keck (2006) and paraphrase type according to McInnis (2009) were also presented. For the qualitative data, the researcher comprehensively collected students' perceptions in understanding paraphrases according to their past experiences.

The population of this study was third-year English Language Education students of UNP. The sample size was obtained with the number of 59 out of total of 128 by using Cochran's sample size formula (1977). Through the use of cluster sampling, the researcher selected K1-2017 and K3-2017 as a research subject because the entire number of students in both classes corresponded to the obtained sample size. Four respondents whose paraphrased texts were categorized as near-copy, minimal revision, moderate revision, and substantial revision were also selected to participate in an individual interview.

The instruments used for this study were a paraphrasing task using four authors' arguments as source texts taken from an article entitled "Using Writing as a Scaffold to Academic Discussions in the Foreign Language Classroom" by Darren Keith Lascotte (2018) and also a personal and structured interview using Bahasa Indonesia (Indonesian language). After the testing, 236 paraphrased texts were annotated with their lexical characteristics (the extent or length of paraphrase, the number of unique links as well as general links based on the criteria proposed by Keck (2006) and the presence or the absence of citations and certain patterns which do not meet the criteria proposed by McInnis (2009). After being annotated and evaluated, the paraphrase results were extracted into quantitative data containing the average number of paraphrased words, unique links and general links found in students' attempted paraphrases as well as the number of paraphrase categories based on the Keck's Paraphrase Taxonomy (2006) and McInnis' Level of Paraphrase Appropriateness (2009).

Participants' responses from the interview were transcribed, translated into English, organized, interpreted and coded before being presented in the form of description which will explain students' perceptions and understanding toward paraphrasing strategy according to their experiences and practices of paraphrasing in the previous writing courses.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

RESULT

- a. *The average number of copied words found in students' attempted paraphrases*

Table 1 below indicates that the mean of the students' length of paraphrases was 32. This means that from every paraphrasing task given to the students in the test, the most common length of paraphrase that students made was 32 words. Within every 32-word paraphrase, the average amount of words which students directly plagiarized from the original sentence is 12 words with the typical amount of general links is 3 words. In other words, most of the time, students tended to copy and imitate 12

author's words in every 32-word paraphrase they made. It means that only 20 words which were truly restated in students' own words; the rest was still categorized as plagiarism.

Table 1. *Lexical Characteristics of Students' Attempted Paraphrases*

Lexical Characteristics	Mean	Standard Deviation
Length of paraphrase	32	8.86
Words in unique links	12	7.68
Words in general links	3	1.74

b. *Students' Paraphrase Types/Categories according to Keck's Taxonomy of Paraphrases (2006)*

Table 2 below shows that of the four paraphrase types, the most frequent use is 'minimal revision', that is 115 times (49%). The less frequent use is 'near-copy' amounting 67 times (28%). The other two types are 'moderate revision' and 'substantial revision', used only 42 times (18%) and 12 times (5%) respectively. In addition, these two most common paraphrase types appear to be patchwriting (failed versions of paraphrases where students' paraphrases still employed a great resemblance to the original text) and direct copying.

Table 2. *Number of students' paraphrases based on the types proposed by Keck (2006)*

Paraphrase Types	Number of paraphrases	Percentage of paraphrases
Near copy	67	28%
Minimal Revision	115	49%
Moderate Revision	42	18%
Substantial Revision	12	5%
	236	100%

c. *Students' Paraphrase Types/Categories according to McInnis' Level of Paraphrase Appropriateness (2009)*

Table 3 suggests that the most common level of paraphrase that students regularly encountered when writing paraphrases is somewhat inappropriate. It only fulfilled 3-4 criteria with 140 paraphrases (59% out of total paraphrases being investigated). It is then followed by inappropriate level of paraphrase with 77 paraphrases (33% of total paraphrases), serving as the second most commonly used among the students. Somewhat appropriate level was only achieved by 19 paraphrases (8% of total paraphrases). Last but not least, the correct level of paraphrase, which is an appropriate level, only makes up zero number signalling its absence in students' paraphrase results.

