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This study addresses the awareness and use of the summarizing rules by Korean English learners. There are four summarizing rules examined in this study: selection, reproduction, transformation, and intrusion. College students and high school students were mostly involved and Korean language instructors and advanced English users participated as reference groups. The awareness of the summarizing rules was assessed by questionnaire and the actual use of the summarizing rules was analyzed by frequencies of the rules used in the summaries. This study found that the participants who had more experience of writing summaries understood the summarizing rules better. Ignorance of the intrusion rule caused the students to add their personal opinions in their summaries. Language proficiency influenced paraphrasing and integrating ideas. The findings of this study will present features of L2 summarizing and offer some pedagogical implications for teaching summarizing and L2 writings. Direct instruction on the summarizing rules helps students to use the rules properly. Summarizing is not appropriate for testing comprehension, at least in L2 situations, since lower language ability was an obstacle to write a good summary.

I. INTRODUCTION

Writing can help students concentrate on what they are studying and become actively involved in the text. Many studies have shown that writing plays an important role in successful studying. Summary writing has been considered as one of the more effective ways to teach writing since it has been considered to have transfer effects to facilitate the process of comprehending texts (Rinehardt, Stahl & Erickson, 1986). Students can learn the course content better by summarizing a reading assignment in writing (Homstad & Thorson, 2000). Since it is a valuable skill for studying, students were often required to
summarize a text in academic settings (Guido & Colwell, 1987). Some studies argued that summarizing is essential to academic success in the field of reading and writing but also in the process of learning (Garner & McCaleb, 1985; Kirkland & Saunders, 1991).

Studies on summarization started in the late 1970s. Summarizing orally or in writing is a fundamental communicative activity because it was found that children without this ability cannot learn a language and communicate in that language (Brown & Smiley, 1978). Summarizing is also an academically important activity for both fostering and monitoring comprehension (Garner & McCaleb, 1985). Besides monitoring comprehension and recall, the process of summarization can enhance learning because it assists the readers to clarify the meaning and important discourse (Brown, Campione & Day, 1981).

Vigorous research on summarization has been conducted in the context of teaching English as a first language (L1). Starting from Brown and Smiley’s research (1978), researches on summarization have been actively conducted in the L1 area, with participants ranging from third graders to college students. Earlier research hypothesized that the summary writing ability would develop in sequence (Brown et al., 1981; Brown & Day, 1983). Some studies observed the summarizers’ characteristics and compared their summaries to discover differences (K. Taylor, 1984; Johns, 1985). Some research examined the effect of topic interest, writing ability as well as summarization training on summary writing (Head, Readence & Buss, 1989). Many studies hold that instruction in summarizing improves the students’ performance in summarizing (Brown & Day, 1983; Guido & Clowell, 1987; K. Taylor, 1984).

While diverse research on summarization has been conducted in L1 contexts, not much is known about the processes and products of summarizing in English-as-a-second language (ESL) or English-as-a-foreign language (EFL). Johns and Mayes (1990) conducted the first research study done with learners learning English as a second language (L2). They examined ESL university students’ process and product of summary writings, dividing the students into two language proficiency groups (i.e., high and low). Yamada (2002) investigated how Japanese intermediate EFL learners summarized texts and integrated sources. Cordero-Ponce (2000) studied college students learning French as a second language to evaluate the effects of explicit instruction on summarizing rules on reading comprehension and summary performance.

There are, however, only a few studies done with Korean students (Joh, 2000; Kim, 1998, 2001; Prochaska & Moon, 2004). Joh (2000) and Kim (1998, 2001) used summaries to test the participants’ reading comprehension, and Prochaska and Moon (2004) analyzed the learners’ summaries to see whether students plagiarize or not. These studies involved only the college students’ summarizing, so they could not fully reveal features of L2 summarizing.
This study investigates Korean students’ L2 summarization skills comprehensively: how Korean students conceptualize the summarizing rules and how Korean students use the summarizing rules in their summarizing. There are four rules that will be examined in this study: selection, intrusion, reproduction, and transformation. Each rule requires different language skills: selection and intrusion require some reading skills, reproduction needs writing ability and transformation requires cognitive operation. Thus, if language proficiency influences their summarizing, it would reveal the differential use of the summarizing rules.

