

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
King Saud University
Deanship of Graduate Studies
English Department

Summarization Strategies Adopted by the Senior Level
Female Students of the Department of English at King
Saud University

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Master's Degree in Applied Linguistics in the Department of English
at the College of Arts, King Saud University

By

Asma Ibrahim Alshabanah

Thesis Supervisor:

Prof. Mahmoud Isma'il Saleh

1426 / 2005

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.1. Introductory remarks

In the last ten years we have seen a number of significant changes in the field of foreign language teaching. Views have changed with regard to both what should be taught – the linguistic content of syllabuses – and how we should teach – the techniques and procedures needed to transform this content into language skills. Thus, although oral proficiency is still accorded priority in most general purpose language programs, at least in the early stages, there is no longer any strong conviction that the learners should spend a long time on mastering the spoken form of the language before being exposed to its written form. Reading has come to play a much greater part in the program; also writing has to a large extent been rehabilitated.

We have come a long way from the time when practice in this skill consisted mainly of writing sentences, in the form of exercises, at one extreme, and of writing compositions at the other. There now exists a great variety – perhaps, for the teacher, even a bewildering variety – of material for practicing writing within a controlled or guided framework. The broad purpose and methodological implications of this material is clear: learners need to be helped towards a mastery of the written form of the language.

Instructors have always complained about the lack of knowledge and use of certain skills necessary for the academic writing of nonnative speakers of English. Some of these skills involve outlining, paraphrasing and summary writing. Informal talks with instructors in the Department of English (women's section) at King Saud University revealed that such skills are occasionally included in courses of reading comprehension but no specific instruction is given on how to acquire them.

Successful academic writing involves, among other things, the ability to integrate the words and ideas of other writers into one's texts (Campbell, 1990). A writing skill that is usually given some coverage in programs of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) is the skill of summary writing. The teaching of summary writing occupies an important place in the EAP syllabus (Johns and Mayes, 1990). Accordingly, this skill is given coverage in many academic writing textbooks used in such programs (e.g. Oshima and Hogue, 1991, Amaudet and Barrett, 1984, Rosenthal and Rowland, 1986).

In many courses, one is required to write summaries of articles or other readings, where the summary captures the gist or essence of a work for an audience who has no immediate access to the original. Summarizing material is a method of learning that helps one retain the most important concepts and facts. It forces one to think about what one has read and to

Identify and organize the essential material. Summary writing is especially valuable to the student, for it is an aid in learning to read more accurately. As Byrne (1984) pointed out “Most language examinations contain a question which asks the candidate to summarize either part or all of a passage. The precise form which this question takes varies from board to board, but, whatever the exact wording of the question; you should always approach a summary in the same way” (p.88).

It is generally agreed that summary writing is a skill that does not develop on its own, but requires instruction (see, for instance, Guido and Colwell, 1987). Writing summaries is a necessary academic skill. There are different types of summaries used in the academic field: the assignment summary, writing a response to a reading passage, the abstract, "the one or two sentences summary or mini-summaries, as is typical of annotated bibliographies" (Swales and Feak, 1994, p.106) and the traditional précis type. The existence of so many different types of summary makes summarization strategies a fruitful area of research. It is with one type of summary that I am concerned in this research, “the assignment summary”- in which the students are asked by the instructor to summarize a particular text. Like other types of summary, writing a summary needs careful instruction, and it should not be subject to a hit – or – miss method.

Pedagogical textbooks have put emphasis on skills related to summary writing such as making notes or outlining, but very little attention has been given to what strategies students should use in order to produce adequate summaries. Neither has there been enough attention given to summarization strategies from the empirical perspective. The present study attempts to investigate and analyze the performance of female students of the Department of English at King Saud University in the area of summary writing.

1.2. Significance of the study

The process of summarizing English texts by EFL students is a neglected issue in the literature of summarization. The aim of this study is to investigate the summarization strategies employed by senior level Saudi female students of the Department of English at King Saud University. Informal contacts with instructors in the department have emphasized that most of the students are unable to write adequate summaries when they are assigned to do so.

The significance of focusing on this skill lies in the fact that little empirical research has been done in this area, and none has been concerned with the analysis of the summaries written by Saudi female students. It is, therefore, hoped that this study would be of use both from the theoretical

and pedagogical points of view. The present study tries to diagnose the problems of Saudi female students when they summarize.

Theoretically, it will enhance our understanding and broaden our views of what a summary is. It will also contribute to our understanding of the condensation processes used in writing summaries. In addition, we may gain insights into the sub-skills used in writing summaries, such as note-taking, outlining, reduction, or paraphrasing.

Pedagogically, this study will hopefully be of significance for learners as well as for educators and syllabus designers. This study may enhance the learners' awareness of the areas of difficulties which they encounter when they write summaries. It may also trigger the educators' insights to instruct students to pay attention to the strategies used in successful summary writing. Syllabus writers or course designers may also gain insights that help in improving and modifying the textbooks used for teaching summary writing as part of comprehension or writing processes. These observations are supported by Guido and Colwell (1987) who say that "... it seems that there is a need for direct instruction for teaching summarization skills rather than having students learn on their own through trial and error" (p. 91). Summary writing has been shown to be a helpful method for understanding and recalling what students read (Al-Haidari, 1991).

1.3. Statement of the problem

My own experience, as a student learning English as a second language for more than ten years, and as one who has never been taught properly how to write an adequate summary, has made me aware of the need for direct instruction in summary writing. In addition, as an MA student I noticed that teachers always complain about the students who cannot write summaries when they are asked to produce a library research paper, for instance. This has motivated me to investigate the area of summarization which is a very important skill needed by every student.

1.4. Aims of the study and research questions

The general aim of this study is to investigate undergraduate students' written summaries to see what problems are involved in the process of summarization. More specifically, the aims are to try to find answers to the following questions:

1. What strategies do students use in order to select and reproduce the main ideas of the original?
2. What paraphrasing strategies do students use in their summaries?
3. What condensation strategies do students use?
4. What combination strategies do students use?
5. Do students add any personal comments in their summaries?

6. What attribution strategies do they use in their summaries?

1.5. Delimitations of the study

This study was limited to the senior level of King Saud University female students of the Department of English, since I found it more convenient to get my data from them. The study was restricted to summarization strategies of expository texts of the types students are expected to encounter either in their reading comprehension or in their reading of their course material. At the same time the content of the chosen texts tried to discover the points of weakness in summarization. The proficiency level of the students varies according to their accumulative averages (or GPA) between 1.94 and 4.56, the highest 6 students from 4.06 to 4.56, 21 students from 3.04 to 3.98, 22 students from 2.07 to 2.97, and one student with the lowest level 1.94, having fifty students as the total number of subjects.

1.6. Definition of terms

Macro-proposition

“A proposition or its generalization / construction that is included in the macro-structure is called a macro-proposition. Thus some propositions may be both micro – and macro-propositions (when they are relevant); irrelevant propositions are only micro-propositions, and generalizations and

constructions are only macro-propositions” (Kintsch and Van Dijk, 1978, p.374).

Paraphrasing

“Producing alternative versions of a sentence or text without changing its meaning” (Crystal, 1992, p.322).

Reduction

It refers to the condensation of the content of the original piece of text, either semantically or syntactically.

Rewording

Rewording is a type of paraphrasing in which two items are “interchangeable in both directions” (Hoey, 1983, p.112). The paraphrased item is delivered using an overall change of words or grammar with no discernible change in meaning.

Strategy

“A strategy may be defined as a particular method of approaching a problem or task, a mode of operation for achieving a particular end, a planned design for controlling and manipulating certain information” (Brown, D., 1980, p.83).

Summarizing

Summarizing is a process whereby the source material is condensed and adequately presented in a neutral fashion, basically in the summarizer's own words (Swales & Feak, 1994, p.105-106).

Summary

A summary is a shortened, concentrated version of a text or an article, that contains all important parts of the original passage but in fewer words, and it does not contain one's opinion (Hare and Borchardt, 1984).

Vocabulary replacement

“This involves replacing words in the source with synonyms and perhaps changing the grammar” (Swales & Feak, 1994, p.113).

1.7. Thesis outline

The study consists of five chapters. The first chapter introduces the study, its purpose, significance, and research hypotheses. It also delimits the scope of investigation and specifies the definitions of the terms used. The second chapter provides a background account of studies and research that have been done in areas related to this study. The review of the literature offers useful insights for the design of the model adopted in this study, and it is presented under the following headings:

1. Writing.
2. Note-taking and summarization.

3. Summarization:

- a. Theoretical perspective.
- b. Pedagogical perspective.
- c. Empirical studies.

In chapter three, I discuss the methodology of the study including the selection of subjects, the design of the model and the pilot study. Chapter four is concerned with the analysis of data where examples of the different types of summarization strategies used in the subjects' summaries are given and the percentages of use are shown. Finally, in chapter five, I discuss the findings, their implications and make suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Related Literature

2.1. Introduction

This section aims at reviewing selected literature that is relevant to the notion of summary writing in English for academic purposes in order to derive insights pertinent to the phenomenon under study. It also attempts to find out what previous researchers have done in this area, as well as highlights areas where the literature is lacking so that the current study may be placed in the right perspective. The review will be presented under the following headings:

1. Writing.
2. Note-taking and summarization.
3. Summarization:
 - a. Theoretical perspective.
 - b. Pedagogical perspective.
 - c. Empirical studies.

2.2. Writing

The relationship between thinking and writing is quite clear. They are recursive processes, one has to go back to go forward. Composing involves all thinking skills regardless of the nature of the writing task, as reported by Olson (1984), who stated that “The process of writing requires tapping all

the levels of thinking”(p.30). Writing is a learning tool for heightening and refining thinking. Critical and reflective thinking are fostered through the prewriting, writing and post-writing activities.

Olson (1984) reported Flower and Hayes’s (1981) ideas about writing as one of the most complex of all human mental activities. It is a form of problem solving where the writer must produce an organized set of ideas by selecting and arranging from a vast amount of knowledge, then fits what he or she knows to the needs of the reader as well as the rules of formal prose. Writing is one of the most challenging of thinking experiences. “By helping students become better thinkers, we would enable them to become better writers and vice-versa” (Olson 1984, p.31).

Zaki and Ellis (1999) have also pointed out,

To produce a composition writers must go through their memory to establish what they know, review the information they have generated and translate it into print, organize main ideas into a logical sequence, look for details, construct a framework for communicating the intended message, transform thought into a written script and evaluate the product (p.3).

Current research on the process of writing emphasizes its cyclical and recursive nature. Writers are always planning (pre-writing) and revising (re-writing) as they compose (writing). These processes are continuously going on. Writers produce multiple drafts and revise each. The emphasis on

this process affected the teaching of writing where "revision" assumed to have a position of central importance. The role of the teacher in responding to student writing is intervening during the whole process of composition to offer formative feedback which will help the student improve his or her writing (Zaki and Ellis, 1999).

2.3. Note-taking and Summarization

The relevance of the skills of note taking and summarizing is a common feature of many writing activities which relate in some way to what we have read or heard, since we often make a note of certain ideas and then re-present them in some other form.

These, then, are important skills for the learners, and it is essential that they should not be left with the impression that they are artificial classroom activities, which are of little practical value except for the purpose of passing examination... Note taking is used to refer to the activity both of making notes on a text which has been read and of taking notes on a text which has been heard. It is acknowledged that note taking is itself a form of summarizing (Moore, 1997).

The ability to take notes in English is an essential skill for students in universities and colleges where English is the medium of instruction for some, if not all, courses.

Many educators believe that taking notes from lectures will facilitate learning if students record information while listening or reading. Taking notes is a useful strategy for increasing retention of information. In fact, notes comprise a tangible, external reposition of information that can be retrieved and rehearsed once the instructional event has passed (Carrier and Titus, 1979).

Di Vesta (1972) believes note taking could stimulate encoding processes within the learner, increasing the like-hood that the material to be learned is meaningfully coded and stored during input. Transforming the verbatim material through associating, chunking or coding may occur because the note-taker must extract, summarize, and organize transitory information.

Having notes available alleviates excessive demands on memory. From this perspective, notes are useful because they potentially help the learner rehearse content that has been recorded and serve a mnemonic or reconstructive function by helping the learner remember or reconstruct parts of the content not included in the notes themselves (Weener, 1974).

Hadwin, Kirby and Woodhouse (1999) investigated working memory, verbal ability and prior knowledge as predictors of:

- The quality of students' notes taken during a lecture;
- Summaries of the lecture written during the review period;

- Recall of the lecture content.

The usefulness of taking notes was considered in terms of the quality of summarization and the recall of the lecture material of three groups of students who:

1. listened to the lecture, took notes and reviewed their own notes;
2. listened to the lecture and reviewed a set of provided notes;
3. listened to the lecture, took notes and then reviewed a set of provided notes.

The sample was 94 first year students across a wide range of subjects. In contrast to the present study, students whose home language was not English were eliminated. The data indicated that students with better working memories benefited more from listening to a lecture than listening and taking notes. However, the quality of summaries written was a more powerful predictor of academic performance than the individual differences between students. The most effective condition was for the students to concentrate on listening to the lecture and then be provided with a prepared set of notes, similar to a handout.

Even though taking notes while listening to a lecture is a common practice, few studies have investigated the effects of training students to take good notes. In fact, the few studies that provided explicit training on note-taking are inclusive in their findings.

Procedures described by Howe (1970) were used to calculate the percentages of lecture information present in subject notes and free recall test answers. The average amount of lecture units recorded in lecture notes was 27 percent. Results also showed that 79 percent of the content of the free recall test answers came directly from the notes. Palmatier (1971) compared four different note-taking methods in a related study with high school students. In one case, students were taught to use a formal outline procedure. In the second and third cases, two-column and three-column procedures were taught. In a fourth case, students were told to take their notes in their usual way. Training consisted of instruction in the format to be used and practice of this format while listening to a certain lecture. Two dependent variables were measured. The quality of the notes was assessed by a composite score representing note completeness, clarity, and conciseness. Comprehension of lecture information was assessed by a 30 – item comprehension test that was noted among students from the four different training groups. There were differences in the quality of notes. The formal outline procedure was most effective, and the three-column method was effective in helping students take better notes.

Sutherland, Badger and White (2002) compared the core academic skill of note taking at lectures of these Wider Access students with both international and conventional students. They also investigated the

students' aims of their note taking, and the techniques they used. Two methods were used:

(i) The notes from a lecture of the international and conventional students were analyzed according to Hull's categories as extended by Sutherland et al. (2002);

(ii) Six students from each group were interviewed on why and how they took notes. The goal of most international students was instrumental: to get an accurate record of the lecture which would help them with subsequent essays and exams. Most of the British students (both Wider Access and conventional) had a similar aim, however a minority of the latter were more likely to see the lecture in addition as a source of references for further reading.

Using a text passage for their experimental material, Kulhavy, Dyer, and Silver (1975) varied the pre-reading instructions by telling subjects in two cases that they would receive either a multiple-choice test or an essay test. Subjects in a third condition were not told anything about the text. On the post-test, all subjects received both multiple-choice and essay questions. No relationship was found between test instructions and test mode. An interaction was found, however, between test instructions and the study behavior variable, (i.e., note taking, underlining versus reading only). The interaction showed that students who took notes were hampered by any form of test expectation. This is an unexpected finding, since one might

assume experienced students would regard this information as helpful in adopting an appropriate note taking strategy. Perhaps students have a generalized approach in their note taking. But when they expect a specific type of test, they try to modify this strategy.

Rickards and Friedman (1978) found that test expectancy did not affect the quality of notes taken or total test performance. However, an examination of the notes taken for an essay test revealed that they were qualitatively different from those taken in anticipation of a multiple-choice test, with the former containing more high-level, idea-oriented passage material. On a cued recall test the essay group also recalled more high-structural important items than those expecting a multiple-choice test. The second group conversely recalled more low-structural important items.

The note taking system was consistent with the informational demands of the set test because the sample that followed the system recorded most of the facts and ideas included in the test. That is why an effective note-taking system should help learners record and encode information that can be retrieved and used; hence, the structure of the note-taking system encouraged students to build a framework for the information which could be then used in the final exam. The richness of one's internal organization increases the probability of retrieving information at a later time (Shimmerlik, 1978).

Paper and Mayer (1978) explained that the efficacy of training is that teaching the students to take notes will raise their overall attention level and help them focus on the to-be learned material. Because note-takers exert more effort or attend more carefully, they are apt to learn better. Paper and Mayer (1978) refer to this explanation as attention and effort theory.

