AN ANALYSIS OF PATCHWRITING PRACTICE IN ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT STUDENTS' ACADEMIC WRITING

THESIS

Submitted by

NISRINA MAWARDAH

NIM. 180203110

Student of *Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan*

Department of English Language Education

FAKULTAS TARBIYAH DAN KEGURUAN UNIVERSITAS

ISLAM NEGERI AR-RANIRY BANDA ACEH

2022 M / 1443 H

THESIS

Submitted to *Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan*

Universitas Islam Negeri Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

The Bachelor Degree of Education in English Language Teaching

by:

Nisrina Mawardah

180203110

Student of *Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan*

Department of English Language Education

Approved by:

Main supervisor	Co-supervisor
Dr. Luthfi Aunie, M.A.	Safrul Muluk, S.Ag., M.A., M.Ed., Ph.D.
Date: 22 / July / 2022	Date: 18 / July / 2022

It has been defended in *Sidang Munaqasyah*
in front of the board of the Examination for the working paper
and has been accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Bachelor Degree of Education on English Language Teaching

On:

Thursday, 27 July 2022
27 Dzulhijjah 1443 H

In Darussalam, Banda Aceh

Board Examiner,

Chairman,

Dr. Luthfi Aunie, M.A.

Secretary,

Sarini Vita Dewi, S.T., M.Eng.

Member,

Safrul Muluk, S.Ag., M.A., M.Ed., Ph.D.

Member,

Dr. Rahmi, S.Pd.I., M.TESOL.

Certified by:
The Dean of *Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan*
Universitas Islam Negeri Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh

Dr. Muslim Razali, S.H., M.Ag.
NIP. 195907091989031001

SURAT PERNYATAAN KEASLIAN

(Declaration of Originality)

Saya yang bertandatangan di bawah ini:

Nama	: Nisrina Mawardah
NIM	: 180203110
Tempat/Tanggal lahir	: Banda Aceh, 01 Mei 2000
Alamat	: Bayu, Darul Imarah, Aceh Besar, 23352, Aceh

Menyatakan dengan sesungguhnya bahwa skripsi saya yang berjudul:

An Analysis of Patchwriting Practice in English Education Department Students' Academic Writing

adalah benar-benar karya saya, **kecuali semua kutipan dan referensi yang disebutkan sumbernya.** Apabila terdapat kesalahan dan kekeliruan di dalamnya, maka akan sepenuhnya menjadi tanggung jawab saya. Demikian surat pernyataan ini saya buat dengan sesungguhnya.

Banda Aceh, 15 Juli 2022

Saya yang membuat surat pernyataan,

Nisrina Mawardah

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

بِسْمِ ٱللَّهِ ٱلرَّحْمَٰنِ ٱلرَّحِيمِ

Alhamdulillahirabbil'alamin. In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious and Most Merciful. All praises to Allah SWT, for strengths and His blessings in completing this thesis. Peace and salutation be upon to our prophet Muhammad PBUH, along with his family and companions who have brought enlightenment into human life and guided us from the darkness to the most educated world.

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Luthfi Aunie, M.A., and Safrul Muluk, S.Ag., M.A., M.Ed., Ph.D., as the supervisors who have helped, advised, and guided me in completing this thesis. Also, to all the Department of English Language Education lecturers who taught and guided me during the study. May Allah make all things easier for you and reward you, in His heaven.

Then, the most prestigious thanks and love go to my parents and siblings, who have been my support system, prayed, and supported me unconditionally. Also, my appreciation and gratitude to all my beloved friends whose names I did not mention one by one who always supported me emotionally, and thank you for always support me during this time. May Allah bless us and unite us in His heaven.

Banda Aceh, 15 July 2022
The Writer,

Nisrina Mawardah

ABSTRACT

Name	: Nisrina Mawardah
NIM	: 180203110
Faculty	: *Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan*
Major	: Department of English Language Education
Thesis working	: An Analysis of Practice of Students' Patchwriting in English Education Department Students' Academic Writing
Main Supervisor	: Dr. Luthfi Aunie, M.A.
Co-Supervisor	: Safrul Muluk, S.Ag., M.A., M.Ed., Ph.D.
Keywords	: Patchwriting; Academic Writing

This research investigated students' patchwriting in academic writing. This research examined the form of patchwriting conducted by English education students and investigated students' strategies to avoid patchwriting in their writing. The participants were purposively selected; they are English education students' class of 2018 who already did the Seminar Proposal in the odd and even semesters of the 2021-2022 academic year and got an A in the academic writing class. The data collection was collected using two data instruments: document analysis (students' proposal) and interview. There were five proposals to be analyzed, and also five participants were interviewed. From document analysis, the results show that there were six forms of patchwriting; word-level, phrase-level, clause-level, text-level, combination-level, and no changes-level. The form that most likely occurs in students' academic writing is word-level. The interviewed results show that there were four strategies from students to avoid patchwriting; learning more deeply about paraphrasing, using translation technique, understanding text before writing, and practicing more often. From the analysis of this study, it can be concluded that currently, students did not have intention to plagiarize when writing proposals, but they lacked knowledge about how to paraphrase properly and correctly so that they fell into patchwriting.

TABLE OF CONTENT

ACKNOWLEDGMENT ..... **iv**
ABSTRACT ..... **v**
TABLE OF CONTENT ..... **vi**
LIST OF TABLES ..... **viii**
LIST OF APPENDICES ..... **ix**
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION **1**
A. Background of Study 1
B. Research Questions 6
C. Research Aim 6
D. Significance of the Study 6
1. Students 6
2. Lecturers 7
3. Researcher 7
E. Research Terminologies 7
1. Patchwriting 7
2. Academic Writing 8
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW **10**
A. Patchwriting 10
1. Definitions of Patchwriting 10
2. Level of Patchwriting 11
B. Academic Writing 14
1. Definitions of Academic Writing 14
2. Types of Academic Writing 15
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY **17**
A. Research Design 17
B. Research Participants 18
C. Methods of Data Collection 19
1. Document Analysis 19

2. Interview 20
D. Method of Data Analysis 22
1. Document Analysis 22
2. Interview 23
CHAPTER IV FINDING AND DISCUSSION 24
A. Research Findings 24
1. Forms of patchwriting committed by the students 24
2. Students' strategies to avoid patchwriting 34
3. Students' Patchwriting Experience 38
B. Discussion 41
CHAPTER V CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 46
A. Conclusions 46
B. Recommendations 47
REFERENCES 48
APPENDICES 52
AUTOBIOGRAPHY

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4. 1 The findings of patchwriting forms committed by the students 24
Table 4. 2 Extract of patchwriting form from participant B 26
Table 4. 3 Extract of patchwriting form from participant D 27
Table 4. 4 Extract of patchwriting form from participant A 28
Table 4. 5 Extract of patchwriting form from participant D 28
Table 4. 6 Extract of patchwriting form from participant E 29
Table 4. 7 Extract of patchwriting form from participant B 30
Table 4. 8 Extract of patchwriting form from participant C 31
Table 4. 9 Extract of patchwriting form from participant C 31
Table 4. 10 Extract of patchwriting form from participant E 32
Table 4. 11 Extract of patchwriting form from participant E 33

جامعة الرانري
AR-RANIRY

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A Appointment Letter of Supervisor

Appendix B Recommendation Letter from The Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan to conduct field research

Appendix C Confirmation letter from Department of English Language Education

Appendix D Interview Protocol

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background of the study, research questions, aim of the study, significance of the study, and the research terminologies of the study.

A. Background of Study

Every EFL student learns and understands four main aspects of the English language: reading, listening, speaking, and writing. EFL students need to master all four skills without leaving any aspect, especially writing skills, which is an important aspect of students' academic performance. In line Zarfsaz and Ahmadi (2017), claimed that the ability to clearly express meaning and purpose in writing is an important skill in academic areas. Writing is not just an ordinary writing activity, but more than that. Writing is a process and an activity where the writer tries to express what they have thought about something in an obvious way.

Writing skill is the most challenging skill for students because they should understand the topic they will write about by themselves and pay attention to anything, as well as related to punctuation in writing. For students, it is difficult when they were asked to start writing the first sentence. It becomes more complicated when students have to write something related to research. The same as what Ameer and Hussein (2015), they mentioned that writing skill is a challenge for foreign language learners, especially in writing a research paper. Other than that, students must include other skills such as reading to present good writing.

Compared to other skills, writing skill has several things that students must pay attention to, and it takes a longer time to be done. Also, when they have a lack writing ability, it will be hard for them to do good academic writing. It makes students experience difficulties that encourage them to do the academic dishonesty. The serious case of academic dishonesty that often occurs in academic writing is plagiarism. In the academic aspect showing the situation where the plagiarism occurs when students write, they underestimate plagiarism case and choose to do summarizing without citation as a normal action in completing assignments (Muluk et al., 2021).

Plagiarism is known that this is a serious problem in writing. As Doró (2017) said that the originality of manuscript publication is one of the topics that takes full attention in the academic community around the world. Not only for professional researchers who want to publish their writings, but the awareness of plagiarism must also be warned to students and also novice writers who have a big chance to do a plagiarism. Because they do not have much experience in writing.

