



EFFECT OF EIGHT-WEEK TRAINING WITH TITLE-FOCUSED INSTRUCTIONS ON STRUGGLING EFL SUMMARY WRITERS AT AKITA PREFECTURAL UNIVERSITY, JAPAN

Kana Ozakiⁱ

Research and Education Center for Comprehensive Science,
Akita Prefectural University,
Akita, Japan

Abstract:

While source-based writing is considered crucial in academics, summary writing remains challenging for English as a foreign language (EFL) students. This study investigated how 27 writers with low English proficiency improved their summarization performance after receiving eight-week title-focused reading instructions for scientific expository texts. The reading and writing strategies that boosted students' first language (L1) summary performance were statistically examined using paired sample *t*-tests. The findings revealed the most significant improvement in the main idea coverage of the source text, which boosted some reading and writing strategy use. Using keywords from the texts also enhanced the prediction of content meanings, promoting upper-level processing. The results imply that the simple title-focused instructions can increase beginner writers' coverage of primary ideas, which leads to enhancing their total summarization performance.

Keywords: EFL students, summarization strategies, low English proficiency, title-focused instructions

1. Introduction

Summarization is an integrated language task that involves writing from sources (Cumming *et al.*, 2016), and summarization skills are essential for academic success (Kato, 2021; Keck, 2006). However, writing summaries is regarded as one of the most challenging skills to learn because it requires a high level of expertise in both reading and writing (Hirvela, 2004): at least an upper-intermediate level of English proficiency (Kirkland & Saunders, 1991). This requirement has resulted in little research on student writers with low English proficiency (e.g., Hua, 2014). Most of the research on summarization found the effect of integrated reading and writing strategies on

ⁱ Correspondence: email kozaki@akita-pu.ac.jp

intermediate or advanced writers, which, however, failed to enhance the summarization performance of beginner writers (e.g., Cho & Brutt-Griffler, 2015; Choy & Lee, 2012). Thus, studies should investigate how beginner or struggling writers can develop their summarization skills when an appropriate instruction is provided.

Summarization instruction plays an important role in enhancing students' integrated skills. Most EFL learners in Asia, including Japan, Korea, and Vietnam, have little experience with summarization and desire appropriate, explicit instructions (Cho & Brutt-Griffler, 2015; Hua, 2024; Kato, 2018c). Many scholars tend to conclude that novice EFL writers' difficulties with summarization are caused by their underdeveloped writing skills (e.g., Li, 2014a); however, it should not be overlooked that reading in English is still challenging in the context of L2 summarization (Hirvela, 2004). While Hua (2024) has shed light on novice summary writers and proposed summarization strategies to enhance reading comprehension, no study has reported how such instructions can boost novice summary writers' reading comprehension for summarization, nor which instructions beginner EFL learners can follow to complete summarization tasks. To address the gap, this study investigated how students can improve their summarization performance with a fundamental and explicit reading instruction—the title-focused method—and how the instruction affects summarization strategies that are useful to improve their performance.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Definition of Summarization

Many researchers have proposed various definitions of good summarization (e.g., Brown & Day, 1983; Friend, 2001; Hedgcock & Ferris, 2009; Kintsch & Van Dijk, 1978). Casazza (1993) described the process of summarization as follows: comprehending the text, identifying the main ideas of the passage, deleting supporting or trivial information, organizing similar ideas in a coherent pattern, and rephrasing source ideas in the writer's own words. These definitions of summarization have been supported by recent researchers and simplified into three main procedures: comprehending the text, identifying the main ideas of the source, and condensing important ideas into one's own words (Hosseinpour, 2015; Kato, 2018a).

The evaluation criteria for written summaries also provide essential skills that writers should have. Li (2014a) simplified the elements of summarization by examining the role of reading and writing in the summarization performance of Chinese EFL students. His four criteria are primarily based on the reading comprehension theory proposed by Kintsch and Van Dijk (1978), which includes: main idea coverage (MIC), integration (INT), language use (LU), and source use (SU). Although there are variations in the names of the summarization components, many researchers agree on these four elements (e.g., Kato, 2018b, 2018c, 2022; Chen & Su, 2011).