Table 3. *Students' paraphrase categories according to McInnis' level of paraphrase appropriateness (2009).*

Appropriateness level of paraphrase	Number of paraphrases	Percentage of paraphrase
Appropriate (meets all criteria)	0	0%
Somewhat appropriate (meets 5-6 criteria)	19	8%
Somewhat inappropriate (meets 3-4 criteria)	140	59%
Inappropriate (meets fewer than 3 criteria)	77	33%
TOTAL	236	100%

d. *Students' Perceptions of Paraphrasing*

1. Preserve the authenticity of original meaning

When asked about the definition of paraphrase, all the participants in this study agreed that paraphrasing is a technique of restating a sentence or a passage through paraphraser's own words without imitating the original. However, only two participants with minimal revision and moderate revision were able to explain the complete definition of paraphrase. They said that in a paraphrase, one is supposed to preserve the authenticity of original meaning so that the authors' points are still intact, as mentioned by moderate revision participant below:

Paraphrase is a technique of changing / transforming an excerpt or a piece of statement from someone by using our own language without changing the meaning. The changes are usually in the construction and choice of words (Participant 2, moderate revision).

In addition, all the participants highlighted that paraphrasing is a technique that is employed only in writing, and not in speaking. They all used the words "excerpts, passages, paragraphs, texts, and authors' sentences" that all of these terms exclusively refer to a portion of one's written work. For instance, Participant 1 whose paraphrase was categorized 'substantial revision' and Participant 4 whose paraphrase was 'near copy' correspondingly describe that the objects being restated are in the forms of paragraphs and authors' sentences. Their responses are as follows:

Paraphrase technique is a technique of stating the author's original sentence in our own words" (Participant 1, substantial revision).

Paraphrase is a way of restating a passage / paragraph by not changing the meaning, but changing the word or the sentence structure" (Subject 4, near copy).

2. Paraphrase is difficult if not supported by students' English proficiencies and dictionaries

Participants' responses revealed that paraphrase was considered somewhat difficult on a rating scale "easy, somewhat difficult, difficult, and very difficult." In addition, three participants (those with near copy, minimal revision and substantial

revision) added several points on determining the scale of paraphrase difficulty. According to them, paraphrase can be difficult under particular conditions, such as the complex characteristic of passage/text that needs to be paraphrased (in terms of the sentence length, the familiarity of words and the grammatical structure employed in the text), and also the use of electronic and social media devices to support students in paraphrasing. For instance, Participant 3 with a minimal revision result described that:

I think that a paraphrase strategy is on the level of somewhat difficult.... If the text that needs to be paraphrased contains a long and complicated sentence and we are not supported and assisted with the use of dictionaries and electronic devices, such as phones and internet, in order to seek and find the correct synonyms/alternative words, then paraphrase becomes difficult (Participant 3, minimal revision).

Aside from the textual aspect, students' low English proficiency also contributes to their attitudes in viewing that paraphrase is difficult. This low English proficiency is particularly on students' weak vocabulary skills which lead to their comprehension problems in reading academic texts. Three participants with substantial revision, moderate revision, and minimal revision results agreed that they had an issue related to vocabulary deficiency. Participant 1 with substantial revision result said that:

An inadequate range of vocabulary really makes us, EFL students, struggle with reading, especially with understanding the meanings of certain words in the passage, most of which are unfamiliar words. While the students have not understood the meanings of certain words in the passage yet, the activity of modifying and altering those words whose meanings are even difficult for us to understand doubles the pressure (Participant 1, substantial revision).

3. First acquaintance with paraphrase for most participants is at college

Still in the light of students' views, another issue emerging related to a view about paraphrase is the novelty of paraphrasing concept among majority of EFL students, particularly of English Language Education students of UNP. Two participants (with moderate revision and minimal revision) mentioned that their first-ever encounter toward the concept of paraphrase was when they studied in the college, more precisely during Intermediate Reading (in the fifth semester) and Academic Writing course (in the sixth semester). For instance, Participant 3 stated, "before attending to the university, I was never introduced to the concept of paraphrase."

Meanwhile, two other participants acknowledged that they had ever experienced writing paraphrases during their secondary schools. Participant 4 with near copy result stated that her paraphrasing knowledge was gotten since her major in high school was Language. In addition, Participant 1 with substantial revision result said that what she did in high school during a writing activity was paraphrasing although her teacher did not say that it was a paraphrasing task, as quoted below,

I think that I have ever encountered a paraphrasing practice by using Indonesian language. My high school teacher once asked us, students, to review and summarize all the contents and materials in a

textbook by using our own wordsWhen introducing this practice, she did not use the term 'paraphrases.' Still, this practice is similar to a paraphrase technique that I found in a college. Hence, I assume that this practice that I did in the middle school is also called a paraphrase, too (Participant 1, substantial revision).

