USE OF AN INTERNET-BASED PARAPHRASING TOOL AND INAPPROPRIATE TEXTUAL BORROWING IN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' LANGUAGE RESEARCH PAPERS

Jaynette D. Jacildo[1], Gideon S. Sumayo[2]*

[1,2]*Department of Secondary Education, University of Southern Mindanao- PALMA Cluster Campuses, Libungan, Cotabato, Philippines*
jdjacildo@usm.edu.ph[1], gideonsumayo@usm.edu.ph[2]

Abstract: This quantitative study aimed to determine inappropriate textual borrowing using the traditional paraphrasing method and compared it to an internet-based paraphrasing tool. It also identified the types of paraphrasing that the tool uses. Additionally, it sought to identify the significant difference between the number of inappropriate textual borrowings when using these two methods. This study employed a descriptive-comparative research design involving the works of 48 third-year BSE English majors enrolled in a language research course at a state university in North Cotabato, Philippines. The results were interpreted and analyzed through Jalilifar et al.'s Coding Scheme and Keck's Taxonomy of Paraphrasing. The study revealed that respondents were more prone to inappropriate textual borrowing when using the traditional method compared to using a tool. Specifically, self-plagiarism was common with the traditional method, while opaque citations were frequent when a tool was used. The study found that the tool predominantly employed substantial revisions (246 instances), followed by near copies (128 instances). Furthermore, a highly significant difference was found in the number of inappropriate textual borrowings between the two methods. Pedagogically, the study suggests teaching proper paraphrasing techniques and the ethical use of internet-based paraphrasing tools, promoting better academic integrity.

Keywords: *Descriptive-comparative research; internet-based paraphrasing tool; inappropriate textual borrowing; language research; Philippines*

INTRODUCTION

Academic writing is one of the most fundamental skills that students should have. It includes writing papers, subject reports, essays, compositions, academically focused journals, short-answer test responses, technical reports (e.g., lab reports), theses, and dissertations (Mufidah & Dewi, 2021). Thus, proper paraphrasing is necessary for students, especially when writing research papers. However, students face difficulties paraphrasing independently (Behrens & Rosen, 2010). This difficulty led students to use internet-based paraphrasing tools, a free online text-processing software that paraphrases sentences, paragraphs, articles, book chapters, or research papers (McCarthy & Rogerson, 2017). These tools include SpinBot, SpinnerChief, Quillbot, and other AI paraphrasing tools. In previous years, internet-based paraphrasing tools have alarmed higher education institutions, which have struggled with the issue of inappropriate textual borrowing or plagiarism (Meyer, 2018). More so, it is the practice of owning and producing textual information from the ideas or words of other people without proper acknowledgment (Ellis et al., 2018).

This issue poses challenges related to academic integrity and the accurate representation of original ideas. The significance of this study lies in its impact on scholarly discourse and the need for effective writing and citation practices. According to Jalilifar et al. (2018), academic journals of English students contain inappropriate textual borrowing, which could also be present in the language research papers of the students. Imbued upon the importance of academic integrity, this research would also like to unveil what inappropriate textual borrowings are made or done by the language research students at a state university through a coding scheme and taxonomy of paraphrasing.

Despite the growing body of literature addressing plagiarism and academic

integrity (Jalilifar et al., 2018; Nguyen, 2023; Kost, 2024), there remains a notable research gap concerning the nuanced relationship between internet-based paraphrasing tools and inappropriate textual borrowing, specifically in the context of English major students at a state university in North Cotabato, Philippines. The available literature often lacks a comprehensive analysis of strategies to effectively mitigate the risks of inappropriate textual borrowing while leveraging the benefits of these tools. No previous studies have focused on this issue using language research papers of English students in this specific context. This research aimed to bridge this gap by providing a focused examination of the challenges posed by paraphrasing tools that lead to plagiarism.

This study aimed to determine the significant difference between internet-based paraphrasing tools and inappropriate textual borrowing. Specifically, the research objectives were:

1. Determine the inappropriate textual borrowing in the text without using the traditional paraphrasing method.
2. Determine the inappropriate textual borrowing in the text after using the internet-based paraphrasing tool.
3. Identify the types of paraphrasing techniques used by the internet-based paraphrasing tool using the Taxonomy of Paraphrasing.
4. Assess if there is a significant difference in the number of inappropriate textual borrowing instances when using an internet-based paraphrasing tool versus traditional paraphrasing.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Paraphrasing in Academic Writing
Paraphrasing is a crucial skill in academic writing, enabling writers to convey information while avoiding plagiarism. Research indicates that effective paraphrasing involves more than merely substituting synonyms; it requires a deep understanding of the source material and the ability to manipulate syntactic structures. For instance, studies show that many students tend to rely heavily on synonym replacement, often neglecting to alter sentence structures significantly, which can lead to inadequate paraphrasing outcomes (Na & Mai, 2017; Yağiz, 2019). Moreover, learners frequently encounter challenges such as limited vocabulary and difficulties in comprehending the source text, which hinders their ability to paraphrase effectively (Na & Mai, 2017; Ovilia et al., 2022). Techniques commonly employed by students include changing from active to passive voice and combining various strategies, yet these approaches often fall short of producing high-quality paraphrases (Ovilia et al., 2022). Therefore, educators should focus on enhancing students' comprehension and vocabulary to improve their paraphrasing skills, ultimately fostering better academic writing practices (Yağiz, 2019).