The finding of the experiment indicated that the trained students used more frequently an outline in taking notes in the post-test than in the pre-test. In addition, the content of the test answers came directly from the lectures. This provides confirmation of Howe's (1970) notion that what is remembered is what is recorded during note taking.

Logan (2003) developed a teaching technique to help students to understand the concept of intellectual property and to see the importance and advantages of using information ethically. This workshop's activities emphasize note taking as a process. Participants play with a variety of note taking systems structured to help students learn to skim, scan, recognize relevant information, identify and select main ideas and supporting details, summarize, paraphrase, cite sources, extract information and evaluate information and results.

Note taking conferencing is the technique developed by Logan (2003), which involves sitting down one-on-one with each child and looking at his or her note taking processes and discussing them together. Then the

teacher can give the exact feedback and fix problems before the project is due.

The workshop also addresses how to transfer note taking strategies to the process of highlighting and underlining. Connections are drawn between prewriting strategies and note taking so that students can simplify the task of writing or creating a final project.

Some researchers, however, found that summarization was not different from any other strategies (Arnold, 1942, Stordahl and Christenson, 1956, and Germane, 1921). Arnold (1942) taught freshman and other college students to use the study skills of note taking, underlining, rereading, and summarization. The results of the study showed that there were no significant differences between summarizing and the other study skills on both long- and short-term measures of retention.

2.4. Summarization

This section reviews some of the important studies related to the notion of summarization. It investigates the available studies on summary writing in English for academic purposes. The studies will be reviewed and placed in the appropriate perspectives: theoretical, pedagogical, or empirical.

a. Theoretical Perspective

Summarization is a skill used by almost everyone, but summarization as an academic skill has theoretical underpinnings. The notion of summary

writing is related to what Van Dijk (1977) calls the theory of pragmatic macro-structure of discourse and its relation to the grammatical, the cognitive, and the metacognitive levels. According to Van Dijk, macro-structures are part of the information processing necessary to cope with the limitation of memory working. Summarization, or, as he puts it, macro-structuring, is performed through various methods such as generalization, which requires mapping actions into their common super-acts, deletions of unnecessary information, or, as he puts it, “non-relevant acts”, and transformation applied to the local meaning, using macro-rules such as using intuition to decide which is the main act. Van Dijk concludes that the main objective of macro-structure is to reduce the highly complex information into a manageable size. He points out, “macro-structures are further required in order to make explicit the semantic relations between a discourse and its (possible) summaries. Thus, it is assumed that a summary is a verbal expression of a macro-structure of the discourse it summarizes” (Van Dijk, 1977, p.197).

There are various summarization skills that are involved in semantic macro-structures, such as deletion, reduction, and condensation. Tadros (1981) points out that the same macro-structure in one situation could be a microstructure in another context. She also points out that the semantic macro-structure can be arrived at by the process of deletion and reduction

on the one hand and integration on the other, whereby the essential units of information are integrated into a higher level of semantic macro-structure.

According to Kintsch and Van Dijk (1978), when readers read a passage they form a gist in their minds, and that gist represents their overall comprehension of that passage. This gist is formed through processes of deletion, generalization, and integration.

Brown and Day (1983) identified six rules for condensing text to its gist following the processes suggested by Kintsch and Van Dijk (1978). These rules are: (1) delete unimportant information, (2) delete redundant information, (3) superordinate a term for a list of items, (4) superordinate a term for a list of actions, (5) select topic sentences, if any, and (6) invent topic sentences if none is provided (cited in Al-Haidari, 1991, p.6-7).

Condensation is a summarization skill that has been highlighted by Lemke (1987). He discussed the thematic condensation in technical discourse within the framework of the social uses of that discourse. His study is based on Halliday's work in which Halliday examines a text in relation to the way it deploys the general semantic resources of the language. Lemke's starting point was the identification of some features of technical discourse such as the absence of human agents in most technical writings, and the domination of the third person forms. Lemke pointed out "... in technical discourse the degree of condensation – that is, the number

of unexpressed thematic items and relations that are needed to make sense of those that are expressed – is much greater than for other discourse types” (Lemke, 1987, p.442).

In their work, Brown and Yule (1983) have fully explained the analysis of discourse where various aspects of discourse are discussed in detail. Of special interest are the chapters that deal with the nature of reference in text and discourse. Some important ideas were presented such as cohesion, which account for the essential semantic relations whereby any passage of speech or writing is enabled to function as a text, and substitution have a great bearing on the summarization process.

Of the most outstanding researchers in the area of analyzing the semantic structure of texts are Kintsch and Van Dijk (1978). In their study, their objective was twofold: first to formulate a coherent semantic text base to compensate for limitations of working memory, and second to generate recall and summarization protocols. Their model also includes macro operators whose purpose is to reduce the information in a text to its theoretical macro-structure. According to their model, coherent text bases are constructed by a process in cycles and constrained by limitation of working memory. Macro processes are used to reduce the information in a text base through deletion and various types of rules and processes related to the theoretical macro-structure. They also touched upon the idea of

coherence where the meaning and reference of sentences are derived both from their constituent components and from their relation to the interpretation of other sentences. The cognitive correlation of this observation is that a language user needs to relate new incoming information to the information he or she already has, either from the text, the context, or from the language user's general knowledge system.

Kirkland and Saunders (1991), with pedagogy in mind, emphasize the complexities of summarization skills. They discuss some of the difficulties pertaining to summary writing. The constraints to good summary writing fall into two major categories: first, external constraints which include purpose and audience of assignment, features of the assignment, discourse community conventions, nature of the material to be summarized, time constraints, and working conditions. The second are internal constraints which include "L₂ proficiency, content schemata, affect, formal schemata, cognitive skills, and metacognitive skills" (p. 108).

According to Kirkland and Saunders, the basic skills to cope with these internal constraints are adequate reading skills, comprehension level, adequate control of grammar and vocabulary, and writing skills to manipulate and express information. Kirkland and Saunders also confirmed that these L₂ skills are not affected by the same skills the learner may have in his or her mother tongue.

From the above review of theoretical studies, it is clear that the notion of summarization is significant to researchers interested in summary writing as an academic skill. This justifies the undertaking of the current study into learners' strategies and how they actually summarize.

b. Pedagogical Perspective

Summary writing has been introduced in a number of pedagogical books as one type of academic writing. Swales and Feak (1994) present an overview of the aspects involved in successful academic writing such as how to handle the discussion of data, writing summaries, writing critiques and how to conduct a research paper. With regard to summary writing, Swales and Feak state the features of a good summary emphasizing three principal requirements:

1. It should offer a balanced coverage of the original.
2. It should present the source material in a neutral fashion.
3. It should condense the source material and be presented in the summary writer's own words.

Swales and Feak then go on to produce valuable procedural steps for summary writing (for details see Swales and Feak, 1994, p.106). They present various tasks in order to acquaint the learner with the skill of writing summaries, including some related tasks for the language used in

summary writing (such as nominal that-clauses or summary reminder phrases).

Spatt (1983), pedagogically motivated, defines the skill of summarization as the ability to sum up a group of related ideas briefly and completely. Spatt lays stress on the skill of understanding before summarizing. She proposes several necessary pre-summarizing skills such as the skill of underlining, annotation, drawing inferences and outlining as skills used by the summarizer in order to represent the content from a source or more than one source in the form of a summary. Then she explores the kinds of summaries providing the learner with a sufficient amount of exercises to train the learner to write summaries of different kinds and for different purposes.

Summary writing is also introduced in Reid (1982) as “a condensation of the main ideas in an article” (p.87). In this book, Reid presents the goal of summary writing as to give the readers, who have not read an article or a source, an overview of what the article or the source is about; that is, giving the readers an objective, complete, accurate, and balanced view of the source or article.

In addition, he differentiates between writing an abstract and summary writing, pointing out, “...the abstract: a summary of a scientific article that is generally located at the beginning of the article. By reading the abstract,

readers can quickly decide whether or not they want to read the entire article” (Reid, 1982, p.87).

Reid also differentiates between writing an abstract and writing a response to a written material as a different skill that consists of two parts: a summary and analysis of the material (the first part) and the reader’s response or comments regarding the material (the second part). A great amount of useful exercises are provided by Reid in order to acquaint the learner with the various skills discussed in the book.

In their study, Guido and Colwell (1987) found that summary writing is an extremely complex task that is not fostered through trial and error method. They concluded that direct instruction is required to enable students to develop meaningful summaries. Their proposal for direct instruction for summarization consisted of five steps:

1. Break down complex skills into small ones.
2. Demonstrate how the skills should be performed.
3. Conduct guided practice lessons.
4. Provide time for independent practice and application.
5. Provide feedback for steps 2-4.

The proposal also outlined practical rules that fit into the first three steps of the proposal such as omitting the unnecessary detail, avoiding

repetition, using general terms instead of specific items and using one word to describe a list of actions.

Summary writing has received some kind of attention in the field of teaching English as a second or a foreign language. Recent techniques for teaching summary writing have been suggested by Al-Issa (1998). Al-Issa provides six techniques for teaching the learners how to write a summary, which he implemented with his students in Oman. One of these techniques was to list five or more words on the board and ask the students to individually produce a narrative or a descriptive piece of writing depending on the type of words provided. Another interesting technique was to give the student a long reading text with some comprehension questions related to the main points of the text. By answering these questions in full, the students will find themselves writing a summary of the text. In addition, Al-Issa (1998) suggested preparing a text and a summary of the text with gaps in it for a cloze exercise. “The cloze activity will help the student: (a) to identify the key words and place them in the appropriate blanks; and (b) to see a model summary after all the blanks are filled in” (p.38)

Peretz (1986) has made an important contribution to the teaching of summary writing to EFL students, especially to science and technology students. She offers two types of activities to be used in class: pre-summarization activities and summarization activities.

For the pre-summarization activities, she suggests that teachers should explain to the learners the different types of texts or articles in order to know the overall organization of the text structure and be able to identify its parts as the thesis sentences, the introduction, important ideas, hypotheses, and the conclusion. She also suggests the provision of instruction in note taking and/or text-making techniques such as underlining key words, making marks in the margin, and even writing notes in the margin. In addition, Peretz emphasizes that the teacher should direct the learners to read and reread the text in order to explain what the article is about since reading for academic purposes requires a great degree of concentration, precision and intensity.

For the summarization activities, Peretz suggests that the summarizers divide the text into sections where each section could be summarized individually then they can form the full summary. Another point that Peretz discusses is the level of abstraction in relation to the type of information required by the audience. She points out that “Real world audiences are frequently less interested in supporting details than academic audiences” (Peretz, 1986, p.31). Peretz gives evidence of the success of her procedures in her own teaching. It remains to be seen whether these will have an impact on pedagogy.

Strever and Newman (1997) have promoted written fluency by summarization. They instituted integration to promote active negotiation of meaning in written text. In this case students do not only send journal entries to an “E-partner”, but they also make meaning by summarizing their E-partners’ journal entries. The summary is sent to both E-partner and instructor. The researchers found that by using interactive electronic journal and summary writing they are offering their students opportunities to write, read, comprehend, and produce summaries in a less intimidating environment where the students themselves are the responders rather than their instructors. The researchers after creating guidelines for summaries and having experienced peers introduce their advanced ESL classes to E-mail. The results showed that through the electronic medium students gain skills and confidence that will serve them in their college classes.

In a more recent study, Endres-Niggemeyer (2000) advocates in her article that Sim Sum (Simulation of Summarizing) system does what its name promises: it stimulates summarizing of human experts and thus produces a computational cognitive model of their processing. To this aim, readers are guided along the whole path of Sim Sum realization: the empirical investigation, the system design drawn from observables, the implementation as an animated multimedia presentation, and an evaluation in an educational environment. The evaluation covers an obvious use of the Sim Sum CD, namely demonstrating to students how experts summarize

and teaching them some of the experts' intellectual strategies. Beside its role in system development, this test helps teachers of summarization integrate Sim Sum into their classes.

From the previous review of the pedagogical studies related to summary writing we can conclude that summary writing is regarded as one type of academic writing, but since it is a complex skill, it needs to be informed by empirical research. This is the concern of the next section.

c. Empirical studies

Research on summary writing is conducted for educational and academic purposes. Horowitz (1986) investigated the implications of seven types of writing tasks in English for academic purposes based on the data collected from actual handouts and essay examinations given to students in university classes. His objective was to suggest how writing tasks could be created to stimulate the essential characteristics of real university writing assignments. These seven types of writing tasks are summary of/reaction to a reading, annotated bibliography, report on a specified participatory experience, connection of theory and data, case study, synthesis of multiple sources and research project. His formula for a generalized academic writing task stressed the main objective of each writing task. The result of this survey showed that the task of summary writing comes third in place.

This emphasizes the importance of summary writing for academic purposes.

Taylor (1984) conducted a study in which he investigated the different summary skills of inexperienced and professional writers. Taylor's purpose was to see whether the amateurs and the professionals use different strategies to accomplish the task of summarizing an expository article. For his protocol-based experiment, he selected 18 subjects (9 professionals and 9 students) who were given a 750-word article entitled "Grant and Lee: A study of Contrast" to be summarized in no more than one-third of the original (about three to six sentences as suggested by the researcher). The results showed that the amateurs need more practice and experience to produce adequate summaries.

Carrell (1984) studied the effects of rhetorical organization of different types of expository prose on ESL readers of different native languages. The study included 80 subjects. These subjects were 32 Spanish, 16 Arabs, 12 Chinese, some Koreans, and others. Subjects read four different ways of organizing expository prose suggested by Meyer (1979): description, problem/solution, comparison, and collection of description.

Results indicate that various discourse types had differing effects on the quantity of free recall for different language groups. For the Arabic group, there were significant differences among (1) comparison, (2)

problem/solution and collection of description, and (3) causation. Thus, the reason Arabic-speaking subjects found the collection of descriptions type of discourse equal to the problem/solution type, and better than the causation type, may be, according to Carrell, “due to the preferred rhetorical pattern of Arabic, which has been described as being one of coordinate parallelism.” (cited in Al- Haidari, 1999, p.14).

The goal of the study of Zaki and Ellis (1999) was to determine the effects of using student-teacher writing conferences in teaching essay writing to fourth year English majors at the Faculty of Al-Alson on their writing performance, reflective and critical thinking. The study had a pre-post control group design. Twenty-nine fourth year male and female students were randomly assigned to either the control or the experimental group. Students of the experimental group were instructed using student-teacher writing conferences whereas the control group received the usual treatment (teacher’s written comments) and received no such instruction. Tools of the study included a composition grading scale, a test of reflective thinking (prepared by the researcher), Waston & Glaser’s critical thinking appraisal (the Arabic version) and a language proficiency exam (prepared by the researcher). Results revealed that students’ writing performance improved significantly. There were also significant results about students’ improvements in reflective and critical thinking.

In an earlier study, Brown and Smiley (1977) dealt with how learners from different age groups differ in identifying the ideas of a text. They studied four age levels (8, 10, 12, and 18), and they found that older subjects were much better than younger ones in identifying the main ideas of the text. In a series of three experiments conducted in 1978, they found that special instruction helped high school and college students remember important elements of text better than the unimportant.

The ability to summarize texts follows a developmental process. Researches have shown that children are able to summarize but their summaries are less efficient than those of older children and adults (Brown and Day, 1983, Brown, Day, and Jones, 1983, and Johnson, 1978). In Brown et al.'s study (1983); college and older high school students were developmentally better in their propensity to plan ahead; in their rating of pausal units, and in their ability to include more idea units into the same number of words than young children. Younger children (fifth and seventh grade students), on the other hand, appeared to treat the task of summarizing as one of deciding whether to include or delete information from the story into their summary. The authors call this a copy-delete strategy in which children read text elements sequentially, decide what to include and what to exclude, and if they decide to include something, they copy it from the text.

Summary writing is a skill that involves comprehension processes since the summarizer cannot produce an adequate summary of the original without understanding and comprehending the original material. Various research studies on the relationship between summarizing and comprehension were conducted by different researchers. Glover, Plake, Roberts, Zimmer and Palmere (1981) investigate the possibility that different levels of processing during reading would influence the degree of recall of information in a passage. In their study, it was hypothesized that readers would generate greater numbers of idea units and logical intrusions, as the level of reader schema-text base interaction increased. The results of this research generally support the notion that recall is a function of the level of processing/distinctiveness of encoding. Tasks requiring readers to draw more extensively on previous knowledge (paraphrasing and making logical extension such as inferences) resulted in higher rates of recall from the essay materials. A problem with this research is that, "...some subjects were unable or unwilling to paraphrase or draw logical extensions during reading. This lack of ability may be attributable to an overall lack of skill in reading comprehension" (Glover, et al., 1981, p.743).