4. Techniques and references about paraphrasing are unfamiliar for all participants

When asked about the paraphrase techniques which were frequently used by them, all of the participants correspondingly confirmed that they still did not know any kinds of technique that are involved within the concept of paraphrases. Hence in order to get more answers from the participants, the researcher then gave the information about the common techniques which can be performed by students. For instance, in the word level comes the technique of rearranging the word order, using synonyms, definitions, and antonyms. Meanwhile, in the sentence level appears the technique of shifting active to passive, changing a positive sentence into negative, etc. All the participants came across being attentive and focused in receiving the researcher's explanation. The information was then responded with a head-nodding gesture by Participant 2 (moderate revision), saying that:

Honestly, I used none of the techniques that you described just now. I also had no idea that a paraphrase has any particular techniques in its concept. For all this time, I just paraphrased the authors' words by using my own feeling and intuition. If my intuition tells that my paraphrase is already simpler and more concise for my readers to read, then I'll go with it. In other words, I was not aware of what I did was, for instance, what people call as a technique of using synonym (Participant 2, moderate revision).

When the question addressed whether the participants used reliable sources, such as published books or articles, in learning about the concept of paraphrase and other note-taking strategies, all of them came into an agreement that they used neither books nor articles as a study guide. They described that they only used their own interpretations, guesses and understandings from what they had learned in Academic Writing course to determine whether their paraphrases were correct or not. Participant 3 with minimal revision highlighted that as quoted below.

I write my own paraphrases based on my beliefs and my own understandings toward what a paraphrase is..... In the learning process, we are put in groups and asked to seek the paraphrasing materials from the internet before doing our own presentations in front of the classroom (Participant 3, minimal revision).

Moreover, Participant 4 with near copy explained that she did not know the books nor articles to read and to learn about the paraphrases as quoted below.

...The separate materials from internet honestly do not help much in improving my understanding toward paraphrasing. The problem is I am also clueless about the books and articles that are relevant and

credible for us, students, to use as a guide in learning. It is so hard to find books (Participant 4, near copy)

5. Paraphrase provides benefits for students and lecturers

Although all the participants still showed confusion and lack of familiarity toward a paraphrasing strategy, they still thought that paraphrase was beneficial and helpful for them in a number of respects. Three participants, whose paraphrases are moderate revision, minimal revision and moderate revision, shared similar opinions that, according to them, paraphrasing strategy could assist them to construct the meaning/information of the text to be more meaningful and easier to recall. For instance, participant 3 with minimal revision said,

In paraphrasing, we are urged to restate all of authors' points in our own words. It automatically gives us a bigger space to interact or connect with the meaning of the text. Rather than only memorizing and remembering the text, restating the text can make the information stick to our memory longer (Participant 3, minimal revision).

In addition, Participant 2 with moderate revision further remarked that paraphrasing can be used to check student/someone's reading comprehension. She said, "Paraphrasing will obviously help the lecturers to see and assess the extent to which we have understood the passage." Aside from this, Participant 4 with near copy added another important point, "if done correctly, paraphrasing can also protect us from the plagiarism crimes." Lastly, Participant 1 with substantial revision mentioned, "Through paraphrasing, a complicated structure of author's sentence can be simplified into a more comprehensible structure that we can understand by using our own words."

Discussion

On average, most of the paraphrasing results of Universitas Negeri Padang students specialized in English Language Education Program 2017 were categorized as minimal revision; with the typical plagiarized words were 12 within a 32-word-paraphrase. Considering the fact that Indonesian students still committed 38% (nearly 40%) plagiarism in a piece of sentence of 32 total words, the chances of plagiarism for more complex sentences and even paragraphs in students' research papers are, thus, higher. This finding is corresponding to Keck (2006) who also discovered that L2's typical attempted paraphrases were filled with nearly 40% of unique links/copied words. The fact that the majority of EFL students' attempted paraphrases were filled with a considerable degree of plagiarism suggests a more effective way for instructors to give instruction of paraphrase types which are categorized as plagiarism in Academic Writing course. As stated by Keck (2006), the discussion of plagiarism threats in minimal revision and near copy as the most common strategies of undergraduate and graduate L2 students are required in ESL writing courses so that students are conscious of the risks of these strategies.