Roig (2016) highlighted that certain types of text recycling using Machine Translation (MT) are deemed acceptable in academic settings, such as turning conference presentations and theses into journal articles or using the same material in multiple book editions. Importantly, this is only acceptable when the original source is properly acknowledged. However, Roig cautioned that with rapid technological advancements, the ease with which all forms of academic writing can be detected, retrieved, saved, and processed will increase, potentially challenging the current practices of text recycling.

Building on the discussion of academic integrity, Keck (2006) introduced a classification system for paraphrases known as the Taxonomy of Paraphrase. This system categorizes paraphrases into four groups, ranging from slight resemblance to significant alteration. Despite this framework, Keck acknowledged that the specific degree of modification required for accurate paraphrasing remains ambiguous, leaving room for further exploration of how

paraphrasing should be effectively taught and assessed.

On the topic of paraphrasing techniques, Howard (2018) explored the discrepancies in how paraphrases are identified, explained, and evaluated. He pointed out that poorer paraphrasing techniques often involve simple word substitution using word processing software or online dictionaries, resulting in what he termed "close paraphrasing," "superficial paraphrasing," or "patchwriting." These practices highlight the need for more sophisticated approaches to teaching and evaluating paraphrasing.

Finally, Shi (2022) conducted a study focusing on the correct methods of paraphrasing. Shi's research underscored the importance of paraphrasing in academic writing, particularly in higher education. According to Shi, students' attempts to paraphrase can provide valuable insights into their ability to read and understand texts, as well as their capacity to justify ideas with evidence. However, Shi also pointed out an underlying assumption that both researchers and students are familiar with and accept common practices for paraphrasing and properly acknowledging source texts, which may not always be the case.

Internet-based Paraphrasing Tools
The use of internet-based paraphrasing tools in academic writing has garnered significant attention, particularly among students facing challenges in this area. Research indicates that many students prefer online paraphrasing tools over manual methods, as these tools can simplify the paraphrasing process and help reduce similarity scores in plagiarism detection software like Turnitin (Fitriani et al., 2024). Positive perceptions of these tools have been reported, with students noting improvements in their writing quality and increased confidence (Harnoyo, 2024; Xuyen, 2023). However, concerns about academic integrity arise, as automated paraphrasing tools may inadvertently encourage plagiarism by generating text that

lacks proper context and meaning (Hammond et al., 2024). Furthermore, while tools like ChatGPT have shown promise in enhancing academic writing skills, students must critically evaluate the outputs to ensure they maintain the original intent and quality of the source material (Emran et al., 2024). Thus, while online paraphrasing tools can be beneficial, they require careful use and critical engagement to uphold academic standards when writing any academic text, such as research papers.

Internet-based paraphrasing tools are internet sites that are used to paraphrase. It reconstructs a statement or idea to make it new and original. Examples are QuillBot and SpinBot. With its widespread use and ease of access, these tools have altered how information is created, shared, and evaluated. However, from an educational perspective, certain Internet-based content's quality, efficacy, validity, and dependability are in doubt. The same techniques used for machine translation apply to text processing programs used for online paraphrasing (MT). While MT typically focuses on translating between languages, a broader view of text processing might work between or within linguistic data (Ambati et al., 2020).

Another study was conducted by Gipp et al. (2022) about the effectiveness of paraphrasing tools such as SpinBot and SpinnerChief in the arXiv (40 documents), which are scientific papers, graduation theses (40 documents), and Wikipedia articles (80 documents). Along with Turnitin and PlagScan to identify plagiarism. The result showed that the paraphrased documents contained few copied paragraphs and produced unclear or obfuscation information. However, the results also revealed that no plagiarized texts were detected in the documents using Turnitin and Plagscan.

In line with the research, Fitria (2021) conducted a study about the use of the online paraphrasing tool which is QuillBot. The result showed that the Artificial Intelligence (AI) tool is helpful to students

and effective to utilize, especially when the students are having difficulty in paraphrasing English sentences. Thus, it can paraphrase information by using synonyms and changing the active sentences to passive, the word order, and the form of the word. The result also showed that through QuillBot, a paraphrased text keeps the exact meaning of the original text and avoids plagiarism. Moreover, Nurmayanti and Suryadi (2023) also conducted a study about Quillbot. The researcher found that Quillbot makes the students' writing easier when creating scientific papers. The researcher also found out that through this tool, the confidence of the students increased as they could pass more organized assignments or scientific papers.

The challenge of paraphrasing and the use of article-spinning tools benefit not only students but also web entrepreneurs. According to Lancaster (2020), article spinners work like paraphrasing tools, rewriting content to avoid duplication and increase website exposure, helping site owners generate income. This has led to the term "essay spinning," as students can use these tools for free. However, researchers may also be tempted to use these tools to recycle previously published work, raising concerns about academic integrity.