The findings of this study will present features of L2 summarizing. It is anticipated that the study will offer some suggestions to teach not only summary writing but also L2 writing, and to use summarizing for other purposes such as testing language proficiency or developing study skills.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Factors Affecting Summarizing

The early studies tried to investigate the developmental characteristics of summarizing. In the L1 context, learners tend to improve in summarizing skills as they mature, but their quality differs among ages and learners. However, it was not always true that the older learners wrote better summaries. Age is not a crucial factor in the ability of summarization (Rinehart & Thomas, 1993). There seemed to be something more than just age in the ability to summarize.

It was important to identify the factors that affect summarization by using tasks designed in many different ways in research on summarizing. Many researchers consider summary writing as a deep-structure process requiring such cognitive processes as comprehension, evaluation, condensation, and transformation of the original texts (Carlisle & Rice, 2002; Garner, 1985; Hidi & Anderson, 1986; Johns, 1985; Kirkland & Saunders, 1991).

Many researchers believe that a good reader can summarize better (Head, Readence & Buss, 1989; B. Taylor, 1982; K. Taylor, 1986). Summarizing involves some major cognitive activities such as identifying main ideas, distinguishing main ideas from supporting details, determining the structure and organization of the text, and recognizing sequences of events, which are all considered crucial to good comprehension (Cordero-Ponce, 2000). One of the major differences between adults’ and children’s summarization skills may be related to this ability (Garner, 1982; Hidi & Anderson, 1986). For this reason, summary writing has often been employed as a test of measuring
comprehension.

Other studies, however, have revealed that an effective summary requires more than mere reading comprehension; it requires a certain level of writing ability (Brown et al., 1981; Brown & Smiley, 1978; Coffman, 1994; Garner, 1985; Hidi & Anderson, 1986; Johns, 1985; King, Biggs & Lipsky, 1984; K. Taylor, 1984). Some people can not write a summary of their reading even when they read it with understanding.

Much research found the factors affecting summarization such as language proficiency, features of the material, and availability of the text (Brown et al, 1981; Johnson, 1983; Kirkland & Saunders, 1991; Rinehart & Thomas, 1993; K. Taylor, 1986). The difficulty of summary is a matter of ability to write shortly or to paraphrase, not of comprehension (Winograd, 1984). Poor writers, however, often depend on the text they are summarizing by just cutting and replicating some parts of the original text (K. Taylor, 1986). The writer’s L2 proficiency is one of the essential constraints affecting L2 summarizing (Kirkland & Saunders, 1991). Lee (1986) argued that “assessing comprehension with a target language task may limit the learners’ ability to demonstrate what they comprehended” (p. 353).

Summary writing is, however, different from general writing; summary writing requires combining and paraphrasing the original text, whereas general writing requires planning and generating new content (Hidi & Anderson, 1986). Inadequate summarization is more likely to result from summarizers’ inability to coordinate and integrate different parts of discourse than from their inappropriate judgement of the importance in the original texts (Hidi & Anderson, 1986; Meyer, Brandt & Bluth, 1980; B. Taylor, 1982). Therefore summarizers should be concerned more with what to include and delete from the original text, how to paraphrase the selected information, and what organizations of ideas make sense, not how to plan and create new content.

There are many facets related to the text. Hidi and Anderson (1986) argued that availability of the text for reference influence students’ summarizing. The length, the genre and the difficulty of the original text can make a difference in summary writing (Hill, 1991). Cordero-Ponce (2000) said that the texts for studies of summarizing should be selected carefully because the length, vocabulary, density of ideas, explicitness, and cohesion of important ideas make it difficult for students to understand and recall information from the texts.