Another aspect of this is that the majority of students' paraphrases identified as plagiarism either contained patchwriting or direct copying without being marked by inverted commas. This finding is related to Howard, Serviss, and Rodrigue's research results (2010) revealing that from 18 students' paper writings being investigated, nearly all of them involved verbatim copying and patchwriting suggesting students' low understanding and students' negligence in reading the source texts. Howard

(1995) also pointed that patchwriting in students' paraphrases or summaries signal students' lack of experience and lack of knowledge in writing from sources. Keck (2006) further emphasized the importance of promoting and teaching a proper paraphrasing strategy (substantial revision) so that students are trained with the use of this strategy in writing paraphrases. To infer, students' passivity in reading the text and their inadequate understanding of the form of "substantial paraphrase" are seen as some of the factors why accidental or deliberate patchwriting and copying actions occurred in students' paraphrases.

Keck's finding (2006) also revealed that L1's attempted paraphrases tended to fall between minimal revision and moderate revision whereas L2's attempted paraphrases were more likely to be categorized between near copy and minimal revision. Apparently, the finding of this study is also consistent with Keck's (2006) in terms of ESL participants' tendencies in making near copy and minimal revision for their paraphrasing strategies. This common phenomenon of plagiarism found in ESL and EFL students' attempted paraphrases, then, indicates not only students' weak comprehension toward the text, but also students' developing linguistic resources in transforming the lexical and syntactical structure to be different from those in the source text. As stated by researchers (Howard, 1995; Keck, 2006; Khristawan & Widiati, 2013; Liao & Tseng, 2010; Na & Nhat Chi Mai, 2018), the tendencies of students in determining their paraphrase strategies can also be affected by their existing linguistic proficiency; if their linguistic resources are limited and inadequate, it would hinder them in understanding and restating the complex structure of the source text which leads to direct copying and inappropriate paraphrasing practices (i.e. patchwriting).

Furthermore, after being evaluated using McInnis' criteria of an appropriate paraphrase (2009), a great number of students' attempted paraphrases (217 or 92%) were categorized between somewhat inappropriate and inappropriate. This inappropriateness of students' paraphrases were reflected on their major reliance on the source text, their word-by-word reading strategy and their inserted personal opinions that this action can lead to copying, patchwriting, incorrect synonyms, and even change in the original meaning. It indicates students' lack of knowledge toward the criteria of a good or appropriate paraphrase (Khairunnisa et al., 2014; Khristawan & Widiati, 2013) and their passive engagement toward the contextual meaning of the text as also discussed by Howard (1995). Knowing that the meanings of individual words can change after being brought in context and being exposed to the criteria of an appropriate paraphrase can assist students to paraphrase more effectively.

Verbal reports from four respondents in the interview session also indicated that students still had little understanding and lack of familiarity toward the concept of paraphrasing. In presenting the definition of paraphrases, all the students corresponded to the common concept of paraphrase, which was the technique of restating one's words by using our own language, but two respondents excluded the description of "maintaining the original meaning" which this idea might badly impact on their paraphrased texts. This finding is, thus, similar to Khristawan & Widiati's finding (2013) on the aspect of participants' awareness of the common definition of paraphrase, but also different on the aspect of two participants' inability to explain the complete definition of paraphrase in this study. Furthermore, as indicated in their answers, some participants were still confused and mistaken in differentiating between summaries and paraphrases. Regardless, they still viewed paraphrasing in a positive manner that they regarded it as a useful and beneficial practice. It then

suggests a good opportunity for instructors to give more incentives and efforts in familiarizing the concept and the practice of paraphrase to students since there is already a positive attitude/view toward paraphrase coming from students.

Furthermore, the difficulty of paraphrasing strategy, according to participants, was generally somewhat difficult. Some of the participants explained further that paraphrasing strategy could be difficult due to particular reasons (i.e., the complexity of the text and the availability of supplementary supports such as phones, dictionaries and thesaurus). However, these in-between attitudes of students in seeing the level of difficulty of paraphrase was not consistent with the final products of paraphrase they produced. As acknowledged by Khristawan and Widiati (2013), although students had already understood the common nature of paraphrase, they still looked hesitant and puzzled during the stage of finishing and evaluating their paraphrases in the meta-cognitive process. It implies that the ideas and attitudes that students have built in their minds regarding paraphrasing cannot help them much in writing their paraphrases because their understanding might still be deficient due to the limited information they collected when studying about paraphrases.