Vieyra, Strickland, and Timmerman (2013) investigated research about students' plagiarism and patchwriting patterns in science and engineering students' research proposals which focuses on the source material, the type of plagiarism, the location, and the citation status. They differentiate textual plagiarism as someone who intends to do plagiarism, while patchwriting here may be unintentional plagiarism produced by novice writers in developing their writing skills. From the results of their research, the level of plagiarism was lower when the checking process was carried out on the writings of students who used English as their main language. In this case, the

research is checking for plagiarism in English writing only as a focus. It can be concluded that when students can understand the language and a piece of knowledge about how to do it well, the level of plagiarism will be low. But sometimes plagiarism cannot be avoided due to the lack of knowledge about strategy in writing.

In other situations, some students know how to avoid plagiarism by paraphrasing, but their lack deeper knowledge about the definition of paraphrasing. As a result, their writing is detected as patchwriting unknowingly. Most students usually like to change some words in a sentence or paragraph to synonyms without further changes. The other is just changing the grammatical structures. Many students do this action unexpectedly, and when they check their writing on any plagiarism checker, their writing is detected as a high plagiarism. This is because of their lack of knowledge about how to paraphrase correctly.

Based on the researcher's observation from preliminary research, not all students in academic writing class understand well how to do a good and correct paraphrase. Some students avoid plagiarism by paraphrasing, but they misunderstand the rule of paraphrasing, "changing the idea with your own words." They just changed some words with the synonym, without making any further changes from the original source, and then get detected as patchwriting or called as close paraphrasing or plagiarism unconsciously.

Several things cause these patchwriting cases to arise; one of the biggest causes is the language barrier, especially for L2 learners. Differences in language use can be the reason why patchwriting appears, and students may misunderstand the concept of

paraphrasing. On the one hand, they do not want to change the idea from the original source, which makes a point of an idea disappear. But on the other hand, when the changes made are too few, it turns into a case of patchwriting and leads to plagiarism.

According to research about patchwriting by Wood, Roggenbuck, Doerschler, and Hicks (2018), who investigated the benefits of a writing center workshop about patchwriting in students' writing, there were still many students who were not familiar with the term of patchwriting, they were not even aware of it. Because of that in this research, Wood et al. (2018) conducted a workshop about this topic. The purpose is to know what faculty perceptions and responses to plagiarism cases, to know the problem of what students know and do with their source material, and to help students learn how to write and paraphrase correctly from the source.

During the workshop, Wood et al. (2018) tried to show a comparison writing of patchwriting paragraph with the original source in PowerPoint slide. They asked all students whether it was acceptable or not. All students have varied answers; some students answered it's not acceptable to consider this case plagiarism, the others called it accidental plagiarism, and the rest called it patchwriting. After that, the researchers ask them to write with a source. As a result, 38% of them most strongly agreed that they did the accidental plagiarized, and 58% of them did not really understand how to work with the source before participating in this workshop. This might happen when students lack knowledge about how to avoid plagiarism and paraphrase well.

Doró (2018) classified patchwriting based on the size and borrowed word; *phrase-level patchwriting, sentence-level patchwriting,* and *text-level patchwriting*. The researcher investigated the level and proportion of copying those students did. In analyzing the data, the researcher compared the participants' writing with the original sources to find the level of borrowed words or the forms of patchwriting that participants did. As a result, each participant gave a different result in the form of patchwriting; there is heavy textual borrowing and only slightly adapted.

Many researchers have conducted research related to plagiarism, but it is still limited to patchwriting. There is one research about patchwriting in East Java, and the participants were fifth-semester students who took Academic Writing class. Because of consideration of the area of the research, the researcher wants to try doing the analysis of this patchwriting practice in Banda Aceh. This research is also interesting because sometimes when students try to avoid plagiarism, they unknowingly commit patchwriting. Because of that, the researcher wants to analyze the practice of patchwriting in students' academic writing to know the forms of patchwriting that most likely occur in students' writing.

There were some differences from the previous studies; most researchers were doing research to find the answer to students' strategies in avoiding plagiarism in their writing. In this research, the researcher wants to know the students' second plan in using the other strategies when they fail it before. With this, the researcher is interested in conducting research titled "Analysis of patchwriting practice in English Education

Department students' academic writing" at Ar-Raniry State Islamic University, Banda Aceh.

B. Research Questions

1. What forms of patchwriting most likely to occur in students' academic writing?
2. What strategies do students use to avoid patchwriting in students' academic writing?

C. Research Aim

1. To examine the forms of patchwriting of English Education students' academic writing.
2. To investigate the strategies of English Education students to avoid patchwriting in students' academic writing.

D. Significance of the Study

1. Students

It is expected that this research would be useful for all students who read this research and especially for EFL students. By finding the forms of patchwriting, students will be aware of differentiating various types of patchwriting and know how to paraphrase correctly.

2. Lecturers

After analyzing these findings, future educators and lecturers can straighten this problem to the students so that students will have a clearer understanding of paraphrasing, and fewer students did patchwriting or avoided plagiarism in their academic writing. Having a clearer understanding of what will bring students to the plagiarism cases will help students be more aware of how to paraphrase correctly.

3. Researcher

It is also essential for the researcher because, at the same time, the researcher can also learn how to avoid patchwriting and know more about any forms of it. Knowing more about the forms of patchwriting will help avoid academic dishonesty and produce good academic writing.

E. Research Terminologies

1. Patchwriting

Many students still do not know about the existence of patchwriting in the writing process. Students were more familiar with words; *plagiarism, and paraphrasing* in academic writing. When plagiarism means taking words or ideas from a source without put the source, patchwriting explains students already warned about plagiarism but still misuse sources (Pecorari, 2003). In addition, Ameer and Hussein (2015) mentioned that patchwriting happens when people try to deleting some words, modifying grammatical structure, and changing some words with the synonym. When

the students overuse the direct quotation, it will bring them to plagiarism. To avoid plagiarism, students paraphrase, which is to change the original idea with the same word. But, avoiding plagiarism and doing paraphrase not simple as that because there are many aspects that we have to pay attention to. Even writing requires good planning and organizing skills as well as paying attention to spelling, punctuation, and word (Muluk et al., 2022).

Howard (1992, as cited in Doró, 2017) defined patchwriting as "copying from a source text and then deleting some words, altering grammatical structures, or plugging in one-for-one synonym-substitutes" (p. 2). Similarly, Wools (2006, as cited in Ameer and Hussein, 2015) defined patchwriting as “being a sort of stitching techniques, selecting complete sentences or sections from different sources and stitching them together with one’s own writing” (p. 129). Students taking academic writing classes and having no experience in writing can be called novice writers, where they are not very familiar with academic writing and still need experience in that field. As Howard (1995) stated, patchwriting is a product of novice writers who still do not have enough experience with independent writing assignments in new discourses.

AR-RANIRY

2. Academic Writing

According to Akmal, Dahliana and Fadhila (2019), writing can be defined as a process of someone exploring their thoughts and feelings about a subject. Similarly, Komariyah (2015) stated that “writing is an effort to express the writer’s thinking,

feeling, or ideas in written form by considering writing aspects and writing stages to be clear understood by the readers." In the writing process, it is always important to take care of how the author can deliver good information clearly, and not complicated to read. That is why writing is not only about an idea, but it also contains the thoughts and feelings of the author.

According to Johnson (2016), academic writing is where people writing creatively in its own forms and functions because it has their own purpose in delivering ideas to the reader. Similarly, Bowker in Swarni (2017) has said, academic writing is a wide variety of writing genres that arrange its own set of rules and the applications itself. In the same way, Khadijah (2020) defined academic writing as "a type of script that has an educational purpose with particular rules" (p. 20). Writing a thesis itself is not easy, considering the many references that must be included in the writing. Considering something like technical writing, the types of writing, and achive the goal to present information in that writing.

Based on the definition above, it concludes that academic writing is a written paper with educational settings that frequently used for educational purposes by following the writing rules in any specific discipline.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter discuss about relevant theories related to the study, such as the definition of patchwriting, levels of patchwriting, the definition of academic writing, and types of academic writing.

A. Patchwriting

1. Definitions of Patchwriting

English Education department students can be said to be novice writers when they take academic writing to follow. At that time, they may have just been introduced to various terms related to writing. They were introduced to the terms plagiarism and paraphrasing because these are important things in writing. Rogerson and McCarthy (2017) mentioned in their study that in paraphrasing, authors are allowed to convey the same idea as the original source but in a different way. However, many of the students are not introduced to the term patchwriting, which can happen in the writing process.

Patchwriting is not the same as plagiarism, where the activities are carried out intentionally and consciously (Pecorari, 2003). Leung and Cheng (2017) defined plagiarism as an action that involves stealing someone else's work and making it their own. Khairunnisak (2018) also stated that plagiarism is the act of imitating someone else's ideas without citing the source and claiming that it is his/her own idea. While basically, the average people who do patchwriting are novice writers who do not have

writing experience. (Pecorari, 2003) also said that the writings of novice writers who are accidentally detected as patchwriting can become competent academic writers when they have the desire and always trying to develop their writing skills. While other authors, Li and Casanave (2012) argued that patchwriting is just an indication of novice writers that were still learning to understand the concept of paraphrasing, that is, using the same ideas but in different ways.

Research by Kumalasari (2018) mentioned that there are three things that lead students to do patchwriting. First, when students try to avoid plagiarism by omitting some words from the original sentences. The second thing is when students try to change a few words with the synonym and have the closest meaning to the original words without making any further changes. The third thing is when students try to mix or restructure the original sentence to make it a little bit different.

