Patchwriting in English Department Students' Academic Writing

Yuliana Kumalasari

English Education, Languages and Arts, State University of Surabaya
yulianakumalasari@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Abstrak

Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mendeskripsikan di level apa siswa membuat patchwriting, dan bagaimana siswa membuat patchwriting dalam tulisan akademik mereka. Penelitian ini dilakukan dalam kualitatif. Ada enam partisipan dari sebuah universitas negeri di Jawa Timur yang mengambil jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris. Mereka merupakan siswa tahun ketiga dalam masa belajarnya dan sedang memprogram mata kuliah Paper Writing. Data-data berasal dari draft tulisan-tulisan siswa dan bacaan asli mereka. Hasil menunjukan bahwa walaupun persamaan-persamaan masih muncul dalam tulisan siswa, ada perbedaan-perbedaan di dalamnya. Berdasarkan hasil perbandingan antara tulisan-tulisan tersebut, ada enam tingkat modifikasi dalam parafrase siswa. Level tersebut adalah level kata, frase, klausa, paragraf, kombinasi, dan tanpa perubahan. Siswa lebih banyak menggunakan level kombinasi dalam tulisan mereka. Disamping itu, ada enam cara patchwriting berdasarkan modifikasi yang siswa-siswa buat dalam statemen mereka. Mereka adalah mengkopi langsung, merubah kata-kata, merubah struktur, penghilangan, penambahan, dan penggabungan. Diantara tipe-tipe tersebut, siswa cenderung untuk menggunakan penggabungan karena mereka menggabungkan lebih dari satu tipe patchwriting di parafrase mereka.
Kata Kunci: *Patchwriting,* Penulisan Akademik .

Abstract

The purpose of this study, therefore, is to describe in what level the students made patchwriting, and then how students make patchwriting in their academic writing. This study employed a qualitative approach. There were six participants from a state university in East Java majoring English Education programme. They were in the third year of their study and taking Paper Writing course. The data came from the students' writing draft and their original passages. The results show that even though the similarities still appeared in the students' passages, there are differences among them. According to the comparison among students' writings, there were six levels of modification in students patchwriting. They were word, phrase, clause, combination, and no changes-level. The students mostly used combination-levels in their rewriting. Besides, there were six processes of patchwriting based on the modification that the students made in their writing. They were Copying Directly, Changing Words, Changing Grammar, Omitting, Adding, and Combining. Among those process, the students tended to use Combining since they combined more than one ways to make patchwriting in their academic writing.
Keywords: Patchwriting, Academic Writing

INTRODUCTION

Writing in the academic field might be a challenge, especially for novice writers. It is because academic writing is different from creative writing. Inexperienced writers could be easy to fall into academic dishonesty due to their writing processes. One of the examples is plagiarism. Many reasons probably become the factors why plagiarism might attack the beginner writers. This might include unintentional plagiarism, such as improper quotation, paraphrase, citation or reference (Bahadori et al., 2012). It implies that the students do not have enough knowledge about common issues in academic writing. The students also might misunderstand the idea of 'in their own words', which is a common expression in the definition of summarising or paraphrasing. Besides, Roig

(2015) stated that uncomprehended ideas or texts lead students to plagiarize. The students might misunderstand the new material since they will work with new concepts or ideas, especially if the material is in a foreign language. Roig (2001) also found in his study that the different language styles in students' paraphrases are related to the text's difficulty level, such as the unfamiliar technical terms in the text are not explained properly by the students.

Furthermore, writing strategies have a role in writing academic field (Jong, 2017). The main strategies that help students to avoid plagiarism are summarizing and paraphrasing (Bailey, 2011). As a consequence, the students are necessary to master both skills since the students' work should not overuse direct quotation. Moreover, by using summary and paraphrase, the

students can show how they understand the text. It is because the idea of summary is retelling the information and shortening the length of the text by only taking some important points by using own words. While, paraphrase is repeating the information by using own words, but the length of the rewriting is the same as the original (Oshima & Hogue, 2013, p. 127).

However, according to the researcher's observation, not all students can summarise or paraphrase properly at one time they learn it. They still need a process to make a good paraphrase for their writing since it belongs to their learning process. As the result of the different developing process of learning, some situations might appear, for example when the students learn to paraphrase a text. When the first time they make their paraphrases, they only tend to omit a few words, change some words with its synonym, or restructure the sentence. These actions lead the students to 'patchwriting' condition.

According to Howard (1993), patchwriting refers to imitate from an original text and then omit some words, change grammatical structures, or substitute a few words by its synonym in that paragraph. Husein (2014) also described patchwriting as a pedagogical state, precisely writing in the foreign language. He stated that this phase can make the students find out their own strategies and techniques. Therefore, it becomes a bridge for them to develop their style to be independent writers. Besides, Pecorari (2008) explained that patchwriting is also a process of modifying and extending text from the original source without comprehending the idea of the material. As the consequence, the students have a lack of their writing skills because they cannot get the essential points from the text.

