



Vol. 3 No. 5 (May) (2025)

## **Challenges of Using Artificial Intelligence (AI) Paraphrasing Tools at University Level: A Survey Research**

**Dr. Farkhanda Jabeen**

Assistant Professor, FJWU

**Sana Tariq**

M.Phil Scholar, FJWU

**Umm- e- Aimen**

M.Phil Scholar, FJWU

**Muqaddas Khan**

M.Phil Scholar, FJWU

### **Abstract**

The growing use of artificial intelligence (AI) paraphrasing tools among university students creates both potential and serious obstacles in academic writing. While these technologies are convenient and efficient, they raise questions about academic integrity, output quality, and the development of critical thinking abilities. This study utilizes a quantitative research design and participants were chosen by using convenient sampling technique. Survey questionnaire was developed for gathering responses from participants. Students faced different challenges by paraphrasing texts and results revealed six themes Perception and preference, effectiveness and ease of use, dependence and over reliance, academic integrity, accuracy and reliability and lastly challenges of using paraphrasing tool. These are some major challenges which were faced by students are risk of plagiarism, In accurate or poor quality rewriting, loss of original meaning , Over reliance on technology, lack of vocabulary skill, in accuracy of paraphrasing tools. The research recommends incorporating AI literacy into university courses, encouraging ethical use, and developing more effective detection techniques to maintain academic standards. Addressing these difficulties would enable educators and institutions to better lead students in using AI tools ethically and successfully.

**Keywords:** Paraphrasing, Academic writing, Plagiarisms, Inaccuracy

### **Introduction**

Writing is among the most challenging skills required of university students. Writing skill is necessary for academic achievement. Academic achievement refers to the ability to accomplish good learning outcomes. This achievement influences positively or negatively on different aspects of students personality (Ahmed et al., 2024). Effective writing necessitates mastering abilities such as analyzing, synthesizing, inferring, producing organized paragraphs, developing meaningful content, and demonstrating grammatical competence alongside lexical knowledge (Anderson, 2020). Writing also requires fluency in language and the coordination of high-level metacognitive skills to convey precise details



## Vol. 3 No. 5 (May) (2025)

and generate new ideas (Brown & Smith, 2021).

Paraphrasing tools can lead to issues such as meaning distortion, grammatical inaccuracies, and over-reliance on automated systems. These challenges are particularly significant at the university level, where critical thinking and originality are integral to academic success (Bates, 2019). The implications of such tools extend beyond writing quality; they also affect students' engagement with source material and their development of analytical skills (Tan & Goh, 2021).

Paraphrasing involves rewording a text while preserving its original meaning. It requires the ability to rephrase content using different words and structures without altering the core idea (Koh & Tan, 2020). For example, the sentence "She quickly ran to the store because she was running late" can be paraphrased as "She hurried to the store since she was behind schedule." This process, while seemingly straightforward, poses significant challenges for students, particularly those still mastering academic writing (Walker, 2022).

Research indicates that many students fail to paraphrase effectively, often producing work that closely mirrors the original source (Li & Zhang, 2021). This lack of proficiency not only affects the quality of their writing but may also result in allegations of plagiarism (Thompson & Clarke, 2023). Teaching proper paraphrasing techniques is therefore essential, particularly for university students who are expected to produce high-quality academic work (Kim & Lee, 2022).

Direct quotations, while occasionally useful, should be used sparingly. Overuse of quotations may indicate a lack of writing skills and critical engagement with the topic (Williams, 2021). Poor paraphrasing, on the other hand, is frequently caused by a lack of understanding of the text (Liu & Kim, 2022). This emphasizes the significance of teaching students not only how to paraphrase but also how to critically assess and synthesize data (Tan, 2021).

While paraphrasing tools offer convenience, they come with limitations that may hinder academic development. Students who rely excessively on these tools risk losing their ability to engage deeply with texts and articulate ideas independently (Koh, 2020).

### **Literature review**

A paraphrasing tool is a program that allows people to edit text so that it contains different words while maintaining the meaning of the original text (Rogerson, 2020). Paraphrasing is the practice of rephrasing or restating someone else's ideas or information using your own words and sentence structures. It is a common technique used in academic writing to present information in a more concise or understandable way while still attributing the original source. Paraphrasing necessitates a thorough comprehension of the information and the capacity to present it in a new way without altering its original meaning (Miranda, 2022).