2.2 Summarization Strategies

Among the four elements of summarization, MIC is regarded as the most influential when completing summarization tasks because the writer must begin with an understanding of the source text (e.g., Cohen, 1994; Kintsch & Van Dijk, 1978; Sarig, 1993; Yu, 2008). Some researchers have suggested that using reading strategies is more influential than writing strategies in producing summaries (Asención Delaney, 2008; Cohen, 1994; Sarig, 1993). However, Li (2014a) developed a questionnaire on 26 reading and 29 writing strategies and found that writing strategies played a more important role than reading strategies or general English proficiency in summarization tasks. Thus, discussion of useful strategies in summarization remains controversial.

Applying Li's (2014a) questionnaire, Kato (2018b) investigated when and how often superior and inferior novice L2 summary writers used strategies. The results showed that the strategies were most frequently used during reading and writing. More advanced summary writers used them more often, with some exceptions. Kato (2018b) also added that the varied use of summarization strategies relied on the writers' level of English proficiency. As such, it was important that the present study investigate which summarization strategies are helpful, particularly for beginner writers, and which strategies they can use by themselves.

2.3 Title-focused Instructions

Hua (2024) suggested a title method as one of four strategies to select topic sentences in summarization. Reading a title effectively provides readers with thematic information of a source text, which evokes readers' background knowledge before reading (Grabe, 1991). This can help readers infer topics and the theme. Text comprehension, thus, is more successful when readers encourage inference, combining their prior knowledge and text information while reading (Wolfe & Goldman, 2005). Titles also help readers grasp topic sentences related to the title in each paragraph. As words included in titles often appear in important sentences (Kupiec et al., 1995), referring to or remembering the title while reading can encourage readers to identify the main ideas of texts. Identifying topic sentences is key to producing summaries: students extract important ideas from the source while reading and express them in their own words while writing, both of which are essential to complete summarization tasks (Hua, 2024).

In this present study, title-focused instructions consist of 1) reading a title before reading to activate prior knowledge, and 2) identifying main ideas related to the title in each paragraph. As previous studies often failed to enhance low-EFL-proficiency students' summarization performance with integrated reading and writing instructions (e.g., Cho & Brutt-Griffler, 2015), giving many instructions cannot work for them. Though Hua (2024) proposed a title method with some other instructions in summarization tasks, its effect on writers' summarization performance has not been reported yet. As such, this present study provides participants with only title-focused instructions and investigates how these reading instructions affect the novice summary writers' reading and writing strategy use, addressing the following research questions:

- 1) Do title-focused instructions affect low-EFL-proficiency students' L1 summarization performance on expository texts?
- 2) What summarization strategies are used more frequently to develop their summarization performance after receiving instructions?

3. Materials and Methods

3.1 Research Design

To answer the research questions, the present study employed a longitudinal quantitative research design, comparing students' summarization performance before and after eight-week instruction at Akita Prefectural University, Japan, in the 2023–2024 academic year. Quantitative data were collected through pre- and post-training summarization performances and questionnaires about strategy use provided immediately after the tasks. The data included richer insight into the pedagogical effect of instructions on struggling summary writers.

3.2 Participants and Their Language Abilities

The participants comprised a total of 27 EFL learners (11 females and 16 males, aged between 19 and 20 years, majoring in biology in an undergraduate program at Akita Prefectural University, Japan). They attended English class once a week. Their average English proficiency was low, or the A2 level of the CEFR, according to their TOEIC scores (mean = 324 on a 0–999 scale). Almost all students had no experience with summary writing in either English or their L1. Participants' consent to participate included informed consent, voluntary engagement, restricted data, anonymous participation, potential for harm, and informed results. Written consent was obtained from all participants. They not only attended the eight-week instruction provided by the author but also completed two summarization tasks and questionnaires pre- and post-training. Students who were absent from training or did not complete either task were excluded from the study.

3.3 Data Collection Instruments and Procedures

Quantitative data were collected from two summarization performances pre- and post-training and two questionnaires about strategy use. The data were statistically analyzed using Excel (Microsoft, 2021). The results from paired sample *t*-tests provided descriptive and inferential statistics to measure the significant improvement in summarization performance and strategy use. The duration of this study was set at eight weeks. During the training, the participants produced oral or written L1 summaries with four different expository English texts under title-focused instructions. Data collection procedures are as follows.