Several studies have been conducted on the patchwriting. For instance, Pecorari (2003) found that a competent academic writer has ever become a patchwriter to support his development. In other words, it implies patchwriting as the transitional stages. The learners learn how to adapt or adopt the sources to support their writing, especially in the beginning level of academic writing. Therefore, it is very easy for the beginner to attempt patchwriting at the beginning of their academic writing learning. Other research is conducted by Abdul-Ameer and Hussein (2015). They investigated students' graduation research papers, then tried to detect the plagiarism and patchwriting of it by comparing the paragraphs and the original. They found that the students commit patchwriting. Then, Pecorari (2003) also found in her study of postgraduate students' papers that the writers were trapped into plagiarise without any intention to do that and most of them do patchwriting. According to her point of view, she explained this condition as transitional stages since the lack of knowledge became the main

factors. Vieyra and et al. (2013) also conducted research to code what kind of indication in the students' research proposal that might lead the students into plagiarism, for instance, the type of sources, the nature of the inappropriate use, the most common place to copy, and the citation.

The previous studies above imply that the use of patchwriting might help students to develop their learning process. This notion might be true, as the researcher realized that deleting or adding some words, changing with its synonym, and restructuring the sentence are easy to do when reconstructing a text into the new one. This may also be faced by some inexperienced writers when they start to write academically. Transferring idea into a new form might not be easy for the beginner. Therefore, to keep up the idea of the text can become a challenge. Besides, the incorrect interpretation to write 'using own words' might become the problem. Based on the researcher's experience, constructing the text into the new form can be interpreted as 'using own words' while paraphrasing the text. This belief raises because of the lack of knowledge about the concept of paraphrases and kind of textual plagiarism, such as patchwriting. As the result, the symptoms of patchwriting appear in the researcher's draft during the writing process.

Even though patchwriting could become a helpful stage for inexperienced writers, especially to write the early writing draft, it has not received much attention, especially in the Indonesian context. Based on the researcher's point of view, the terms patchwriting itself is unfamiliar for students, although they probably do the indication of patchwriting. Then, research in the area of patchwriting is still limited. Previous studies mostly asserted that patchwriting is part of plagiarism. It is because the percentage of patchwriting usage is high in students' work (Howard, Servis, and Rodrigue, 2010).

Based on the explanation above, it is necessary to conduct research on patchwriting to find out in what level students made their patchwriting and how the students made patchwriting in their academic writing. The level and the way students did text modification might become an introduction to the importance of revision, citation, and plagiarism for the students. In particular, the writer wants to study a problem related to how patchwriting appears in the students' writing.

In line with the explanation above, this present study conducts in order to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the differences between students' paraphrases compared with the original sources in their academic writing?
2. How do the students make patchwriting in their paraphrases in academic writing?

METHODOLOGY

The research used a qualitative approach. It is suitable with the aim of the study which sought to identify and describe the level of patchwriting and how the students make patchwriting. Ary et al. (2010) stated that qualitative research produces the result in the form of words rather than numbers. Thus, the data of this study is in the form of words. Besides, Creswell (2014) said that qualitative is better used to get the detailed understanding of the problems. Then, the analysis in detail is necessary for this study.

The participants in this study were the students in a state university in East Java majoring English Education programe. The thirteen students in a class were selected on purposive sampling. The researcher checked the students' draft to decide which excerpt that could be analyzed (check data collection procedure in 3.5 to further explanation). After the process of selection, there were only six students chosen as the participants of this study.

They came from the fifth semester who took academic writing class (Paper Writing). These fifth semester students were selected because of the consideration that it was the first time they wrote academically by including sources in their writing during their academic writing study. Their previous writing classes were mostly writing an essay without attaching any sources inside, for instance, descriptive, narrative, and expository essay. An additional reason was an introduction to paraphrase and summarise were taught by the instructors in the class. Therefore, the tendency to patchwrite in their writing was higher since it was the first time they worked in adapting the soures as inexperienced writers.

The data obtained by the researcher were the students' draft of their writing task which included citing sources or texts. The writing instructor gave the main project that was submitted as the students' final product in Paper Writing class. This task required the students to make a theoretical paper. Even though there were at least three drafts which were produced by the students to make a complete paper, the researcher more focused in the students' first draft since the occurrence of patchwriting mostly appeared in it. It means the researcher collects eighteen drafts for six students. In addition, the students should attach at least 10 sources in order to support their paper.

Then, a collection of drafts helped in order to check the researcher's assumption about the occurrence of patchwriting after the students getting feedback from the instructor. Therefore, the researcher tracked the changes of students' excerpt in the first until the third draft. If the researcher found out that there was a changes, the researcher checked the original passage from that excerpt. It means the role of the second and the third draft are used to find out the patchwriting through the researcher's assumption before looking for the original passage. Thus, the researcher more focused in the student's first draft and the original material that became the main data in this study for both research questions.

The researcher became the main instrument in this study in order to collect and analyze the data. Furthermore, there was a checklist in the form of a codebook. The researcher developed a codebook which contained a number of predetermined codes (see Table 1). The use of codebook help researcher to be more systematic in coding the textual data (Creswell, 2014). This codebook, however, was subject to changes based on the analysis of data.

Table 1. Ways to Do Patchwriting and Description of Pre-determined Codes

Ways to Do Patchwriting of Codes	Code Used in Figures	Description
Copying Directly	DC	Copying the whole directly without any changes.
Changing Word (Synonym)	WC	Nearly direct copying but changing a few words with its synonym.
Omitting	OM	Nearly direct copying but deleting a few words in the text.
Changing Grammar	GC	Reorganizing the sentence order or the tenses which are used.
Combining	CO	Using the combination of the technique above, but the text is still nearly the same as the original or there is no citation in the material.

The researcher asked the the students' permission to take their writing as the samples in the study. The class instructor helped the researcher in order to gather the writing drafts. Besides the students' drafts, the class instructor gave the result of students' Turnitin. The Turnitin came from the writing class' instructor who uploaded every students' draft after they submitted it. Therefore, the researcher also had the students' Turnitin version since the instructor gave the copied file. Then, the both data were in the form of softfile. Besides the students' works, the researcher also collected the sources which they used in their citation.