The advancement of online learning has fundamentally changed the educational landscape, offering unmatched flexibility and access to educational resources. Online education, which began as a way to extend learning opportunities to contemporary students, such as working professionals and those in remote areas, has since evolved into a standard mode of education. (Sahar et al., 2024). Relying on an AI paraphrase tool denies pupils the opportunity to develop their writing



## Vol. 3 No. 5 (May) (2025)

talents authentically. Instead of participating in critical thought and original expression, kids may rely on automatic answers, impeding their intellectual and academic advancement. By skipping the process of creating unique content, students miss out on crucial learning opportunities that promote creativity, critical thinking, and effective communication (Dekker, 2020).

### **Types of Paraphrasing Tool**

There is plenty of Paraphrasing Tool that can be access by student. Not only it offers free service to do the paraphrasing, it can also be access anywhere. According to a study by paraphrasing-tool.com, quillbot.com, prepotseo.com, and spinbot.com are the popular paraphrasing tools students used in helping them writing essays. The paraphrasing tools that have been mentioned are web pages that can be accessed freely by students. The following is a description of the various types of popular paraphrasing tools:

#### **QuillBot.com**

QuillBot.com is one of the most widely used free paraphrasing tools on the internet. Quillbot.com artificial intelligence (AI) is used to suggest paraphrases based on the text entered (Xuyen, 2023). In situations where teachers and students are unable to paraphrase writing manually, QuillBot.com provides a solution by assisting them in doing so automatically. The procedure for using this tool is straightforward. QuillBot.com can rewrite texts after we have written or pasted the texts and then clicked on the Paraphrase button (REGUIG, & MOUFFOK2023). QuillBot.com offers seven paraphrase modes: standard, fluent, formal, simple, creative, expand, and shorter. Standard and fluency mode are free to use, however formal, basic, creative, expand, and shorter modes require a premium subscription.

#### **Paraphrasing-tool.com**

Paraphrasing-Tool.com makes use of intelligent, decision-making software to determine the most appropriate way to reword, or paraphrase, the text being rewritten. Unlike QuillBot.com, the websites of Paraphrasing-Tool.com are very straightforward and only provide one mode of paraphrasing (Miranda, 2022). It didn't have as many features as quillbot.com. This website is only providing free paraphrasing generator. According to the websites, paraphrasing-tool.com functions similarly to an automated thesaurus, meaning that it just uses synonyms and does not generate new text structures as a result of their use. Prepostseo.com is one of the most well-known websites for providing content as well as SEO-related tools and resources. This website provides more than 195 tools for a variety of purposes, with the majority of them being completely free to use.

#### **Spinbot.com Article spinner**

SpinBot.com converts human-readable content into extra, intelligently readable text. It is a free, automatic article spinner that may be used to create new content. It is an article rewriting tool that employs a marked-up version of the text to indicate which sections should be changed or rearranged (Gautam, & Jerripothula, 2020). SpinBot.com is free to use. Spinbot.com generates a vast number of variations on the underlying article that do not materially alter the



meaning.

### **Paraphrasing-online.com**

Paraphrase Online is a free online paraphrasing tool that can help you accurately paraphrase your articles, sentences, and paragraphs (Fitria, 2021). No technical knowledge or experience is required to utilize the tool. You can start right away. The website has been designed to be simple enough for anyone to use and begin paraphrasing the information with outstanding outcomes without any prior training.

According to Sanjaya there are six ways paraphrasing tool avoid plagiarism; (1) Transform a word into a different part of speech. (2) Replace the word with synonym. (3) Reverse the word order. (4) Defines the term differently. (5) Make use of different signals of attribution. (6) Change the structure of the sentence and use a different transition word.