3.3.1 Source Texts

Two source texts for the summarization tasks were prepared from a college English text (*Science for Fun!* by Kinseido, Japan, 2017) aimed at EFL learners with TOEIC scores between 300 and 400, which are appropriate for the participants. Both were expository, each including approximately 250 words and a Japanese glossary. One text describes how bitter-sensing taste cells, which are located outside the mouth, prevent animals from being harmed by rotten food or harmful bacteria. At the same time, another report describes a phenomenon of natural selection on a highway, where shorter-winged birds were better at avoiding cars and survived longer than their long-winged competitors.

3.3.2 Summarization Tasks

To evaluate participants' written summaries, a modified version of Li's (2014a) analytical scoring rubric, using a 3-point (0–3) Likert scale, was used (Appendix A). The rubric estimates four essential elements of summarization: MIC, INT, LU, and SU. Only MIC was evaluated by counting the number of main ideas covered from the five predominant ideas. Up to five points were given as MIC, covering five main ideas; three points were given as INT, LU, and SU. Participants were asked to complete the task within thirty minutes. The task instructions included reading the passage and writing a summary of approximately 200 characters in Japanese, which condenses the source to one-third of its length. Participants were explicitly instructed to avoid translating entire English sentences. L1 was utilized for summarization, allowing participants to fully demonstrate their summarization work without being influenced by potential linguistic errors.

3.3.3 Two Raters

The students' written summaries were scored by two raters: the author and a part-time English teaching colleague at Akita Prefectural University. The score for each participant was calculated as the average of the two raters' scores. Pearson's correlation coefficient indicated high interrater reliability ($r = 0.76$ for the first summarization task, $r = 0.77$ for the second).

3.3.4 Questionnaires

Immediately after completing summarization tasks in the first and the last week, respectively, participants were asked to answer a modified version of Kato's (2018b) questionnaire (originally developed by Li (2014a)) with a 3-point (0–3: never used to often used) Likert scale to examine the varied use of reading and writing strategies (Appendix B). The frequency was rated from 0 to 3, referring to low (0–0.9), middle (1–1.9), and high (2.0–3.0), which is the applied and simplified version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning profile of results initially developed by Oxford (1990).

3.4 Abbreviated Terms Used in the Study

EFL/English as a foreign language

L1/First language

CEFR/Common European Framework of Reference for Languages

M/Means

MIC/Main Idea Coverage

INT/Integration

LU/Language Use

SD/Standard Deviations

SU/Source Use

TOEIC/Test of English for International Communication

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Do Title-Focused Instructions Affect EFL Students' L1 Summarization Performance?

Students' L1 summarization performance significantly improved after receiving the title-focused instructions. Table 1 presents the means of the students' summarization scores obtained pre- and post-training. The students' overall performance improved from 7.67 during pre-training to 10.61 during post-training ($t(26) = -7.32, p = 4.52\text{E-}08$), out of a possible 14.00. The effect size of Cohen's d ($d = 1.89$) also indicated a strong effect of the instructions on students in summarization tasks (Cohen, 1988; Plonsky & Oswald, 2014). Particularly, the instructions had a significant effect on students' post-training performance for MIC ($d = 1.55$), a moderate effect on INT ($d = 1.03$), and a moderate-to-large effect on LU ($d = 1.32$) (Plonsky & Oswald, 2014). Additionally, Pearson's correlation analysis revealed strong correlations between total performance and MIC ($r = 0.88$) and INT ($r = 0.74$).

Table 1: Comparison of Students' Pre- and Post-Training Summarization Scores

	Means		Standard Deviations		t	d
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post		
Main Idea Coverage (5.00)	1.57	3.13	0.97	1.03	-5.76	1.55***
Integration (3.00)	1.57	2.04	0.50	0.38	-4.49	1.03***
Language Use (3.00)	1.83	2.54	0.58	0.49	-6.01	1.32***
Source Use (3.00)	2.69	2.91	0.41	0.24	-2.37	0.66*
Overall (14.00)	7.67	10.61	1.66	1.45	-7.32	1.89***

Note: *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.