The researcher got the data from students' works. There were at least three drafts that every student made. However, the researcher focused in the first draft.

Furthermore, the researcher assumed that there was the indication of patchwriting if the students revised their writing in the second or third drafts. The researcher selected three students' excerpt from each student. Then, the reseacrher traced the original sources of the students' writing through the students' references. However, there were several students who did not put the name of sources in their reference list. It made the researcher checked their Turnitin to look for whether Turnitin also detected the similarities in the students' writing. After that, the researcher could see the primary sources of those excerpts from Turnitin to find out the original sources. Besides, the researcher also asked the students' material if they still had it. After getting the original passage and the students' excerpt, the data was ready to analyze.

At the start of the analysis, the researcher had selected the students' writing. After getting the proper excerpt and its original material, the researcher started to compare between the first draft and the original material. Actually, analyzing data in qualitative research has three stages (Ary et al., 2010). They are familiarizing and organizing, coding and reducing, and interpreting and representing.

The first is familiarizing and organizing. In this step, the researcher read the students' works and the original passage. Then, the rereading process was needed for the follow-up activity. The data had to be familiarized well by the researcher in order to analyze in depth. The researcher wrote a note to capture what the participants had done in their writing comparing to the original text. Then, the list of note was made by the researcher to ease the next steps.

The second is coding and reducing. In this step, the researcher read the data and interpreted for the comparison. It was conducted to recognize the differences and similarities in the data. The researcher put a mark in the students' writing to ease identifying the codes. Then, several codes which tended to appear were used in coding (see table 1). However, it was only a predetermined code made by the researcher that evolved during the analysis.

Then, the researcher coded the whole of the students' text first. After that, the researcher asked two other coders checking two of the six students' work to ensure the reliability of the coding. The two coder checkers had experience in writing at the university level since they were advanced students. The researcher gave the two coders the students' writing and the original passage. After checking the codes, the researcher selected the data into two categories, related and not related to the study. The unrelated data was omitted from the discussion.

The third is interpreting and representing. In this step, the researcher described and elaborated the data in order to answer the research questions. The researcher presented the results in the form of words. The evidence of the data, which was gathered before supported the researcher's explanation. Finally, the researcher concluded the results of this study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
In What Level the Students Make Patchwriting

The results are in the form of sentences. In each table, there is an underlined writing that shows the similarities which appear both in students' writing and the material source. This underlined writing comes from not only the Turnitin's highlighted part but also the researcher's observation through the text. There is an excerpt number at the beginning of each sentence. It is used to reduce the redundancy of the sentence in the description. Besides, the excerpt number eases the readers while they read the explanation of the sentence. The readers can track which sentence that describes the excerpt number, for example, excerpt number 1.3 indicates that 1 stands for Student 1 and 3 for the 3rd sentence of the total sentences of Student 1 in the excerpt (it can be from either students' patchwriting or their original text). Moreover, the description for each table follows after the table. In the description of the results and elsewhere, there is the italic text which indicates fragments of the sentence that is discussed further.

Furthermore, the results show that the level of modification is distinguished into six categories. They are word-level, phrase-level, clause-level, text-level, combination-level, and no changes-level.

a) Word-Level

Word-level modification was found in students' writing. It modified the word slightly. The students could add or delete or use synonyms for getting the equal meaning of the word from the sentence. Mostly, this modification does not have a great effect on the sentence's composition since the word is the basic element in a sentence. The example of word-level can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2 Word Level in Students' Patchwriting

Student 2's patchwriting	Original Material
[2.1]"Elbow (1973, 1997, 2000) has stressed the importance of feedback that is timely and related both to the ongoing teaching and to the nature of the assigned composition."	[2.2]"Elbow (1973, 1997, 2000) has consistently stressed the importance of feedback that is timely and related both to the ongoing teaching and to the nature of the assigned composition."

Student 2 only erased a single word in the sentence 2.1. The word which was deleted is *consistently*. Then, the rest of excerpt 2.1 was copied exactly the same as its original material (sentence 2.2). It means that the Student 2 works in word-level since he modified his text by deleting a single word from the text in his original material. The omission of adverb, *consistently*, only affects the verb phrase. It is because *consistently* modifies the verb phrase *has stressed* which indicating consistency. Moreover, the composition of both sentence 2.1 and sentence 2.2 are slightly the same.

b) Phrase-Level

Phrase-level modification was indicated by modifying the phrase from the original material. Students made the additional phrase(s) in their writing. Besides, the phrase could be deleted if it is unnecessary. The changes in phrase-level can be seen in the example in Table 3.

Table 3 Phrase Level in Students' Patchwriting

Student 5's patchwriting	Original Material
"Shi (2015)... [5.1]The specification of self-talk words is like instead of saying <u>"I'm really upset with myself"</u> or <u>"something good has happened to me,"</u> students better <u>used a more specific framing statement, such as "I'm really upset with my preparation for this speech"</u> (self-critical) <u>and "I feel good about preparing for this speech"</u> (self-reinforcing)."	[5.2]"For example, instead of referring to general situations, such as talking to oneself when <u>''I'm really upset with myself''</u> or <u>''something good has happened to me,''</u> we <u>used a more specific framing statement, such as ''I'm really upset with my preparation for this speech''</u> (self-critical) <u>and ''I feel good about preparing for this speech''</u> (self-reinforcing)."