Summarizing a text that students had read was found to increase the students' recall of important information in the text in addition to improving their reading comprehension. Doctorow, Wittrock, and Marks (1978) divided 488 sixth-grade students into four groups. The first group

attempted to summarize a passage which lacked paragraph heading. The second group was provided with heading but not instructed to summarize. The third group was instructed only to read. The fourth group, which was provided with paragraph heading and instructed to summarize what they read, did significantly better than the other three groups on a multiple-choice recall measure. According to Liden and Wittrock (1981), teachers can facilitate reading comprehension by inducing the readers to attend to the text, to relate the text to their knowledge and experience, and to build associations and inferences from it. Linden and Wittrock induced fifth-grade students to generate metaphors, analogies, summaries, pictures and inferences as they read three stories. Results showed that students writing summary sentences outperformed other students using more traditional methods like answering questions, identifying main ideas, events and characters.

Adams (1980) taught fifth grade students, who had adequate reading skills but demonstrated deficiencies in study skills, an SQ3R-like study strategy that she had developed. It contained a summarizing step. Using this strategy these students made significant improvements in their ability to recall textual information and retained these improvements after a two-week delay.

Kintsch and Kozminsky (1977), unlike the researchers above, are concerned with the identification of the common core of comprehension processes that underlie both listening and reading skills. In this study, Kintsch and Kozminsky compare the summaries written by the subjects after reading a story with those written after listening to the story. The subjects were 24 college students who either listened to or read three tape-recorded stories, each about 2000 words in length. The subjects' summaries were of particular interest because they reveal more directly the organizational process in text comprehension, which tend to be obscured in recall. Summarization involves different psychological processes from recall, and is sensitive to organizational and structural variables (such as the availability of a schema). The researchers found an interesting feature of the summaries written by the subjects. This feature concerned devoting a large portion of their summaries to the first quarter of each story than to any of the remaining quarters. According to the researchers, this result appears to reflect a bias in favor of the setting of the story, which subjects seem to regard as very important in a summary.

In writing a summary the student is practicing composition at its most ideal form, for a good summary requires that all statements be in the briefest and clearest possible grammatical arrangement. An explanation for the effectiveness of a summary has been advanced by Hebb (1966) as cited in Dyer (2001) that over time information is successfully recognized and

firmly anchored in memory. Therefore, activities which promote this reorganization, such as writing a summary, should result in increased learning (Dyer, 2001).

Other researchers, Head, Redence, and Buss (1989), were interested in investigating the influence of reading comprehension on summarizing. Their method was to test comprehension of a passage by using multiple-choice questions and compare their answers with the summary of the same target passage. Another point of investigation in this study was related to factors that might affect the success of summarizing. These factors are:

1. The level of subjects' interest in the target passage topic.
2. The general writing ability of the subjects.
3. The level of summarizing ability that the subjects possess.

After examining the performance of 49 seventh-grade students in a middle school, several implications were drawn from the results. First, it seems necessary to state that text comprehension should be measured in different ways, depending upon the comprehension model that the researcher wishes to investigate and upon the level of summarizing ability of the subjects. Second, possible differences in reader variables such as topic interest, writing ability, and exposure to summarization training should be taken into account.

Winograd (1984) chose to examine the strategy differences between good and poor readers as they summarized what they read. The subjects of the study consisted of 75 eighth-graders and 37 adults who performed several tasks. The study indicated that most students were aware of what writing a summary demands. However, good and poor readers displayed some differences. While good readers behaved like adults in identifying important information in texts, poor readers had many difficulties doing so. Also, although poor readers were consistent in identifying points in the text as being important, they failed to include these points in their summaries. This suggested that summarizing a text requires more than merely understanding the passage. In addition, the need for training students on how to summarize becomes clear.

Some of the most influential researchers in the area of summary writing are Johns and Mayes (1990) who have analyzed the summary protocols of university ESL students. In this study, Kintsch and Van Dijk's model (1978) was employed to compare idea units in summary protocols by the subjects at two levels of proficiency. The subjects were 80 ESL students who fall into two groups: 40 low proficiency (L) and 40 high proficiency (H). Significant differences between the two groups were found in two categories: replication of sentences from the original text, and combinations of idea units taken from two or more punctuated sentences in the original. The findings indicate that there are few significant differences between

high and low proficiency ESL university students in the idea unit manipulation which produces summary products.

In his study, Moore (1997) investigated two important issues: first, how summarization is handled in EAP writing textbooks; second, how summarization practices might differ between students from different cultural backgrounds. He postulated that a source of difficulty is the notion of attribution when encountered in a text to be summarized. In this study, the subjects were 26 international students from Asian backgrounds (Malaysia and Hong Kong) and 26 students from Australian backgrounds. The subjects were asked to write a summary (150-200 words) of a short lecture entitled *Academic Writing at University*. The analysis of the subjects' summaries was concerned with the extent to which summarized propositions were attributed (either to the lecturer or to those authors referred to in the lecture). The overall results obtained from this analysis indicated that the Australian summarizations of the propositions were more attributed, either explicitly or implicitly, than those of the international group. Another result that was found in the subjects' summaries was the absence of the proposition that contains attribution in six of the international summaries. The researcher interpreted these results by firstly, suggesting that the result may reflect differing levels of English language proficiency for the two groups, specially listening proficiency. Secondly,

the results may reflect different attitudes to knowledge on the part of the two groups.

Another study is the study of Kim (2001). This study reports part of the findings of a study of Korean EFL students' skill in summarizing an English text. The participants were 70 freshmen who were assumed to possess the typical Korean EFL students' characteristics related to summary writing. The two English texts employed were expository texts taken from a college-level ESL reading book. One of the texts (i.e., Text A) was assumed to be easier than the other (i.e., Text B). Data gathered from two summaries were analyzed in terms of the content idea units included in the summary, the idea units on four importance levels, use of three summarization rules (i.e., deletion, selection, and transformation), and accuracy. According to the results, the participants in this study were sensitive, though not fully, to importance. The most frequently used rule was the deletion rule, and the least frequently used rule was the transformation rule. Analysis of data also revealed that text difficulty can affect the summary writer's behavior. Changes in the writers' behaviors due to text difficulty were noted in the proportion of content idea units included in the summary, the use of selection and transformation rules, and in the accuracy rate, but not in the use of the deletion rule or total rule use. Results indicate that Korean EFL students do not possess effective

summarization skills and are in need of appropriate instruction and practice to improve these skills.

Al-Haidari (1991) in his study investigated the extent of the application of the rules of summarization suggested by Brown and Day (1983) by 21 Saudi male students studying at a major American Midwestern university. The study also investigated the language change that Saudi students make when they are given a chance to revise their first draft of a summary. When students summarized and revised their summaries, they followed the think-aloud procedure to allow for more investigation of their strategies when they summarize when they revise.

The study found that Saudi students applied the rules of deletion of unimportant information, deletion of redundant information, and selection of available topic sentences easily. Saudi students, on the other hand, faced some difficulty applying the super-ordination of a term for a list of items and the invention of a topic sentence when none is available.

The study also showed that when they revised their summaries, Saudi students added to their revision more than they deleted. The changes that they made in their revision tended to make the meaning of the revision clearer and more accurate. Also the study showed that the students made grammatical and informational changes more often than mechanical ones.

Corbeil (2000) states that university students studying a second language are often required to summarize information they read or hear in that language. These learners bring with them a number of first-language summarization skills which may have an effect on how they acquire second-language summarization skills. According to the results of this study, both first-language summarization skills and second-language proficiency affect second-language summarization skills, except for inclusion of main ideas and amount of distortion which are more affected by first-language summarizing skills. Neither first-language summarizing skills nor second-language proficiency has an effect on combining within and across paragraphs and the use of macro-propositions.

In another study, Friend (2000) selected several passages to be summarized. They were either taken from Day (1980) or adapted from adult literacy materials and were comparable to "Native Americans", which was one of the passages used in Friend's study. Experimenters modeled the strategy, led the class in developing a summary as a group, and then had students apply the strategy to construct a summary individually. Papers were collected, corrected, and returned in the next class session with a model summary for experimental conditions and a model self-response for the control group. The experimenters led the whole class in using the strategy to construct another summary; then each student was asked to write his or her own summary. The results showed that students who were

taught to summarize using either generalization or repeated references did significantly better than the control group on other measures, including predetermined important concepts in their final summaries, excluding unimportant concepts, constructing the thesis of the entire article, and stating full ideas, not just topics. From the results we can see that using generalization and repeated references removes the mystery from summarization and helps the students understand what the author means.

From the foregoing review of related literature, it is clear that there is a paucity of research into the complex strategies involved in summary writing. It is also clear that empirical studies on summarization have used, as subjects, groups of learners other than Saudis, except for Al-Haidari (1991) who took Saudi male students in an ESL sitting as subjects for his study. And since the strategies adopted by learners may be, to some extent, culture specific, as is evident in Moore (1997), and the setting in the present study is totally different (EFL), it is hoped that the current research may make a contribution to that area.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology and Procedures

3.1. Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the selection of the subjects and the procedures followed in the investigation of the phenomenon under study. These procedures include the designing of the model adopted for the study and its verification through a pilot study.

3.2. Selection of Subjects

The whole number of subjects was 63 students, ten of whom were selected randomly for the pilot study. Fifty-three students were contacted to take part in the study. Three subjects did not wish to continue after initially agreeing to participate. Thus the study included fifty female students. The subjects ranged in age from 22-26 years old.

The subjects for this study were fifty students selected randomly from the senior level of female students of the Department of English at King Saud University. The reason for choosing this level is that, at this level, students would have finished their comprehension courses where summarization questions form part of the comprehension exercises. Therefore, subjects at this level are supposed to be aware of the task of summarization. The proficiency level of the students varied according to

their accumulative averages (or their GPA) between 1.94 and 4.56, the highest 6 students from 4.06 to 4.56, 21 students from 3.04 to 3.98, 22 students from 2.07 to 2.97, and one student with the lowest level 1.94.

3.3. Research Instruments and Procedures

The data for the study were collected by giving the subjects two texts to summarize. Care was taken in text selection where the first one was an expository text of general interest entitled “Energy Sense Makes Future Sense” (See Appendix I). The text was taken from a reading book from which teachers in the Department of English select comprehension passages, *Reading for Adults* by McVincent, Lewis, and Weir (1977). The length of this text is 787 words and the students were asked to reduce the text to the third of its length; that is, about 262 words in their summaries. The sentences of this text were numbered by the researcher to facilitate the process of analyzing the students’ summaries. The text used in this task was shown to teachers of the Department who judged the suitability of the text for summarization on account of the redundant statements which could be reduced and successfully summarized by the subjects. In addition, an analysis of the text revealed that this text falls under what is called “the problem-solution pattern” in Hoey’s terminology (Hoey, 1983). This pattern of organization involves the existence of a problem. Problems raise the expectations of solutions. More than one possible solution may be

discussed and evaluated. If the evaluation is negative, another possible solution is provided. Without a positive solution, even though tentative, the discourse is not complete. In the text under study, the problem of looking for sources of energy other than oil was presented, and its possible solutions were discussed.

The text was submitted to 6 specialists in the field of teaching English. They evaluated its suitability and agreed that the text was within the range of vocabulary of students and can measure what it is supposed to measure. It was also in accordance with the desired aims. Validity was obtained by showing the text to colleagues and instructors in the Department. They were asked to summarize the text and provide comments on the suitability of the text. It was found, for instance, that the MA students used less paraphrasing strategies than the instructors did. But on the whole there was an agreement on which were the main ideas. These results were encouraging and the text was regarded suitable linguistically and cognitively. The instructors agreed that the text can discover and diagnose the students' weakness and the problems involved in the process of summarization.

As regards the second text, it was of a different type. It was selected from an English Language Periodical, *ELT Journal*. The text "Playwriting and English Language Teaching" by Elgar (2002) was related to what

students are studying, and it was characterized by the feature of attribution, “a textual device which functions to create a distance between author and summarizer” (Moore, 1997, p.45). The reason for this is that previous studies such as that by Moore (1997) indicated that students from different backgrounds have different approaches to the notion of attribution presented in their summaries. In his study he found that the Australian students’ summaries were more attributed than those of the Asian students from Malaysia and Hong Kong. The results of Moore’s study have motivated the researcher to investigate the notion of attribution in the summaries of Saudi female students. The steps which were followed with the first text for validity and suitability were also adopted with the second text.

3.4. Methods of Analysis

Both qualitative and quantitative approaches to the analysis of the data were adopted, with the scales tipping towards qualitative analysis. This is because the nature of the problem, being a case study which is more oriented towards qualitative analysis and description. At the same time, some numerical data showing the frequencies and percentages of the summarization strategies adopted by the subjects were presented.

3.5. The Model of the Summarization Strategies

The first step in conducting this research was to investigate the notion of summarization strategies in the literature as in Brown and Day (1983), Johns and Mayes (1990), Al-Haidari (1991), Moore (1997) and others. Insights derived from the application of the phenomenon illuminated the way and guided me as to what to look for. So, I started by analyzing the summaries of the subjects in the pilot study very carefully in order to identify instances of summarization strategies. After that, I designed a preliminary model, which was modified as the study progressed. Finally, the analysis of the data and the review of the literature led to designing a model of the summarization strategies as presented below.

A. Accurate Reproduction of Ideas

1. Picking out main ideas.
2. Accurate paraphrasing:
 - a. Rewording.
 - b. Vocabulary replacement.
3. Accurate combination of ideas, not combined in the original.
4. Reduction
 - Semantic reduction.
5. Attribution

a. Explicit.

b. Implicit.

B. Distorted Representation of Ideas

1. Reproduction of unimportant ideas.
2. Direct copying of the original statements
 - a. Copying without any change.
 - b. Copying with minimal change.
3. Deleting important ideas.
4. Faulty combination of ideas.
5. Inaccurate macro-propositions.
6. Addition of personal comments.
7. Using non-attributed ideas.
8. Deletion of propositions including attribution.

3.6. Pilot Study

After studying the notion of summarization strategies in the literature, I selected some students from the senior level randomly for the pilot study. The expository text “Energy Sense Makes Future Sense” was given to a group of ten students during one of their classes. The subjects were able to write the summaries in a 50-minute session. After distributing the text, the

instructions were read and explained clearly and subjects were encouraged to ask questions if needed.

At the end of the class, the summaries of the ten students were collected, analyzed and reanalyzed. The students' summaries were analyzed and compared with the original text in order to derive insights, which would enable the researcher to design a model of summarization strategies. The students' summaries were also compared with the instructors' summaries and the researcher's summary, in order to determine the main ideas of the text that need to be mentioned in the summary. The model resulting from the pilot study and the insights derived from the literature contained two major categories: accurate representation of ideas and distorted representation of ideas, each of which includes a number of strategies as presented in 3.5. above. The model was shown to instructors in the Department to judge its validity as a research instrument. They were requested to test its applicability to the analysis of a sample of data collected from the subjects. The result pointed to the need of making certain modifications.

After two weeks the same two texts were handed to the subjects of the pilot study to test its reliability. According to Pearson's formula r was 0.87 and was significant at .01 level, and the r formula for the second text was 0.81, which show that the texts were reliable.

The steps which have been followed with the first text for validity and reliability were adopted with the second text as well, as pointed out earlier.

Then the texts were given to the whole population on two consecutive days with the same instructions used in the pilot study.

The following table (table.1) represents the results of the analysis of the summaries in the pilot study.

Table (1)

Results of the pilot study

Summarization strategies	Number of students	
	Passage #1	Passage #2
<u>A) Accurate Reproduction of Ideas:</u>		
1- Picking out main ideas	5	2
2- Accurate paraphrasing:		
a) Rewording.	7	6
b) Vocabulary replacement.	5	0
3- Accurate combination of ideas	6	3
4- Reduction:		
Semantic reduction.	4	4
5- Attribution:		
a) Explicit		6
b) Implicit		5
<u>B) Distorted Representation of Ideas:</u>		
1- Reproduction of unimportant ideas.	6	10
2- Direct copying of the original statements:		
a) Copying without any change	10	10
b) Copying with minimal change	8	4
3- Deleting important ideas.	10	9
4- Faulty combination of ideas.	10	6
5- Inaccurate macro- propositions	4	3
6- Addition of personal comments	7	4
7- Using non-attributed ideas		5
8- Deletion of propositions including attribution		4

To conclude, the pilot study analyzed the students' summaries and compared them with the original text. That analysis of the summaries and the literature reviewed has led to the construction of the model presented above. The categories of summarization were shown to instructors in the Department, who validated the use of these categories. Therefore, the model has proven to be applicable and reliable in relation to the sample studied.