This view is also supported with the confession of the participants saying that their understanding toward the concept of paraphrase was conjectural. Their understanding depended heavily on their personal interpretations and understandings of “good paraphrases” in their minds without supported or guided by any reliable literature. They also stated that academic sources (books or journal articles) which could facilitate them to learn further about paraphrasing and other note-taking strategies or conventions in academic writings were not available during their study in Academic Writing course. These findings, thus, extend the previous studies which found that ESL or EFL students’ weak understanding of the concept of paraphrase was affected by their socio-cultural backgrounds which did not recognize the practice of paraphrase (Liao & Tseng, 2010; Na & Nhat Chi Mai, 2018; Qian Du, 2013) and the daunting nature of paraphrase (Hirvela & Du, 2013; Khristawan & Widiati, 2013; Thadphoothon, 2019).

To say the least, these qualitative findings suggest a more meaningful approach where reading and writing activity is integrated in teaching paraphrasing strategy (Fatimawati & Badiozaman, 2014; Khristawan & Widiati, 2013) as well as other conventions in academic writing (i.e., referencing and other note-taking strategies) which can expose and train students, as novice writers, for more reading activities, more paraphrasing practices, and more reliable resources regarding the topics of academic writing and writing from sources.

CONCLUSION

These findings portray how students’ paraphrases illuminate their paraphrasing performances in actuality. Overall, their paraphrasing performances are still lacking to prevent plagiarism and to establish credibility in their academic writing manuscripts. Still, the students here serve as novice writers who have not been frequently exposed toward the practice and the concept of paraphrase and the use of sophisticated English language in academic texts. In other words, they are lack of exposures and experience which lead to their struggle in reading the source texts and writing paraphrases.

In a theoretical framework, these findings are hoped to enrich and broaden the common concept of paraphrase among EFL community from initially revolving around its definition and techniques to focusing more on evaluating the number of copied words and the level of appropriateness contained in a paraphrase. This set of

evaluation is then able to facilitate EFL students and writers to crosscheck their or someone else's paraphrases and to arise their awareness of plagiarism in academic writing. In a practical framework, these findings are hoped not to become hurdles in teaching and learning paraphrasing. Instead, they are hoped to positively represent a good opportunity for curriculum planners, instructors and students to view this as a growing and adjusting moment for students to interact and engage more with the concepts and practices of paraphrasing in order to avoid plagiarism in academic writing.

REFERENCES

- Bazerman, C. (1994). *The Informed Writer: Using Sources in the Disciplines*. 544. Retrieved from http://www.amazon.com/Informed-Writer-Using-Sources-Disciplines/dp/0395687233/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1431282862&sr=8-1&keywords=informed+writer
- Chien, S. (2014). Cultural Constructions of Plagiarism in Student Writing: Teachers' Perceptions and Responses. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 49(2), 120–140. Retrieved from <https://tmu.pure.elsevier.com/en/publications/cultural-constructions-of-plagiarism-in-student-writing-teachers--2>
- Choi, Y. R. (2012). Paraphrase Practices for Using Sources in L2 Academic Writing *. *English Teaching*, 67(2), 51–79. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/5851342/Paraphrase_Practices_for_Using_Sources_in_L2_Academic_Writing
- Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling Techniques* (3rd ed.). United States of America: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Dollahite, N. E., & Haun, J. (2012). *Sourcework: Academic Writing from Sources* (J. Hicks & T. Jefferies, Eds.). Boston: Sherrise Roehr.
- Dung, T. T. M. (2010). *An Investigation in Paraphrasing Experienced by Vietnamese Students of English in Academic Writing* (University of Da Nang). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323576330_Paraphrasing_in_Academic_Writing_a_Case_Study_of_Vietnamese_Learners_of_English
- Fatimawati, I., & Badiozaman, A. (2014). Paraphrasing Challenges Faced by Malaysian ESL Students. *Issues in Language Studies*, 3(1), 49–69. Retrieved from http://www.ils.unimas.my/images/pdf/v3n2/ilsv3n2_ida.pdf
- Harshbarger, T. G. (2012). The Process of Paraphrasing: Exercises To Build Paraphrasing Skills. *The Tsuda Review Journal*, 57, 67–94. Retrieved from https://tsuda.repo.nii.ac.jp/?action=repository_action_common_download&item_id=44&item_no=1&attribute_id=22&file_no=1
- Hayuningrum, H., & Yulia, M. F. (2017). Students' Problems in Writing Paraphrases in Research Paper Writing Class. *Language and Language Teaching Journal*, 15(01), 133–148. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.2012.150101>
- Hirvela, A., & Du, Q. (2013). "Why am I paraphrasing?": Undergraduate ESL Writers' Engagement with Source-Based Academic Writing and Reading. *Journal of English*