4.2 Do Title-Focused Instructions Affect EFL Students' Use of Summarization Strategies?

Significant increases in frequency of strategy use between pre- and post-training performances were identified for three reading strategies and two writing strategies: Strategy 2 (*Reading the title*), Strategy 4 (*Using context clues to predict meaning*) and Strategy 15 (*Underlining key words*) during the reading stage; and Strategy 28 (*Scanning for a specific word to use in writing*) and Strategy 31 (*Working out the main idea of a paragraph*) during the writing stage (Table 2). Only Strategy 2 (*Reading the title*) showed a more significant

increase in use ($p = 0.008$) than the other four ($p < 0.05$). However, in post-training performance, Strategy 4 (*Using context clues to predict the meaning*) was the most frequently used strategy ($M = 2.37$). Regarding Cohen's effect size, summarization training had a small effect on two strategies: Strategy 4 (*Using context clues to predict the meaning*) ($d = 0.59$) in reading, and Strategy 31 (*Working out the main idea of a paragraph*) ($d = 0.58$) in writing.

Table 2: Comparison of Individual Strategies Used in Pre- and Post-Training

Strategy	Means		Standard Deviations		<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post		
2. Reading the title	1.56	2.00	0.83	1.02	-2.59	0.47**
4. Using context clues to predict the meaning	1.89	2.37	0.96	0.62	-2.30	0.59*
15. Underlining key words	0.52	1.04	1.00	1.17	-2.40	0.48*
28. Working out the main idea of a paragraph	1.37	1.89	0.95	0.83	2.08	0.58*
31. Scanning for a specific word to use in writing	1.52	1.89	1.07	0.99	2.33	0.36*

Note: ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.

4.3 Impact of Title-Focused Instructions on Reading and Writing Strategy Use

One of the most important findings is that the title-focused instructions significantly affected increasing MIC and the total performance ($p < 0.001$, respectively). This result affirmatively answers the first research question (do title-focused instructions significantly affect low-EFL-proficiency students' summarization performance?). As expected, this title method appears useful in improving beginner writers' reading comprehension in summarization. Interestingly, in addition to MIC, INT and LU were also significantly affected by the title instructions, even though any writing instructions, such as integrating main ideas or paraphrasing, were not given. Thus, students who increased MIC can also improve their INT and LU to some extent by themselves. This supports previous studies indicating that MIC is predominant in the four summarization elements (Li, 2014a).

One reason MIC was increased is the increase in frequency of strategy use. This answers the second research question (what summarization strategies are used more frequently to develop their summarization performance?) The most dominant strategy was *reading the title*. This implies that many of the students wanted to acquire this basic reading strategy and found it useful in summarization, although the title method was seldom emphasized in previous literature (e.g., Kato, 2018; Li, 2014a). Another strategy that seemed effective in improving MIC is *using context clues to predict meaning*, which was used the most frequently post-training. As the words in titles often display key words of a text (Kupiec et al., 1995), students might be able to identify context clues more easily. They then began to use strategies that employed keywords. The strategy *using context clues to predict meaning* helped with students' higher-level processing, which allowed readers to map contextual information onto prior knowledge (Nassaji, 2002). By contrast, many studies have discussed the significance of bottom-up processes in summary reading (e.g., Kato, 2018b; Li, 2014a). In general, lower proficiency often

hinders the automatic identification of words and grammar, as well as higher-level processing. In this study, however, the strategy of inferring text meanings from key words may compensate for students' underdeveloped bottom-up processing caused by their limited vocabulary.

These results contrast with the findings of some previous studies in which low-proficiency summary writers did not significantly improve their summarization performance after receiving integrated reading and writing instructions (e.g., Cho & Brutt-Griffler, 2015). Cho and Brutt-Griffler (2015) suggested that low- and intermediate-proficiency groups might develop reading and writing skills slowly. In this study, however, eight weeks of summarization training can provide a positive effect on students' L1 summarization performance, and the simple instruction related to the title may suit low EFL proficiency students.

Another significant finding regarding strategy use was that the title-focused instructions affected not only reading but also writing strategy use. This answers the second research question (which strategy can enhance summarization performance?). As the students grasped key words of a text more easily by means of a title-focused reading approach, they also began to use writing strategies that employed key words: *working out the main idea of a paragraph* and *scanning for specific words to use in writing*. It is noteworthy that students who successfully gained main ideas in reading also used them more often in writing by themselves, although no writing instructions were given. Thus, importantly, increasing MIC can encourage writers include more main ideas in their production, which may lead to better summarization performance.