In addition, students who use an online paraphrasing tool also fail to show that they comprehend the assessment activity, making it impossible to show that they met the learning objectives. They also engage in academic dishonesty if they fail to cite the original author of the material they have used as a source for their paraphrasing. They would not pass the subject for which they submit such information on both grounds (Lancaster, 2020).

Inappropriate Textual Borrowing
Since writers cannot completely avoid using other people's texts in any academic genre, text borrowing occurs across all academic disciplines (Pecorari, 2008). Yet, with the growth of text output brought on by the internet and other technological advancements, it is now simple to copy and paste written things into one's own work. In a strict sense, plagiarism is defined as "literary theft, stealing (by copying) the words or ideas of someone else and passing them off as one's own without crediting the source" and is thus commonly understood as textual borrowing "without due citation" (Park, 2003).

Jones (2009) and Dinneen (2021) stated that inappropriate textual borrowing is also called back translation, in which the students copy the main source of information and then translate it into another language through a Machine Translation online like Google Translate. After that, translate it back to the English language, which results in another version; thus, it has no citation of the original author.

The amount of research on academic dishonesty has, however, lagged the numerous studies on academic dishonesty among university students. According to Clarke and Lancaster (2016), the rise in the number of plagiarizing authors "results in rapid progression within the subject for less fit academics, to the detriment of more fit academics," in addition to creating negative publicity.

Sun (2013) analyzed 600 journal articles using Turnitin and human raters, finding fewer plagiarism cases in social science journals compared to other fields, with multi-author papers showing higher text-matching scores. Sun and Yang (2015) examined self-plagiarism, citation patterns, and paraphrasing techniques in language and education, identifying 30 paraphrasing methods, including rewriting prior works. Bretag and Carapiet (2017) also found significant language reuse and self-plagiarism among Australian academics. Despite limitations, studies (Dahl, 2017; Savage, 2014) suggest that anti-plagiarism tools like Plagi Serv, Turnitin, and iThenticate help reduce plagiarism when used alongside teaching, though some regions or publishers lack consistent evaluation strategies.

METHOD

Research Design

In this quantitative research, the authors employed a descriptive-comparative research design that aims to investigate the differences between the variables. Specifically, the study utilized descriptive research design to determine the inappropriate textual borrowing in the text using traditional paraphrasing and after using an internet-based paraphrasing tool, and on the types of paraphrasing techniques used by the internet-based paraphrasing tool through a taxonomy of paraphrasing and coding schemes. On the other hand, comparative research design determined if there is a difference in the number of inappropriate textual borrowing when utilizing internet-based paraphrasing tools and traditional paraphrasing. A descriptive-comparative research design described the differences among groups in a population without manipulating the independent variable (Crantell, 2011).

Sampling Procedure

In addition, the study utilized a complete enumeration or total population sampling procedure to determine the number of respondents in the study. Moreover, the said sampling procedure is used since there is a small number of the population. Total population sampling is where the whole population with shared interest is being studied and when the target group is small (Cayang & Ursabia, 2024). The respondents of this study were (48) 3rd-year college students who were enrolled in a language research course during the school year 2023-2024.

Data Sources

The first author collected and used the respondents' language research papers as corpora. To quantify the existence of different types of inappropriate textual borrowing, the authors utilized the features in Turnitin software. In addressing the study's objectives, the authors carefully followed Jalilifar et al.'s (2018) Coding Scheme and Pratama et al.'s (2022) Taxonomy of Paraphrasing in the language research papers, both with and without the use of internet-based paraphrasing tools. The coding scheme includes categories such as secondary, opaque, self-plagiarism, and no citation, while the taxonomy of paraphrasing encompasses near copy, minimal revision, moderate revision, and substantial revision. These categories helped determine the types of paraphrasing techniques used by the students and ChatGPT. The identified types of inappropriate textual borrowing and paraphrasing techniques were the result of careful deliberation and consensus between the two authors.

Data Gathering Procedure

Permission to conduct the study was obtained through a letter sent to the campus director. Upon approval, the authors proceeded to the next step—securing the respondents' permission. Hence, Informed Consent Forms (ICFs) were distributed to the respondents, providing a detailed explanation of the study's purpose, objectives, and what participation would involve. These forms ensured that respondents were fully informed about the nature of the research, including any potential risks and benefits. Additionally, the ICFs clarified that participation was voluntary and that respondents could withdraw from the study at any time without any consequences (Bisin & Sumayo, 2024; Ortega & Sumayo, 2024; Royeras & Sumayo, 2024).