CHAPTER FOUR

Analysis of Data and Results

4.1. Introduction

As mentioned earlier a study comprising 50 summaries written by the subjects was conducted by the above model (see 3.5). The strategies of summarization presented in the model are exemplified and examples are given for convenience. The examples were drawn from the subjects' summaries and are presented as they appeared in the summaries.

The student's summary is placed as an example, followed by the piece of text from the original which is relevant to the example. The first two or three examples are picked out from the first passage (Energy sense makes future sense) while the following examples are picked out from the second passage (Playwriting and English language teaching). Tables of the categories are provided after the explanations of the examples used for each category and frequencies and percentages are indicated. The first category to be investigated in this chapter is Accurate Reproduction of Ideas which starts with the sub-category "Picking out main ideas".

4.2. Accurate Reproduction of Ideas

1. Picking out main ideas

For a reasonable representation of the original, the summarizer should carefully pick out the elements that are considered important. What is considered important depends on the original text; the first text used in this study is a problem-solution text which discusses the problem of energy sources and its possible solutions (Hoey, 1983). The second text is characterized by the notion of attribution, to investigate the strategies that the students use in order to summarize someone's words.

Passage I

Example (1)

We should take care of the energy and use it less than we use to store energy for future.

Original

In the meantime, we can all help to protect the environment by not wasting energy. This means driving more carefully (if you have to use a car- it's healthier and cheaper to ride a bike) and turning off unnecessary lighting and heating in the home. In these small ways we can all help to make the world a cleaner, healthier place for future generations.

(last paragraph: sentences 2,3,4)

In this example, the summarizer has represented the main idea of the last paragraph of the original text where she successfully picked the main

idea of the paragraph. But the summarized sentence could have been condensed further without any loss of meaning as in, for instance "We should take care of the energy and use it economically to keep it for the future". Nevertheless, the student's sentence could be considered as the main idea of the last paragraph of the original.

Example (2)

Using oil too much brought the world to its senses and made it think of other alternatives like coal and natural gas, but they realized that coal is heavy pollutant and gas is limited in supply.

Original

The increase in the price of oil has brought the world to its senses. Governments are searching for a suitable alternative, but so far in vain. They are considering how they can make better use of the two other major fuels, coal and natural gas, but they have found that neither can take the place of oil in their economies. In recent years there has been a growing concern for the environment and coal is not a popular fuel with environmentalists. Coal mines are ugly, and their development has a serious effect on animal and plant life; coal itself is a heavy pollutant. Natural gas, the purest of the three fuels, is also the most limited in supply. (second paragraph)

Here, the summarizer has accurately picked out the main idea of this paragraph of the original text and she represented it in her own words showing the awareness of the summarization strategy she is using.

Passage II

Example (1)

Rycik (1990-40) advocates the use of playwriting in English teaching because it leads them to discover the value of teamwork.

Original

Rycik (1990-40) advocates the use of playwriting in LI English teaching, claiming that it gives students the opportunity to hone their creative writing skills and cultivate their imagination. It also leads them to discover the value of cooperation and the importance of teamwork.

(first paragraph: sentence2,3)

The summarizer, in this example advocated the main idea of the paragraph. Nevertheless, she presented the main idea in a concise way and more condensed than the original, giving the importance of English teaching to the value of teamwork and skipping its importance to the creative writing skills and cultivation of imagination.

Example (2)

Salvante describes playwriting residency programs. The advantage that the student could take from these programs is writing plays and develop greater self-esteem.

Original

Salvante (1993) describes playwriting residency programs she administers for US public schools. These programs sponsor professional playwrights to

work in schools, helping students to write plays. Through writing plays students can develop greater self-esteem, become more autonomous learners, and feel a sense of accomplishment. Moreover, "rather than perceiving students as empty vessels waiting to be filled with information, the visiting playwright can use the art form to turn learning into a journey of self-discovery and assume that students are already overflowing with valuable potential waiting to be tapped" (ibid.:37)

(second paragraph)

In this example, the summarizer has represented the main idea of the second paragraph of the original text where she successfully picked the main idea of the paragraph. Although the student did not represent the idea in her own words completely. The following table shows the number of students who accurately picked out the main ideas of each passage as well as there percentages.

Table (2)

Picking out main ideas

Strategy	Passage	No. of students	%
Picking Out main ideas	Passage 1	13	26
	Passage 2	14	28

In the first passage, 26% of the whole sample was able to pick out the main idea while in the second passage 28% were able to do so.

2. Accurate paraphrasing

Paraphrasing is another strategy of representing the ideas of the original accurately. "A paraphrase is a restatement (in your own words) of the ideas in the original" (Swales and Feak, 1994, p.13). Paraphrasing could be achieved by means of rewording or vocabulary replacement.

a. Rewording

In rewording, the same message is delivered by the summarizer, but in different words.

Passage I

Example (1)

...governments have neglected to find other source of energy, relying heavily on oil.

Original

Governments neglected other sources of energy: electricity was generated from oil and power stations were fired by it. (paragraph1: sentence5)

In this example, the summarizer has accurately paraphrased the idea presented in the original text. She reproduced the same message by substituting the long expression "...: electricity was generated from oil and power stations were fired by it" by rewording as in "... relying heavily on oil" while at the same time successfully condensing the expression and eliminating the details.

Example (2)

The governments began to think of the nuclear power which is capable of producing a large amount of energy but it is so dangerous so they started thinking of other alternative.

Original

The answer would seem to lie in nuclear power station. They need very little fuel to produce enormous amount of power and they do not pollute the atmosphere. Their dangers, however, are so great and the cost of building them so high that some governments are unwilling to invest them. Not only could one accident in a single nuclear power station spread as much radioactivity as a thousand Hiroshima atom bombs, but the radio-active waste from these stations is extremely dangerous for one hundred thousand years. So is there no possible alternative to nuclear power?

(paragraph3)

Here, the summarizer has represented the idea in this paragraph and successfully used her own words in a condensed way. The student has expressed "to produce enormous amounts of power" in different words "of producing a large amount of energy" keeping the same meaning.

Passage II

Example (1)

It also makes them know how useful and important to work as a team.

Original

It also leads them to discover 'the value of cooperation and the importance of team work'.

(paragraph1: sentence3)

In this example the summarizer expressed the same meaning of the original but using her own words.

Example (2)

Rycik said that the use of playwriting in English teaching, gives the students a chance to improve their writing and use their imaginations".

Original

Rycik (1990:40) advocates the use of playwriting in L1 English teaching, claiming that it "gives students the opportunity to hone their creative writing skills and cultivate their imaginations". (paragraph1: sentence2)

The summarizer, in this example, represented the idea of this sentence using her own words.

Table (3) shows the number of students who were able to use rewording in their summaries as well as their percentages.

Table (3)

Rewording

Strategy	Passage	No. of students	%
Rewording	Passage 1	20	40
	Passage 2	14	28

In the first passage 40% of the whole sample were able to make rewording while in the second 28% only were able to.

b. Vocabulary Replacement

In vocabulary replacement, the summarizer uses synonyms to replace an expression in the original text while preserving the meaning of the original.

Passage I

Example (1)

Presently, the search is on for suitable alternatives, but so far in vain.

Original

Governments are searching for a suitable alternative, but so far in vain.

(paragraph2: sentence 2)

The summarizer, in this example has replaced the expression "are searching" in the original by the synonymous expression "presently, the search is on" in the summary as a paraphrasing strategy. This replacement is the only change in the replicated sentence. It may be pointed out that in this example, the summarizer has copied out the rest of the original sentence "... suitable alternatives, but so far in vain." But this strategy does not fall in the area under discussion (see strategy 2-b, section 4.3).

Example (2)

Oil alternative: gas and coal cannot substitute oil.

Original

They are considering how they can make better use of the two other major fuels, coal and natural gas, but they have found that neither can take the place of oil in their economies. (paragraph2: sentence 3)

In this example, the summarizer has replaced the expression "take the place of" in the original by the synonymous expression "substitute" in the summary as a paraphrasing strategy.

Passage II

Example (1)

However, playwriting activities enable youth leaders to impose high standards of performance on participants, since the leaders are speaking through and for the potential future audience the group will have to satisfy with their final dramatic performance.

Original

Indeed, playwriting activities enable youth leaders to impose higher standards of performance on participants, since the leaders are “speaking through and for the potential future audience the group will have to satisfy with their final dramatic performance”. (paragraph7: sentence3)

The summarizer in this example copied the whole sentence as it is but made a minimal vocabulary replacement which was shown by her using ‘However, playwriting’ instead of ‘Indeed, playwriting’.

Example (2)

She said that the students who are underachievers in school were able to be more successful in writing and performing plays.

Original

She notes that young people who were underachievers in school were able to attain high standards when writing and performing plays,

(paragraph7: sentence2)

In this example the summarizer showed a minimal vocabulary replacement at the beginning of the sentence where she used the verb "said" instead of "notes". Another vocabulary replacement was shown when she used "be more successful" as paraphrase of "attain high standards" keeping the same meaning of the original.

In table (4), it is obvious that the strategy of vocabulary replacement was used by almost the same number of students in the two passages.

Table (4)

Vocabulary Replacement

Strategy	Passage	No. of students	%
Vocabulary Replacement	Passage 1	18	36
	Passage 2	20	40

In the first passage 36% were able to make vocabulary replacement while 40% were able to make it in the second passage.

3. Accurate Combination of Ideas

The summarizers may successfully combine ideas, which were not combined in the original text, as a strategy of condensing and representing the same ideas in a shorter form.

Passage I

Example (1)

Nuclear power would seem to be answer to the problem for it needs very little fuel to produce enormous amounts of energy and it does not pollute the atmosphere.

Original

The answer would seem to lie in nuclear power stations. They need very little fuel to produce enormous amounts of power and they do not pollute the atmosphere.

(paragraph3: sentences1,2)

Here, the summarizer has combined sentences 1 and 2 from paragraph 3 in the original and represented them in one sentence. But, the summarizer has not reduced the content of the sentences. However, this example shows the tendency to copy directly from the original, since the summarizer has not changed or paraphrased the content of the two sentences. She just combined the two sentences with a slight change in the order of the words.

Example (2)

That seems the problem is solved but as the population of the world increased the more energy is used, that leads to the rais up of earth's tempreture which can its nature elements. Finally, the best solution for this problem rely on us, we should take care of our environment.

Original

Many scientists are optimistic that new ways of generating large amount of energy will be successfully developed, but at the same time they fear the consequences. If the world population goes on increasing at its present rate, and each individual continues to use more energy every year, we may, in fifty years' time, be burning up so much energy that we would damage the earth's atmosphere. By raising the temperature of the atmosphere, we could melt the Arctic and Antarctic ice-caps and change the pattern of vegetable and animal life throughout the world- a frightening possibility.

These dangers will have to be kept in mind as scientists continue with their experiments. In the meantime, we can all help to protect the environment by not wasting energy. This means driving more carefully (if you have to use a car – it's healthier and cheaper to ride a bike) and turning off unnecessary lighting and heating in the home. In these small ways we call all help to make the world a cleaner, healthier place for future generations. (paragraphs 7,8)

Here, the summarizer has combined the idea of paragraph 7 with the idea of the last paragraph (paragraph8) and represented them in two paraphrased sentences. The summarizer has successfully summarized these two paragraphs (neglecting her minor grammatical or spelling mistakes).

Passage II

Example (1)

Wessles (1991) recommend playwriting in EFL/ESL contexts which centers around playwriting and performance while gives much rise to intensive language practice.

Original

Wessles (1991) and Heath recommend playwriting in EFL/ESL contexts. Wessels (ibid.) describes an EFL course which centers around playwriting and performance. Through group discussion her students draw up an outline of a play. Each scene is then improvised. While some students act out the parts of the characters, others note down the dialogue which the actors produce. The scenes are then written up to be used as the script of the play. The improvisation of plays gives rise to much intensive language practice.

(paragraph4 +paragraph5: sentence1)

The writer in the original passage has expressed his ideas in a prolonged sentence, but here the summarizer combined her sentences into two meaningful sentences giving finally one meaningful sentence without distorting the original.

Example (2)

Heath claims that literary writing generates essentials of language learning and he recommends playwriting on the basis of research which demonstrated the effectiveness of the drama activities. He suggests that school would do well to imitate neighborhood organizations and think of the power of drama.

Original

Heath (1996:776) claims that literary writing 'generates essentials of language learning. Students write and rewrite, listen to their own and other's words again and again, read aloud to others, reshape their efforts to make words "say" just what they want them to mean. Literature has no rival in its power to create neutral repetition, reflection on language and how it works, and attention to audience response on the part of learners.'

Heath (1993) recommends playwriting on the basis of research which demonstrated the effectiveness of the drama activities, including playwriting and performance, run by US inner-city youth organizations. She notes that young people who were underachievers in school were able to attain high standards when writing and performing plays, and that 'once these actors became their own authors, they seemed to tap in performance a deep range of linguistic competence that they otherwise did not display' (ibid.:181). Indeed, playwriting activities enable youth leaders to impose high standards of performance on participants, since the leaders are 'speaking through and for the potential future audience the group will have to satisfy with their final dramatic performance' (ibid.183).

Heath (ibid.185) draws implications from the success of such drama activities for the development of English language skills, suggesting that 'school would do well to imitate neighborhood organizations and think of the power of drama and fuller uses of role playing for bringing out performance that reflects the fullest possible range of linguistic competence of students'.

(paragraph6+ paragraph7+ paragraph8)

Here, the summarizer has combined the first sentence of each paragraph and represented them in two sentences. But, the summarizer has not paraphrased or changed the words in the sentences. Here, the tendency to copy directly from the original is clearly shown by this summarizer.

Table (5) shows the numbers and the percentages of the students who made accurate combination of ideas.

Table (5)

Accurate Combination of Ideas

Strategy	Passage	No. of students	%
Accurate Combination of Ideas	Passage 1	17	34
	Passage 2	22	44

In the first passage 34% of the whole sample were able to make accurate combination of ideas while 44% were able to make it in the second passage.

4. Reduction

Reduction can be achieved by condensing the original piece of text semantically or syntactically:

Semantic Reduction

This involves the use of a superordinate lexeme instead of its hyponym(s) that is/are mentioned in the original text.

Passage I

Example (1)

Geothermal energy has been successfully used in New Zealand, Iceland and Italy...

Original

Another resource of energy, which could be more widely used, is that generated by hot water or steam from under the earth (geothermal energy as it is called). This form of energy is already used in New Zealand, Iceland (paragraph6: sentences1,2)

The summarizer used the superordinate lexeme "Geothermal energy" instead of enumerating the hyponyms "energy from hot water and steam from under the earth". The superordinate lexeme was used by the writer of the original text in the same sentence but it was represented between brackets while the summarizer has successfully substituted the hyponyms by this superordinate lexeme.

Example (2)

We can also use geothermal energy which is successful in Italy to prevent the earth's atmosphere damage.

Original

Another resource of energy, which could be more widely used, is that generated by hot water or steam from under the earth (geothermal energy as it is called). This form of energy is already used in New Zealand, Iceland (paragraph6: sentences1,2)

Just as in the previous example, the summarizer used the superordinate lexeme "Geothermal energy" instead of enumerating the hyponyms "energy from hot water and steam from under the earth".

Passage II

Example (1)

Jackson and Kerr-Norflett observe that the use of play building can improve the student's language skills and activities.

Original

Jackson and Kerr-Norflett (1997: 102-3) suggest the use of Jamaican-style play building, and write of how '[i]n the play-building process students speak, listen, write, read, generate ideas, pose problem statements, and generate logical solutions. All of these activities foster and enhance literacy skills in ways that actively involve students in the learning process.'

(paragraph3: sentences5,6)

Example (2)

Jackson and Kerr-Norflett suggest the use of Jamaican- style play building which enhance literacy skills and activities.

Original

Jackson and Kerr-Norflett (1997: 102-3) suggest the use of Jamaican-style play building, and write of how '[i]n the play-building process students speak, listen, write, read, generate ideas, pose problem statements, and generate logical solutions. All of

these activities foster and enhance literacy skills in ways that actively involve students in the learning process.' (paragraph3: sentences5,6)

The summarizers in these two examples have semantically reduced the original since they did not enumerate the activities mentioned in the original text, but preserving the meaning of the sentences.