### **Challenges of using paraphrasing tool:**

#### **Risk of Plagiarism:**

One of the most pressing concerns with paraphrasing tools is the potential for unintentional plagiarism. While paraphrasing tools are designed to help students reword content, they often don't sufficiently alter the structure and wording of the original text (Domingues, 2022). Paraphrasing tools rarely contain correct citation or attribution of the original source, increasing the danger of plagiarism. Academic writing requires students to not only paraphrase information, but also properly cite the original sources of ideas or discoveries. When employing paraphrasing software, students may fail to provide proper citations for paraphrased text, leading to plagiarism claims (Zimba & Gasparyan, 2021). If correct credit is missing, plagiarism detection technologies will often fail to detect improperly paraphrased language, worsening the problem. Students may not grasp the need of attributing original writers, which is incorrect.

#### **Inaccurate or Poor Quality Rewriting:**

Inaccurate or poor-quality Rewriting while utilizing paraphrase tools is a common problem in academic writing (Dawson, 2020). Despite the potential for paraphrase tools to help students, they can result in unexpected consequences such as misreading of the original text, poor language, and grammatical mistakes.

Paraphrasing technologies frequently struggle to capture the exact meaning of the original content, especially when dealing with complicated or field-specific language (Merkel, 2020). This can result in considerable meaning distortion, in which the reworded language no longer accurately represents the original message. For example, in academic writing, technical terminology is frequently replaced by synonyms that may not have the same implications, rendering the paraphrased material misleading or ambiguous.

#### **Loss of Original Meaning:**

Paraphrasing tools may also struggle to replicate the original meaning or context of the text, particularly when dealing with specialist or technical terminology. Precise language is vital in academic writing since concepts frequently have specific meanings within a given discipline (Chui, 2023). A paraphrase tool may



## Vol. 3 No. 5 (May) (2025)

miss subtle subtleties in a topic or misrepresent the original author's tone or intent. For example, in a research paper describing complicated scientific ideas, if the tool does not fully comprehend the issue, it may change phrases or phrasing in a way that misrepresents the content, leading to erroneous findings or errors in analysis. This is a critical concern since it can have a direct impact on the integrity and correctness of the research findings.

### **Over reliance on Technology:**

One of the more pernicious consequences of paraphrasing tools is that students may over-rely on technology, viewing it as a shortcut to academic writing rather than a tool to augment their learning (Akbar, 2020). Instead of attentively reading the content, analyzing it, and synthesizing information to build their own understanding, students may rely on paraphrase tools to accomplish the work. This minimizes their opportunity to be concerned about the material while also honing their critical thinking skills.

### **Lack of vocabulary skills**

Students have struggled to learn to write due to a lack of vocabulary. Vocabulary provides the foundation for sentence construction, which is at the heart of practical writing skills (Schmitt, & Schmitt, 2020). Students use spoken and written words daily to communicate their ideas, beliefs, and feelings to people around them. A good vocabulary repertoire can help students to speak or write to deliver their thoughts. Electronic dictionaries and more reading activities can help students with limited vocabulary (Allen, 2023).

### **Inaccuracy of paraphrasing tools**

Poorer paraphrasing techniques frequently use a simple approach by substituting some words with synonyms discovered using word processing software's or online dictionaries' capability, as per (Cheng, 2023). A student's attempts to paraphrase in higher education can give "insight into how well students read and write." The prominence and accessibility of digital technology and Internet-based sources have changed "how knowledge is constructed, shared, and evaluated." However, some Internet-based content's quality, effectiveness, validity, and dependability are debatable from an educational perspective

### **Rationale of study**

The study on the challenges of employing AI paraphrase tools at the university level is extremely important since it addresses essential issues such as academic integrity, learning outcomes, and the ethical usage of artificial intelligence in education. One of the primary concerns is the potential misuse of these tools, which can blur the line between original work and automated rewriting, posing a plagiarism risk. By studying these issues, the research can assist universities in developing clearer rules to promote academic integrity while permitting responsible AI support.

Additionally, overreliance on AI paraphrasing tools may weaken students' writing and critical thinking skills, as they might skip the essential process of engaging deeply with source material. This study can shed light on how such tools impact learning and suggest ways to balance their use with skill development. The value of paraphrasing tools at the university level stems from





## Vol. 3 No. 5 (May) (2025)

the importance of academic integrity, critical thinking, and scholarly work quality. At this level, students are required to read extensively, generate creative arguments, and do high-quality, trustworthy research. Misuse or overreliance on paraphrasing tools can result in inadvertent plagiarism, low quality writing, and a lack of true involvement with the subject matter. Furthermore, these techniques may fail to accurately portray the original content's meaning or context, distorting the intended message.