Data Analysis Procedure

In this study, descriptive statistics such as frequency, mean, and percentage were utilized to present the inappropriate textual borrowing in the text using traditional paraphrasing, the inappropriate textual borrowing in the text after using an internet-based paraphrasing tool, and the types of paraphrasing techniques used by the internet-based paraphrasing tool through paraphrasing strategy theory and taxonomy

of paraphrasing types. The use of descriptive statistics can aid in the summary of data, either as a visual summary using box plots and histograms or as a basic quantitative measure like means or percentages (Kaliyadan & Kulkarni, 2019). On the other hand, to answer our concerns about inferential statistics, the T-test for Independent Samples or Unpaired T-test was used. It was utilized to illustrate significant differences in the number of inappropriate textual borrowing when using internet-based paraphrasing tools and traditional paraphrasing. According to Gleichmann (2020), when comparing the averages or means of two independent or unrelated groups, an unpaired t-test (also called an independent t-test) is a statistical method used to see if there is a significant difference between the two.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Inappropriate Textual Borrowing in the Text Using Traditional Paraphrasing Method

Table 1. revealed that the use of the traditional paraphrasing method obtained a mean score of 11.65, which means that the respondents committed lower inappropriate textual borrowing. This was evidenced by a minimum textual borrowing of zero (0) and a maximum inappropriate textual borrowing of 38. It was also revealed that most of the respondents committed inappropriate textual borrowing ranging from 0-5 and 11-15 with a total frequency of 13 (27.08%) and 14 (29.17%), respectively. However, only one respondent committed inappropriate textual borrowing, which ranged from 21-25, 31-35, and 36-40, respectively, representing 2.08% in each range.

This finding suggests that most 3rd year BSE students are knowledgeable in paraphrasing and have a lower risk of plagiarism when using traditional methods. However, findings still emphasize the significance of continuously applying learning interventions that challenge students to think critically and independently. Additionally, educators should continue to encourage students to express their own ideas instead of relying on internet-based paraphrasing tools to enhance their paraphrasing skills. As mentioned by Inayah and Sulistyaningrum (2021), some students still have difficulties in paraphrasing; for instance, they lack the ability to apply paraphrasing techniques, which need further teaching. Also, Ardelia and Tiyas (2019) stated that not all students are knowledgeable in the proper way to paraphrase, which results in being labeled as plagiarists, which needs continual teaching.

Table 1. *Inappropriate Textual Borrowing in the language research papers using traditional paraphrasing method of third-year English students, Libungan, 2023.*

Variables	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Textual Borrowing			0	38	11.65
0-5	13	27.08			
6-10	9	18.75			
11-15	14	29.17			
16-20	6	12.5			
21-25	1	2.08			
26-30	3	6.25			
31-35	1	2.08			

Table 2 shows the violations utilized using the traditional paraphrasing method, categorized according to the Coding Scheme. It was revealed that respondents tend to commit self-plagiarism, which nearly copied texts from published papers, articles, or theses without proper

acknowledgment, with a mean of 4.96. This finding implies that students committing self-plagiarism without proper acknowledgment of the author compromise the integrity of their paper and the credibility of their work. In line with the study by Bretag and Carapiet (2017), most authors of academic research papers are highly committed to self-plagiarism. On the other hand, secondary citation, having ranked second to the traditional paraphrasing violations, indicates that students are aware of the significance of citing the author. However, this could lead to misinterpretation of the original source or the author. Furthermore, opaque citations are ranked third with a mean of 1.63, which indicates that students still acknowledge the source even though it is unclear or insufficient. This finding suggests that students should scrutinize the source of the text they have copied to avoid difficulty in verifying claims.

Moreover, the traditional paraphrasing method that was frequently used by the students is No Citation; this finding implies that students failed to cite the source and may have difficulty citing it properly. This supports the findings of Azis et al. (2019), who showed that the majority of the students lack knowledge of citing properly the source or the author of the text they have copied. Consequently, it decreases the credibility of the research and the image of the researcher because of the improper acknowledgment of the author's works. With this, proper citation to the original author is essential to help maintain the integrity of the student's paper.

The data indicates that when respondents use traditional paraphrasing methods, they often reuse ideas from other sources without giving proper credit. This is evident in the high frequency of self-plagiarism and secondary citation issues. These practices suggest that many students may not fully understand how to paraphrase correctly or cite sources appropriately. Therefore, it is important to implement educational programs that teach proper

paraphrasing techniques and the significance of accurate source citation. This will help reduce instances of inappropriate textual borrowing and promote academic honesty. According to the study by Akbari (2020), many students lack the necessary skills to paraphrase effectively and cite sources correctly. These findings highlight the critical need for educational interventions focused on improving paraphrasing abilities and promoting awareness of accurate source citation in order to maintain academic integrity. Similarly, Choy and Lee (2012) discovered that 36% of the students enhanced their paraphrasing skills after completing multiple exercises. Furthermore, all the students expressed the need for additional practice to further improve their paraphrasing abilities. They were confident that with more practice, their writing skills would improve.

Table 2. *Inappropriate Textual Borrowing in the language research papers using traditional paraphrasing method of third-year English students, Libungan, 2023.*

Variables	Frequency	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Self-Plagiarism	238	0	21	4.96
Secondary Citation	192	0	17	4.00
Opaque Citation	78	0	16	1.63
No Citation	51	0	6	1.06

Inappropriate Textual Borrowing in the text after using Internet-based Paraphrasing Tool

Table 3 shows that respondents achieved a mean score of 3.85 for inappropriate text borrowing after using the online paraphrasing tool, with a minimum of 0 and a maximum improper textual borrowing of 16. The data showed that most respondents carry out textual borrowing only 0-5 with a frequency of 36, 6-10 with a frequency of 1, 11-15 with a frequency of 8, and 16-20 with a frequency of 3 only. This means that it effectively reduced inappropriate textual borrowing after the usage of paraphrasing tools.