2. Level of Patchwriting

In Doró's (2017) study, there were three patchwriting differences based on the size: *phrase-level patchwriting, sentence-level patchwriting, and text-level patchwriting*. The first type of patchwriting is *phrase-level*, where there are more than 3-word strings that are not changed from the original phrase and should have been paraphrased. The second is *sentence-level*; it happens when the writer copies the complete sentence with minimal changes such as adding structure or conjunctions. The last is text or discourse level patchwriting, and this occurs when the author copies sentence in sequences, even to paragraphs with very few changes.

Similarly described in another study by Doró (2018), there are four levels of patchwriting; *phrase-level patchwriting, sentence-level patchwriting, text-level patchwriting, and extended-level patchwriting*. The three levels are the same as in her previous research, and there was only one additional level in this study, namely *extended-level patchwriting*. *Extended-patchwriting* is a writing strategy that is also similar to the other levels of patchwriting. *Extended-patchwriting* happens when students try to change four words or longer from original sources but still with the same paragraph and have the same length.

Meanwhile, Kumalasari (2018) has different finding of the various levels of patchwriting, with six categories:

1. Word-level patchwriting: This category occurs when students try to add, delete, or change some words with the synonym of the word in a sentence.
2. Phrase-level patchwriting: This is the level of patchwriting when students try to construct or delete the additional phrase(s) into their writing.
3. Clause-level patchwriting: It is a level where the student tries to modify the clause by adding a new clause in their writing or deleting the previous one.
4. Text-level patchwriting: This category occurs when students try to create the modification by adding some new sentences, omitting some sentences, and replacing the several parts in the paragraph.
5. Combination-level patchwriting: It happened when students combined the category of patchwriting into their writing.

6. No changes-level patchwriting: This happens when the student decides not to make any changes, and the result is their writing having the same order as the original source.

As in addition, Kumalasari (2018) also try to find the answer to how students make patchwriting in their academic writing. The results are that there are five types of how students do the patchwriting; copying directly, changing words (synonym), omitting, changing grammar, and combining.

In this research, Kumalasari (2018) made a codebook for these types of patchwriting to help the researcher be more systematic in coding the data. There are DC for copying directly, WC for changing the word, OM for omitting, GC for changing grammar, and CO for combining. As a result, most of the students used *combination-level* when doing the patchwriting, and the combination mainly was at *phrase-level* and *clause-level*.

In comparison, plagiarism also has similar levels. Fish and Hura (2013) differentiates plagiarism into four types:

- Using ideas from another author's work and not citing the source
- Using phrases from another author's work and not citing the source
- Using sentences/paragraphs from another author's work and not citing the source
- Submitting an entire document by another author as your own work

Other than that, Vieyra et al. (2013) mentioned that the types of plagiarism are divided into four types: direct copy, word change, grammar change, and complex

plagiarism. They explained that direct copy, also called verbatim copy, is when someone is copying word for word from the original source directly. While word change is when people copy the idea word by word too, they also make some changes by replacing some words with synonyms. Then there is a grammar change when the writer tries to rearrange the sentence structure from the original source and change the grammar structure. Then the last one is complex plagiarism. The author has tried to avoid plagiarism in the three ways above, but most of the sentences can still be detected because of copying or not giving citations.

Meanwhile, Kumar, Priya, Musalaiah & Nagasree (2014) have different opinions about various types of plagiarism; he mentioned that plagiarism is done intentionally and unintentionally. According to them, intentional plagiarism occurs when someone uses all or part of another person's work but does not give proper credit as a sign that it is someone else's work. While when someone tries to avoid plagiarism by paraphrasing, but it was done incorrectly, it leads to unintentional plagiarism.

B. Academic Writing

1. Definitions of Academic Writing

Writing is one of the most important aspects of learning a language, especially in the academic field. According to Akkaya and Aydın (2018), academic writing is one step in the process of academic research, in which it is reported about the situation from the thought, experience, observation, and applications/tests of the researchers. Writing skills are very important because when a researcher has a lacks of writing

ability in academic writing, it would be difficult for the researcher as he would not be able to report his research findings properly (Zulfikar, 2020). Singh (2016) add that academic writing is important because that is one of the productive skills that is essential in settling academic success.

Similarly, Al Badi (2015) mentioned that academic writing is a complicated process because, in the process, it comprises some aspects which are the foundation to write good academic writing. Other than that, academic writing is challenging for EFL students because they are constrained by their lack of understanding of the language and the different languages from their community (Fageeh & Mekheimer, 2013).

2. Types of Academic Writing

Based on Hussain (2019), academic writing is divided into several types:

a. Essays

An academic essay fundamentally is a presentation of the author's idea in writing an essay. The average academic essay length is about five paragraphs that have a set of rules which should contain an introduction part, body, and conclusion.

b. Term Paper

Under essay, there is a term paper, a learner who prepares to write a full-term research paper. A rule for a term paper should have 1-3 references per page.

c. Research Paper

The differences between the term paper and the research paper are that the academic study is carried out in a research paper and expresses a writer's idea insight of others. The length of the research paper is at least eight pages, and it also concludes with some references.

d. Dissertation/Thesis

Dissertation/Thesis is one of the terms of the university for their students to graduate. Hussain also said that a dissertation/thesis is like an academic book. It is more academic than a research paper, and it is written based on a hypothesis before the writer sets the thesis. The author must present all questions and solve the study's research question.

جامعة الرانري
AR-RANIRY

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the description of the research design, research participants, method of data collection, and method of data analysis.

A. Research Design

A qualitative approach is the most suitable approach for this research. In qualitative research, the instrument that validates is the researcher himself. It can be by researchers' understanding of qualitative research methods, mastery of the material, and researchers' readiness to observe the research objects (Sugiyono, 2013). In this case, the researcher analyzes information from the data (a form of words or text) from the participants' documents and interviews with the participants.

The most appropriate research design for this case is the case study to answer all of the research questions. Zulfikar (2020) defined a case study as one of the research methodologies by researchers to conduct an in-depth exploration of something in an individual or group of people. The researcher used this type of research design because this type will investigate a phenomenon in a real-world context. The purpose was to tell the reader about the analysis of a case or some cases conducted in research.

B. Research Participants

The researcher used purposive sampling in determining the participants, by provide several criteria in this study. According to Klar and Leeper (2019), purposive sampling is a condition in which the selection of participants is subjectively. Andrade (2021) defined purposive sampling as a sample that determines the criteria that is related to the purpose of the study.

The researcher analyzed five students' proposals. The researcher needs students from the English Language Education Department of the Ar-Raniry State Islamic University of Banda Aceh to be interviewed. The criteria for being the participants were:

1. English Education Department students' class of 2018
2. Students who already passed the Seminar Proposal from odd and even semesters of 2021/2022
3. The students whose Academic Writing score was A-/A

The researcher deliberately set these specific criteria to find specific participants. The researcher set the first criteria, by finfing students' class of 2018 because they were students who were in the process of writing thesis when the research was conducted. The second criteria were prepared so that researchers could analyze the writings they have presented at the proposal seminar. The third criteria were prepared to make the population smaller and the researcher will get specific participants who meet all the criteria for their writing to be analyzed, and to be interviewed.

C. Methods of Data Collection

In doing this research, the researcher doing Document Analysis and Interviews as the methods of data collection. The researcher chose document analysis as the method of data collection to find the first research question, and the interview was the other method to answer the second research question.

1. Document Analysis

Owen (2014) defined that "Documents can provide background information prior to designing the research project, for example prior to conducting interviews" (p. 8). In this research, the researcher focused on analyzing the form of patchwriting committed by students in their proposal by using Turnitin as a tool to check the patchwriting. Based on research conducted by Hunt and Tompkins (2014), some faculty members from several universities believe that they prefer Turnitin over other websites to detect plagiarism. This is because they believe that Turnitin can detect more plagiarism with a more intuitive design that makes it easier to navigate.

In collecting the data, the researcher conducted several steps to do. The procedures of the data collection instrument were conducted by asking permission to the English Education Department to get the data and analyzed students' proposal. First, to answer the first research questions, the researcher asked the Department of English Education to find the data. After getting the data, the researcher determined which research paper possibly commits patchwriting using Turnitin, as the plagiarism checker

software. From this process, the researcher chose five research papers that was committed as patchwriting to be analyzed later for this research. Third, in analyzing phases, the researcher tried to find out and classified the forms of patchwriting that mostly occur in students' proposal thesis. In this research, the researcher focused on the total proposal; these are chapter I, Chapter II, and Chapter III.

2. Interview

Interview were conducted as one of the research tools that help the researcher to get answers to the research. Griffee (2018) defined an interview as a research tool that has a purpose and a clear form whose content is about conversations between people or groups whose purpose is to find data to be analyzed. After finding out and analyzed the data, the researcher interviewed the author of the proposal to answer the second research question about what strategies they will use to adopt better writing strategies. Before the interview process, the researcher asked the participants' willingness to be interviewed. Because when the participants do not want to be interviewed, the researcher cannot analyze their proposal and cannot find their strategies after committing their writing as a patchwriting case.

The researcher used a semi-structured interview, so the answer is not just focused on the written and prepared questions. Because in the interview process, the interviewer needs more information in detail about the participants' thoughts and feelings. In addition, by using a semi-structured interview, the interviewer have more

flexibility in asking some new information whose questions were not included in the list of interview questions, but still on the related topic.