At the university level, using paraphrasing tools presents several challenges, including the risk of unintentional plagiarism, as these tools may generate content that is too similar to the original or not adequately altered. This reliance can also hinder critical thinking and the development of writing skills, as students may bypass the effort of understanding and engaging with the material. Furthermore, paraphrasing tools can produce inaccurate or awkwardly rewritten text, misinterpreting context or meaning, and diminishing the quality of academic work. Over-reliance on these tools may also undermine originality and academic integrity, as students might use them to shortcut the learning process, potentially violating ethical standards in academic writing.

### Objectives

The objectives of the study were to:

1. Find students' perception about the use of AI paraphrasing tools as part of their academic writing.
2. Identify challenges faced by students while using AI paraphrasing tools

### Methodology

This study will employ a quantitative approach, using a survey research design to collect data from university students. The survey was designed to measure the frequency and severity of challenges associated with paraphrasing tools, as well as the recommendation used to overcome these challenges. The data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics, including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations.

### Population

The population of this study includes students at university level who had familiarity with AI paraphrasing tools.

### Sample of the study:

The sample for this research consisting of 50-55 university students from various academic disciplines. The primary goal is to examine the challenges students face when using paraphrasing tools, so the sample was representative of different student groups to capture a diverse range of experiences. The target population includes students currently enrolled in undergraduate and graduate programs at university.

### Context of the study

This study was conducted in premisis of university in Rawalpindi to identify the challenges of using paraphrasing tools by students at university level. This study specifically focuses on students enrolled in the university.



## Procedure

Data was collected using a Survey questionnaire developed by google form were directly send to participants at university level. The questionnaire was designed with Likert-scale questions to assess the frequency of paraphrasing tool use, challenges related to academic integrity, writing quality, and the perceived impact on academic performance.

## Ethical consideration

This research study was conducted with utmost attention to ethical considerations. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, ensuring they understood the research purpose, risks, and benefits. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained throughout the data collection and analysis process. The research team minimized potential harm and ensured benefits outweighed risks, adhering to the principles of beneficence and non-maleficence. Data was stored securely and shared only with authorized personnel, upholding data protection and confidentiality standards. The researchers declared no financial or personal conflicts of interest, ensuring objectivity and impartiality.

## Results and interpretation

### Theme 1: Perceptions and Preferences

**Table 1:** Have you ever used paraphrasing tools for academic purpose.

		SA	A	N	D	SDA	Mean	SD
N	F	56	—	—	—	—		
56	%	100	—	—	—	—	1.00	.000

Table 1 indicates that 100% (100% SA) of the university students agreed with the statement “Have you ever used paraphrasing tools for academic purpose”. Furthermore, mean is (1.00) the absence of variability (SD = 0.000) reinforces the idea that every respondent feels the same way about the use of these tools.

**Table 2:** I feel confident in using paraphrasing tools for my academic purpose.

		SA	A	N	D	SDA	Mean	SD
N	F	8	24	20	4	—		
56	%	14.3	42.9	35.7	7.1	—	2.36	0.819

Table 2 indicates that 57.2% (14.3SA +42.9A) of the university students agreed with the statement “**I feel confident in using paraphrasing tools for my academic purpose**”. While others and 35.7% respondents are neutral or slightly less confident. Overall, there is moderate confidence in using paraphrasing tools Furthermore, mean score is (2.36).



Vol. 3 No. 5 (May) (2025)

**Table 3: I frequently use paraphrasing tools in my academic writing.**

		SA	A	N	D	SDA	Mean	SD
N	F	12	25	13	6	—		
56	%	21.4	44.6	23.2	10.7	—	2.23	0.914

Table 3 indicates that 66% (21.4% SA+44.6A) of the university students agreed with the statement “**I frequently use paraphrasing tools in my academic writing**”. While others and 23.2% respondents are neutral or slightly less confident. Furthermore, mean score (2.23).