The data revealed that the utilization of internet-based paraphrasing tools has

dropped the incidence of inappropriate textual borrowing in the language papers of third-year BSE students. This data implies that such tools can be beneficial in helping students generate original content by paraphrasing. However, it is important to recognize that these tools are not infallible and may not eliminate the problem of plagiarism. Therefore, it is still crucial to continue teaching proper paraphrasing, citation, and the appropriate use of internet-based paraphrasing tools. As stated by Aqiilah (2023), online paraphrasing tools

help students improve their writing in terms of finding synonyms, changing sentence structure, word order, etc. In addition, Lancaster (2020) stated that spinners rewrite and paraphrase texts in multiple spins to produce web content that would not be detected as plagiarized. Similarly, Miranda (2021) found out that paraphrasing tools help students avoid plagiarism as it increases students' vocabulary to comprehend the core idea of texts and with proper paraphrasing.

Table 3. *Inappropriate textual borrowing in the language research papers after using Internet-based paraphrasing tool of third-year English students, Libungan, 2023.*

Variables	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Textual Borrowing			0	16	3.85
0-5	36	75			
6-10	1	2.08			
11-15	8	16.67			
16-20	3	6.25			

Table 4 revealed that the most frequently observed type of inappropriate textual borrowing is Opaque Citation, with a mean of 2.69 and a frequency of 129. This means that using the internet-based paraphrasing tool can help to rephrase texts. However, students often hinder the identification of the original source of the texts. The data showed that the least frequent type is No Citation, with a mean of 0.27 and a frequency of 13, which students tend to commit to in their papers.

This finding indicates that students showed greater improvement in their rephrasing abilities when utilizing internet-based paraphrasing tools compared to traditional paraphrasing methods. The increase in opaque citation frequency or citing sources without clearly indicating where the information came from indicates that students often credit sources but fail to properly indicate direct quotes, leading to a high level of apparent paraphrasing. Meanwhile, a decrease in secondary citation and self-plagiarism shows that these tools

can facilitate students to change and produce their own original text. However, internet-based paraphrasing tools do not eliminate inappropriate textual borrowing as it is evident that texts may still exactly or nearly copy the original text without proper citation.

This data implies that even when using internet-based paraphrasing tools, students should ensure clarity and transparency with citations to avoid inappropriate textual borrowing. As a matter of fact, McCarthy and Rogerson (2017) believed that paraphrasing tools produce outputs that are technically different from the original source. Nevertheless, they convey the same ideas without proper citation, which leads to facilitated plagiarism. In addition, Curtis and Vardanega (2016) found that internet-based paraphrasing tools often substitute synonyms and alter sentence structures without changing the meaning of the text, which lacks proper citations and leads to opaque citations where the original source is not clearly acknowledged.

Therefore, while these tools help reduce

some forms of inappropriate textual borrowing, they do not fully prevent it and may even contribute to subtler forms of plagiarism. This underscores the need for students to maintain clarity and transparency in citations, even when using advanced paraphrasing tools.

Table 4. *Mean Rating of Inappropriate textual borrowing in the language research papers after using an Internet-based paraphrasing tool of third-year English students, Libungan, 2023.*

Variables	Frequency	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Opaque Citation	129	0	16	2.69
Secondary Citation	23	0	6	0.48
Self-Plagiarism	20	0	7	0.42
No Citation	13	0	6	0.27

Types of Paraphrasing Techniques used by the Internet-based Paraphrasing Tool using Taxonomy of Paraphrasing

Table 5 illustrates the distribution of paraphrasing techniques utilized by the internet-based paraphrasing tool, categorized according to the Taxonomy of Paraphrasing. It was revealed that substantial revision is the most frequently used type of paraphrasing when using the paraphrasing tool, with a total frequency of 246, followed by a near copy with a frequency of 128. Moreover, minimal revision and moderate revision, though less common, still highlight the presence of users who make only slight changes or somewhat significant alterations to the original text.

This finding indicates that using a paraphrasing tool enables students to rephrase entire passages or comprehensively reconstruct content without detection as uncredited copying. The present study shows that most of the papers do not exhibit unique links or copied words from the original sources. In fact, Gipp et al. (2022) found that the paraphrasing tools SpinBot and Spinner-chief effectively produce content that Pagscan and Turnitin do not detect as plagiarized. Additionally, Fitria (2021) revealed that QuillBot helps students avoid plagiarism or inappropriate textual

borrowing.

However, Near Copy, second to the highest, showed that there are still high instances in internet-based paraphrasing tools that the changes of words in a passage might be the same in other links. This finding suggests that internet-based paraphrasing tools have limitations and may inadvertently produce text that matches other sources, highlighting the need for improvement of these tools. Combining paraphrasing tools with an advanced plagiarism detection system to examine any existing content from other sources. As a matter of fact, Lancaster (2020) revealed that essay spinning paraphrasing tool failed to cite original authors, which led to inappropriate textual borrowing. Also, Sarair et al. (2019) discovered that the near-copy type of paraphrasing is always observed, which means students failed to paraphrase correctly, as 50% or more words are copied from the original source. Consideration of the data also revealed that paraphrasing tools obtained Moderate Revision, in which only 1-9% of words are copied, including Minimal Revision, in which 20-40% copied words from other sources.