Most parts in sentence 5.1 were highlighted by Turnitin. However, there were several phrases which did not highlight. They were *"The specification of self-talk words is like instead of saying.... students better..."* The rest of sentence 5.1 was the same as sentence 5.2. Student 5 deleted the phrase *"For example, instead of referring to general situation.."*. He changed the deleted part in sentence 5.2 *"..such as talking to oneself.."* with a new phrase in sentence 5.1 *"The specification of self talk words.."*. He made the previous phrase which rolled to introduce the example, then modified into the noun phrase that became the subject of his writing. Besides, Student 5 also changed the word *we* in sentence 5.2 into a new phrase *students better* in sentence 5.1. This replacement came from word-level into phrase-level. It substituted the subject with the reference to clarify who the subject was. Therefore, the researcher inferred that

Student 5 did phrase-level modification in his writing for sentence 5.1.

c) Clause-Level

Clause-level modification meant the changes in the clause context. The clause could be modified by adding a new clause or omitting the previous clause. Changing the clause position might affect the statement's composition. It was because the clause had a complete thought that could act as a sentence. Therefore, the modification in clause-level could change the main clause of the original statement. It can be seen in Table 4 as the example.

Table 4 Clause Level in Students' Patchwriting

Student 6's patchwriting	Original Material
[6.1]As Bailey (1990) states "<u>A diary is a first-person account of a language learning or teaching experience, documented through regular, candid entries in a personal journal and then analyzed for recurring patterns or salient events</u>" (p.215).	[6.2]"<u>A diary is a first-person account of a language learning or teaching experience, documented through regular, candid entries in a personal journal and then analyzed for recurring patterns or salient events.</u>"

Student 6 mostly wrote from sentence 6.2. It made the similarities were high between those sentences. However, Turnitin only highlighted minor parts which were *"...Bailey (1990) states... (p.215)"*. Actually, those highlighted parts were an additional which became the main clause in sentence 6.1. The researcher concluded that Student 6 changed the direct quotation into the indirect quotation. Therefore, an additional clause is required in order to quote indirectly.

d) Text-Level

Text-level modification allowed the students to change the paragraph for their writing. This modification worked by adding the new sentence(s) in the paragraph or omitting unnecessarily detailed sentence(s). It means the students can replace the several parts in the paragraph by deleting the old version and then write the latest revision of the text. Besides, the students can reformulate the sentence(s). Reordering the sentences inside the text can be categorized as text-level modification. The text's order will change if there is the difference between sentences after the modification. The example in Table 5 below shows the change which is written by Student 3 in his patchwriting.

Table 5 Text Level in Students' Patchwriting

Student 3's patchwriting	Original Material
[3.1]"The	[3.2]"This suggests that we can

three characteristics of CPS are <u>mutual responsiveness, commitment to the joint activity, commitment to mutual support</u> (Bratman, 1992).″	identify, in a rough and preliminary way, a trio of features characteristic of SCA: [3.3](i) *Mutual responsiveness*: In SCA each participating agent attempts to be responsive to the intentions and actions of the other, knowing that the other is attempting to be similarly responsive. [3.4]Each seeks to guide his behavior with an eye to the behavior of the other, knowing that the other seeks to do likewise. [3.5](ii) *Commitment to the joint activity*: In SCA the participants each have an appropriate commitment (though perhaps for different reasons) to the joint activity, and their mutual responsiveness is in the pursuit of this commitment. [3.6](iii) *Commitment to mutual support*: In SCA each agent is committed to supporting the efforts of the other to play her role in the joint activity. [3.7]If I believe that you need my help to find your note (or your paint brush) I am prepared to provide such help; and you are similarly prepared to support me in my role. [3.8]These commitments to support each other put us in a position to perform the joint activity successfully even if we each need help in certain ways."

Turnitin highlighted the part in sentence 3.1 which was *"...mutual responsiveness, commitment to the joint activity, commitment to mutual support (Bratman, 1992)"*. Student 3 erased the details of sentence 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, and 3.6. He only took the main point of those statements. As a consequence, there was a paragraph in each point that omitted. Student 3 simplified the explanation by cutting the paragraph's details. In addition, he also changed the main clause in sentence 3.2. Student 3 replaced *the three characteristics of CPS* (sentence 3.1) to become *a trio of features characteristic of SCA* (sentence 3.2). It implies that Student 3 replaced the word *a trio* with *the three*. Besides, for the acronym SCA which stands for *Shared Cooperative Activity* (sentence 3.2), it replaced with CPS which stands for *Collaborative Problem Solving* (sentence 3.1). Even though, Student 3 did not do only text-level but also phrase-level in his text modification. Then, the researcher counted the modification in sentence 3.1

belongs to text-level since it is the most dominated in the whole text if it is compared to the original text.

e) Combination

The students did not work in one level of text modification in their patchwriting. Some of them combined more than one level of modification in order to produce a new text. Therefore, the paraphrases text could be consisted of a combination of both the word and phrase-level, word and clause-level, or clause and phrase-level. The students could use all three level of modification, such as word, phrase, and text-level at the same time in order to paraphrase the reading passages. The combination was depended on the students' skill in rewriting the text. Therefore, each student did not combine the text in the same way. Table 6 gives the example of a combination between the clause and word-level in Student 4's patchwriting.