5. Recommendations

5.1 Recommendations for Future Practice

Based on these findings, this study suggests recommendations on how teachers should instruct struggling summary writers at the beginning stages.

5.1.1 At the Initial Stage

L1 summarization of an English text can be useful for both teachers and students, as they can identify how much they comprehend the text.

5.1.2 Identification of Necessary Instructions

If some students show challenges in reading comprehension, they should continue practicing L1 summarization of English texts, provided with title-focused reading instructions; other students who display more advanced text comprehension should be immediately provided with writing instructions to complete L2 summarization tasks.

5.1.3 Development of Main Idea Coverage

With a title-focused approach, teachers should help students identify key words and related main ideas of a text for at least eight weeks. Teachers should keep their instructions as simple as possible at this stage.

5.1.4 Gradual Shift to L2 Writing Instructions

When students become accustomed to using key words to produce L1 summaries, teachers should guide them to L2 writing stages. Teachers should begin with instructions employing key words and then language use later in order to develop the skills of integration, language use, paraphrasing, and content accuracy (Kato, 2024):

- To help students integrate the identified main ideas of source texts
- To provide synonymous terms of verbs and nouns to replace some words extracted from texts
- To help students use lexical and syntactical knowledge to produce summaries
- To help students confirm content accuracy of written summaries

These writing practices should take approximately twelve months (Chen & Su, 2011; Ortega, 2003) until struggling writers learn vocabulary, paraphrasing, and language use.

5.2 Limitations and Future Research

This study has some limitations. First, the results of this study should be interpreted with caution in comparison to investigations of L2 written summaries. In particular, L2 summaries written by low-proficiency EFL students often contain plagiarism and direct copying (Kato, 2018a); in contrast, the results of L1 summarization in this study were less affected by students' low writing proficiency. Second, this study used only expository texts. Though this was done so because previous literature has already suggested that the text structure of expository texts is more suitable for practicing writing summaries than narratives are (e.g., Li, 2014b), future research should employ various types of text to examine which is best to use in teaching beginner summary writers. Third, the improvement of summarization in this study is limited. Although the title-focused instructions affected both reading and writing strategy use, more explicit writing instruction, as suggested above, is needed to encourage students to become more proficient summary writers. Lastly, there may be a possibility that repeated practice increased participants' reading comprehension, though this study emphasized the effect of the provided instructions. Paradoxically, repeated writing summary benefits weaker readers in particularly in developing reading skills, such as mapping macrostructure and engaging in higher processing (Marzec-Stawiarska, 2016). Thus, this study should be interpreted with caution that the improvement of summarization performance should be partly benefited by repeated practice, which enforces reading comprehension at the same time.

5.3 Implications

This study's findings have three main implications. First, regarding theoretical implications, this study sheds light on direct and explicit instructions that struggling writers can follow to develop their summarization performance. Based on a theory that suggested that successful summarization requires at least a high-intermediate level of English (Kirkland & Saunders, 1991), little research has focused on struggling summary writers with low English proficiency nor found little effective instructions on them (e.g., Cho & Brutt-Griffler, 2015; Hua, 2024; Kato 2018b). This study, however, can enhance educational equity for underdeveloped summary writers, particularly for Asian students who have had little opportunity to learn summarization.

Contrary to reading theories, such that bottom-up processing is essential for reading, reading for summarization can be improved even by those with limited vocabulary in a shorter term (e.g., twelve months vs. eight weeks). This may be because reading for summarization and reading for comprehension or tests are different (Li, 2014a); the former mainly requires understanding the important ideas of a text, while the latter requires entire comprehension. Thus, providing summaries as a reading purpose can encourage less proficient readers to enhance inferential processing and allow them to recognize their progress in reading comprehension. Furthermore, summarization skills are required not only in academic but also in social environments after graduation (Hua, 2024). Thus, learning summarization instead of mere reading during an academic period would benefit students career-wise.

Lastly, simplicity and explicitness of the instructions are key for teaching struggling EFL learners. Particularly for Asian students, introduction to summarization tasks should begin with reading instructions because they face challenges in both reading and writing in English (Hirvela, 2004). Additionally, some EFL learners experience cultural barriers in writing English; Japanese people, for example, are not familiar with direct mention in L1; thus, teachers should be aware of students' cultural verbal backgrounds and, at the same time, encourage them to recognize these cultural differences.