Table 5. *Types of paraphrasing techniques used by internet-based paraphrasing tool of third-year English students, Libungan, 2023.*

Variables	**Frequency**
Substantial Revision	246
Near Copy	128
Minimal Revision	23
Moderate Revision	4

Significant Difference in the Number of Inappropriate Textual Borrowing when Using Traditional Paraphrasing and Internet-based Paraphrasing Tool

Table 6 shows the difference between the number of inappropriate textual borrowing when using traditional and internet-based paraphrasing tools. The result shows that there is a highly significant difference between traditional and internet-based

paraphrasing tools (t=4.931, p-value=0.000). It reveals that the number of inappropriate textual borrowing using traditional (m = 11.65) is significantly higher than the number of inappropriate textual borrowing when using internet-based paraphrasing tools (m = 3.85).

The lower incidence of inappropriate textual borrowing in the internet-based paraphrasing tool suggests that respondents potentially decrease the risk of unintended plagiarism and ensure that the content paper is as authentic as possible. This finding suggests that the internet-based paraphrasing tool is much more efficient in reducing improper textual borrowing in contrast to traditional methods. This could be due to the wide access to internet sources such as scientific papers, graduation theses, and Wikipedia, as well as tools that could detect plagiarized content like Turnitin and PlagScan (Gipp et al., 2022). Also, Fitria (2021) stated that students who struggle with paraphrasing English sentences can use AI tools to avoid unintentional plagiarism and improve their papers. Similarly, Nurmayanti and Suryadi (2023) state that Quillbot helps students increase their confidence in meeting academic requirements by making their writing more organized and scholarly.

In addition, McCarthy and Rogerson (2021) stated that aside from students utilizing internet-based paraphrasing tools could avoid plagiarism, this could also be helpful for students to save time. Moreover, Dinneen (2021) found that the employment of these tools could also improve writing skills.

However, while internet-based tools seem to outperform traditional methods in minimizing textual borrowing, there is a potential risk of students becoming overly reliant on these tools, which could hinder the development of their own critical thinking and paraphrasing skills. Thus, while the findings highlight the practical benefits of internet-based tools, they also underscore the importance of balancing their use with continued instruction in traditional paraphrasing techniques to ensure students develop the necessary skills to write independently and critically. Educators should now prioritize strengthening students' comprehension and vocabulary to enhance their paraphrasing abilities, thereby promoting more effective academic writing practices (Yağiz, 2019).

Table 6. *Comparative results of the difference in the number of inappropriate textual borrowing when using traditional and internet-based paraphrasing tools, Libungan, 2023.*

Variable	Mean	Mean Difference	t	df	p-value	Interpretation
Traditional	11.65	7.79	4.931	76.43	0.000	Highly significant difference
Internet-based	3.85					

CONCLUSION

The study concluded that 3rd-year BSE English students committed more instances of inappropriate textual borrowing when using traditional paraphrasing methods compared to internet-based tools. The findings revealed that while traditional methods posed challenges for students in independently paraphrasing and citing sources, the use of online paraphrasing tools, combined with plagiarism checkers, significantly reduced these challenges. These tools not only helped students avoid plagiarism but also enhanced their paraphrasing and critical thinking skills, allowing them to modify text effectively and generate original content.

Moreover, the data demonstrated that students using internet-based paraphrasing tools showed a greater ability to create unique ideas without directly copying from

the original sources. The increased use of these tools was correlated with a marked decrease in inappropriate textual borrowing, highlighting their effectiveness in supporting academic integrity. However, the study also noted the risk of opaque citations with these tools, suggesting that while they reduce overt plagiarism, they may still lead to subtler forms of improper citation.

The present study recommends that students should help themselves learn proper paraphrasing or citing to avoid plagiarism. They can also seek help from their teachers or experts in exploring various paraphrasing tools. In addition, boosting self-confidence and believing they can write scholarly papers is beneficial in creating more unique paper content. Moreover, educators should help their students enhance their paraphrasing ability by teaching them the proper paraphrasing, citing, and textual borrowing, as well as introducing alternative techniques of paraphrasing. Additionally, continuously motivating them to learn and fostering critical thinking among students is highly recommended as it heightens the originality of their work.

Since the study was only limited to one discipline, which was secondary education, it is recommended that future research delve into other disciplines, like criminology, hospitality management, agriculture, or elementary education discipline, to give us information on their differences in patterns or structures of paraphrasing. It is highly noted that this study was only limited to one generative artificial intelligence tool, which was Quillbot; hence, it is empirical to recommend that other researchers may also explore other Generative Artificial Intelligence writing tools to see if these tools offer a variation in the types of paraphrasing committed. More so, the revealed data on plagiarism committed while undergoing traditional paraphrasing methods by the respondents demand scrutiny, particularly exploring their awareness of the ethical use of these writing tools, which can give answers as to why this certain act of dishonesty is prevalent in the academic context. The absence of awareness in terms of ethical use could be a crucial issue, leading students to do such acts of academic dishonesty.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

Akbari, A. (2020). Spinning-translation and the act of plagiarising: how to avoid and resist. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 45*(1), 49–64. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2019.1709629

Ambati, V., Vogel, S., & Carbonell, J.G. (2020*). Active learning and crowd-sourcing for machine translation*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'10), Malta.