In table (6), the results of the use of semantic reduction by the students are shown.

Table (6)

Semantic Reduction

Strategy	Passage	No. of students	%
Semantic Reduction	Passage 1	19	38
	Passage 2	20	40

In the first passage 38% were able to make reduction while 40% were able to make it in the second passage.

5. Attribution

On one level, the functions of attributions in academic discourse may be thought of as a form of citation, fulfilling a function similar to that of the footnote. But they have another very important function – this is systematically to establish a distance between the original proponent of an idea and the person who represents this idea; that is to say between the author and the summarizer (Tadros, 1985). In case of a summary,

attribution expresses the ‘attitude’ that the ideas being summarized are held by the author but are not necessarily held by the summarizer (Moore, 1997). Here, I choose more than one paragraph of the second passage (attribution is a feature of the second passage not the first passage, because the second passage contains ideas of writers other than the author himself) which could represent the four categories of attribution, either accurate or inaccurate, with examples of the students’ summaries.

a. Explicit attribution of proposition

Passage II

Example (1)

Writing in the first language, according to Rycik, helps in discovering the skillful writers among the students and teaches them how to be cooperative.

Original

The benefits to be gained from the writing and performance of plays in both first (L1) and second language (L2) English teaching have been described by various authors Rycik (1990:40) advocates the use of opportunity to hone their creative writing skills and cultivate their imaginations. It also leads them to discover ‘the value of cooperation and the importance of teamwork’.

(the first paragraph)

The summarizer copies the paragraph as it is to save effort, and sometimes the conjugation of verbs is wrong. Although many summarizers reduced some words of the original, yet they attribute the main idea to its writer.

Example (2)

Sandock says that the students will help themselves in reading and writing when they perform a play.

Original

Sandock (1994:414) considers that students' reading skills are promoted when they perform a play written by their class: 'Students are encouraged, not by the teacher but by the play itself, to study words and phrases, to pay attention to cues – to get it right.' (paragraph3:sentence2)

Here, the summarizer represented the paragraph reducing some words of the original, yet she attributed the main idea to its writer.

The following table, table (7), represents the number of students who attributed some ideas explicitly, in addition to their percentage.

Table (7)

Explicit Attribution

Strategy	Passage	No. of students	%
Explicit Attribution	Passage 2	37	74

The results obtained from the above table indicate the number of students who managed to use explicit attributions was high (37 students – 74%).

b. Implicit attribution of proposition

Example (1)

Authors claim that writing plays in both the first and the second language serves many benefits. It teaches the students the value of cooperation and it rises their imagination and creativeness.

Original

The benefits to be gained from the writing and performance of plays in both first (L1) and second language (L2) English teaching have been described by various authors Rycik (1990:40) advocates the use of opportunity to hone their creative writing skills and cultivate their imaginations. It also leads them to discover 'the value of cooperation and the importance of teamwork'. (the first paragraph)

Example (2)

Another said that the students encouraged the study words and phrases to pay attention to cues – to get it right.

Original

Sandock (1994:414) considers that students' reading skills are promoted when they perform a play written by their class: 'Students are encouraged, not by the teacher but by the play itself, to study words and phrases, to pay attention to cues – to get it right.'

(paragraph3:sentence2)

The summarizers, in these two examples, made an effort in summarizing the paragraph, but they omitted the name of the writer and

substituted it by the word “authors” or “another”. Yet they did not attribute the idea to themselves.

In table (8), the number of students who attributed others’ ideas implicitly is shown with their percentages.

Table (8)

Implicit Attribution

Strategy	Passage	No. of students	%
Implicit Attribution	Passage 2	6	12

The results obtained from this table indicate the number of students who managed to use implicit attributions (6 students – 12%) which was considerably low compared to the use of explicit attributions.

The second part of this chapter is concerned with the distorted representation of ideas, starting with the strategy of reproducing unimportant ideas.

4.3. Distorted Representation of Ideas

1. Reproduction of unimportant ideas

This involves representing ideas that are not important or rewriting minor details mentioned in the original text.

Passage I

Example (1)

It [oil] was so cheap that the whole world depends on it, many people will be surprised when they learn how many items in their home depends on it.

Original

(4) It [oil] was so cheap and plentiful that the whole world came to depend on it ...
(7) Many people are surprised when they learn how many items in their homes contain oil. (paragraph1: sentences4,7)

The summarizer has represented the idea in sentence (4) of the original, which is considered as a crucial part of the text, but she added sentence (7) which is not important. It is also obvious that the summarizer has just juxtaposed the two sentences without paraphrasing them or making any changes in the words except for the expression "contain oil" which was replaced by "depend on it". It may be pointed out that there is also an instance of direct copying from the original; as mentioned earlier, there could be more than one strategy used by the summarizer in the same example.

Example (2)

Many people are surprised when they learn how many items in their home contain oil.

Original

Many people are surprised when they learn how many items in their homes contain oil. (paragraph1: sentence7)

Here, the summarizer has represented, or actually, copied this sentence which has an unimportant idea. This idea does not constitute an important part of the summary, so it should not take place in the student's summary.

Passage II

Example (1)

On the other hand, Salvate who suggests that the professional playwrights should work in schools to help the students to write plays.

Original

Salvate (1993) describes playwriting residency programs she administers for US public schools. These programs sponsor professional playwrights to work in schools helping students to write plays. (paragraph2: sentences1,2)

The summarizer has mentioned one part of the original sentence and neglected the important part of the sentence which sheds light on the main idea of the sentence.

Example (2)

Playwriting residency programs who described by Salvate for US public schools. These writing plays students can develop greater self-esteem, become more autonomous learners.

Original

Salvate (1993) describes playwriting residency programs she administers for US public schools. These programs sponsor professional playwrights to work in schools helping students to write plays. Through writing plays students can develop greater self-esteem, become more autonomous learners, and feel a sense of accomplishment. Moreover, "rather than perceiving students as empty vessels waiting to be filled with information, the visiting playwright can use the art from the turn learning into a journey of self-discovery and assume that students are already overflowing with valuable potential waiting to be tapped" (ibid.:37). (paragraph2)

Here, the summarizer has also represented an unimportant part of the original sentence as well as the important part of the sentence which expressed the main idea of the paragraph. The summarizer's first sentence is unimportant since it does not show the main idea of the paragraph.

Table (9) represents the number of the students who reproduced unimportant ideas in their summaries with their percentages.

Table (9)

Reproduction of unimportant Ideas:

Strategy	Passage	No. of students	%
Reproduction of unimportant Ideas	Passage 1	23	46
	Passage 2	26	52

In the first passage 46% of the whole population reproduced unimportant ideas while 52% of them did so in the second passage.

2. Direct Copying from the Original Text

Most of the subjects (summarizers) tended to copy out sentences from the original text either verbatim or copying out sentences with slight changes. Some subjects tended to copy out parts of sentences and juxtapose them, with the result that there is a collection of sentences that do not flow.

a. Copying without any change

This involves just lifting the sentence as it is presented in the original text, without any change.

Passage I

Example (1)

Scientists have recently turned their attention to natural sources of energy, the sun, the sea, the wind and hot spring.

The above sentence is verbatim copying from the original

Scientists have recently turned their attention to natural sources of energy, the sun, the sea, the wind and hot spring. (paragraph4: sentence2)

Example (2)

They need very little fuel to produce enormous amounts of power and they do not pollute the atmosphere.

Original

They need very little fuel to produce enormous amounts of power and they do not pollute the atmosphere. (paragraph3: sentence2)

Just as the previous example, the summarizer has copied out the sentence as it is without making any change.

Passage II

Example (1)

Wessels describes an EFL course which centers around playwriting and performance.

Original

Wessels describes an EFL course which centers around playwriting and performance. (paragraph4: sentence2)

Example (2)

Wessels and Heath recommend playwriting in EFL/ESL contexts.

Original

Wessels (1991) and Heath (1993:1996) recommend playwriting in EFL/ESL contexts. (paragraph4: sentence1)

Example (3)

Among other advantages, they note that screenwriting involves a complete writing process, and requires both individual and group work.

Original

Among other advantages, they note that screenwriting involves a complete writing process, and requires both individual and group work. (paragraph3: sentence4)

The summarizers, in these examples, have copied the original sentence without any change, without exerting any effort in summarizing the sentence. This shows the students' tendency to copy out from the original text in order to write their summaries.

The following table, table (10), shows the results of students' use of copying without change in numbers and percentages.

Table (10)

Copying without any change

Strategy	Passage	No. of students	%
copying out without any change	Passage 1	46	92
	Passage 2	48	96

In the first passage 92% copied sentences without change while in the second passage 96% did so.

b. Copying with minimal change

Here the summarizer might delete parts of the original sentence or add a word to represent the sentence with minimal change as in:

Passage I

Example (1)

Many scientists are optimistic that new ways of generating large amount of energy will be developed, but they fear of the consequences.

Original

Many scientists are optimistic that new ways of generating large amount of energy will be successfully developed, but at the same time they fear the consequences.

(paragraph7: sentence1)

In this example, the summarizer has only deleted two expressions from the original sentence "Successfully" which in the original comes after "will be" and "at the same time" which comes after "but". Besides, she has wrongly inserted "of" in the copied sentence. The sentence has thus been represented with a slight change.

Example (2)

These danger should be kept in mind as scientists continue with their experiments.

Original

These dangers will have to be kept in mind as scientists continue with their experiments.

(paragraph8: sentence1)

Here, the summarizer has copied the original sentence as it is but she just replaced the word "will have to be" in the original by the word "should be" as a minimal change.

Passage II

Example (1)

All these activities foster and enhance literacy skills in ways that actively involve students in the learning process.

Original

All of these activities foster and enhance literacy skills in ways that actively involve students in the learning process. (paragraph3: sentence6)

The summarizer, in this example, has copied the original sentence as it is with minimal change by omitting the preposition "of".

Example (2)

Finally, Heath draws implications from the success of such drama activities for the development of English language skills.

Original

Heath (ibid.185) draws implications from the success of such drama activities for the development of English language skills. (paragraph8: sentence1)

Here, the summarizer has copied the original sentence as it is but she just added the word "finally" as a minimal change.

The following table, table (11), shows the number of students who copied sentences from the original but with minimal change as well as their percentages.

Table (11)

Copying with minimal change

Strategy	Passage	No. of students	%
Copying with minimal change	Passage 1	29	58
	Passage 2	20	40

In the first passage 58% of the sample copied sentences with minimal change while in the second 40% did so.

3. Deletion of important ideas

Some summarizers left out important parts or ideas that were mentioned in the original text. Such ideas are considered important since they constitute a crucial part of the summarized passage. These ideas are the key elements (according to the schematic representation of the problem-solution text): situation, problem, solution and evaluation. In other words, those students could not recognize the contours of the overall problem-solution framework.

Passage I

Example (1)

The price of oil is in increase and governments try to make a suitable solution for that by considering the major types of fuels which are coal and natural gas but they can't because of their effects.

Original

The increase in the price of oil has brought the world to its senses. Governments are searching for a suitable alternative, but so far in vain. They are considering how they can make better use of the two other major fuels, coal and natural gas, but they have found that neither can take the place of oil in their economies.

(paragraph2: sentences1,2,3)

Here, the summarizer has represented the ideas of sentences 1, 2 and 3 of the second paragraph in the original text, but she has left out an important part in her representation. The summarizer has stated that coal and natural gas are possible solutions of the problem of finding alternative sources of energy other than oil, but she did not explain why they cannot be a suitable alternative for oil. In Hoey's terminology, the evaluation component of the pattern is missing.

Example (2)

Many scientists are afraid of the increasing of depending on energy that will destroy the atmosphere of earth.

Original

Many scientists are optimistic that new ways of generating large amount of energy will be successfully developed, but at the same time they fear the consequences. If the world population goes on increasing at its present rate, and each individual continues to use more energy every year, we may, in fifty years' time, be burning up so much energy that we would damage the earth's atmosphere. By raising the temperature of the atmosphere, we could melt the Arctic and Antarctic ice-caps and change the pattern of vegetable and animal life throughout the world- a frightening possibility.

(paragraph7)

The summarizer in this example represented a very shallow sentence ignoring the most important idea of this paragraph. She did not put the important idea that shows how to help minimize these negative results (by reducing the use of energy and pollutants), she just mentioned that scientists fear of using energy. Therefore, the summarizer represented a distorted idea without the important part of it.

Passage II

Example (1)

Salvate (1993) describes programs she administer for public school where they help students in writing plays so they become more autonomous learners and turn into a self-discovery.

Original

(1) Salvate (1993) describes playwriting residency programs she administers for US public schools. (2) These programs sponsor professional playwrights to work in schools, helping students to write plays. (3) Through writing plays students can develop greater self-esteem, become more autonomous learners, and feel a sense of accomplishment. (4) Moreover, “rather than perceiving students as empty vessels waiting to be filled with information, the visiting playwright can use the art form to turn learning into a journey of self-discovery and assume that students are already overflowing with valuable potential waiting to be tapped.”

(the second paragraph)

The summarizer has deleted some important ideas without which the sentence lacks some of its original meaning. She thought that by omitting more sentences, this means summarization. The summarizer has picked out parts of each sentence of the paragraph and combined them inaccurately where the resulting sentence became meaningless. She put the part of sentence (4)- where the verb ‘turn’ is used with the subject ‘learning’- to complete the sentence that she had started where she focused on ‘the students’ deleting important parts of the sentence. She used this verb with the subject ‘they’ which led to a distorted idea.

Example (2)

It is also help in literary writing.

Original

Heath (1996:776) claims that literary writing 'generates essentials of language learning. Students write and rewrite, listen to their own and other's words again and

again, read aloud to others, reshape their efforts to make words "say" just what they want them to mean. Literature has no rival in its power to create neutral repetition, reflection on language and how it works, and attention to audience response on the part of learners.' (paragraph6)

Here, the summarizer represented a very shallow sentence ignoring the most important idea of this paragraph. She deleted an important idea that shows how literary writing helps in language learning, while she just mentioned that playwriting helps in literary writing. Therefore, the summarizer represented a distorted idea.

Table (12) presents the number of students who deleted important ideas and their percentages.

Table (12)

Deletion of important ideas

Strategy	Passage	No. of students	%
Deletion of important ideas	Passage 1	36	72
	Passage 2	33	66

In the first passage 72% of the subjects deleted important ideas while 66% did so in the second passage.

4. Faulty combination of ideas

This strategy involves inaccurate combination of two or more ideas of the original.

Passage I

Example (1)

Houses built by solar energy but also it has limited usage only in daylight and in the countries where the weather is unreliable.

Original

(4)Houses have already been built which are heated entirely by solar energy.(5) However, solar energy can only be collected during daylight hours, and in countries where the weather is unreliable, an alternative heating system has to be included.

(paragraph4: sentences4,5)

Here, the summarizer is trying to combine sentences (4) and (5) of the fourth paragraph of the original but she failed to do so accurately. Evidence of lack of comprehension is obvious when the summarizer said that houses are built by solar energy, which is absolutely wrong since it is the heating that is done by solar energy not the building that is made by solar energy. In addition, the summarizer has just picked up words and juxtaposed them to form sentences resulting in ill-formed and meaningless sentences. The summarizer has picked up the cataphoric part of sentence (5) "in countries where the weather is unreliable" and used it anaphorically; i.e., related it to

what has gone before, thus leaving out the rest of the sentence "an alternative heating system has to be included". This has led to a distorted combination and to missing the meaning of the sentence.

Example (2)

In recent years, they have found that coal and natural gas are not suitable to be used in our life. They need very little fuel to produce enormous amounts of power and they do not pollute the atmosphere which is very dangerous.

Original

The increase in the price of oil has brought the world to its senses. Governments are searching for a suitable alternative, but so far in vain. They are considering how they can make better use of the two other major fuels, coal and natural gas, but they have found that neither can take the place of oil in their economies. In recent years there has been a growing concern for the environment and coal is not a popular fuel with environmentalists. Coal mines are ugly, and their development has a serious effect on animal and plant life; coal itself is a heavy pollutant. Natural gas, the purest of the three fuels, is also the most limited in supply.

The answer would seem to lie in nuclear power station. They need very little fuel to produce enormous amount of power and they do not pollute the atmosphere. Their dangers, however, are so great and the cost of building them so high that some governments are unwilling to invest them. Not only could one accident in a single nuclear power station spread as much radio-activity as a thousand Hiroshima atom

bombs, but the radio-active waste from these stations is extremely dangerous for one hundred thousand years. So is there no possible alternative to nuclear power?