6. Conclusion

This study investigated the impact of title-focused instruction on the L1 summarization performance of 27 low-proficiency EFL students in English expository texts and identified strategies that could improve their summarization skills. The findings from paired sample *t*-tests revealed that the instructions significantly affected all four summarization skills. In particular, MIC was significantly enhanced by the instructions. This may be because focusing on the title allowed the students to identify key words more easily in the text and infer content meanings with higher processing. Given only title-focused instructions, students spontaneously used some reading and writing strategies, employing key words more frequently. These strategies may have enhanced students' performance in inferring main ideas and integrating them in reading and

writing. These results imply that title-focused instructions are suitable for beginner writers of summaries to increase MIC and total performance. Additionally, those strategies that students spontaneously used more often after the training can actually be taught simultaneously to further enhance their summarization skills.

Acknowledgements

I thank Ms. Sugawara, who served as the co-rater for this research, for her consistent and precise assistance. I also extend my gratitude to all students who participated in this study. This study received funding support from the Creative Study Project (県大地研-47), Akita Prefectural University. The funding body had no role in the study design, data collection, analysis, interpretation of results, or decision to publish this manuscript. The author acknowledges Sage Author Services for writing assistance and Editage (www.editage.com).

Creative Commons License Statement

This research work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>. To view the complete legal code, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode.en>. Under the terms of this license, members of the community may copy, distribute, and transmit the article, provided that proper, prominent, and unambiguous attribution is given to the authors, and the material is not used for commercial purposes or modified in any way. Reuse is only allowed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

About the Author(s)

Kana Ozaki is an assistant professor in the Research and Education Center at Akita Prefectural University. She received her master's degree in TESOL in 2016 from the Institute of Education at University College London. Her research interests include text structures, reading-to-write, and summary writing in the EFL context.

Email: kozaki@akita-pu.ac.jp

References

Asención Delaney Y, 2008. Investigating the Reading-to-Write Construct. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 7(3): 140–150. doi: 10.1016/j.jeap.2008.04.001

- Brown AL, & Day JD, 1983. Macrorules for Summarizing Texts: The Development of Expertise. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 22(1): 1–14. doi: 10.1016/S0022-5371(83)80002-4
- Casazza ME, 1993. Using a Model of Direct Instruction to Teach Summary Writing in a College Reading Class. *Journal of Reading* 37(3): 202–208.
- Chen YS, & Su SW, 2012. A Genre-Based Approach to Teaching EFL Summary Writing. *ELT Journal* 66(2): 184–192. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccr061
- Cho H, & Brutt-Griffler J, 2015. Integrated Reading and Writing: A Case of Korean English Language Learners. *Reading in a Foreign Language* 27(2): 242–261.
- Choy SC, & Lee MY, 2012. Effects of Teaching Paraphrasing Skills to Students Learning Summary Writing in ESL. *Journal of Teaching and Learning* 8(2): 77–89. doi: 10.22329/jtl.v8i2.3145
- Cohen AD, 1994. English for Academic Purposes in Brazil: The Use of Summary Tasks. In: Hill C, & Parry K (Eds.), *From Testing to Assessment: English as an International Language*, Longman, London, pp 174–204.
- Cohen J, 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Science*, 2nd edn. Academic Press.
- Cumming A, Lai C, & Cho H, 2016. Students' Writing from Sources for Academic Purposes: A Synthesis of Recent Research. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 23: 47–58. doi: 10.1016/j.jeap.2016.06.002
- Friend R, 2001. Effects of Strategy Instruction on Summary Writing of College Students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 26(1): 3–24. doi: 10.1006/ceps.1999.1022
- Grabe W, 1991. Current Developments in Second Language Reading Research. *TESOL Quarterly* 25(3): 375–406. doi: 10.2307/3586977
- Hedgcock J, & Ferris D, 2009. *Teaching Readers of English: Students, Texts, and Contexts*. Routledge, New York. Doi: 10.4324/9781315465579
- Hirvela A, 2004. *Connecting Reading and Writing in Second Language Writing Instruction*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press. doi: 10.3998/mpub.8122864
- Hirvela A, & Du Q, 2013. Why Am I Paraphrasing? Undergraduate ESL Writers' Engagement with Source-Based Academic Writing and Reading. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 12(2): 87–98. doi: 10.1016/j.jeap.2012.11.005
- Hosseinpour M, 2015. The Impact of Teaching Summarizing on EFL Learners' Microgenetic Development of Summary Writing. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills* 7(2): 69–92.
- Hua V.T.T, 2024. Investigating the Real Situation of Reading Comprehension and Summary Writing and Proposing Some Summarization Strategies for EFL Students at A University in Delta, Vietnam. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching* 8(1): 69–81. doi: 10.46827/ejfl.v8i1.5260
- Kato M, 2018a. Providing Comprehension Clues in L1 to Japanese EFL Summary Writers: Do They Help? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature* 7(5): 12–21. doi: 10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.7n.5p.12