## Theme 2: Effectiveness and Ease of Use

**Table 4: The paraphrased content from these tools maintains the original meaning.**

		SA	A	N	D	SDA	Mean	SD
N	F	6	30	14	4	2		
56	%	10.7	53.6	25.0	7.1	3.6	2.39	0.908

Table 4 indicates that 64.3% (10.7% SA+53.6A) of the university students agreed with the statement “**The paraphrased content from these tools maintains the original meaning**”. While others and 25.0% respondents are neutral or slightly less confident. Furthermore, mean score (2.39).

**Table 5: Paraphrasing tools help me express original ideas in a clear and more coherent way.**

		SA	A	N	D	SDA	Mean	SD
N	F	9	30	14	4	2		
56	%	10.7	53.6	25.0	7.1	3.6	2.18	0.855

Table 5 indicates that 64.3% (10.7% SA+53.6A) of the university students agreed with the statement “**Paraphrasing tools help me express original ideas in a clear and more coherent way**”. While others and 25.0% respondents are neutral or slightly less confident. Furthermore, mean score (2.18).

**Table 6: I experience technical issues with paraphrasing tools.**

		SA	A	N	D	SDA	Mean	SD
N	F	8	29	15	3	1		
56	%	14.3	51.8	26.8	5.4	1.8	2.29	0.847





## Vol. 3 No. 5 (May) (2025)

Table 6 indicates that 66.1% (14.3% SA+51.8A) of the university students agreed with the statement “**I experience technical issues with paraphrasing tools**”. While others and 26.8% respondents are neutral or slightly less confident. Furthermore, mean score (2.29).

**Theme 3: Dependence and Over-Reliance****Table 7: I rely heavily on paraphrasing tools for my academic writing.**

		SA	A	N	D	SDA	Mean	SD
N	F	13	22	9	11	1		
56	%	23.2	39.3	16.1	19.6	1.8	<b>2.37</b>	<b>1.105</b>

Table 7 indicates that 62.5% (23.2% SA+39.3A) of the university students agreed with the statement “**I rely heavily on paraphrasing tools for my academic writing**”. Furthermore, mean score (2.3).

**Table 8: Using paraphrasing tools undermines my own writing abilities.**

		SA	A	N	D	SDA	Mean	SD
N	F	5	29	14	8	—		
56	%	8.9	51.8	25.0	14.3	—	<b>2.45</b>	<b>0.851</b>

Table 8 indicates that 60.0% (8.9% SA+51.3A) of the university students agreed with the statement “**Using paraphrasing tools undermines my own writing abilities**”. While others and 25.0% respondents are neutral or slightly less confident. Furthermore, mean score (2.45)

**Table 9 I use paraphrasing tools as a substitute for my own writing.**

		SA	A	N	D	SDA	Mean	SD
N	F	7	28	11	9	1		
56	%	12.5	50.0	19.6	16.1	1.8	<b>2.45</b>	<b>0.971</b>

Table 9 indicates that 62.5% (12.5% SA+50.0A) of the university students agreed with the statement “**I use paraphrasing tools as a substitute for my own writing.**” While others and 19.6% respondents are neutral or slightly less confident. Furthermore, mean score (2.45).

**Theme 4: Academic Integrity****Table 10: Paraphrasing tools can help me avoid plagiarism.**



		SA	A	N	D	SDA	Mean	SD
N	F	10	21	17	5	3		
56	%	17.9	37.5	30.4	8.9	5.4	<b>2.46</b>	<b>1.061</b>

Table 10 indicates that 62.5% (17.9% SA+37.5A) of the university students agreed with the statement **“Paraphrasing tools can help me avoid plagiarism.”** While others and 30.4% respondents are neutral or slightly less confident. Furthermore, mean score (2.45).

**Table 11: I have been accused of plagiarism or academic dishonesty due to the use of paraphrasing tools.**

		SA	A	N	D	SDA	Mean	SD
N	F	4	21	13	16	2		
56	%	7.1	37.5	23.2	28.6	3.6	<b>2.84</b>	<b>1.041</b>

Table 11 indicates that 44.6% (7.1% SA+37.5A) of the university students agreed with the statement **“I have been accused of plagiarism or academic dishonesty due to the use of paraphrasing tools”**. While others and 23.2% respondents are neutral or slightly less confident. Furthermore, mean score (2.45).