Aqiilah, N. (2023). Online paraphrasing tools in EFL academic writing: *Problems, affordances, and students' feelings*. Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana.

Ardelia, I. & Tiyas, Y. R. (2019). The acquisition of paraphrasing and its impact on teaching and learning quotations to avoid plagiarism. *Getsempena English Education Journal, 6(1),* 159-171. https://doi.org/10.46244/geej.v6i1.873

Azis, W. A., Suryanti, Y., & Sutisna, E. (2019). Students' difficulties to write paraphrasing text and summarizing text. *Pedagogia Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan, 11*(1). https://doi.org/10.55215/pedagogia.v11i1.7196

Behrens, L., & Rosen, L. J. (2010). *Writing and reading across the curriculum (6th ed.).* Longman.

Bisin, B. A., & Sumayo, G. (2024). Perceptions, knowledge, and beliefs of secondary literature teachers on online streaming services in select public schools in North Cotabato, Philippines. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies,*

6(2), 612–632. https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v6i2.1754

Bretag, T., & Carapiet, S. (2017). A preliminary study of identify the extent of self-plagiarism in australian academic research. *Plagiary: Cross-disciplinary studies in plagiarism, fabrication, and falsification, 2 (5),* 1-12.

Cayang, J. A. C., & Ursabia, E. M. E. (2024). Leveling Up Mathematical Skills: The Effectiveness of Game-Based Learning. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives, 2*(7). 784-791.

Choy, S. C., & Lee, M. Y. (2012). Effects of teaching paraphrasing skills to students learning summary writing in ESL. *Journal of Teaching and Learning, 8(2)*. https://doi.org/10.22329/jtl.v8i2.3145

Clarke, R., & Lancaster, T. (2016). Contract cheating: The outsourcing of assessed student work. *In: Bretag, T. (eds) Handbook of Academic Integrity*. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_17

Crantell, M. A. (2011). Demystifying the research process: Understanding a descriptive comparative research design. *Pedriatic Nursing, 37 (4),* 188.

Curtis, G. J., & Vardanega, L. (2016). Using internet-based paraphrasing tools: Original work, patchwriting or facilitated plagiarism*? International Journal for Educational Integrity, 12*(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-016-0014-2

Dahl, S. (2017). *Turnitin®:* The student perspective on using plagiarism detection software. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 8*(2), 173-191.

Dinneen, C. (2021). Students' use of digital translation and paraphrasing tools in written assignments on direct entry English programs. *English Australia Journal, 37* (1), 40-51. https://doi: 10.3316/informit.748262877947586

Ellis, C., Zucker, I.M., & Randall, D. (2018). The infernal business of contract cheating: Understanding the business processes and models of academic custom writing sites. *International Journal for Education Integrity, 14*,1-21.

Emran, A. Q., Mohammed, M. N., Saeed, H., Keir, M. Y. A., Alani, Z. N., & Ibrahim, F. M. (2024). Paraphrasing ChatGPT answers as a tool to enhance university students' academic writing skills. *2024 ASU International Conference in Emerging Technologies for Sustainability and Intelligent Systems (ICETSIS)*. 501-505, https://doi: 10.1109/ICETSIS61505.2024.10459386.

Fitria, T. N. (2021). QuillBot as an online tool: Students' alternative in paraphrasing and rewriting of English writing. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities, 9* (1), 183-196.

Fitriani., Jihad, A., Alimuddin, A. H., & Bahang, M. D. (2024). Online paraphrasing practices for academic writing in Indonesian higher education. *KnE Social Sciences, 9*(19), 263–272. https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v9i19.16506

Gipp, B., Ruas, T., Meuschke, N., Foltynek, T., & Wahle, J. P. (2022). Identifying Machine-Paraphrased Plagiarism. *International Conference on Information*, pp 393-413. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Gleichmann, N. (2020, February 14). Paired vs unpaired t-test: Differences, assumptions and hypotheses. *Technology Networks Informatics*. https://www.technologynetworks.com/informatics/articles/paired-vs-unpaired-t-test-differences-assumptions-and-hypotheses-330826

Hammond, K. M., Lucas, P., Hassouna, A., & Brown, S. (2024). A wolf in sheep's clothing? Critical discourse analysis of five online automated paraphrasing sites. (2024*). Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice, 20*(7). https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.7.08

Harnoyo, R. A. (2024). Online paraphrasing tools in language learning: Students' perceptions to overcome the difficulties in academic writing. *Issues in Applied Linguistics & Language Teaching, 6*(1). 171-178. https://doi.org/10.37253/iallteach.v6i1.9325

Howard, R. (2018). *Writing matters: A handbook for writing and research*. New York NY: McGraw-Hill.