- Kato M, 2018b. Good and Poor Summary Writers' Strategies: The Case of Japanese High School EFL Learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 9(6): 1199–1208. doi: 10.17507/jltr.0906.09
- Kato M, 2018c. Exploring the Transfer Relationship of Summarizing Skills in L1 and L2. *English Language Teaching* 11(10): 75-87. doi:10.5539/elt.v11n10p75
- Kato M, 2021. Summarization in English as a Foreign Language: A Study Comparing L2 Summary Performances to Summarizers' L2 Vocabulary Size and L1 Summarizing Skill. *English Language Teaching* 14(5): 77-88. doi: 10.5539/elt.v14n5p77
- Kato M, 2022. Examining the Dependability and Practicality of the Analytic Rubric of Summary Writing Using Multivariate Generalizability Theory: Focusing on Japanese University Students with Lower-Intermediate Proficiency in English. *English Language Teaching* 15(9): 82–94. doi: 10.5539/elt.v15n9p82
- Kato M, 2024. Developing an Analytic Rubric for Japanese EFL Learners' Summary Writing. *English Language Teaching* 17(12): 1-12. doi: 10.5539/elt.v17n12p1
- Keck C, 2006. The Use of Paraphrase in Summary Writing: A Comparison of L1 and L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(4): 261-278. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2006.09.006
- Kintsch W, & Van Dijk TA, 1978. Toward a Model of Text Comprehension and Production. *Psychological Review* 85(5): 363–394. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.85.5.363
- Kirkland MR, & Saunders MAP, 1991. Maximizing Student Performance in Summary Writing: Managing Cognitive Load. *TESOL Quarterly* 25(1): 105–121. doi: 10.2307/3587030
- Kupiec J, Pedersen J, & Chen F, 1995. A Trainable Document Summarizer. *SIGIR '95: Proceedings of the 18th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*:68 – 73. doi: 10.1145/215206.215333
- Li J, 2014a. The Role of Reading and Writing in Summarization as an Integrated Task. *Language Testing in Asia* 4(1). doi: 10.1186/2229-0443-4-3
- Li J, 2014b. Examining Genre Effects on Test Takers' Summary Writing Performance. *Assessing Writing* 22: 75–90. doi: 10.1016/j.asw.2014.08.003
- Marzec-Stawiarska Małgorzata, 2016. The Influence of Summary Writing on the Development of Reading Skills in a Foreign Language. *System* 59: 90-99. doi: 10.1016/j-system.2016.04.006
- Nassaji H, 2002. Schema Theory and Knowledge-Based Processes in Second Language Reading Comprehension: A Need for Alternative Perspectives. *Language Learning* 52(2): 439–481. doi: 10.1111/0023-8333.00189
- Oxford R, 1990. *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know?* Heinle and Heinle, Inc., Boston
- Plonsky L, & Oswald FL, 2014. How Big Is “Big”? Interpreting Effect Sizes in L2 Research. *Language Learning* 64(4): 878–912. doi: 10.1111/lang.12079
- Rivard LP, 2001. Summary Writing: A Multi-Grade Study of French-Immersion and Francophone Secondary Students. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 14(2): 171–186. doi: 10.1080/07908310108666620