(paragraphs 2,3)

In this example, the summarizer's first sentence which forms an idea of the second paragraph of the original has been combined with a sentence that belongs to the third paragraph, but this combination was not so accurate. The student has just juxtaposed the sentences without understanding them. This is obvious when she used "they" in the second sentence as if it refers to "coal and natural gas" while it was originally referring to "nuclear power stations" producing a distorted combination of ideas.

Passage II

Example (1)

Heath (1996) claims that literary writing generates essentials of language learning and recommends playwriting on the basis of research.

Original

Heath (1996) claims that literary writing generates essentials of language learning..... Heath (1993) recommends playwriting on the basis of research which demonstrated the effectiveness of the drama activities...

(paragraph6: sentence1+paragraph7: sentence1)

In this example the summarizer has combined the words of Heath (1996) with the words of Heath (1993) in a wrong way.

She condensed Heath's statements to the extent that she distorted the original sentence.

Example (2)

The benefit gained from the writing and performance of plays in both first language and second language. How that leads to discover the value of cooperation and the importance of teamwork.

Original

The benefits to be gained from the writing and performance of plays in both first (L1) and second language (L2) English teaching have been described by various authors Rycik (1990:40) advocates the use of opportunity to hone their creative writing skills and cultivate their imaginations. It also leads them to discover 'the value of cooperation and the importance of teamwork'. (paragraph1)

The summarizer is trying to combine sentences (1) and (3) of the first paragraph of the original but she failed to do so accurately. She revealed her lack of comprehension when she just combined part of the first sentence with the third sentence directly, producing a distorted idea.

In the following table, table (13), the number of the students who combined some ideas inaccurately is shown as well as their percentages.

Table (13)

Faulty combination of ideas:

Strategy	Passage	No. of students	%
Faulty combination of ideas	Passage 1	30	60
	Passage 2	15	30

In the first passage 60% made faulty combinations of ideas while in the second passage the percentage was only 30%.

5. Inaccurate Macro-proposition

The summarizer, sometimes, represents a generalization about a paragraph or the whole passage inaccurately.

Passage I

Example (1)

There could be serious shortage of oil the next 10 years, not because that one use oil more than other.

Original

The world is running out of oil, and energy experts believe that there could be serious shortages in ten years' time. Not only is each individual using more oil than ever before, as the standard of living in industrialized countries rises, but the population explosion means that each year many more people will be using oil in some form or other. Until recently we took oil for granted: it seemed it would never stop flowing. It

was so cheap and plentiful that the whole world came to depend on it. Governments neglected other sources of energy: electricity was generated from oil and power stations were fired by it. It found its way into many of the products of light industry. Many people are surprised when they learn how many items in their homes contain oil.

(the first paragraph)

In this example, the summarizer is representing an inaccurate generalization of the first paragraph of the original. She replaced the expression "each individual" in the original by "that ... one" and she replaced "using more oil than ever" by "use oil more than other". It is obvious that the summarizer has inaccurately paraphrased the original sentences and produced a distorted sentence with the result that the sentence has become meaningless.

Example (2)

The research will carry on as long as the population goes on increasing to find solution to our issue in future.

Original

Many scientists are optimistic that new ways of generating large amount of energy will be successfully developed, but at the same time they fear the consequences. If the world population goes on increasing at its present rate, and each individual continues to use more energy every year, we may, in fifty years' time, be burning up so much energy that we would damage the earth's atmosphere. By raising the temperature of the atmosphere, we could melt the Arctic and Antarctic ice-caps and change the pattern of vegetable and animal life throughout the world- a frightening possibility.

These dangers will have to be kept in mind as scientists continue with their experiments. In the meantime, we can all help to protect the environment by not wasting energy. This means driving more carefully (if you have to use a car – it's healthier and cheaper to ride a bike) and turning off unnecessary lighting and heating in the home. In these small ways we can all help to make the world a cleaner, healthier place for future generations. (paragraph 7,8)

Here, the summarizer has made a generalization of the last two paragraphs (7 and 8) where she finished her summary with it as the ending idea of the whole passage. Therefore, this sentence is considered as an inaccurate macro-proposition.

Passage II

Example (1)

The student listen and rewrite the play which shows the effectiveness of creative writing and listen to something they did not something that already exist.

Original

The improvisation of plays gives rise to much intensive language practice. Moreover, because the participants 'are creating the play themselves, rather than responding to an existing text, there is usually no shortage of ideas, nor any unwillingness to contribute to the developing scenes' (Wessels 1991:234). The play scripts can also form the basis of teaching material for other classes (ibid.235).

Heath (1996:776) claims that literary writing 'generates essentials of language learning. Students write and rewrite, listen to their own and other's words again and again, read aloud to others, reshape their efforts to make words "say" just what they

want them to mean. Literature has no rival in its power to create natural repetition, reflection on language and how it works, and attention to audience response on the part of learners.’

Heath (1993) recommends playwriting on the basis of research which demonstrated the effectiveness of the drama activities, including playwriting and performance, run by US inner-city youth organizations. She notes that young people who were underachievers in school were able to attain high standards when writing and performing plays, and that ‘once these actors became their own authors, they seemed to tap in performance a deep range of linguistic competence that they otherwise did not display’ (ibid.:181). Indeed, playwriting activities enable youth leaders to impose high standards of performance on participants, since the leaders are ‘speaking through and for the potential future audience the group will have to satisfy with their final dramatic performance’. (ibid.183). (paragraphs 5+6+7)

In this example, the summarizer has inaccurately represented a generalization of the paragraphs (5, 6 and 7) by using some words of each paragraph having a final sentence that (in her point of view) represented the paragraphs. This sentence shows that either she did not comprehend the passage or she did not know how to summarize what she had read.

Example (2)

Playwriting has many benefits 1) develop performance of plays and writing 2) make the second language English more strong.

Original

Heath (1993) recommends playwriting on the basis of research which demonstrated the effectiveness of the drama activities, including playwriting and performance, run by US inner-city youth organizations. She notes that young people who were underachievers in school were able to attain high standards when writing and performing plays, and that 'once these actors became their own authors, they seemed to tap in performance a deep range of linguistic competence that they otherwise did not display' (ibid.:181). Indeed, playwriting activities enable youth leaders to impose high standards of performance on participants, since the leaders are 'speaking through and for the potential future audience the group will have to satisfy with their final dramatic performance' (ibid.183).

Heath (ibid.185) draws implications from the success of such drama activities for the development of English language skills, suggesting that 'school would do well to imitate neighborhood organizations and think of the power of drama and fuller uses of role playing for bringing out performance that reflects the fullest possible range of linguistic competence of students'. (paragraphs 7+8)

Here, the summarizer has made a generalization of paragraphs 7 and 8 but she started her summary with it as the main idea of the whole passage. Therefore, this sentence is considered an inaccurate macro-proposition of the passage.

In this table, table (14), the number of the students who made inaccurate macro-propositions is given with their percentages.

Table (14)

Inaccurate Macro-proposition

Strategy	Passage	No. of students	%
Inaccurate Macro-proposition	Passage 1	21	42
	Passage 2	16	32

In the first passage 42% of the sample made inaccurate macro-propositions while in the second passage the percentage was only 32%.

6. Addition of personal comments

A good summary should not include any personal comments of the summarizer. The summarizer is not allowed to include or add any information, comments or evaluation more than what is in the original (Swales and Feak, 1994).

Passage I

Example (1)

Unfortunately, governments have neglected to find other source of energy, relying heavily on oil.

Original

Governments neglected other sources of energy: electricity was generated from oil and power stations were fired by it. (paragraph1: sentence5)

Here, the summarizer has added the word "unfortunately". This is considered as a personal comment or judgment on what she is saying. This is not allowed, and the summarizer has produced her own comments as part of the summary of the original text.

Example (2)

Unfortunately, these natural energy source are insufficient and unavailable for everyone, everywhere.

Original

While experiments in generating energy from the sea and the wind are interesting, neither can be considered an obvious solution to a future energy crisis; the first because a lot of energy is needed to generate energy from the sea, and the second because the amount of energy generated from wind would satisfy only a small percentage of a nation's needs. (paragraph5: sentence3)

As in the previous example, another summarizer has added the word "unfortunately". This is considered a personal comment or judgment on what she is saying since it is not the opinion of the writer of the original text.

Passage II

Example (1)

Many sociolinguists said that playwriting encourages the students to study more, not because of the teacher but by the play itself.

Original

Sandock (1994:414) considers that students' reading skills are promoted when they perform a play written by their class: 'Students are encouraged, not by the teacher but by the play itself, to study words and phrases, to pay attention to cues – to get it right.'

(paragraph3:sentence2)

This example contains a word that is not derived from the original passage; it is the summarizer's personal comment. The summarizer used the word "sociolinguists" in her summary while there was not any indication to use it in the original passage.

Example (2)

We may say that playwriting activities enable youth leaders to impose high standards and reflects the fullest possible range of linguistic competence of students.

Original

Indeed, playwriting activities enable youth leaders to impose higher standards of performance on participants, since the leaders are “speaking through and for the potential future audience the group will have to satisfy with their final dramatic performance”.

Heath (ibid.:185) draws implications from the success of such drama activities for the development of English language skills, suggesting that ‘schools would do well to imitate neighborhood organizations and think of the power of drama and fuller uses of role playing for bringing out performance that reflects the fullest possible range of linguistic competence of students’.

(paragraph7:sentence3+paragraph8:sentence1)

In this example the student has expressed her personal point of view after her summarization of the passage. She put her opinion by using the words "we may say" missing the fact that we are not the writers of the passage and that she is just summarizing it.

The following table, table (15), shows the percentages and the number of the students who added their personal comments.

Table (15)

Addition of personal comments

Strategy	Passage	No. of students	%
Addition of personal comments	Passage 1	4	8
	Passage 2	5	10

In the first passage 8% of the sample added personal comments while in the second passage the percentage was only 10%.

7. Using non-attributed ideas

As mentioned earlier, I chose some paragraphs of the second passage since attribution is a feature of only the second passage not the first passage. These paragraphs could represent the four categories of attribution, either accurate or inaccurate, with examples of the students' summaries.

Passage II

Example (1)

Playwriting has many benefits (1) Develop performance of plays and writing, (2) make second language English more strong.

Original

The benefits to be gained from the writing and performance of plays in both first (L1) and second language (L2) English teaching have been described by various authors Rycik (1990:40) advocates the use of opportunity to hone their creative writing skills and cultivate their imaginations. It also leads them to discover 'the value of cooperation and the importance of teamwork'.

(the first paragraph)

The summarizer stated the ideas of the writer without mentioning his name and attributed everything to herself.

Example (2)

All of these activities foster and enhance literacy skills in ways that actively involve students in the learning process.

Original

Jackson and Kerr-Norflett (1997: 102-3) suggest the use of Jamaican-style play building, and write of how '[i]n the play-building process students speak, listen, write, read, generate ideas, pose problem statements, and generate logical solutions. All of

these activities foster and enhance literacy skills in ways that actively involve students in the learning process.'

(paragraph3:sentence5,6)

Here, the summarizer represented this sentence without attributing it to Jackson and Kerr-Norflett (1997), which gives the reader the impression that these are the summarizer's own words.

Here, in table (16), the number and the percentage of the students who used non-attributed ideas in their summaries are given.

Table (16)

Using non-attributed ideas

Strategy	Passage	No. of students	%
Using non-attributed ideas	Passage 2	10	20

This table shows that the students who used non-attributed propositions were only 10 students out of the fifty students (that is 20 % of the whole subjects).

8. Deletion of propositions including attribution

Some of the summarizers omitted the whole proposition that includes the attribution thinking that this leads to a good summary.

Passage II

Example (1)

The improvisation of plays gives rise to much intensive language practice. The playscripts can also form the basis of teaching material for other classes.

Original

The improvisation of plays gives rise to much intensive language practice. Moreover, because the participants 'are creating the play themselves, rather than responding to an existing text, there is usually no shortage of ideas, nor any unwillingness to contribute to the developing scenes' (Wessels 1991:234). The playscripts can also form the basis of teaching material for other classes (ibid.235).

(paragraph5)

The summarizer in this example has ignored the existence of the attribution in the paragraph. Therefore, she just represented the first sentence and the last sentence in the paragraph deleting the sentences that include attribution.

Other students have omitted the first paragraph of this passage to avoid the representation of the attribution.

Table (17) shows the number and the percentage of the students who deleted propositions including attribution.

Table (17)

Deletion of Propositions with Attribution

Strategy	Passage	No. of students	%
Deletion of Propositions with Attribution	Passage 2	9	18

Here, the table shows that deleting propositions including attribution was done by only 9 students (18 %).

In short, this chapter presented the strategies of summarization in the model and examples were given for convenience. The examples were drawn from the subjects' summaries and presented as they appeared in the summaries. Tables of the categories were provided after the explanations of the examples and frequencies and percentages are indicated. The findings and discussion of these results are given in the following chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion: Findings and Discussion

5.1. Introduction

This thesis has been concerned with the notion of summarization strategies adopted by the senior level female students of the Department of English at King Saud University. From analyzing the summaries of the subjects and reviewing the literature, the model of the summarization strategies was formed having two major parts, each subdivided into sub categories:

1 – Accurate reproduction of ideas, which is divided into five sub-categories.

2 – Distorted representation of ideas, which is divided into eight sub-categories. (For details, see section 3.5)

These categories are dealt with in relation to the research questions set out in chapter one, and the findings that resulted from the analysis of the subjects' summaries are highlighted. Implications of the study and suggestions for further research are discussed.

5.2. Research Questions

This study aimed to investigate the written summaries of undergraduate students to see what strategies they use, and what problems are involved in the process of summarization. In this section, I discuss the questions of the research that were mentioned in chapter one. In order to investigate these questions, a model of summarization strategies was designed (see section 3.5). Each of the six questions will be investigated and discussed in this section separately as follows:

1. What strategies do students use in order to select and reproduce the main ideas of the original?

In order to answer this question we have to look at the model of summarization strategies, more specifically, the strategy of "picking out main ideas", the strategy of "reproduction of unimportant ideas" and the strategy of "deleting important ideas". According to the results shown in chapter four (see strategy 1, section 4.2 and strategies: 1 and 3, section 4.3), the students were using these strategies having 26 % of the subjects who picked out the main ideas of the first passage and 28 % of them picked out the main ideas of the second passage accurately, which shows that students are really unable to select and reproduce the main ideas of the original text (see table 2). In addition, the students made inaccurate macro-propositions according to the results in table (14) where 42% of the subjects made inaccurate macro-propositions in the first passage and 32% made

inaccurate macro-propositions in the second passage; this actually supports the fact that the students did not manage to make accurate macro-propositions or did not use this strategy accurately. Moreover, table (12) has shown that more than 50% of the subjects have deleted important ideas from the original texts (passage I: 72% and passage II: 66%). At the same time, about 50% of the subjects have reproduced unimportant ideas of the original texts instead of reproducing the important ideas i.e. the main ideas, as shown in table (9) (passage I: 46% and passage II: 52%).

It is worth mentioning that these strategies are interrelated because when the student deletes an important idea, she is not only excluding it from the summary but she is also unable to select or reproduce this main idea. It is also the case when a student is unable to pick out a main idea; she is accordingly not including it in the summary.

2- What paraphrasing strategies do students use in their summaries?

The students were able to use some paraphrasing strategies such as "rewording" and "vocabulary replacement". As shown in table (3), "rewording" was used by 40% of the subjects in the first passage and 28% of them used "rewording" in the second passage, which forms a reasonable percentage of the whole subjects of this study. "Vocabulary replacement",

almost as "rewording", was used by 36% of the subjects with the first passage, and 40% of them used it with the second passage (see table 4).

3- What condensation strategies do students use?

Only some students were able to use some condensation strategies such as "semantic reduction". As shown in table (6) they constitute less than 50% of the subjects (passage I: 38% and 40% for passage II). In addition, if the students used other condensation strategies, then they did not turn to use the strategy of "copying from the original" (strategy 2: a. and b., section 4.3). This is supported by the results shown in tables (10) and (11). According to table (10), 92% of the subjects used copying without any change from passage I, and 96% of them used this strategy with passage II, and according to table (11) about 58% of the subjects used copying with minimal change from the first passage and 40% of them used this strategy with the second passage, which shows that students did not use more condensation strategies and just tended to copy sentences from the original despite the fact that some students have used the "semantic reduction" strategy.