Inayah, N., & Sulistyaningrum, S. D. (2021). Employing online paraphrasing tools to overcome student's difficulties in paraphrasing. *Stairs: English Language Journal, 2*(1), 52-59. https://doi.org/10.21009/stairs.2.1.7

Jalilifar, A., Soltani, P., & Shooshtari, Z. G. (2018). Improper textual borrowing practices: Evidence from Iranian applied linguistics journal articles. *Journal of English Purposes, 35*, 42-55. https://doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2018.06.003

Jones, M. (2009). Back-translation: The latest form of plagiarism. *The 4th Asia Pacific conference on educational integrity*, pp. 1-7.

Kaliyadan, F., & Kulkarni, V. (2019). Types of variables, descriptive statistics, and sample size. *Indian Dermatology Online Journal, 10*(1), 82-86. https://doi.org/10.4103/idoj.IDOJ_468_18

Keck, C. (2006). The use of paraphrase in summary writing: A comparison of L1 and L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15*(4), 261–278.

Kost, C. (2024). A comparative study of the accuracy of Turn-It-In's artificial intelligence detector in CTU doctoral assignments. *The Pinnacle, 2*(1). 1-12. https://doi.org/10.61643/c15963

Lancaster, T. (2020). Academic discipline integration by contract cheating services and essay mills. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 18*, 115-127. https://doi:10.1007/s10805-019-09357-x

McCarthy, G. (2019). *Coaching and mentoring for business*. Sage, London.

Meyer, P. (2018). *Adoption of plagiarism detection software by college faculty*. Northern Illinois University.

Miranda, D. (2021). The impact of paraphrasing tools on students paraphrasing skills.

Mufidah, I. L., & Dewi, A. R. (2021). Enhancing English writing skill through POEW strategy. *TRANS-KATA: Journal of Language, Literature, Culture and Education, 2*(1), 26–40. https://doi.org/10.54923/jllce.v2i1.30

Na, C. D., & Mai, N. X. N. C. (2017). Paraphrasing in academic writing: A case study of Vietnamese learners of English. *Language Education in Asia, 8*(1). 9-25. http://dx.doi.org/10.5746/LEiA/17/V8/I1/A02/Na_Mal

Nguyen, X. (2023). Using the online paraphrasing tool Quillbot to assist students in paraphrasing the source information: English-majored students' perceptions. 21-27. 10.21467/proceedings.150.3.

Nurmayanti, N., & Suryadi, S. (2023). The effectiveness of using quillbot in improving writing for students of English Education Study Program. *Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan: Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengembangan Pembelajaran, 8* (1), 32-40. https://doi.org/10.33394/jtp.v8i1.6392

Ortega, W., & Sumayo, G. (2024). Public elementary teachers' motivation and pedagogical competence in teaching non-readers: A correlational study. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives, 2*(4), 60-67. https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0052

Ovilia, R., Addinna, A., & Oktoviandry, R. (2022). Students' paraphrasing ability in academic writing; techniques and challenges. *Komposisi: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa, Sastra, dan Seni, 23*(2). 141-151. https://doi.org/10.24036/komposisi.v23i2.119456

Park, C. (2003). In other (people's) words: Plagiarism by university students–literature and lessons. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 28*(5). 471-488.

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

Pratama, Y., Prawesti, A., & Fridolini. (2022). An analysis of students' writing skills in paraphrasing: A case study of 5th-semester diploma students of English language and culture department of darma persada university. *Getsempa English Education Journal, 9*(1), 13-28.

Roig, M. (2016). *Recycling our own work in the digital age.* In: Bretag T (ed) Handbook of Academic Integrity. Springer, Singapore, pp 655–669.

Royeras, J. T., & Sumayo, G. S. (2024). Vocabulary knowledge and inferential reading comprehension of senior high school students: A Descriptive-Correlational Inquiry. *East Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 3*(3), 1143–1154. https://doi.org/10.55927/eajmr.v3i3.8164

Sarair, S., Astila, I., & Nurviani, R. (2019). Acehnese students'skills in paraphrasing english texts: A case study at two universities in banda aceh. *Proceedings of EEIC, 2*, 151-159.

Savage, S. (2014). Staff and student responses to a trial of Turnitin plagiarism detection software. In *Proceedings of the Australian Universities quality Forum*, (27).

Shi, L. (2022). Textual borrowing in second-language writing. *Written Communication, 21*(2), 171-200.

Sun, Y. C. (2013). Do journal authors plagiarize? Using plagiarism detection software to uncover matching text across disciplines. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 12*(4), 264-272.

Sun, Y., & Yang, F. (2015). Uncovering published authors' text-borrowing practices: Paraphrasing strategies, sources, and self-plagiarism. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 20*, 224-236. https://doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2015.05.003

Xuyen, N. T. (2023). Using the online paraphrasing tool Quillbot to assist students in paraphrasing the source information: English-majored students' perceptions. *Proceedings of the 5th Conference on Language Teaching and Learning*. 21-27. https://doi.org/10.21467/proceedings.150.3

Yağiz, O. (2019). Exploring paraphrasing among l2 academic writers. Kafkas University Journal of the Institute of Social Sciences, 24. 427-444. https://doi.org/10.9775/kausbed.2019.046