The interviews were conducted through telephone due to the distance between the interviewer and the participants. Also, due to the conditions where it is a little bit hard to find a good internet network to do an online interview with the participants. The researcher prepared an audio recorder to record the interview between the interviewees and the researcher. At first, the researcher introduced herself and explained the purpose of their interview. After that, the researcher explained the interview material, it was about patchwriting. Then, asked some prepared questions to get the answer from the interviewees.

There were some questions related to this research that the researcher asked the interviewees:

1. Do you know what plagiarism is? Can you mention it?
2. Do you think avoiding plagiarism while still in the proposal writing stage (not final) is important? Why?
3. Do you think the activity of writing and thinking about strategies to avoid plagiarism at the same time is difficult? Why?
4. From 1 to 5, how hard do you think it is to avoid plagiarism?
5. Are you sure that the way you paraphrase is correct and helps a lot in reducing the level of plagiarism in your writing? Why?
6. Have you ever paraphrased by replacing some words with their synonyms without making further changes? How often you did it?

7. Have you ever paraphrased by adding or deleting some words from the original sources without making further changes? How often you did it?

8. Do you know what patchwriting is?

9. After you know what patchwriting is, do you feel that there are patchwriting cases in your proposal thesis? Why?

10. Can you tell me what strategy you will take to avoid that patchwriting case in your future writing?

D. Method of Data Analysis

1. Document Analysis

The first procedure that the researcher used in analyzing was document analysis. The data obtained by the researcher from English Education Department, then chose some part to be checked in a trusted software plagiarism checker, Turnitin. After that, the researcher looked for the result of the participants writing from the plagiarism checker. The researcher tried to read and analyzed the paper carefully to select which part is committed as patchwriting. To find the right part to be analyzed, the researcher already marked some paragraphs or sentences and checks quotations and references from students' papers to find the original source. After that, the researcher tried to find the original source from the internet where students get those ideas or those writing by using Turnitin. When looking for original sources, it is time to determine

the data that have been analyzed because there were several paragraphs written using the correct paraphrase too.

After collected all of the chosen parts of the writing and the original sources, researcher detect findings in the form of patchwriting formats that mostly appear in student proposals. The researcher took some parts that can be used as samples to compare student writing (which is detected as patchwriting) with the original source.

2. Interview

The researcher used thematic analysis as a method in analyzing the interview transcript. According to Braun et al. (2012), defined "Thematic analysis (TA) is a method for identifying, analyzing, and interpreting patterns of meaning ('themes') within qualitative data" (p. 297).

Based on those patterns, the researcher used this type of analysis for the interview transcripts. Interview conducted with the students who have written the proposal, by help the researcher answer another research question related to the finding data. The purpose was to find further information about their strategies related to their writing which detected as patchwriting. The researcher tried to analyze the information from the participants and connect it with the result of the participants' writing. The process of analysis was done by checked carefully, one by one the answers from the participants.

جامعة الرانري
AR-RANIRY

CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter discussed about the findings and discussion of the first and the second research question from this research. The document analysis was carried out to answer the first research question, while the interview was conducted to answer the second research question.

A. Research Findings

1. Forms of patchwriting committed by the students

To answer the first research questions, the researcher presented table 4.1 as the findings of patchwriting forms. In this study, the forms of patchwriting were divided into six levels: *word-level*, *phrase-level*, *clause-level*, *text-level*, *combination-level*, and *no changes-level*. The results of the study will be explained in more detail in the table below.

Table 4. 1

The findings of patchwriting forms committed by the students

No.	Level of Patchwriting	The Number of Finding	Participants' Seminar Proposal
1.	Word Level	48	• 3 patchwriting forms were from A's Seminar Proposal • 15 forms were found in B's Seminar Proposal • 9 were from C's Seminar Proposal • 10 were from D's Seminar Proposal • 11 were from E's Seminar Proposal

2.	Phrase Level	6	• 1 form was found from A's Seminar Proposal • 2 patchwriting forms were from B's Seminar Proposal • 1 was found in C's Seminar Proposal • 1 was from D's Seminar Proposal • Another was from E's Seminar Proposal
3.	Clause Level	4	• 1 form was found from A's Seminar Proposal • 1 was found from B's Seminar Proposal • 1 was found from C's Seminar Proposal • 2 patchwriting forms were found from E's Seminar Proposal
4.	Text Level	1	• It was found in B's Seminar Proposal
5.	Combination Level	11	• 1 was found from A's Seminar Proposal • 1 patchwriting form was found from B's Seminar Proposal • 2 were found in C's Seminar Proposal • 6 forms were found in D's Seminar Proposal • Another from was from E's Seminar Proposal
6.	No Changes Level	19	• 1 pathcwriting form was found from A's Seminar Proposal • 1 was found in B's Seminar Proposal • 3 were found from C's Seminar Proposal • 14 were from E's Seminar Proposal

As the researcher mentioned before, the researcher used document analysis to analyze forms of patchwriting cases that appear on the proposal of English Education Department student who is still in the process of writing a thesis. The following extract shows that the student's proposal was detected as patchwriting. Based on the research findings, the researcher found various forms of patchwriting cases. The various forms were *word-level*, *phrase-level*, *clause-level*, *text-level*, *combination-level*, and *no-changes level*.

a. Word Level

According to Kumalasari (2018), mostly, this patchwriting level is a level that does not change the sentence structure that much. It is because, at the *word-level*, students only change one or more words with the synonym without further changes. For example, participant B in table 4.2 modified the *word-level* by replacing one word with the synonym without any further changes in that one sentence.

Table 4. 2

Extract of patchwriting form from participant B

Patchwriting work	Original Work	Source
Therefore, validity refers to the suitability between a test as an instrument of measurement and the domain of what it is supposed to measure.	**Consequently,** validity refers to the suitability between a test as an instrument of measurement and the domain of what it is supposed to measure.	A journal entitled "Validity and Reliability of English Summative Test for Senior High School"

Table 4.2. shows that participant B took a full sentence from a journal entitled "Validity and Reliability of English Summative Test for Senior High School" and then changed the word "Consequently" with "Therefore" which has the same meaning. The next table presents the *word-level* patchwriting from participant D.

Table 4. 3

Extract of patchwriting form from participant D

Patchwriting Work	Original Work	Source
Another study was **conducted** by Naulan Millatina (2016) **regarding** the **application** of guided questioning techniques in improving students' writing skills on narrative texts **in** secondary schools in Indrapuri.	Another study was **held** by Naulan Millatina (2016) **about** the **implementation** of guided-question technique in improving students' writing skill on narrative text **at a** secondary school in Indrapuri.	A thesis entitled "Using Guiding-Question Technique in Teaching English Writing (An Experimental Study at MTsN 4 Banda Aceh)

The extract in table 4.3 shows that participant D took a sentence from the same thesis from the UIN Ar-Raniry repository and put the citation the same as the original author wrote it. Here, participant D tried to paraphrase the sentences from the original source by replacing some words with their synonyms, deleting some words, and also adding a few words to make it different.

From the examples above, it can be concluded that participants B, and D committed patchwriting in the form of *word-level*. As mentioned before in chapter 2, the *word-level* is when students modify a sentence by changing the word with the synonym, deleting, or adding some words without further changes.

b. Phrase Level

According to Kumalasari (2018), *phrase-level* is when students modify the phrase from the original writing by deleting unnecessary phrases or adding new phrases. For example, participant A copied a sentence from a journal entitled "Learning Evaluation using Work Preparation in Turning Machine Process Lessons." The changes can be seen in table 4.4.

Table 4. 4

Extract of patchwriting form from participant A

Patchwriting Work	Original Work	Source
To find out aspects of **students'** weaknesses in **carrying out** learning activities.	**Knowing** aspects of students weaknesses in **teaching** and learning activities.	Journal entitled "Learning Evaluation using Work Preparation in Turning Machine Process Lessons"

Participant A tried to paraphrase this sentence by changing a word with a new phrase in the beginning and in the middle of the sentence. The purpose of this action is to make a slight change, but unfortunately, Turnitin can still detect the similarity of the sentence.

Table 4. 5

Extract of patchwriting form from participant D

Patchwriting Work	Original Work	Source
Achievement tests measure mastery and proficiency in **various fields** of knowledge (Ary **et al., 2009).**	Achievement tests measure mastery and proficiency in **a different area** of knowledge (Donal Ary**, 2010).**	A thesis entitled "Developing Students' Vocabulary Through Short Story in Rural Area"

Table 4.4. and table 4.5. provides evidence that both participant B and participant D tried to avoid plagiarism by putting the citation and paraphrasing the sentence. It is

supported by Doró (2017), who said that *phrase-level* happens where there are more than 3-word strings that are not changed from the original phrase and should have been paraphrased. Therefore, Turnitin still can detect where the participant got the idea because the whole structure of the sentence was still the same.

c. Clause Level

Based on research by Kumalasari (2018), *clause-level* is when the student tries to modify the clause by adding a new clause in their writing or deleting the previous one.