- for Academic Purposes*, 12(2), 87–98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2012.11.005>
- Howard, R. M. (1995). *Plagiarism, Authorships, and the Academic Death Penalty*. 57(7), 788–806.
- Howard, R. M., Serviss, T., & Rodrigue, T. K. (2010). Writing from Sources, Writing from Sentences. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.1558/wap.v2i2.177>
- Hu, G., & Lei, J. (2015). Chinese University Students' Perceptions of Plagiarism. *Ethics & Behavior*, 25(03). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2014.923313>
- Hu, G., & Lei, J. (2016). Plagiarism in English academic writing : A comparison of Chinese university teachers' and students' understandings and stances. *System*, 56, 107–118.
- Irmadamayanti. (2018). *An Analysis of Paraphrasing Experienced by English Students in Academic Writing*. Ar-Raniry State Islamic University.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.09.006>
- Khairunnisa, W., Sutapa, Y. G., & Surmiyati. (2014). Students' Problems in Paraphrasing. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran*, 3, 1–9. Retrieved from <http://jurnal.untan.ac.id/index.php/jpdpb/article/view/7625>
- Khrismawan, B., & Widiati, U. (2013). Students' Perceptions about Paraphrasing and Their Cognitive Processes in Paraphrasing. *TEFLIN Journal*, 24(2), 135–157. Retrieved from <http://journal.teflin.org/index.php/journal/article/viewFile/162/150>
- Lascotte, D. K. (2018). Using Writing as a Scaffold to Academic Discussions in the Foreign Language Classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 56(4). Retrieved from https://americanenglish.state.gov/files/ae/resource_files/etf_56_4_24-31.pdf
- Liao, M., & Tseng, C. (2010). Students' Behaviors and Views of Paraphrasing and Inappropriate Textual Borrowing in an EFL Academic Setting. *Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 14(2), 187–211. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ920542.pdf>
- McInnis, L. (2009). *Analyzing English L1 And L2 Paraprasing Strategies Through Concurrent Cerbal Report and Stimulated Recall Protocols* (University of Toronto). Retrieved from <https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/handle/1807/18105>
- Na, C. Do, & Nhat Chi Mai, N. X. (2018). Paraphrasing in Academic Writing: a Case Study of Vietnamese Learners of English. *Language Education in Asia*, 8(1), 9–24. https://doi.org/10.5746/leia/17/v8/i1/a02/na_mai
- Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and Original: Plagiarism and Patchwriting in Academic Second-Language Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(4), 317–345. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2003.08.004>
- Qian Du. (2013). "What do You Mean 'in My Own Words'?" Undergraduate ESL Writers'

Paraphrasing Experiences in an Advanced Academic Writing Course (Vol. 2). The Ohio State University.

Spatt, B. (2011). *Writing from Sources* (Eighth). Boston: Bedford/St.Martin's.

Thadphoothon, J. (2019). EFL Students' Perceptions of Paraphrasing Skills and their Paraphrasing Challenges. *The 4th International Conference on Innovative Education and Technology (ICIET2019)*, (July). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334319165_Students'_Perceptions_of_Paraphrasing_Skills_and_Challenges

Vandermeay, R., Meyer, V., Rys, J. Van, & Sebranek, P. (2012). *The College Writer Brief: A Guide to Thinking, Writing, and Researching* (Fourth; M. Eckman, M. Leslie, J. Fifer, A. Haines, E. Ramsey, & J. Tangney, Eds.). Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Wallwork, A. (2011). *English for Writing Research Paper*. New York: Springer.

Winkler, A. C., & Metherell, J. R. (2012). *Writing the Research Paper* (Eighth; L. Uhl, K. Derrick, K. Streiby, E. Reny, & C. Douglass-Graff, Eds.). Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.