Table 6 Combination Level in Students' Patchwriting

Student 4's patchwriting	Original Material
[4.1]"It also mention by O'Malley and Chamot (1990), a tool that is used for students, in order <u>to help them</u> understand and keep <u>new information</u> (p.1).″	[4.2]"Learning strategies were also illustrated (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990) as "special thoughts or behaviors that individuals use <u>to help them</u> comprehend, learn, or retain <u>new information</u>" (p.1)."

Some parts in sentence 4.1 are highlighted by Turnitin. Student 4 wrote a clause "*It also mention...*" at the beginning of the statement. This modification was in phrase-level since it consisted of several words which led to a new independent clause. Then, it is followed by the additional noun phrase, "*a tool that is used for students*". Then, Student 4 replaced the subject from *individuals* to *students*. Next, the word *comprehend* became its equal meaning, *understand*. Another was the word *retain* modifying into *keep*. Those previous examples indicate that there is the modification of word-level. In addition, Student 4 also deleted some phrases and words in the sentence 4.2 for instance, *special thoughts or behaviors that...* and *learn*. Therefore, there is more than one level of modification in the Student 4 paraphrase.

f) No Changes

Two students decided to write their text exactly the same as its original material. Therefore, there were no differences between the students' writing and the original passages. The students did not modify anything from the text. They preferred to copy directly since they did not need any efforts to do that. They did not add, delete, replace, or reorder anything in the text. The

example of no changes modification is showed in Table 7 below.

Table 7 No Changes Level in Students' Patchwriting

Student 1's patchwriting	Original Material
[1.1]"Engage in interpretation strategies, reading the essaywhile exerting certain judgment strategies,[1.2]a. Classifying error types (lexis, syntax, morphology, spelling), leading to an assessment about the command oflanguage, [1.3]b. Identifying comprehensibility, leading to an assessment of language use and rhetorical strategies [1.4]c. Interpreting rhetorical strategies (in terms of relevance, rhetorical knowledge and performance, coherence, redundancies, topic development), leading toan assessment of content and organization, andd. [1.5]Envisioning the situation and personal viewpointof the writer."	[1.6]"Engage in interpretation strategies, reading the essay while exerting certain judgment strategies, [1.7]a. Classifying error types (lexis, syntax, morphology, spelling), leading to an assessment about the command of language [1.8]b. Identifying comprehensibility, leading to an assessment of language use and rhetorical strategies, [1.9]c. Interpreting rhetorical strategies (in terms of relevance, rhetorical knowledge and performance, coherence, redundancies, topic development), leading to an assessment of content and organization, and [1.10]d. Envisioning the situation and personal viewpoint of the writer." (Cumming, A., Kantor, R., & Powers, D. E., 2002)

Student 1's patchwriting and the original material were exactly the same. Turnitin highlighted all of the words in the student's excerpt, except the miswritten words. It was because Turnitin did not detect any similarities for those words since it produced a different word. The miswritten words might happen because the students supposed to forget checking the spelling of the writing before they submitted their work. The example of miswritten were in sentence 1.1 (*essaywhile*), 1.2 (*oflanguage*), 1.4 (*toan* and *andd*), and 1.5 (*viewpointof*). Besides the miswritten, the rest of the words and the grammatical structure of the statements were the same as the original material. Therefore, the researcher pointed out that there are no specific changes in the text.

To sum up, Table 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 show in what level students made patchwriting compared with their

original material. The changes are categorized into six level according to the part of the text. They are word, phrase, clause, and text-level. Actually, the word-level modification is easy to do. The students replace the word or omit it. There were one excerpt from Student 2 who did word level modification. Then, there were one excerpt from Student 5 modifying in the phrase-level. They reorder the words of the phrase. Besides, the modification in clause-level is done mostly by making an independent clause in the students' patchwriting. Mostly, the students made the indirect quotation. Thus, the clause modification is necessary to create a new independent clause. Four excerpts were made from Student 2, Student 4, and Student 6 in clause level. Furthermore, the other level which is developed in the students' modification is a combination. Four students wrote seven excerpts in combination level. They combined more than one level of modification in a paraphrase. Combining phrase and clause-level is mostly done by the students in their writing. On the other hand, another level that does not change anything in the text is named as no changes-level. There were only four excerpts from two students in this study who did no changes-level. Furthermore, even though there is a various level of modification, the occurrence of patchwriting is still indicated. The underlined writing in Table 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7 shows that most students' writing has similarities with its original text even though they have .different level of patchwriting.

How Students Make Patchwriting in Their Paraphrases in Academic Writing

As noted in the previous section, the writing which students made have the indication of patchwriting. The results of the analysis revealed how the students doing patchwriting are slightly similar to its predetermined codebook. However, there is a new code that appears in the study named Adding. Thus, the ways to make patchwriting which are found in this study are Copying Directly, Changing Words, Changing Grammar, Omitting, Adding, and Combining.

a) Copying Directly

It can be defined as copying the whole directly without any changes. It means that the students do not change anything from the original text. The example of Copying Directly is "*Articulate a scoring decision, while summarizing and reinterpreting judgments" (Student 1).* Another example is

> *"True collaboration brings together people who offer complementary skills, knowledge, materials, and other resources in order to understand and to build the joint understanding of the circumstances and*

realize a shared goal that they cannot achieve alone (Griffin, P., 2017) "(Student 3).