Table 4. 6

Extract of patchwriting form from participant E

Patchwriting Work	Original Work	Source
This study will provide some useful information for students, as information on reading comprehension strategies that can improve their ability to understand the text. The teacher may benefit from a prediction strategy to improve students' understanding of the text. While researcher, as an information or contribution to other researchers who will conduct more complex research.	**The result of this research to** students, as information on reading comprehension strategies that can improve their ability to understand the text. The teacher may benefit from a prediction strategy to improve students' understanding of the text. While researcher, as an information or contribution to other researchers who will conduct more complex research.	A thesis entitled "The Implementation of Prediction Strategy in Improving Students' Reading Comprehension on English Recount Text"

From the table above, participant E made a new paragraph by adding a new clause at the beginning of the sentence. Although she tried to make a great change in the beginning, she copied the rest of the sentences. Because of that, Turnitin caught

this part as plagiarism and detected it as *clause-level* of patchwriting because the participant had tried to paraphrase it.

d. Text Level

According to Doró (2017), *text-level* occurs when the author copies sentence in sequences, even paragraphs with very few changes. This table below is an example of the form of text level from participant B:

Table 4. 7

Extract of patchwriting form from participant B

Patchwriting Work	Original Work	Source
Then the researcher creates a rubric containing the points about the syllabus and lesson plan. **Then** analyzing each item **of English summative test** made by the teacher. **Next,** matching each item with a table created by the **researcher. After the data is collected, the researcher will count** the number of checklists on the research sheet and **calculate** the average number of percentages of **the result of** research sheet.	Creating a table containing material derived from syllabus and lesson plan; 1. Analyzing each item made by the teacher; 2. Matching each item with a table created by the writer; 3. **Counting** the number of checklist on the research sheet; and 4. **Calculating** the average number of percentages of those testined on the research sheet.	A thesis entitled "The Analysis of The Teacher-Made Test for Senior High School"

It is the only example of a patchwriting case in the form of *text-level* from all participants. Participant B tried to paraphrase from the other author, which was written

using the list of numbers. To make it different, participant B made it in a paragraph, added some conjunctions, but the entire idea was still the same.

e. Combination Level

Kumalasari (2018), in her research, said that students did not work only on one level in their writing. They use more than one level to modify their writing as an effort to paraphrase the idea. Students could use two levels of patchwriting and combine them into one, but also, some students used three levels simultaneously.

Table 4. 8

Extract of patchwriting form from participant C

Patchwriting Work	Original Work	Source
So, it can be concluded that vocabulary is a **set** of words used by people or fields including the context in a certain language.	**From the definitions above,** it can be concluded that vocabulary is a **collection** of words used by people or field including the context in a certain language.	A thesis entitled "Improving Students' Vocabulary Mastery Through Audio-Visualized Narrative Text"

The table above is the evidence that participant C did a *combination-level*. The combination is between *word-level* and *phrase-level*. At the beginning of the sentence, participant C deleted a phrase and added 'So' there. Also, in the same sentence, participant C changed a word with a synonym which is the form of *word-level* patchwriting.

Table 4. 9

Extract of patchwriting form from participant C

Patchwriting Work	Original Work	Source

The other definition was stated by Ur (1996: 60), **who** said that vocabulary is one of **the** crucial things to be taught in learning a foreign language because it will be impossible to speak up without a variety of words.	**In addition, it is supported** by Ur (1996:60) that vocabulary is one of **important** things to be taught in learning foreign language because it will be impossible to speak up without variety of words.	A journal entitled "The Effect of Applying Probing Prompting Method on the Students' Achievement in Vocabulary"

The table above shows the combination between *clause-level* and *word-level*. It comes to clause level because we can see at the beginning of the sentence that participant C changed the original writing by adding a new clause. Participant C also took the citation, which means she does not intend to plagiarism, and she already made an effort to paraphrase, but it is not going well.

f. No Changes Level

Kumalasari (2018) stated that there were no differences among students writing with the original source at *no changes-level*. The student chose to copy the sentence or the text directly and did not put any effort such as adding, deleting, replacing, or paraphrasing it. The table below shows the no changes-level written by participant E.

Table 4. 10

Extract of patchwriting form from participant E

Patchwriting Work	Original Work	Source
According to Farrel, A. L. (2016), prediction is a strategy to activate prior knowledge. Prediction creates anticipation and gets students to think about previous	According to Farrel, A. L. (2016), prediction is a strategy to activate prior knowledge. Prediction creates anticipation and gets students	A thesis entitled "The Implementation of Prediction Strategy in Improving Students' Reading Comprehension on English Recount Text"

experiences they might have had about the subject before they read about it. It is a fact that good readers used prediction as they continue to read the story by seeking to confirm or adjust earlier intuitions on the subject. So, predicting is working both before and during reading.	to think about previous experiences they might hav e had about the subject before they read about it. It is a fact that good readers used prediction as they continue to read the story by seeking to confirm or adjust earlier intuitions on the subject. So, predicting is working both before and during reading.	

The table was taken from Participant E's writing. There were no differences from the source, even the way the original author put the citation was exactly the same.

There was another example of *no changes-level* of patchwriting from participant E.

Table 4. 11

Extract of patchwriting form from participant E

Patchwriting Work	Original Work	Source
LRD is a comprehension strategy that builds students' prior knowledge before they read a text, during reading and after reading by listening the teacher's short lecture, reading **atext** selection, and discussing to increase their science inquiry strategies, **comprehensionrather** than reading alone (Manzo and	LRD is a comprehension strategy that builds students' prior knowledge before they read a text, during reading and after reading by listening the teacher's short lecture, reading **a-text** selection, and discussing to increase their science inquiry strategies, **comprehension-rather** than reading alone (Manzo and	A journal entitled "Improving Students' Reading Comprehension Through Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) Strategy"

Rasinki, 2008; Burns, 2010; McKenna, 2002).	Rasinki, 2008; Burns, 2010; McKenna, 2002).

The table above was a unique case. The sentence in participant E's table was completely copied from a journal entitled "Improving Students' Reading Comprehension Through Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) Strategy," but Turnitin does not highlight some words in it. It is because participant E wrote miswritten words, which made it look different. Where actually, it is not really an effort to paraphrase, it is just a typo or miswritten that could have been unintentional by participant E.

2. Students' strategies to avoid patchwriting

After interviewed the participants, the researcher received some information about strategies English Education students could use to avoid patchwriting in academic writing. From the results of the interviews, participants said that they were not aware that they had done it before, but there were strategies that would be taken to avoid patchwriting cases. Those strategies were:

a. Learning more deeply about paraphrasing

As mentioned in the previous chapter, how far students know how to paraphrase well will greatly influence whether to be detected by patchwriting case or not. According to Wood et al. (2018), patchwriting cases might happen when students lack knowledge about how to paraphrase well. When this happens, it brings students to this case, closely paraphrasing or patchwriting. Most of the participants stated that after knowing the existence of patchwriting, they should learn deeply about paraphrasing.

Now they realize that paraphrasing is not as simple as replacing words with synonyms. As participant B stated:

> Previously, I had learned that if used synonyms was one of the techniques for paraphrasing. So, I think that technique can make a good paraphrase. But now I just found out that it is not simple as that, this method can still bring us to the patchwriting actions.

Participant E mentioned her strategies after knowing the existence of patchwriting:

> I think I should learn more about paraphrase deeply, because the problem here is the way we paraphrased. Try to find out which one is the best way to do a good and correct paraphrase. We have to study harder and deeper, because I think sometimes the way I paraphrase sentences was still wrong.

Participant D also stated:

> If we have a lot of vocabulary, it will definitely help us in develop our writing. So maybe it will help us in making a good paraphrase.

From the participants' answers, the researcher can see that some participants agreed to understand how to paraphrase more deeply. According to them, this strategy will be very helpful because previously, their knowledge of paraphrasing was very low, and it will help them reduce the patchwriting level.

b. Using translation techniques

Based on the answer of the participants, most of them said using translation technique will help them a lot in avoiding patchwriting. It is because by using translation technique between one or more language, will bring a totally differences between the text in first language and to the second language. Participant A shared her thought about her strategy:

> There is also a translation technique. In the past, I used a strategy like that when there wasn't much time left and there were a lot of unfinished writings. I'm thinking about it too, I'll keep try to translate what the original author said first, then compare it later. If it's still had the same structure, I try to understand about it again, and write it down. Yes, I'm thinking about search a journal from Indonesian, then translate it into English, or vice versa.

Participant B also stated the strategy she will use to avoid patchwriting. She stated that:

> Em… For me, because this is English, which is a foreign language, when I first read the sentence, I had to really understand its meaning. For example, maybe I will use a translation technique which is go to google translate to see the Indonesian language first, then from that Indonesian language I will try to understand, and thinking of the meaning of it. After that, from there I just concluded or pointed the main idea of the sentence. Then later I will try to make another sentence in English language, by my own language.

Another participant stated a similar answer. As participant C said:

> Maybe this strategy is not very good, but in my personal opinion, the strategy that might be used is like this. If there is a text or sentence in English, I will try to translate it into Indonesian first, so when the text is already in Indonesian, I will translate it again into English. The result were will be more words are changed.

Moreover, participant D also provided a similar answer about trying to read a journal from another language and translate it into English or vice versa. It can be concluded that using the translation technique will help students to avoid patchwriting because the structure of the sentences will change, and also it will help change some words so that the words in that sentence are more varied but still have the same idea.

c. Understanding text before writing

Although this method is very familiar in avoiding plagiarism, this strategy is still important to do. This is because patchwriting exists. After all, students often

underestimate paraphrasing, so many refuse to try to understand every sentence used as a reference in academic writing. Whereas trying to understand the text before writing is the most effective way to make a good paraphrase. As participant A mentioned:

> My supervisor had given me advice how to paraphrase, by trying not to read the journal or research paper at the same time when we revise our writing. So, give one day to read and understand or take notes, then, just stop it, and after a day or two days later, try to write and continue the revision.
>
> Then, Um… If I am personally, I will write it down first the idea before moving on to the my writing. I try to write it first like having a note taking, trying so hard to understand about it, connect it with my own ideas and I'll write it down by my own language.