**Table 12 I am concerned about the potential for plagiarism when using paraphrasing tools.**

		SA	A	N	D	SDA	Mean	SD
N	F	7	34	10	5	—		
56	%	12.5	60.7	17.9	8.9	—	<b>2.23</b>	<b>0.786</b>

Table 12 indicates that 73.2% (12.5% SA+60.7A) of the university students agreed with the statement **“I am concerned about the potential for plagiarism when using paraphrasing tools”**. Furthermore, mean score (2.23).

## Theme 5: Accuracy and Reliability

**Table 13 I am confident in the accuracy of the output from paraphrasing tools.**

		SA	A	N	D	SDA	Mean	SD
N	F	4	31	14	7	—		



56	%	7.1	55.4	25.0	12.5	—	2.43	0.806
----	---	-----	------	------	------	---	------	-------

Table 13 indicates that 62.5% (7.1% SA+55.4A) of the university students agreed with the statement “**I am confident in the accuracy of the output from paraphrasing tools**”. While others and 25.0% respondents are neutral or slightly less confident. Furthermore, mean score (2.43).

**Table 14 I have noticed inconsistencies or inaccuracies in the output from paraphrasing tools.**

		SA	A	N	D	SDA	Mean	SD
N	F	2	24	22	7	1		
56	%	3.6	42.9	39.3	12.5	1.8	2.66	0.815

Table 14 indicates that 46.5% (3.6% SA+42.9A) of the university students agreed with the statement “**I have noticed inconsistencies or inaccuracies in the output from paraphrasing tools**”. While others and 39.3% respondents are neutral or slightly less confident. Furthermore, mean score (2.66).

**Table 15 I need to manually correct errors or inaccuracies in the output from paraphrasing tools.**

		SA	A	N	D	SDA	Mean	SD
N	F	9	24	21	2	—		
56	%	16.1	42.9	37.5	3.6	—	2.29	0.780

Table 15 indicates that 59% (16.1% SA+42.9A) of the university students agreed with the statement “**I need to manually correct errors or inaccuracies in the output from paraphrasing tools**”. While others and 37.5% respondents are neutral or slightly less confident. Furthermore, mean score (2.29).

## Theme 6: challenges of using paraphrasing tools

**Table 16 Paraphrasing tools make it difficult to maintain my writing style.**

		SA	A	N	D	SDA	Mean	SD
N	F	9	20	17	10	—		
56	%	16.1	35.7	30.4	17.9	—	2.50	0.972

Table 16 indicates that 51.8% (16.1% SA+35.7) of the university students agreed with the statement “**Paraphrasing tools make it difficult to maintain my**



## Vol. 3 No. 5 (May) (2025)

**writing style**". While others and 30.4% respondents are neutral or slightly less confident. Furthermore, mean score (2.50).

**Table 17 Paraphrasing tool fail to handle complex academic language effectively.**

		SA	A	N	D	SDA	Mean	SD
N	F	9	21	10	15	1		
56	%	16.1	37.5	17.9	26.8	1.8	<b>2.61</b>	<b>1.107</b>

Table 17 indicates that 53.6% (16.1% SA+37.5) of the university students agreed with the statement "**Paraphrasing tool fail to handle complex academic language effectively**". While others and 17.9% respondents are neutral or slightly less confident. Furthermore, mean score (2.61).

**Table 18 Paraphrasing tools often produce repetitive or unnatural phrasing.**

		SA	A	N	D	SDA	Mean	SD
N	F	6	22	19	6	3		
56	%	10.7	39.3	33.9	10.7	5.4	<b>2.61</b>	<b>1.003</b>

Table 18 indicates that 50% (10.7% SA+39.3) of the university students agreed with the statement "**Paraphrasing tools often produce repetitive or unnatural phrasing**". While others and 33.9% respondents are neutral or slightly less confident. Furthermore, mean score (2.61).