Both the original material and students' excerpt are exactly the same. Turnitin usually highlights the whole parts of the statements since the similarity is very high with its original.

b) Changing Words

It is nearly copying but changing a few words with its synonym. The students replaced certain words in the text in order to make a modification while they were modifying. The bold parts in the example below represent the Changing Words in Student 1's writing, for instance,*"Sweep the **structure** for surface – level recognizable proof**, for example**, length, **organize**, paragraphing, **content** (**wrote or written by hand**)".* It is from the passage, *"**Scan** the **composition** for surface-level **identification**, **such as** length, **format**, paragraphing, **script** (**typed or handwritten**)" (Student 1).*

Student 1 changed five words in his statement. They are *sweep* (from *scan*), *structure* (from *composition*), *for example* (from *such as*), *organize* (from *script*), and *wrote or written by hand* (from *handwritten*). In addition, Turnitin does not highlight the Student 1's paraphrase, even though the sentence structure is the same. However, if the Student 1's work is carefully examined, the similarities with the original text is still detected.

Another example of Changing Words is *"As the theory of self-esteem by (Leary & Baumeister, 2000) stated that **reduced self-esteem consistently related to** the **mental illness** such as depression, anxiety, jealousy, and hurt feelings" (Student 5).* It is from the original passage *"As we discuss in detail later, **losses of self-esteem** are **invariably associated with dysphoric reactions** such as depression, anxiety, jealousy, and hurt feelings" (Student 5).* Student 5 changed some words from the original sentence. The example of replacements are *reduced self-esteem* (from *lossess of self-esteem*), *consistently* (from *invariably*), *related to* (from *associated with*), and *mental illness* (from *dysphoric reactions*). Those words are replaced with their equal meaning.

c) Changing Grammar

It can be described as reorganizing the sentence order or the tenses which are used. The students can change the structure of the sentence, for instance from an active to a passive sentence. Meanwhile, the way of reordering sentence is usually replacing the main position of subject's discussion. The bold writing shows that student's writing and original text have a same discussion's subject. The example of Changing Grammar is *"Furthermore, **diary is** an account to share*

a language learning or teaching experience about salient events which is documented through regular as a candid entries in a personal journal (Bailey, 1990)" (Student 6). It is modified from *"Bailey (1990, p. 215) defines an account to share a language learning or teaching experience about salient events which is documented through regular as a candid entries in a personal journal, **as called as diary**" (Student 6).* Those sentences are slightly similar. It defines a diary's definition. However, the order of both sentences is different. The previous draft writes the detail first before it mentions the main subject which is *diary*. In contrast, Student 6 writes *diary* at the beginning of the sentence since it becomes the main subject.

d) Omitting

It is nearly direct copying but deleting a few words in the text. One of omitting which appears in student's excerpt is *"The three characteristics of CPS are mutual responsiveness, commitment to the joint activity, commitment to mutual support (Bratman, 1992)" (Student 3).* The bold text below shows what part of the text that is omitted. The passage is

"This suggests that we can identify, in a rough and preliminary way, a trio of features characteristic of SCA:
*(i) Mutual responsiveness: **In SCA each participating agent attempts to be responsive to the intentions and actions of the other, knowing that the other is attempting to be similarly responsive. Each seeks to guide his behavior with an eye to the behavior of the other, knowing that the other seeks to do likewise.***
*(ii) Commitment to the joint activity: **In SCA the participants each have an appropriate commitment (though perhaps for different reasons) to the joint activity, and their mutual responsiveness is in the pursuit of this commitment.***
*(iii) Commitment to mutual support: **In SCA each agent is committed to supporting the efforts of the other to play her role in the joint activity. If I believe that you need my help to find your note (or your paint brush) I am prepared to support me in my role. These commitments to support each other put us in a position to perform the joint activity successfully even if we each need help in certain ways.***" (Student 3)

The student omits the bold part from the original material. The result of modification only has the three main points from the original text. It leaves the details of supporting sentences. Therefore, the patchwriting is shorter than the original text.

e) Adding

It is nearly direct copying but adding a few words in the text. Adding can be in the form of a word or phrase. The bold text shows how the occurrence of adding in the students' excerpt at the beginning of the text. The

example of the phrase adding is "**Butler & Roediger (2008) also stated that** *feedback not only helps to correct students' mistakes over long term, but it can also shore up knowledge held with low confidence*" (Student 2). Even though the Student 2 did adding in the text above at the beginning of the sentence, the rest of the sentence is exactly the same as the original text which is "*Feedback not only helps to correct students' mistakes over the long term, but it can also shore up knowledge held with low confidence (Butler & Roediger, 2008)*" (Student 2). Adding appears since the students add a new independent clause at the beginning of the sentence. The new clause is a result of the indirect quotation process.

   f) Combining

It uses the combination of the techniques above, but the text is still nearly the same as the original or there is no citation in the material. There are lots of combination of Combining which appear in students' paraphrases, for example, Grammar and Word Changing. The bold text represents Grammar Changing, whether the underlined text stands for Word Changing. The example is "*Elbow (1973, 1997, 2000) has* <u>emphasized</u> *the importance of feedback as an assessment related* **to the nature of the** <u>**alloted**</u> **composition and to the teaching-learning progress**" (Student 2). It comes from "*Elbow (1973, 1997, 2000) has* <u>stressed</u> *the importance of feedback that is timely and related both* **to the** <u>**ongoing**</u> **teaching and to the nature of the** <u>**assigned composition**</u>" (Student 2).