Participant C also agreed that in avoiding patchwriting, students better understand the idea from the references they read:

> I will read the first text, and readjust with my understanding again, maybe by summarizing the sentences, or looking for words that are more suit the idea, because maybe there are words that don't match each other.

d. Practicing more often

Another strategy that will be very helpful is practicing. When students infrequently practice in write academic writing, it will keep them feel unfamiliar with academic vocabulary and bring them easily to patchwriting cases. In line with Kumalasari (2018), one of the factors that cause patchwriting is lack of practice. However, patchwriting is often done by novice writers. The reason is that novice writer does not have much writing experience. As participant D said:

> The strategy will be read a lot, increase to collect vocabularies, write often, that's all.

Similarly, participant B shared her opinion related to her paraphrasing ability. She said that:

> In my opinion, e… I still have to keep learning. I mean, I can't say it's good, I still have to practice more often.

In this case, only two participants mentioned practicing more often to avoid patchwriting.

3. Students' Patchwriting Experience

The case of patchwriting was closely related to the way how students paraphrase. Through interviewed, researcher asked about how students experienced patchwriting, which they did unconsciously. Most students know what plagiarism is, but they did not know patchwriting also exists. Before asking about the patchwriting itself, the researcher asked about their confidence in how they paraphrase while writing a proposal. The result is most of them felt not really confident about the way they paraphrase. As participant A has said:

> Em… if it is about writing a proposal, I think I'm still not confident enough. The point is I'm still not confident about how to paraphrase it well.

Participant D also has the same thought:

> Actually, if you ask me I'm sure or not, it's fifty-fifty. Because… I'm not too sure if it's a correct way or not, it's just seems like it can reduce plagiarism.

In addition, participant E mentioned that she often uses tools like google translate or free paraphrasing apps. She said:

> Not sure, uh… I mean half of it. Because when I try to paraphrase, I sometimes use google translate, or a free paraphrase application.

From these participants' answer, the researcher can conclude that the reason why student did patchwriting was because their lack of knowledge about paraphrasing. They feeling not confident enough related to their understanding of how to do a good paraphrase and reduce the plagiarism well.

The researcher also asked the participants about their experience in paraphrasing with minimal efforts, such as changing some words with synonyms, so they unconsciously committed patchwriting. Participant B did it quite often, she said:

> Yes, I have. Honestly, when I'm tired, when my mind is stuck, I could say I often do this technique. Yes, quite often.

Participant C also has the same thought:

> Yes, I have. It is when there are long sentences but not all of them have synonyms, so if not every word can be replaced, I just replace a few words that match.

Not in line with participants B and C, participants D and E did not very often change any words with the synonym in paraphrasing. It was also different from participant A who admitted that she never felt like doing this kind of patchwriting.

Other than that, the researcher also asked about the participant's experience in committed patchwriting by deleting or adding some words while paraphrasing. Participant C admitted that she did it sometimes, she said:

> If after deleting the words, and adding new ones, I did it sometimes.

In line with participant C, even though at first participant E felt not sure, but she claimed that she did it sometimes, her answer was:

> Uh, not rarely, but sometimes. Because in paraphrase I often use google translate.

Another participant has a similar experience. Participants A, B, and D stated that they rarely did this kind of patchwriting. It can be concluded that students just added or deleted some words when they needed them to be deleted or added. It was because they do not really think much about how they paraphrase, what matters is that the writing they changed is different from the original source.

About the patchwriting itself, all 5 participants have the same answer. They did not know what patchwriting was and had never heard about it before. After the researcher explained about patchwriting broadly, the researcher asked the participants if they felt that there was a case of patchwriting in the proposals they had written. Participant A mentioned:

> Hm… if it is in the proposal e… yes, there are. Actually, because I don't know anything about patchwriting… But after I remembered again when I was taking the guidance with the supervisor, she also once said that e… Actually, she didn't say this to me to avoid patchwriting. But from the advice she gave to me, it's like she caught me that I've done patchwriting, so she gave some suggestions for that.

Similarly, participant B has the same opinion:

> After looking back on my memory, it seems like… yes, there was, and I think I had done patchwriting.

The other participants, such as participants C, D, and E, had the same answer. They felt like they did it in their academic writing, it is when they wrote their proposal. After knowing about the patchwriting itself, it can be concluded that all the participants admitted that they committed patchwriting while writing the proposal.

B. Discussion

As mentioned in Chapter I, the purpose of this research was to know what forms of patchwriting most likely occur in students' academic writing and to investigate students' strategies to avoid patchwriting. In this research, the academic writings that have been analyzed were student proposals containing chapter I, chapter II, and chapter III.

There were 5 participants who took part in this study, and all were female. To collect the data, the researcher used document analysis and interview. Document analysis is the instrument used to answer the first research question, and interview is an instrument used to answer the second research question. In this discussion part, the researcher discussed more deeply about the finding data that has been collected.

To get the answer to the first research question, the researcher used Turnitin as a plagiarism checker tool that helped identify the plagiarism and the source where the student copied the writing. According to Garba (2017), in recent years, Turnitin has already gotten trusted by many universities as a web-based software that collects over 24 million archived web pages, published books and journals, textbooks, newspapers, and digital thesis. It means that there is no doubt about the result of Turnitin.

The first table provided in the research finding answered the first research question. Evidently, from 5 different proposals, there were 6 forms of patchwriting. They were *word level*, *phrase level*, *clause level*, *text level*, *combination level*, and *no changes level*. This finding is similar to the research by Kumalasari (2018) who

compared students writing with the original sources and investigated how do the students make patchwriting in their paraphrases in academic writing.

From the data, the most common form was *word-level*, which was found in 48 cases. The second position was the form of *no-changes level*, which was found as many as 19 cases. The third form that appears the most in the proposals of all participants was the *combination-level*, with 11 cases. Then, followed by *phrase-level*, which was found in 6 cases, the *clause-level* found in 4 cases, and the last was *text-level* which was found only 1 case.

In the form of *word-level*, 48 cases were found. All participants' proposals analyzed were detected in *word-level* patchwriting cases. *Word-level* is a case of patchwriting where the writer tries to paraphrase with minimal effort. The effort was like replacing some words with synonyms and adding or deleting some words. From the finding data, most of the *word-level* forms were found in the proposals written by participant B. It can be seen in table 4.2. that only 1 word was changed between the original writing and the writing that the participants had tried to paraphrase. It is supported from the previous study written by Kumalasari (2018) which also found this level of patchwriting and mentioned that this modification does not have a great effect on the sentence's composition, so it is easy to be done. It can be concluded that *word-level* form is the simplest form of patchwriting, so writers most often do it in writing.

The second form that appears the most is *no-changes level*, which is 19 cases. *No-changes* occur when writers copy and paste other people's writings without paraphrasing but still provide the source or the citation. In this form, 14 cases were

found in the proposals written by participant E. The proof can be seen in table 4.10 and table 4.11, both have the same form. Participant E copied the long sentence and its citation, hoping that the writing was not detected as plagiarism. However, taking someone else's idea without paraphrasing or making it into a direct quote will result in plagiarism. Despite giving citations, Turnitin still considers it plagiarism. Also supported by Kumalasari (2018), she found *no-changes level* in students writing where the whole parapgrahp does not change but the writer still put the citation. It can be concluded that students were detected as *no-changes level* not because they planned to plagiarize but because they thought that providing citations without making any other changes was enough.

The *combination-level* form occupies the third position, and there were 11 cases. Combination-level is a type of patchwriting that contains 2 or more forms of patchwriting, for example, *word level* and *phrase level*. 6 cases of *combination level* were written by participant C, one of which can be seen in table 4.9 where participant D did a *combination-level* between *clause-level* and *word level*. It can be concluded that in this form, the author shows his intention and effort in paraphrasing by making some changes. Supported by Kumalasari (2018), she also found this type of patchwriting in her research by finding the *combination-level* between the *clause-level* and *word-level*.

Fourth place is the *phrase-level,* which found as many as 6 cases. *Phrase-level* itself is a modification of patchwriting by adding or deleting phrases. There are 1 case of *phrase-level* in participant A's proposal, which can be seen in table 4.4. Participant

A changes the phrase in her writing so that there is a change that we can see. Similar to *phrase-level*, only 4 *clause-level* cases were found in all participant proposals. 1 of them was found in participant E's proposal, which can be seen in table 4.6. by adding a new clause at the beginning of the sentence. From this, it can be concluded that based on the type of *phrase-level* and *clause-level*, students do not use this form too much.

The last one is the *text-level*, the researcher found only 1 case in participant B's proposal. *Text-level* is where the modifications made by the author with copying sentences in sequence or even paragraphs, with very few changes. Here, participant B changed the sentence structure. From the original sequence and using numbers, it was changed to be in the form of paragraphs. It can be concluded that although there were many changes that we can see, the sentence can still be detected by Turnitin because the paraphrasing effort is still minimal. This finding is similar to Doró (2017) who examined the changes made by students to their patchwritten thesis section. They also found students' writing that detected as *text-level* in patchwriting case,

For the second research question, researchers found 4 strategies students can use to avoid patchwriting. These strategies were found from the results of interviews conducted with 5 participants who had written the proposals that the researchers analyzed before. The strategies were learning more deeply about paraphrasing, using translation techniques, understanding the text before writing, and practicing more often.