**Table 19 Paraphrasing tools cannot effectively handle long and complex sentences.**

		SA	A	N	D	SDA	Mean	SD
N	F	10	16	16	12	2		
56	%	17.9	28.6	28.6	21.4	3.6	<b>2.64</b>	<b>1.119</b>

Table 19 indicates that 50% (17.9% SA+28.6) of the university students agreed with the statement "**Paraphrasing tools cannot effectively handle long and complex sentences**". While others and 28.6% respondents are neutral or slightly less confident. Furthermore, mean score (2.64).

**Table 20 Paraphrasing tools don't always provide contextually appropriate alternative.**



		SA	A	N	D	SDA	Mean	SD
N	F	8	19	20	8	—		
56	%	14.3	33.9	35.7	14.3	—	2.51	.920

Table 20 indicates that 48.2% (14.3% SA+33.9) of the university students agreed with the statement “**Paraphrasing tools don’t always provide contextually appropriate alternative**”. While others and 28.6% respondents are neutral or slightly less confident. Furthermore, mean score (2.51).

## Conclusion

This study was conducted to see the challenges which were faced by university students while using paraphrasing tools. Based on the findings it was concluded that while paraphrasing tools offer potential benefits for students at the university level, such as streamlining research and improving writing fluency, their use presents significant challenges. These include ethical concerns surrounding plagiarism and academic integrity, the potential for hindering the development of critical thinking and original thought, the variability in the quality and accuracy of paraphrased text, the risk of stifling creativity and originality in student writing, and potential inequities in access to these tools. To address these challenges, universities must establish clear guidelines for the ethical use of paraphrasing tools, educate students about their responsible use, and emphasize the importance of critical thinking, original thought, and developing strong writing skills. By fostering a culture of academic integrity and responsible technology use, universities can ensure that paraphrasing tools are used effectively and ethically to support student learning and academic success.

## Recommendation

### 1. For Further Researcher

Because of some limitations of this study, the researcher believes that additional research with a larger number of participants is necessary in order to obtain more information on the use of paraphrasing tools at University level. Furthermore, experimental studies are suggested for future researchers in order to be able to directly test paraphrasing tools, which can reveal the impact of paraphrasing tools on students' paraphrasing abilities. A variety of research instruments should be used to gain a thorough understanding of the use of paraphrasing tools in the classroom.

### 2. For Teachers

Given that the use of paraphrasing tools can be one of the aids in helping students learn paraphrasing, as explained in chapter 2, it is hoped that teachers can incorporate paraphrasing tools into learning activities as an example of paraphrasing and can provide input to students about how they should not rely on paraphrasing tools and how they should be confident in their own abilities.





## Vol. 3 No. 5 (May) (2025)

### 3. For Students

The findings of this study reveal that students are extremely reliant on the use of paraphrase tools in their academic work. This may have an impact on students' self-confidence and their ability to paraphrase. The researcher expects that using the information gathered, students will be able to review the use of paraphrase tools and be more cautious when employing paraphrasing tools in the future.

### 4. For the Institutions

The researcher hopes that this research can prove that the use of paraphrasing tools is a common thing for students at the university level. The researcher hopes that the institution can take serious action for students who are proven to have committed plagiarism violations in order to form more brilliant students.

### References

- Ahmed, Q., Jabeen, F., Bibi, H., & Salim, F. N. (2024). Invigorating the Observational Skills of Primary School Students by Visiting Museum as Learning Resource. *Policy Journal of Social Science Review*, 2(4), 52-64.
- Akbar, M. T. (2020). Students' paraphrasing in the literature review section of research proposal. *Jambura Journal of English Teaching and Literature*, 1(1), 1-15.
- Allen, J. (2023). *Inside words: Tools for teaching academic vocabulary, grades 4-12*. Routledge.
- Anderson, S. (2020). Academic writing and its challenges: A perspective for university students. *Journal of Higher Education*, 32(4), 45-59.
- Bates, J. (2019). The impact of technology on student writing and academic integrity. *Education Technology Review*, 28(3), 55-67.
- Brown, R., & Smith, A. (2021). Language fluency in academic writing: The role of metacognitive skills. *Linguistics and Education*, 35(1), 20-32.
- Cheng, Y. H. (2023). Exploring the Effects of Tool-Assisted Paraphrasing Strategy Instruction on EFL Learners' Paraphrasing Performance. *Educational Technology & Society*, 26(4), 51-68.
- Chui, H. C. (2023). ChatGPT as a tool for developing paraphrasing skills among ESL learners. *Journal of Creative Practices in Language Learning and Teaching (CPLT)*, 11(2).
- Dawson, P. (2020). Cognitive offloading and assessment. *Re-imagining university assessment in a digital world*, 37-48.
- Dekker, T. J. (2020). Teaching critical thinking through engagement with multiplicity. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 37, 100701.
- Domingues, I. (2022). A holistic approach to higher education plagiarism: agency and analysis levels. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 41(6), 1869-1884.
- Fitria, T. N. (2021). QuillBot as an online tool: Students' alternative in paraphrasing and rewriting of English writing. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 9(1), 183-196.
- Gautam, A., & Jerripathula, K. R. (2020, September). Sgg: Spinbot, grammarly and glove based fake news detection. In *2020 IEEE Sixth international conference on multimedia big data (bigMM)* (pp. 174-182). IEEE.