Moreover, the Combining contains not only two but also three of patchwriting's ways, for instance, Adding, Omitting and Grammar Changing. The Grammar Changing is shown by the bold text, whether the underlined text below represents the Omitting. Then, the non-italic text represents Adding. As the example of Adding, Omitting, and Grammar Changing combination is "*They found that* **the attitude of students have changed**, *for instance learners focus on process-oriented* rather than *a product-oriented approach*" (Student 4). The original material of the excerpt is "*It is perceived that* **metacognitive strategy instruction changed the attitude of students** <u>*to the listening skill*</u> *and emphasized a process-oriented rather than a product-oriented*" (Student 4).

Those above are several ways of patchwriting which were found in the students' paper. The work of each student had several patchwriting processes. The most common way which appears is Combining. It dominates the patchwriting process among the participants' writing. It reaches 9 of 18 statements come from four students. Then, it is followed by the Direct Copying which has number 4 of 18 statements which is from two students. While, the rest processes, for instance, Adding, Omitting, Changing Word, and Changing Grammar, are

found one for each. Adding and Omitting came from Student 2, whether Changing Word came from Student 5 and Changing Grammar came from Student 6.

Patchwriting in Academic Writing

This study focuses to look for in what level the students make patchwriting and how students made patchwriting in their academic writing, in order to introduce the importance of revision. Moreover, the results of the students' rewriting in academic writing indicate that there are some similarities with the original text on it although there are differences between both. Then, according to the analysis, the process of students made patchwriting are various in their paraphrases.

Regarding the answer to the first research question, "In what level do the students make their patchwriting compared with the original sources in their academic writing?", the changes show that there are six modifications that students made. It is a little bit different from Shi (2004) study that categorized the changes into two, close and total paraphrases. However, if the researcher examined the close paraphrases category, it is slightly similar to the level of modification in this study. The close paraphrases were referred to the changes of the structure and words which indicates the modification in the word, clause, phrase, and text-level. The occurrence of a combination-level is elaborated with modification because it totally changed, but it still maintained several words from the original text. Therefore, the similarities level in combination-level tends to be less since it is more complex than other levels. Furthermore, the different level of modification is in line with Doro (2017) study which also categorized the changes into two levels, sentence and text-level patchwriting. It is similar with the Table 4 and Table 5 that also show the modification in clause and text-level in this study. The reason for the appearance of these differences could be because the students tend to work from the words to the phrase in a sentence while they wrote.

Furthermore, Howard, Serviss & Rodrigue (2010) reported in their study that the inexperienced writers tend to write from sentence to sentence rather than to summarize the idea of the source text that they read. As mentioned in the participants' background, the students worked in writing academic for the first time in this Paper Writing course. Rewriting a passage is not easy, especially for summarizing or paraphrasing the content of the text. Therefore, they should deal with how to adapt a text source for their writing. This condition leads the students to rewrite from sentence to sentence as they were a novice writer. Besides, the different level of proficiency might affect the students' ability in academic

writing. Cummins (1980) categorized the proficiency into three. It was influenced by the different level of intelligent and academic achievement that become a factor in language proficiency. In this study, the students who did combination-level in their modification did not only come from the upper students whose paper was recommended by the instructors, but also from the lower students. Their number for combination modification was similar between two students for both upper and lower students. Hence, the further study that relates to patchwriting and students' proficiency in detailed could be necessary to explain more why the students can do various modifications in their writing.

Then, the answer to the second research question, "How do the students make patchwriting in their academic writing?", mentions that there are six processes of patchwriting. They are Direct Copying, Changing Word, Changing Grammar, Omitting, Adding, and Combining. The result is similar to Vieyra, Strickland, and Timmerman's (2013) study. They mentioned the category of patchwriting which are Direct Copy, Word Change, Grammar Change, and Complex. However, there is an additional way which is found named Adding. Adding is not mentioned as the result of the previous study by Vieyra et al. (2013). It might be because the occurrence of Adding was not found in their participants.

Actually, Adding can be written in the form of a phrase or word. However, in this study, Adding mostly appears in the form of phrases. It deals with the use of indirect quotation in students' paraphrases. Oshima & Hogue (2013) explained that indirect quotations indirectly report a situation. It can be indicated by the existence of the quotation mark, reported verb, and the word *that*. The function of the word *that* is to clarify the quotation, but it can be omitted if the meaning is clear. The reason why Adding appears because the students maybe avoid the overuse of direct quotation. The use of indirect quotation is more tolerable. The students try to transfer the knowledge that they got from reading the original passage by using the indirect quotation. However, as a result of an indirect quotation, the original sentence does not change too much. It makes Adding has high similarities in this study. Besides, as a part of patchwriting, another way which is Combining is commonly used in the students' draft. The type of this Combining combines two or three processes of students make patchwriting. Changing Word becomes the dominant combination in Combining ways. It is different from Grammar Changing and Omitting which have less apparent in the combination of Combining. In addition, the appearance of Combining indicates that the students have complex strategies while they are paraphrasing. It is since they try to turn the original text into a new one.