The first strategy was to learn more deeply about paraphrasing. 3 out of 5 participants stated that they were aware of the importance of knowing the correct way

to paraphrase. Because, based on their experience, the participants themselves were still not sure about the paraphrasing they did.

The second strategy was to use the translation technique. All participants agreed that the translation technique helped them avoid patchwriting. Because if we compare the sentence structure between 2 different languages, it was definitely different. Most of the participants did the translation between English and Indonesian, so according to the participants, this would be very helpful in paraphrasing with no small changes.

The third strategy was to understand the text first before starting to write. All participants agreed that writing while understanding the text, as well as thinking about strategies to avoid plagiarism at the same time was difficult. Therefore, the participants felt that to do a good paraphrase, they should spend enough time. It takes time to understand the text, rewrites the ideas, and rewrite them using our own language.

The last strategy was to practice writing and paraphrasing more often. Patchwriting itself is often done by novice writers. Novice writers themselves are writers who do not have much experience. So, they do not know how to paraphrase properly. According to all participants, by practicing more often and used to do paraphrasing can help to avoid patchwriting periodically.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the conclusions and offers some suggestions to everything related to this research. This chapter is divided into two parts. The first is conclusions, it is a part where the researcher concludes this research. The second is recommendations that contain suggestions for further research on a similar topic.

A. Conclusions

Although patchwriting was still unfamiliar in the academic world, but this case exists. Howard (1992, as cited in Doró, 2017) defined patchwriting as "copying from a source text and then deleting some words, altering grammatical structures, or plugging in one-for-one synonym-substitutes" (p. 2). The finding showed that from 5 proposal participants, there were 6 forms of patchwriting committed in students' proposals: *word-level*, *phrase-level*, *clause-level*, *text-level*, *combination-level*, and *no-changes level*. The form of patchwriting that most likely occurred in students' proposals was *word-level*, and there were 48 cases from a total of 89 cases.

Furthermore, the finding data also showed that participants mentioned 4 strategies to avoid patchwriting. Those 4 strategies were: 1) Learning more deeply about paraphrasing, 2) Using translation technique, 3) Understanding the text before writing, and 4) Practicing more often.

B. Recommendations

Several recommendations are given based on the results of this study. This research is very useful, especially for students who are writing a thesis. With this research, students are expected to be aware of patchwriting issues. That actually, our writing will be easily affected by patchwriting when we do not know enough how to do a good and correct paraphrase. By knowing the forms of patchwriting, students are expected to be more careful in paraphrasing.

For lecturers, it can also offer information to students, so students do not just paraphrase. This has a good impact on students so that they are aware of patchwriting issues and avoid plagiarism more quickly. The findings in this study also discuss strategies that can be taken to avoid patchwriting. Thus, it is very useful for students whose writings are affected by patchwriting because they can correct their writing before the final draft.

For future researchers, it may be possible to focus on research on students' opinions about the importance of patchwriting, and also the factors that caused students to do patchwriting themselves. It is also possible for future research if the others want to do similar research, but use quantitative methods to find out how many percent of words are considered patchwriting in students' academic writing.

REFERENCES

Akkaya, A., & Aydın, G. (2018). Views of academicians on traits of academic writing. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research, 13*(2), 128–160. https://doi.org/10.29329/epasr.2018.143.7

Akmal, S., Dahliana, S., & Fadhila, R. (2019). Cooperative assessment writing practices at an Acehnese private university: Helping or troubling?. *JL3T (Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching), 5*(2), 107–119.

al Badi, I. A. H. (2015). Academic writing difficulties of ESL learners. *The 2015 WEI International Academic Conference Proceedings*, *1*(1), 65–78.

Ameer, M. A. A., & Hussein, K. S. (2015). Plagiarism and patchwriting detection in EFL students' graduation research writing. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, *5*(8), 128-136. www.iiste.org

Andrade, C. (2021). The inconvenient truth about convenience and purposive samples. *Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine*, *43*(1), 86–88. https://doi.org/10.1177/0253717620977000

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. In H. Cooper, P. M. Camic, D. L. Long, A. T. Panter, D. Rindskopf, & K. J. Sher (Eds.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol. 2. Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological* (57–71). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/13620-004

Doró, K. (2017). From phrase to discourse level patchwriting: Is it possible to unlearn?. *Alkalmazott Nyelvtudomany*, *17*, 1-19. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.18460/ANY.2017.1.004

Doró, K. (2018). Extended patchwriting in EFL academic writing of hungarian students: Signs and possible reasons. *University Writing in Central and Eastern Europe: Tradition, Transition, and Innovation*, *29*, 201–214. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95198-0_14

Fageeh, A., & Mekheimer, M. A. A. (2013). Effects of blackboard on EFL academic writing and attitudes. *JALT CALL Journal*, *9*(2), 169–196.

Fish, R., & Hura, G. (2013). Students' perception of plagiarism. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 13*(5), 33-45.

Garba, K. D. (2018). Awareness and perception of academic staff on the use of turnitin software in detecting plagiarism in bayero university kano. *African Journal of Education, Science and Technology*, *5*(1), 1-9.

Griffee, D. T. (2018). An introduction to second language research methods design and data, 2nd edition. TESL-EJ Publications.

Howard, R. M. (1992). A plagiarism pentimento. *Journal of Teaching Writing*, *11*(2), 233–245.

Hunt, J., & Tompkins, P. (2014). A comparative analysis of SafeAssign and Turnitin. *Inquiry: The Journal of the Virginia Community Colleges*, *19*(1), 63-73.

Hussain, S. S. (2019). Strategies for teaching academic writing to saudi L2 learners. *English Language Teaching*, *12*(12), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n12p1

Johnson, A.P. (2016). *Academic Writing Process and Product.* Rowman and Littkefield.

Khadijah. (2020). *An analysis of students' problems in academic writing at English department students in 2019 academic year of UNISMUH* (Publication in 2020) [Undergraduate thesis, University of Muhammadiyah Makassar]. Digital Library Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar.

Khairunnisak. (2018). *The analysis of students perception on plagiarism in completing thesis* (Publication 2018) [Undergraduate thesis, Islamic University of UIN Ar-Raniry]. Repository UIN Ar-Raniry.

Klar, S., & Leeper, T. J. (2019). Identities and intersectionality: A case for purposive sampling in survey-experimental research. *Experimental methods in survey research: Techniques that combine random sampling with random assignment*, 419-433. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119083771.ch21

Komariyah, D. N. (2015). *Writing strategies used by the fourth semester students of english education department (A descriptive study on the fourth semester students of University of Muhammadiyah Purwokerto in academic year 2014/2015)* (Publication in 2015) [Undergraduate thesis, University of Muhammadiyah Purwokerto]. Repository Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto.

Kumalasari, Y. (2018). Patchwriting in english department students' academic writing. *Retain*, *6*(2), 115-125.

Kumar, P. M., Priya, N. S., Musalaiah, S. V. V. S., & Nagasree, M. (2014). Knowing and avoiding plagiarism during scientific writing. *Annals of Medical and Health Sciences Research*, *4*(3), 193-198.

Leung, C. H., & Cheng, S. C. L. (2017). An instructional approach to practical solutions for plagiarism. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *5*(9), 1646-1652.

Li, Y., & Casanave, C. P. (2012). Two first-year students' strategies for writing from sources: Patchwriting or plagiarism? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*(2), 165–180. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.002

Muluk, S., Zainuddin, Z., & Dahliana, S. (2022). Flipping an IELTS Writing Course: Investigating its impacts on students' performance and their attitudes. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *9*(2), 591-612. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v9i2.23314

Muluk, S., Yanis., F. R., Dahliana, S., & Amiruddin, A. (2021). Scrutinizing EFL students' plagiarism practice. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, *9*(1), 145-164. https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v9i1.10492

Owen, G. T. (2014). Qualitative methods in higher education policy analysis: Using interviews and document analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, *19*(52), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2014.1211

Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second-language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *12*(4), 317–345. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2003.08.004

Rogerson, A. M., & McCarthy, G. (2017). Using internet based paraphrasing tools: Original work, patchwriting or facilitated plagiarism?. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *13*(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-016-0013-y

Singh, M. K. M. (2016). An emic perspective on academic writing difficulties among international graduate students in Malaysia. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, *16*(3), 83-97.

Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode penelitian pendidikan pendekatan kuantitatif kualitatif dan R&D*. Alfabeta.

Swarni, B. R. (2017). *Student's problem in writing thesis: Case study at English Department Mataram University.* (Publication in 2017) [Undergraduate thesis, University of Mataram]. Repository Universitas Mataram.

Vieyra, M., Strickland, D., & Timmerman, B. (2013). Patterns in plagiarism and patchwriting in science and engineering graduate students' research proposals. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *9*(1), 35-49. http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/journals/index.php/IJEI/

Wood, J., Roggenbuck, T., Doerschler, P., & Hicks, M. (2018). Sparking a transition, unmasking confusion: An empirical study of the benefits of a writing center workshop about patchwriting. *The Writing Center Journal*, *37*(1), 101–130.