- Sarig G, 1993. Composing a Study Summary: A Reading-Writing Encounter. In: Carson JG, & Leki I (Eds.), *Reading in the Composition Classroom: Second Language Perspectives*, Heinle & Heinle, Boston, pp 161–182.
- Wolfe MB & Goldman SR, 2005. Relations Between Adolescents' Text Processing and Reasoning. *Cognition and Instruction* 23(4): 467-502. doi: 10.1207/s1532690xci2304_2
- Yu G, 2008. Reading to Summarize in English and Chinese: A Tale of Two Languages? *Language Testing* 25(4): 521–551. doi: 10.1177/0265532208094275

Appendix A: Scoring Scale (from Li (2014a) and Kato (2018b))

(1) Main idea coverage of Task 1 /5

- ☐ Taste cells are present not only in the mouth but also in the stomach and intestines.
- ☐ Taste cells have the function of ridding the body of bad stuff.
- ☐ Taste cells were found in a mouse's nose for the first time.
- ☐ The way that taste cells sound alarms is under study.
- ☐ Future research may focus on human noses.

(1') Main idea coverage of Task 2 /5

- ☐ There are swallows that make their habitats on a highway.
- ☐ The problem is that the swallows are killed by cars.
- ☐ The number of casualties decreases because of natural selection.
- ☐ More long-winged birds are killed in accidents, leaving less offspring.
- ☐ Short-winged birds can dodge cars quickly and survive.

(2) Integration

3: A response rearranges the order of the statements logically, displays good examples of integration and connectives, and demonstrates a global interpretation of the source text.

2: A response rearranges the order of statements logically, displays a few examples of integration and connectives, and displays an almost global interpretation of the source text, lacking some information.

1: A response rearranges the order of statements illogically and displays a range of information about the source text.

0: A response consists of only a couple of sentences or is left blank and does not display logical engagement, integration, and connectives.

(3) Language use

3: A response displays consistent facility in the use of language, demonstrating syntactic variety and appropriate word choice in Japanese.

2: A response displays facility in the use of language, demonstrating syntactic variety and a range of vocabulary, although it has a couple of noticeable minor errors in structure or word forms that do not interfere with meaning.

1: A response has more than three serious errors in sentence structure or usage; the text shows a lack of control of vocabulary and/or grammar that often obscures meaning.

0: A response is totally incomprehensible owing to language errors or because the response is left blank.

(4) Source use

3: A response is mainly in the summarizer's own words, and the sentence structures do not include direct translations of any source text, in addition to the accurate use of the source information.

2: A response is basically in the summarizer's own words, and there are sentence structures with a couple of direct translations of the source text, in addition to the adequate use of the source information.

1: A response is primarily a direct translation of the source text with a few of the summarizer's own words and sentence structures.

0: A response is entirely a direct translation of the source text or is left blank.

Appendix B: Summarization Strategy Questionnaire (from Li (2014a) and Kato (2018b))

Directions: This questionnaire aims to explore the strategies you used during your summarization performance. Please choose from 0 to 3 for each item, based on which best expresses your behavior. Answer the open-ended questions at the end.

3: I often used it.

2: I sometimes used it.

1: I rarely used it.

0: I never used it.

Before reading

Strategy

1. Understanding that I should write a summary after reading 0 1 2 3
2. Reading title
3. Noting and analyzing text structure

While reading

4. Using context clues to predict meaning
5. Checking own inference
6. Skipping unknown phrase/portion
7. Inferring word/phrase/sentence meaning
8. Using linguistic knowledge to guess word/phrase meaning
9. Paying attention to the meaning of words/phrases
10. Inferring the content meaning from the discourse
11. Taking notes in English to write the summary later
12. Taking notes in Japanese to write the summary later
13. Rereading for clarification
14. Considering the previous part to read forward
15. Underlining key words to write the summary later
16. Concentrating on reading without preparing for summarization
17. Underlining the topic sentences of each paragraph
18. Planning how to write the summary
19. Identifying the topic sentence of each paragraph

After reading

20. Highlighting key words
21. Planning how to write the summary
22. Using a diagram and a table to recognize what should be written
23. Identifying the topic sentence of each paragraph

While reading

24. Translating the source text directly

25. Using your own words by referring to the source
26. Using a diagram or a table
27. Rereading a portion for use in writing
28. Scanning for a specific word for use in writing
29. Scanning the text for information to use in writing
30. Comparing your writing to the source text
31. Working out the main idea of each paragraph
32. How do you feel after completing the summarization Task 1?