4- What combination strategies do students use?

The students were able to use some combination strategies but they varied in doing so successfully. Looking at the model of summarization strategies, we can see that the strategies involved are: strategy3 (section 4.2) and strategy4 (section4.3). In the strategy of "accurate combination of ideas" (see table 5) 34% of the subjects have accurately combined ideas of the first passage, and 44% of the subjects did so in the second passage, while in the strategy of "faulty combination of ideas" (see table 13) 60% of the subjects inaccurately combined ideas of the first passage and 30% of the subjects did so with the second passage. In other words, the first passage showed less usage of accurate combination strategies while the second passage showed less usage of inaccurate combination of ideas. This could be explained by the assumption that the difference in texts' type has played a very important role in the students' reactions and usage of the combination strategies. The two passages consist of eight paragraphs but the first passage was a kind of problem-solution pattern. This pattern of organization involves the existence of a problem (looking for sources of energy other than oil) and more than one possible solution was discussed and evaluated, where the student might have a difficulty in combining the ideas if she did not understand this pattern. The second passage was related to what students are studying, and it was characterized by the feature of attribution. Here the students do not have to look for the solutions; they just

follow the organization of the text and they almost succeeded in combining the ideas of this text.

5- Do students add any personal comments in their summaries?

The students rarely add their personal comments. It is obvious in table (15) where only 8% of the subjects added their personal comments in the first passage's summary and 12% did so in their summaries of the second passage.

6- What attribution strategies do students use in their summaries?

The students used some attribution strategies such as "explicit attribution" and "implicit attribution". As shown in tables (7) and (8), "explicit attribution" was used by 74% of the subjects in the second passage and 12% of them used "implicit attribution" in it, which forms a reasonable percentage of the whole subjects of this study. This could show that the students are aware of the use of these strategies. In addition, according to the results shown in chapter four (see strategies: 7 and 8, section 4.3), about only 20 % of the subjects reproduced non-attributed ideas of the second passage (for attribution, only passage II is involved) and only 18% of them have deleted the propositions that included attribution, which shows that students are really able to select and reproduce the attributed ideas of the original text (see tables 16 + 17).

From the above, we can see that some of the strategies were used more than other strategies depending on the results mentioned previously in chapter four. In the following tables, (18 and 19), the whole results are restated together in rank order:

Table (18)

Summarization strategies used with passage I in rank order

Summarization strategies	Percentage
<u>A) Accurate Reproduction of Ideas:</u>	
1- Accurate paraphrasing: "Rewording".	40
2- Reduction: Semantic reduction.	38
3- Accurate paraphrasing: "Vocabulary replacement".	36
4- Accurate combination of ideas.	34
5- Picking out main ideas.	26
<u>B) Distorted Representation of Ideas:</u>	
1- Direct copying of the original statements: "Copying without any change".	92
2- Deleting important ideas.	72
3- Faulty combination of ideas.	60
4- Direct copying of the original statements: "Copying with minimal change".	58
5- Reproduction of unimportant ideas.	46
6- Inaccurate macro- propositions.	42
7- Addition of personal comments.	8

Table (19)

Summarization strategies used with passage II in rank order

Summarization strategies	Percentage
<u>A) Accurate Reproduction of Ideas:</u>	
1- Attribution: "Explicit".	74
2- Accurate combination of ideas.	44
3- Accurate paraphrasing: "Vocabulary replacement".	40
4- Reduction: Semantic reduction.	40
5- Picking out main ideas.	28
6- Accurate paraphrasing: "Rewording".	28
7- Attribution: "Implicit".	12
<u>B) Distorted Representation of Ideas:</u>	
1- Direct copying of the original statements: "Copying without any change".	96
2- Deleting important ideas.	66
3- Reproduction of unimportant ideas.	52
4- Direct copying of the original statements: "Copying with minimal change".	40
5- Inaccurate macro- propositions.	32
6- Faulty combination of ideas.	30
7- Using non-attributed ideas.	20
8- Deletion of propositions including attribution.	18
9- Addition of personal comments.	12

5.3. Significant findings

An analysis of the data drawn from the written summaries of the subjects reveals a number of significant findings which are discussed below.

With reference to the tables above (tables 18 and 19), we can see that the strategies used in Accurate Reproduction of Ideas were remarkably low in their percentages while the percentages of the strategies used in The Distorted Reproduction of Ideas were obviously high. This leads to the fact that in general students did not know how to reproduce the ideas in the original text accurately. Knowing that in the process of summarization all strategies found in Accurate Reproduction of Ideas must be used, since all these strategies are related and they complete each other. So, in order to get the best summary all of these strategies should be included in the students' summaries. However, if we take a look at The Distorted Representation of Ideas, we find that some students have failed to use correctly the strategies for writing a summary. Unintentionally they failed to produce a correct summary by using the strategies in part B of the table more than the strategies in part A.

More specifically, in The Accurate Reproduction of Ideas for the first passage, "rewording" was the most frequently used strategy, being

used by 40% of the whole number of the subjects. Although "rewording" was the most used strategy, it still shows a low percentage, which supports the results of Taylor's study (1984) since he said, "When asked what made their work difficult, most of the professionals said finding the main idea, while most of the amateurs said finding appropriate words to substitute for the author's." (p. 698). This is the case here where a large number of the students did not use "rewording" accurately.

After "rewording" comes the strategy of "semantic reduction", where only 38% of the subjects managed to use a superordinate term in the place of a list of subordinates. The percentage was also low in the study of Al-Haidari (1991) for a similar strategy -or as he called it "the super-ordination rule" where Saudi students efficiently applied this rule 39.06% of the time where this rule would be appropriate. In the study of Brown and Day (1983), students efficiently applied the rule in 70% of the cases where it could be applied. The low percentage of this strategy in the present study could be due to the fact that English is not Saudi students' native language. This may then simply be a problem of vocabulary.

The strategy of "vocabulary replacement" was used by 36% of the students, as mentioned earlier. The difficulty facing the students in this strategy may be a result of lack of vocabulary competence or due to the fact that Saudi students are not native speakers of English, and they need more practice and experience in this field.

After that, came the strategy of "accurate combination of ideas" having only 34%. Johns and Mayes' study (1990) has shown that low proficiency students produced fewer combinations of idea units than high proficiency students. This may support the findings of the present study, since only 34% of the students reproduced accurate combination of ideas, which means that the students still need more practice as well as instruction in such a strategy.

The least used strategy was "picking out main ideas" with 28% of the whole number of the subjects. This indicates that this strategy might be the most difficult strategy used by the students in order to achieve accurate summarization of the original text. Taylor (1984) pointed out, " the amateurs read very quickly, did so fewer times, and spent most of their time looking at the beginning and end of the article for statements of what they hoped would be the main idea." (p.695) .The results of the present study differ in their numbers from the results of Al-Haidari (1991) where Saudi students applied the rule of selecting a topic sentence in 50.89% of the cases where it could be applied. But the percentage in the study of Brown and Day (1983) was approximately 70%. This confirms the fact that the students are in real need for instruction and practice in this particular strategy.

For the second passage, "explicit attribution" was the most used strategy by the subjects, forming 74% of the total number of the subjects.

In Moore (1997) the notion of attribution was investigated where the subjects (26 international students from Asian backgrounds and 26 students from Australian backgrounds) were asked to write a summary (150-200 words) of a short lecture entitled Academic Writing at University. The analysis of the subjects' summaries was concerned with the extent to which summarized propositions were attributed (either to the lecturer or those authors referred to in the lecture). The results obtained from this analysis indicated that the Australian summarizations of the propositions were more attributed than those of the international group. There were 17 explicit attributions for the Australian group and only 3 for the Asian group, while the present study shows a high percentage for this strategy (74%) which shows that the students were able to create a distance between themselves and a source text, or they simply preferred to copy the ideas as they appeared in the original text..

The following percentage was 44% for the "accurate combination of ideas", then 40% for both "vocabulary replacement" and "semantic reduction". "Picking out main ideas" and "rewording" came next, with a percentage of 28% of the whole number of the subjects, and the lowest percentage was 12% for the "implicit attribution". Here we can go back to Moore's study where the results showed that 4 Australians out of 26 made "implicit attributions" and 4 Asians out of 26 made "implicit attributions" as well. This supports the results of the present study, and gives some

indication for possible interpretation which might be the low level of proficiency.

We can conclude that as long as the accurate summarization strategies are used more by the students, there will be very good summaries of the original text either of the first or the second passage.

In The Distorted Representation of Ideas for the first passage, we can see that "copying without any change" was the most used strategy, since 92% of the students involved in this study have made this inaccurate strategy. This result is supported by the results of Johns and Mayes' study (1990), where low proficiency students produced more direct (copied) replications than high proficiency students. A possible interpretation may be the level of proficiency of the subjects under study, since it is probably difficult for students to paraphrase (not copy) an idea which they have only dimly understood.

Unlike the results of Al-Haidari (1991), the "deletion of important ideas" was used by 72% of the subjects while the percentages of the correct application of the two rules used by Al- Haidari were 96.87% for the rule of deleting unimportant information and 98.43% for the rule of deleting redundant information. The use of these two rules implies that the subjects of Al- Haidari's study were sensitive to the importance of the information they read, while the present study's results imply that the students cannot

easily identify the unimportant and redundant information that they had to delete from the original passage.

After that 60% of the subjects used "inaccurate combination of ideas". This high percentage of the use of this strategy implies that the students need more experience and instruction in this area, and as mentioned earlier, this is supported by the results of Johns and Mayes' study (1990) showing that low proficiency students produced fewer combinations of idea units than high proficiency students.

Then 58% of the subjects used "copying with minimal change", forming also a high percentage and obviously showing how the students are in need for direct instruction on how to produce accurate summaries and how to paraphrase the writer's words to avoid any kind of copying .

Then 46% of the subjects used "reproducing unimportant ideas". Having such a percentage could be a result of using the strategy of "deletion of important ideas" because when the students delete the important ideas then the unimportant ideas will be reproduced.

The results of Johns and Mayes' study (1990) were relatively close to the results of this study regarding the strategy of "inaccurate macro-propositions". 42% of the students made "inaccurate macro-propositions" in the present study while there was no significant difference between the

low group (35%) and the high group (45%) of the subjects involved in Johns and Mayes' study (1990).

Finally, only 8% added their "personal comments" to their summaries, which indicates that the students concentrated on summarizing what they have to summarize and not to involve themselves in the summarized passage.

For the second passage, copying without any change was also the most used strategy where 96% of the subjects did so, followed by the deletion of important ideas which was used by 66% of the subjects. 52% of the subjects reproduced unimportant ideas of the original passage. After that, copying with minimal change was done by 40% of the students. Inaccurate macro-propositions were made by 32% of the subjects, and 30% made faulty combinations of ideas.

About 20% of the subjects used non-attributed ideas in their summaries, while 18% of them deleted the propositions including attribution. With reference to Moore (1997), there were 5 Australians who used non-attributed propositions while 13 of the Asian group used non-attributed propositions, and 6 of the Asian group deleted the propositions that included attribution. According to the results of the present study, it is clear that the subjects are aware of the use of attribution in their summaries.

The lowest percentage was 12% for the addition of personal comments just as for the first passage.

Seeing these percentages of the strategies of The Distorted Representation of Ideas, we can assume that this could lead students to have distorted summaries of the original text where the ideas of the writer of the original text might be misunderstood or not clearly comprehended. Summary writing is a task that many think is easy but, in actuality, can be quite challenging. In other words, "at any point, the summarizing process may break down, thereby leading to the production of an inappropriate representation of the original. Breakdown may result from comprehension, perhaps due to errors in the activation of appropriate schemata. It may occur during condensation, when information is lost or confused; or it may occur during the production stage, when low level processes, such as syntactic-coding, are insufficient." (Johns and Mayes, 1990, p. 254).

Kirkland and Saunders (1991) pointed out that "students who are attempting to write summaries are operating under a cognitive load determined by their individual assignment and context. It is important to stress that these constraints are all interactive. The students are attempting to marshal their skills and strategies to mediate this cognitive load" (p. 114).

Therefore, instructors should ensure that this cognitive load is manageable and that students have the skills to mediate it. When we consider the nature of reading-writing activities and the complexities of cognition, metacognition, schemata, second language acquisition, and other aspects of summary writing, it becomes clear that the cognitive load on the students is likely responsible for producing inadequate summaries. Kirkland and Saunders also confirmed that these L₂ skills are not affected by the same skills the learner may have in his or her mother tongue.

It is important to mention that the investigation revealed that one sentence of the students' summaries may be used to exemplify more than one strategy and one strategy may be expressed by more than one sentence. For instance, the sentences in a summary of passage I were used as an example of the strategy "accurate combination of ideas", but these sentences showed as well the strategy "copying without any change" (see example 1, strategy3, section 4.2). It is also obvious that one strategy could be exemplified by more than one sentence or idea from the written summaries of the students as shown in chapter four.

It is not always the mistake of the student for not being able to reproduce the ideas of the original passage accurately. It might be the mistake of the teacher who was not able to, or did not, teach the student how to represent the ideas in the original passage accurately. Thus, some pedagogical implications will be discussed below.

5.4. Pedagogical Implications

The present study provides a number of pedagogical insights. First of all and generally speaking, students are in a serious need for direct instruction in summary writing, and more attention should be paid to this type of academic writing, since it is a very helpful method for understanding and recalling what students read. This study sheds light on the areas of difficulties which learners encounter when they write summaries. It may also trigger the educators' insights to instruct students to pay attention to the strategies used in successful summary writing. Syllabus writers or course designers may also gain insights that help in improving and modifying the textbooks used for teaching summary writing as part of comprehension processes or writing processes.

The most striking pedagogical insight exists in The Distorted Representation of Ideas: the strategy "copying without any change" is found to be the most widespread phenomenon in the written summaries of the subjects in both passages. Thus, in both reading and writing courses, it is important for teachers and educators to guide their students to pay attention to such a strategy and its incorrect usage. That is because the summarizer should make the reader of the summary feel as if he or she is reading the original but in a condensed form, using the summarizer's own words without missing important information, and not just rewrite the original where the summary would be nothing but the text itself with a

deletion of trivial details. In addition, the summarizer should not add any personal comments since the summarizer is not writing his or her own ideas but only representing other's ideas in a certain form. This way, students will be aware of the strategies needed to represent the original ideas accurately while summarizing. Thus it is the duty of the teachers to draw their students' attention to the summarization strategies in summary classes as well as in reading and writing classes.

Teachers should also direct their students to recognize the organization of the summary (according to the original text) and to maintain this organization in their summaries, which will guide them to a better understanding and representation of the original text. The teacher must also concentrate on showing the students how to successfully combine ideas not combined in the original text in order to form a coherent and a well-organized summary. Students appear to need further practice in combining sentences within as well as across paragraphs, while retaining the rhetorical relationships established in the original.

Moreover, some summarization strategies involve lexical familiarization which relates a new word to a familiar one such as "Rewording" or "Vocabulary Replacement". In this case the teachers' role is to guide their students to approach such a strategy and to encourage them to internalize the new words and make use of them later, which will enrich their vocabulary knowledge and their paraphrasing processes that would be

used in summarization. It may be wise to encourage this practice of paraphrasing in a discourse domain well known to the students.

In addition, it is the responsibility of the teacher to educate the students to pick out the main ideas from any text and to make an accurate macro-proposition of it, in order to summarize it accurately and in order for the reader of the summary to know all the important information or ideas included in the original text. However, the teacher here should teach the students the difference between the important details and unimportant ones, to avoid deleting vital details included in the original text and to include only important ideas in the summary of the original text.

Furthermore, the teacher has to draw the students' attention to approach the "Attribution" strategy. Students should know that in "Attribution" the summarizer refers to someone else, either explicitly or implicitly, to reproduce the writer's ideas or opinion, and to keep a distance between the writer of the original and the summarizer.

When teachers undertake the task of teaching students such strategies, they would help students cope with their own reading, writing, and summarizing difficulties and produce a better piece of work. It is important for students to acquire not only linguistic and communicative competence but also strategic competence, which leads to overcoming obstacles in summary writing.

Course designers or syllabus writers may also benefit from the findings of this study in improving and modifying the textbooks used for teaching summary writing as part of comprehension processes or writing processes or as a specialized course for summary writing.

5.5. Suggestions for further research

It is hoped that this study has made a reasonable groundwork for further research in identifying some points that could be involved in further investigations.