## Vol. 3 No. 5 (May) (2025)

- Kim, Y., & Lee, J. (2022). Effective paraphrasing in academic writing: Instructional techniques. *Journal of Writing Education*, 24(1), 12-25.
- Koh, H., & Tan, J. (2020). Paraphrasing strategies for university students: Understanding and improving. *Journal of Writing Studies*, 30(4), 99-110.
- Li, X., & Zhang, Y. (2021). Challenges in paraphrasing: A case study of university students. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 33(2), 120-134.
- Liu, M., & Kim, S. (2022). Barriers to effective paraphrasing among university students. *Journal of Writing Development*, 28(3), 45-60.
- Merkel, W. (2020). A case study of undergraduate L2 writers' concerns with source-based writing and plagiarism. *TESOL Journal*, 11(3), e00503.
- Miranda, D. (2022). The impact of paraphrasing tools on students paraphrasing skills (Doctoral dissertation, UIn Ar-Raniry).
- Miranda, D. (2022). The impact of paraphrasing tools on students paraphrasing skills (Doctoral dissertation, UIn Ar-Raniry).
- REGUIG, Y., & MOUFFOK, A. I. (2023). Comparative Analysis of Current Word Processing Applications That Use Artificial Intelligence Case of Study: The Use of Grammarly and Quillbot Amongst Third Year BA Students at Ibn Khaldoun University of Tiaret (Doctoral dissertation, Université IBN KHALDOUN-Tiaret).
- Rogerson, A. M. (2020). The use and misuse of online paraphrasing, editing and translation software. In *A research agenda for academic integrity* (pp. 163-174). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Sahar, F., Jabeen, F., Tabassum, H., & Malik, M. R. (2024). Challenges and Solutions of Online Meetings through Google Classroom at the University Level: A Qualitative Study. *Pakistan Journal of Society, Education and Language (PJSEL)*, 10(2), 420-433.
- SANJAYA, N. I. (2021). STUDENTS' PARAPHRASING SKILLS IN ACADEMIC WRITING: A CASE STUDY AT ENGLISH LITERATURE DEPARTEMENT OF MUSLIM UNIVERSITY OF INDONESIA (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Hasanuddin).
- Schmitt, N., & Schmitt, D. (2020). *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge university press.
- Tan, L., & Goh, S. (2021). Developing critical thinking and writing fluency: The role of paraphrasing. *Journal of Higher Education and Writing*, 42(1), 33-47.
- Thompson, M., & Clarke, B. (2023). Teaching students the art of paraphrasing. *Educational Teaching Journal*, 27(1), 10-23.
- Walker, T. (2022). Challenges of using automated paraphrasing tools in academic settings. *Academic Integrity Journal*, 13(2), 67-80.
- Williams, T. (2021). The dangers of over-quoting and poor paraphrasing in academic papers. *Research Writing Quarterly*, 21(3), 21-30.
- Xuyen, N. T. (2023, June). Using the online paraphrasing tool Quillbot to assist students in paraphrasing the Source Information: English-majored students' perceptions. In *Proceedings of the 5th Conference on Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 21-27).
- Zimba, O., & Gasparyan, A. (2021). Plagiarism detection and prevention: a primer for researchers. *Reumatologia/Rheumatology*, 59(3), 132-137.