Wools, D. (2006). "Plagiarism". In Brown, K. (ed.). *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd ed. Elsevier.

Zarfsaz, E., & Ahmadi, R. (2017). Investigating some main causes and reasons of writing plagiarism in an EFL context. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *6*(5), 214-223. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.5p.214

Zulfikar, T. (2020). *EFL Research: Designs & Thesis Writing*. Padebooks.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

SURAT KEPUTUSAN DEKAN FAKULTAS TARBIYAH DAN KEGURUAN UIN AR-RANIRY
Nomor : B-5702/UN.08/FTK/KP.07.6/04/2022

TENTANG
PENGANGKATAN PEMBIMBING SKRIPSI MAHASISWA FAKULTAS TARBIYAH DAN KEGURUAN UIN AR-RANIRY

DEKAN FAKULTAS TARBIYAH DAN KEGURUAN UIN AR-RANIRY

Menimbang :
a. bahwa untuk kelancaran bimbingan skripsi dan ujian munaqasyah mahasiswa pada Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh, maka dipandang perlu menunjuk pembimbing skripsi tersebut yang dituangkan dalam Surat Keputusan Dekan;
b. bahwa saudara yang tersebut namanya dalam surat keputusan ini dipandang cakap dan memenuhi syarat untuk diangkat sebagai pembimbing skripsi.

Mengingat :
1. UndangundangNomor 20 Tahun 2003, tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional;
2. Undang-undang Nomor 14 Tahun 2005, tentang Guru dan Dosen;
3. Undang-undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2012, tentang Pendidikan Tinggi;
4. Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 74 Tahun 2012 tentang Perubahan atas Peraturan Pemerintah RI Nomor 23 Tahun 2005 tentang Pengelolaan Keuangan Badan Layanan Umum;
5. Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 4 Tahun 2014, tentang Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Tinggi dan Pengelolaan Perguruan Tinggi;
6. Peraturan Presiden RI Nomor 64 Tahun 2013; tentang Perubahan IAIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh Menjadi UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh;
7. Peraturan Menteri Agama RI Nomor 12 Tahun 2014, tentang Organisasi dan Tata Kerja UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh;
8. Peraturan Menteri Republik Indonesia No. 21 Tahun 2015, tentang Statuta UIN Ar-Raniry;
9. Keputusan Menteri Agama Nomor 492 Tahun 2003, tentang Pendelegasian Wewenang, Pengangkatan, Pemindahan dan Pemberhentian PNS di Lingkungan Departemen Agama Republik Indonesia;
10. Keputusan Menteri Keuangan Nomor 293/KMK.05/2011 tentang Penetapan Institut Agama Islam Negeri Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh pada Kementerian Agama sebagai Instansi Pemerintah yang Menerapkan Pengelolaan Badan Layanan Umum;
11. Keputusan Rektor UIN Ar-Raniry Nomor 01 Tahun 2015, tentang Pendelegasian Wewenang kepada Dekan dan Direktur Pascasarjana di Lingkungan UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh;

Memperhatikan : Keputusan Sidang/Seminar Proposal Skripsi Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan UIN Ar-Raniry Tanggal 28 Maret 2022

MEMUTUSKAN

Menetapkan :
PERTAMA : Menunjuk Saudara:
1. Dr. Luthfi Auni, MA — Sebagai Pembimbing Pertama
2. Safrul Muluk Ph.D — Sebagai Pembimbing Kedua

Untuk membimbing Skripsi :
Nama : **Nisrina Mawardah**
NIM : **180203110**
Program Studi : **Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris**
Judul Skripsi : **An Analysis of Patchwriting Practice in English Education Department Students' Academic Writing**

KEDUA : Pembiayaan honorarium pembimbing pertama dan kedua tersebut diatas dibebankan pada DIPA UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh Nomor: SP DIPA. 025.04.2.423925/2022, tanggal 17 November 2021.
KETIGA : Surat keputusan ini berlaku sampai akhir semester Ganjil Tahun Akademik 2022/2023
KEEMPAT : Surat Keputusan ini berlaku sejak tanggal ditetapkan dengan ketentuan segala sesuatu akan diubah dan diperbaiki kembali sebagaimana mestinya apabila kemudian hari ternyata terdapat kekeliruan dalam penetapan ini.

Ditetapkan di: Banda Aceh
Pada Tanggal: 25 April 2022
Dekan,

Muslim Razali

Tembusan
1. *Rektor UIN Ar-Raniry (sebagai laporan);*
2. *Ketua Prodi PBI Fak. Tarbiyah dan Keguruan;*
3. *Pembimbing yang bersangkutan untuk dimaklumi dan dilaksanakan;*
4. *Mahasiswa yang bersangkutan;*
5. *Arsip.*

Appendix B

KEMENTERIAN AGAMA
UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI AR-RANIRY
FAKULTAS TARBIYAH DAN KEGURUAN
Jl. Syeikh Abdur Rauf Kopelma Darussalam Banda Aceh
Telepon : 0651- 7557321, Email : uin@ar-raniy.ac.id

Nomor : B-6556/Un.08/FTK.1/TL.00/06/2022
Lamp : -
Hal : ***Penelitian Ilmiah Mahasiswa***

Kepada Yth,
Ketua Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh

Assalamu'alaikum Wr.Wb.
Pimpinan Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan UIN Ar-Raniry dengan ini menerangkan bahwa:

Nama/NIM : **NISRINA MAWARDAH / 180203110**
Semester/Jurusan : VIII / Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
Alamat sekarang : Gampoeng Bayu, Kab. Aceh Besar

Saudara yang tersebut namanya diatas benar mahasiswa Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan bermaksud melakukan penelitian ilmiah di lembaga yang Bapak/Ibu pimpin dalam rangka penulisan Skripsi dengan judul ***An Analysis of Patchwriting Practice in English Education Department Students' Academic Writing***

Demikian surat ini kami sampaikan atas perhatian dan kerjasama yang baik, kami mengucapkan terimakasih.

Banda Aceh, 07 Juni 2022
an. Dekan
Wakil Dekan Bidang Akademik dan Kelembagaan,

Berlaku sampai : 07 Juli 2022

Dr. M. Chalis, M.Ag.

Appendix C

KEMENTERIAN AGAMA REPUBLIK INDONESIA
UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI AR-RANIRY
FAKULTAS TARBIYAH DAN KEGURUAN
PRODI PENDIDIKAN BAHASA INGGRIS
Jln Syeikh Abdur Rauf Kopelma Darussalam Banda Aceh
Email pbi.ftk@ar-raniry.ac.id Website http://ar-raniry.ac.id

SURAT KETERANGAN
Nomor: B-25/Un.08/PBI/TL.00/08/2022

Sehubungan dengan surat An. Dekan, Wakil Dekan Bidang Akademik dan Kelembagaan Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan UIN Ar-Raniry, Nomor: B-655/Un.08/FTK.1/TL.00/06/2022 tanggal 7 Juni 2022, Ketua Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan UIN Ar-Raniry Darussalam Banda Aceh menerangkan bahwa yang namanya tersebut di bawah ini:

Nama : Nisrina Mawardah

NIM : 180203110

Fak/Prodi : FTK/Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris

Benar telah melakukan penelitian dan mengumpulkan data pada mahasiswa Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris dalam rangka penyusunan Skripsi yang berjudul:

"An Analysis of Patchwriting practice in English Education Department Students' Academic Writing"

Demikianlah surat ini kami buat agar dapat dipergunakan seperlunya.

Banda Aceh, 8 Agustus 2022
a.n Ketua Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris,
Sekretaris Prodi,

Syarifah Dahliana

Appendix D

Interview Protocol

Project : An Analysis of Patchwriting in English Education Department Students' Academic Writing

Date :

Interviewer : Nisrina Mawardah

Interviewee : A, B, C, D, and E

Position of Interview : English Education Students in the final year of their study

This study aims to investigate the strategies of English Education students to avoid patchwriting in students' academic writing. Data collection is carried out in-depth interviews to be recorded and only used for the research purposes to protect the interviewees confidentially based on informed consent. During the interview, you will be asked several questions about the strategies you would apply to avoid patchwriting in academic writing. The interview process will take approximately 15 minutes.

The points covered in this research

1. Interviewee's strategies to avoid patchwriting in students' academic writing
2. Interviewee's experience to patchwriting cases

جامعة الرانري
AR-RANIRY

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

1. Name : Nisrina Mawardah
2. Place/Date of Birth : Banda Aceh, 01 Mei 2000
3. Gender : Female
4. Religion : Islam
5. Nasionality : Indonesian
6. Adress : Bayu, Darul Imarah, Aceh Besar
7. Marital Status : Single
8. Occupation/NIM : Student/180203110
9. The Parent
    a. Father's Name : Marzuki
    b. Mother's Name : Ridha Yulmi
    c. Occupation : Civil servant
    d. Adress : Bayu, Darul Imarah, Aceh Besar
10. Siblings
    a. Younger sister : Humairah Fadilla
    b. Younger brother : Rizky Adliansyah
11. Educational Background
    a. Elementary School: MIN Teladan Banda Aceh (2006-2012)
    b. Junior High School: MTsN Model Banda Aceh (2012-2015)
    c. Senior High School: SMAN 7 Banda Aceh (2015-2018)
    d. University : UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh (2018-2022)

Banda Aceh, 15 Juli 2022

Nisrina Mawardah