There are other points related to summarization that I have not covered here since they are beyond the scope of this investigation and could be covered in other studies, such as:

- * Investigating the summarization strategies adopted by Saudi male students in contrast to female students of English language.
- * Investigating the summarization strategies used by students in two levels, the senior level compared with the elementary level, to examine their improvement.
- * An experimental research could be done on two groups of students where instructions for writing summaries are given to only one group to check the importance of teaching summarization strategies.
- * Different types of written text, other than expository text or pedagogical text, could be used in other investigations.

- * Commentaries from summarizers or questionnaires could be incorporated to validate the researcher's interpretations.
- * A further study could investigate the study skills used by Saudis.
- * Another study could search for an answer to a question like: Does training in writing summaries in Arabic foster summarization in English, and vice versa?
- * It would be interesting to find out whether the model of summarization strategies designed by the researcher could be replicated in other similar studies.

References

- Adams, A. (1980). The use of direct instruction to teach an independent study method to skill deficient fifth grade students. *DAI*, 41(A), 1912.
- Al-Haidari, A. (1991). How Arab students summarize English prose and how they revise their summaries. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- Al-Issa, A. (1998). Train them to summarize. *English Teaching Forum*, 36(2), 38-39.
- Amaudet, M. & Barrett, M. (1984). *Approaches to Academic Reading and Writing*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Arnold, M. (1942). The comparative effectiveness of certain study techniques in the field of history. *Journal of Educational Research*, 33, 449-457.
- Brown, A. & Day, J. (1983). Macrorules for summarizing texts: The development of expertise. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 22, 1-14.
- Brown, A., Day, J. & Jones, R. (1983). The development of plans for summarizing texts. *Child Development*, 54, 968-979.

- Brown, A. & Smiley, S. (1977). The development of strategies for studying texts. *Child Development*, 49, 1076-1088.
- Brown, D. (1980). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Byrne, B. (1984). The general/academic self-concept monological network: A review of construct validation research. *Review of Educational Research*, 54, 427-456.
- Campbell, C. (1990). Writing with others' words: Using background reading text in academic compositions. In B. Kroll, (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carrell, P. (1984). Some issues in studying the role of schemata or background knowledge in second language comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 12, 81-92.
- Carrier, C. & Titus, A. (1979). The effects of note taking: A review of studies. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 4 (4), 299-314.
- Corbeil, G. (2000). Exploring the effects of first and second language proficiency on summarizing in French as a second language. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3 (1-2), 35-62.

- Crystal, D. (1992). Glossary. In W. Bright (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, 4, 273-348.
- Di Vesta, F. J., & Gray, S. G. (1972). Listening and note taking. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 63 (1), 8-14.
- Doctorow, M., Wittrock, M. & Marks, C. (1978). Generative processes in reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70, 109-118.
- Dyer, C. (2001). *Teaching pupils with severe and complex difficulties: Back to first principles*. London, UK: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Elgar, A. (2002). Student playwriting for language development. *ELT Journal*, 56(1), 22-24.
- Endres-Niggemeyer, B. (2000). SimSum: An empirically founded simulation of summarizing. *Information Processing and Management*, 36(4), 659-682.
- Flower, L. & Hayes, J. (1981). Identifying the organization of writing processes. In L. Gregg, & E.R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive Processes in Writing*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Friend, R. (2000). Teaching summarization as a content area reading strategy (2). *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 44(4), 320.

- Germane, C. (1921). Value of written paragraph summary. *Journal of Educational Research*, 3, 116-123.
- Glover, J., Plake, B., Roberts, B., Zimmer, J. & Palmere, M. (1981). Distinctiveness of encoding: The Effects of paraphrasing and drawing inferences in memory from prose. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73, 736-744.
- Guido, B. & Colwell, C. (1987). A Rationale for direct instruction to teach summary writing following expository text reading. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 26(2), 89-98.
- Hadwin, A., Kirby, J., & Woodhouse, R. (1999). Individual differences in note-taking, summarisation and learning from lectures. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, XLV(1), 1-17.
- Hare, V. & Borchardt, K. (1984). Direct instruction of summarization skills. *Reading Research Quarterly*. 20, 67-78.
- Head, M., Redence, J., & Buss, K. (1989). An Examination of summary writing as a measure of reading comprehension. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 28(4), 1-11.
- Hoey, M. (1983). *On The Surface of Discourse*. London, UK: George Allen & Unwin.

- Horowitz, D. (1986). What professors actually require: Academic tasks for the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 445-462.
- Howe, M. (1970). Using students' notes to examine the role of the individual learner in acquiring meaningful subject matter. *Journal of Educational Research*, 64 (2), 61-63.
- Johns, A. & Mayes, P. (1990). An Analysis of summary protocols of university ESL students. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(3), 253-268.
- Johnson, N. (1978). A Structural analysis of the development of story recall and summarization. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, San Diego, California.
- Kim, S. (2001). Characteristics of EFL readers' summary writing: A study with Korean university students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 34(6), 569-81.
- Kintsch, W. & Kozminsky, E. (1977). Summarizing stories after reading and listening. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 69, 491-499.
- Kintsch, W. & Van Dijk, T. (1978). Toward a model of text comprehension and production. *Psychological Review*, 85(5), 363-394.
- Kirkland, M. & Saunders, P. (1991). Maximizing students performance in summary writing: Managing cognitive load. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(1), 105-121.

- Kulhavy, R., Dyer, J., & Silver, L. (1975). The effects of note taking and test expectancy on the learning of text material. *Journal of Educational Research*, 68, 363-365.
- Lemke, J. (1987). Technical discourse and technocratic ideology. In M. Halliday, J. Gibbons, & H. Nicholas, (Eds.), *Learning keeping and using language Vol.II Selected papers from the 8th world congress of applied linguistics*. (pp. 435-460) .Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Liden, M. & Wittrock, M. (1981). The teaching of reading comprehension according to the model of generative learning. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 17, 44-57.
- Logan, D. (2003). Take note!. *Knowledge Quest*, 32(1), 45.
- McVincent, Lewis, R. & Weir, S. (1977). *Reading for adults*. London, UK: Longman House.
- Moore,T. (1997). From text to note: Cultural variation in summarization practices. *Prospect*, 12(3), 54-63.
- Meyer, B. (1979). Organizational patterns in prose and their use in reading. In M. Kamil & A. Moe (Eds.), *Reading research: Studies and application*. (pp. 109-117). Clemson, S. Carolina: National Reading Conference.

- Olson, C. (1984). Fostering critical thinking skills through writing. *Educational Leadership*, 42(3), 28-39.
- Oshima, A. & Hogue, A. (1991). *Writing academic English* (second edition). Boston: Addison Wesley Publishing Company.
- Palmatier, R. (1971). Comparison of four note-taking procedures . *Journal of Reading*, 14 (4), 235- 258.
- Paper, R. & Mayer, R. (1978). Note taking as a generative activity. *Journal of Educational Psychology*,70, 514-522.
- Peretz, A. (1986). Summary writing for EFL students of science and technology. *English Teaching Forum*, 24(3), 31-32.
- Reid, J. (1982). *The Process of composition*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ : Prentice-Hall.
- Rickards, J. & Friedman, F. (1978). The Encoding versus the external storage hypothesis in note taking . *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 3 (2), 136-43.
- Rosenthal, L. & Rowland, S. (1986). *Academic reading and study skills for international students*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Shimmerlik, S. (1978). Organization theory and memory for prose: A Review of the literature . *Review of Educational Research*, 48 (1), 103-20.

- Spatt, B. (1983). *Writing from sources*. New York, NY : St. Martin's Press.
- Stordahl, K. & Christenson, C. (1956). The effects of study techniques on comprehension and retention. *Journal of Educational Research*, 49, 561-570.
- Strever, J. & Newman, K. (1997). Using electronic peer audience and summary writing with ESL students. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 28(1), 24-34.
- Sutherland, P., Badger, R. & White, G. (2002). How new students take notes at lectures. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 26(4), 377-388.
- Swales, J. & Feak, Ch. (1994). *Academic writing for graduate students*. Ann Arbor, Michigan : The University of Michigan Press.
- Tadros, A. (1981). *Linguistic prediction in economics text*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Birmingham, UK: University of Birmingham, English Language Research.
- Tadros, A. (1985). *Prediction in Text*. Birmingham, UK: The University of Birmingham, English Language Research.
- Taylor, K. (1984). The different summary skills of inexperienced and professional writers. *Journal of Reading*, May, 691-699.

- Van Dijk, T. (1977). *Studies in the pragmatics of discourse*. New York, NY: Mouton Publishers.
- Van Dijk, T. (1977). Macro-structures, knowledge frames, and discourse comprehension. In M.A. Just & P. Carpenter (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in comprehension*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Weener, P. (1974). Note taking and student verbalization as instrumental learning activities. *Instructional Science*, 3 (1), 51-73.
- Winograd, P. (1984). Strategic difficulties in summarizing texts. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 19, 404-425.
- Zaki, H. & Ellis, R. (1999). Learning vocabulary through interacting with a written text. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Learning a second language through interaction*. (pp.151-169). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.

APPENDIX

Passage I

Energy sense makes future sense

Paragraph 1

1. The world is running out of oil, and energy experts believe that there could be serious shortages in ten years' time.
1. Not only is each individual using more oil than ever before, as the standard of living in industrialized countries rises, but the population explosion means that each year many more people will be using oil in some form or other.
2. Until recently we took oil for granted: it seemed it would never stop flowing.
3. It was so cheap and plentiful that the whole world came to depend on it.
4. Governments neglected other sources of energy: electricity was generated from oil and power stations were fired by it.
5. It found its way into many of the products of light industry.
6. Many people are surprised when they learn how many items in their homes contain oil.

Paragraph 2

1. The increase in the price of oil has brought the world to its senses.

2. Governments are searching for a suitable alternative, but so far in vain.
3. They are considering how they can make better use of the two other major fuels, coal and natural gas, but they have found that neither can take the place of oil in their economies.
4. In recent years there has been a growing concern for the environment and coal is not a popular fuel with environmentalists.
5. Coal mines are ugly, and their development has a serious effect on animal and plant life; coal itself is a heavy pollutant.
6. Natural gas, the purest of the three fuels, is also the most limited in supply.

Paragraph 3

1. The answer would seem to lie in nuclear power stations.
2. They need very little fuel to produce enormous amounts of power and they do not pollute the atmosphere.
3. Their dangers, however, are so great and the cost of building them so high that some governments are unwilling to invest in them.
 4. Not only could one accident in a single nuclear power station spread as much radio-activity as a thousand

Hiroshima atom bombs, but the radio-active waste from these stations is extremely dangerous for one hundred thousand years.

5. So is there no possible alternative to nuclear power?

Paragraph 4

1. Well, there are several, but none of them seems likely to satisfy future energy demands.
2. Scientists have recently turned their attention to natural sources of energy: the sun, the sea, the wind and hot springs.
3. Of these the sun seems the most promising source for the future.
4. Houses have already been built which are heated entirely by solar energy.
5. However, solar energy can only be collected during daylight hours, and in countries where the weather is unreliable, an alternative heating system has to be included.

Paragraph 5

1. Experiments are being carried out at the University of Arizona on ways of storing solar energy on a large scale.
2. To satisfy a large part of the energy needs of a country like America, huge power stations covering 5000 square miles would

have to be built and one wonders whether this would be acceptable to environmentalists.

3. While experiments in generating energy from the sea and the wind are interesting, neither can be considered an obvious solution to a future energy crisis; the first because a lot of energy is needed to generate energy from the sea, and the second because the amount of energy generated from wind would satisfy only a small percentage of a nation's needs.

Paragraph 6

1. Another source of energy, which could be more widely used, is that generated by hot water or steam from under the earth (geothermal energy as it is called).
2. This form of energy is already being used in New Zealand, Iceland, and the Soviet Union and very successfully in Italy, where it generates a quarter of the nation's electricity.

Paragraph 7

1. Many scientists are optimistic that new ways of generating large amounts of energy will be successfully developed, but at the same time they fear the consequences.
2. If the world population goes on increasing at its present rate, and each individual continues to use more energy every year, we may,

in fifty years' time, be burning up so much energy that we would damage the earth's atmosphere.

3. By raising the temperature of the atmosphere, we could melt the Arctic and Antarctic ice-caps and change the pattern of vegetable and animal life throughout the world- a frightening possibility.

Paragraph 8

1. These dangers will have to be kept in mind as scientists continue with their experiments.
2. In the meantime, we can all help to protect the environment by not wasting energy.
3. This means driving more carefully (if you have to use a car – it's healthier and cheaper to ride a bike) and turning off unnecessary lighting and heating in the home.
4. In these small ways we call all help to make the world a cleaner, healthier place for future generations.

Passage II

Playwriting and English language teaching

Paragraph 1

1. The benefits to be gained from the writing and performance of plays in both first (L1) and second language (L2) English teaching have been described by various authors.
2. Rycik (1990:40) advocates the use of playwriting in L1 English teaching, claiming that it “gives students the opportunity to hone their creative writing skills and cultivate their imaginations”.
3. It also leads them to discover “the value of cooperation and the importance of teamwork”.

Paragraph 2

1. Salvante (1993) describes playwriting residency programmes she administers for US public schools.
2. These programmes sponsor professional playwrights to work in schools, helping students to write plays.
3. Through writing plays students can develop greater self-esteem, become more autonomous learners, and feel a sense of accomplishment.
4. Moreover, “ rather than perceiving students as empty vessels waiting to be filled with information, the visiting playwright can

use the art form to turn learning into a journey of self-discovery and assume that students are already overflowing with valuable potential waiting to be tapped” (ibid.:37).

Paragraph 3

1. Sandock (1994), Baines and Dial (1995), and Jackson and Kerr-Norflett (1997) also propose the use of play writing in an L1 context.
2. Sandock (1994:414) considers that students’ reading skills are promoted when they perform a play written by their class: ‘Students are encouraged, not by the teacher but by the play itself, to study words and phrases, to pay attention to cues – to get it right.’
3. Baines and Dial (1995:86-7) suggest that scripting screenplays may be an appropriate classroom activity, given the extensive exposure of present-day students to the medium of film.
4. Among other advantages, they note that screenwriting involves a complete writing process, and requires both individual and group work.
5. Jackson and Kerr-Norflett (1997:102-3) suggest the use of Jamaican-style play building, and write of how ‘[i]n the play-building process students speak, listen, write, read, generate ideas, pose problem statements, and generate logical solutions.

6. All of these activities foster and enhance literacy skills in ways that actively involve students in the learning process.'

Paragraph 4

1. Wessels (1991) and Heath (1993:1996) recommend playwriting in EFL/ESL contexts.
2. Wessels (ibid.) describes an EFL course which centers around playwriting and performance.
3. Through group discussion her students draw up an outline of a play.
4. Each scene is then improvised.
5. While some students act out the parts of the characters, others note down the dialogue which the actors produce.
6. The scenes are then written up to be used as the script of the play.

Paragraph 5

1. The improvisation of plays gives rise to much intensive language practice.
2. Moreover, because the participants 'are creating the play themselves, rather than responding to an existing text, there is usually no shortage of ideas, nor any unwillingness to contribute to the developing scenes' (Wessels 1991:234).
3. The playscripts can also form the basis of teaching material for other classes (ibid.235).

Paragraph 6

1. Heath (1996:776) claims that literary writing ‘generates essentials of language learning.
2. Students write and rewrite, listen to their own and other’s words again and again, read aloud to others, reshape their efforts to make words “say” just what they want them to mean.
3. Literature has no rival in its power to create natural repetition, reflection on language and how it works, and attention to audience response on the part of learners.’

Paragraph 7

1. Heath (1993) recommends playwriting on the basis of research which demonstrated the effectiveness of the drama activities, including playwriting and performance, run by US inner-city youth organizations.
2. She notes that young people who were underachievers in school were able to attain high standards when writing and performing plays, and that ‘once these actors became their own authors, they seemed to tap in performance a deep range of linguistic competence that they otherwise did not display’ (ibid.:181).
3. Indeed, playwriting activities enable youth leaders to impose high standards of performance on participants, since the leaders

are ‘speaking through and for the potential future audience the group will have to satisfy with their final dramatic performance’ (ibid.183).

Paragraph 8

1. Heath (ibid.185) draws implications from the success of such drama activities for the development of English language skills, suggesting that ‘schools would do well to imitate neighborhood organizations and think of the power of drama and fuller uses of role playing for bringing out performance that reflects the fullest possible range of linguistic competence of students’.