In addition, the occurrence of patchwriting indicates that there is a source text misuse. The study of Jamieson & Howard (2013) showed that the lack of reading understanding about the material can cause this problem. Therefore, the students do not get the global understanding of the text that they read. Another factor that causes patchwriting is the lack of practice. Both reading and writing cannot be separated (Li, 2015). Therefore, reading and writing practices are necessary for academic writing, especially in the learning process. In this study, the instructor actually gave a section about paraphrasing and summarizing as a way of rewriting sources. She also gave assignments to both small groups and individuals. There is also a discussion about the instructor's feedback on the assignments. However, the appearance of patchwriting still existed. Therefore, there is a necessity for revision. The students will find more proper strategies in their writing process to complete the task (Dörrenbächer and Perels, 2016), especially how to avoid plagiarism in their writing. In this case, Turnitin is helpful to identify the similarities. Baily & Challen (2015) mentioned in their study that Turnitin can be used as a learning tool in the academic writing process.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS
Conclusion

This study investigated in what level how students make patchwriting in their academic writing. Even though most students' patchwriting are similar to the original reading text, there are differences in the level of modification. The modification is divided into six levels, word, phrase, clause, text, combination, and no changes-level. More students wrote their modification in combination-level. The combinations mostly consist of phrase and clause-level. It is because they rewrite from sentence to sentence. Furthermore, the existence of similarities shows that the students have the indication of patchwriting while they were modifying the text.

As a consequence, these similarities create several processes of students make patchwriting in their paraphrases. These processes vary for each student. There are six ways which are Copying Directly, Changing Words, Changing Grammar, Omitting, Adding, and Combining in this study. Furthermore, Adding is the latest finding in this study that appears because of the use of indirect quotation. It adds a phrase at the beginning of the original quotation in order to report indirectly. The students use the indirect quotation to avoid the overuse of direct quotation. Besides, this Adding process also has high similarities as like as the other ways which are Copying Directly, Changing Words, Changing Grammar, and Combining. To sum up, this study obtained that there were six level of

modification and there were six ways of student made patchwriting in their academic writing.

Suggestions

The writing instructors might give the students' knowledge of patchwriting. Therefore, the novice writers will put more attention into their writing. The introduction of academic writing issues is essential for the inexperienced writers. It makes them to not easily fall into the issues.

Then, practice and feedback could be given by the instructors. More practices will help students to improve their writing. The discussion of the task should be followed after the practice. The instructors could give some corrective feedback or praises to the students' work.

The students could practice not only the writing skill but also the reading comprehension. It is because the students need to get what the passages mean in order to rewrite the material. Therefore, there is a need to enhance reading comprehension to ease the students understand the text.

Next research could focus on other patchwriting areas. It is because this study was confined to the level and the process of students make patchwriting. However, there are other areas which can be a focus of further studies in Indonesian context, for example, the causes of patchwriting, the students' point of view towards patchwriting, or the effect after getting feedback from the writing instructor related to the patchwriting passages.

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

Abdul-Ameer, M. & Hussein, K. (2015). Plagiarism and patchwriting detection in EFL students' graduation research writing. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5, 128-136.

Ary, D., et al. (2010). *Introduction to research in education*. Canada: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Bahadori, M., Izadi, M., & Hoseinpourfard, M. (2012). Plagiarism: Concepts, factors and solutions. *Iranian Journal of Military Medicine*, 14(3), 168-177.

Bailey, S. (2011). *Academic writing: A handbook for international students*. Canada: Routledger.

Baily, C., & Challen, R. (2015). Student perceptions of the value of Turnitin text-matching software as a learning tool. *Practitioner Research in Higher Education*, 9(1), 38–51

Bratman, M. E. (1992). *Shared cooperative activity in the philosophical review*. Duke University Press.

Creswell, J. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (V. Knight Ed. 4 ed.). London: Sage.

Cumming, A., Kantor, R., & Powers, D. E. (2002). Decision making while rating ESL/EFL writing tasks: A descriptive framework. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86, 67–96. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00137

Cummins, J. (1980). The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: Implication for bilingual education and the optimal age issue. *TESOL quarterly*. 14 (2).

Doro, K. (2017). From phase to discourse level patchwriting: Is it possible to unlearn? *Alkalmazott Nyelvtudomany*, 17. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.18460/ANY.2017.1.004

Dörrenbächer, L., & Perels, F. (2016). Self-regulated learning profiles in college students: Their relationship to achievement, personality, and the effectiveness of an intervention to foster self-regulated learning. *Learning and Individual Differences,* 51, 229–241. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2016.09.015

Howard, R. M. (1993) A plagiarism pentimento. *Journal of Teaching Writing*. 11(3): 233–46.

Howard, R. M., Serviss, T., & Rodrigue, T. K. (2010). Writing from sources, writing from sentences. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 2(2), 177–192.

Hussein, S. K, (20014). "*A computational linguistic Perspective of Authorship and plagiarism*", Lambert Academic Publishing.

Jamieson, S., & Howard, R. M. (2013). *Sentence-mining: Uncovering the amount of reading and reading comprehension in college writers' researched writing*. Medford: American Society for Information Science and Technology.

Jong, J. (2017). *Effective strategies for academic writing*. Bussum: Coutinho.

Li, Z. (2015). Connecting Reading and Writing: A Case Study. *English Language Teaching*, 8(6). 150-158. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n6p150

O'Malley, J.M. & Chamot, A.U., (1990): *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Oshisma, A. & Hogue, A. (2013). *Writing academic English: Longman.*

Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second-language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 317–345.

Pecorari, D. (2008). *Academic writing and plagiarism: A linguistic analysis*. New York: Continuum.

Roig, M. (2001). Plagiarism and paraphrasing criteria of college university professors. *Journal Ethics & Behavior*. 11(3). 307-323. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327019EB1103_8

Shi, L. (2004). Textual borrowing in second-language writing. *Written Communication*, 21, 171-200.

Vieyra, M., Strickland D., Timmerman B. (2013). Patterns in plagiarism and patchwriting in sciene and engineering graduate students' research proposals. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 9(1), 35-49.