Writers’ perception and interpretation of the task may affect the result of their writings (Garner, 1985). Task representation varies from person to person and the concept of a task influences the performance. Poor readers have difficulties in understanding the summarizing task. Students often produce verbatim or near verbatim repetitions, not summaries (Winograd, 1984).
2. The Summarizing Rules

One of the issues in analyzing summaries is how to split summary protocols. To identify and record protocols in summaries, Kintsch and van Dijk (1978) divided summary protocols with proposition units; a proposition unit contains a subject and a predicate combination which includes relative clauses. Coffman (1994) also followed this analysis. Winograd (1984) used sentences as a basic unit for dividing summary segments. Many studies since Brown and Day (1983) have used the idea unit\(^1\) developed by Knoll to analyze summaries.

A summarizing rule is a formulated process involved in actual summarizing performance. Winograd (1984) analyzed good and poor readers’ summaries with his four rules: reproduction, combination, run-on combination, and invention. Johns (1985) examined summaries with the criteria of replication, distortion and personal comments, and Coffman (1994) used three rules of reproduction, transformation, and intrusion to evaluate students’ summaries.

The numbers and proportions of the rule-applied idea units were the criteria to evaluate the quality of a summary. The frequencies of the rule use were analyzed (Head et al., 1989; Joh, 2000). The efficiency of summarization was calculated by dividing the number of main ideas by the total number of words used in the summary (Coffman, 1994; Garner, 1985; K. Taylor, 1986). The number of times students used a rule were divided by the number of potential opportunities to use it (Cordero-Ponce, 2000; Garner, 1985; Hare & Borchardt, 1984; Kim, 1998, 2001).

Whether the important points of the original text are included or not is crucial to a good summary. The importance level was measured by scoring the number of the idea units on each level. Breaking the text into idea units, the relative importance of each idea unit for the theme of the passage was judged from 1 for the most important to 4 for the least important (Armbruster, Anderson & Ostertag, 1987; Cordero-Ponce, 2000; Head et al., 1989; Johnson, 1970; Kim, 1998, 2001). The parts not present in the original text, including distortion and intrusions, were classified into the fifth category of extraneous ideas (Cordero-Ponce, 2000; Garner & McCaleb, 1985). They were sometimes classified into one of summary rules like distortion (Johns, 1985) or intrusion (Coffman, 1994). Kim (1998, 2001) called them inaccuracy.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) Idea unit, developed by Knoll (1977, cited in Johns, 1985) and defined by Carrell (1985) as a single main or subordinate clause, is the most common scheme for summary protocol analysis.\(^2\) Kim (1998) divided accuracy to determine the originality of information into distortion and intrusion. Distortion is defined as “misleading statements, an incomplete item, a confusion of fact, or a grammatical error” and intrusion is explained as a sentence referring to “the reader’s prior knowledge or opinion about the content of the text rather than the information given in the text” (p. 74).
This study examined four summarizing rules: selection, intrusion, reproduction, and transformation. Selection is identifying structurally important text elements. All summary protocols were classified into one of the four levels of judged importance. The selection process requires sensitivity to importance in order to determine what stays and what is to be eliminated in summaries. Intrusion is adding extraneous ideas not presented in the original text. Intrusion is determined as either a statement that represents the reader’s prior knowledge rather than the information given in the text or a statement that gives the summary writer’s own opinion about the content. Reproduction is replicating or paraphrasing original expressions. Two contrastive concepts of copying and paraphrasing are comprised in reproduction. Exact idea-level duplication was classified as copying, and word- or structure- changes were considered paraphrasing. Transformation is integrating two or more content ideas into one superordinate unit. It involves combining idea units within and across paragraphs as well as sentences.

III. METHOD

1. Participants

As summarizing in L2 requires a relatively high level of L2 linguistic ability, it was not practical to involve middle school students in the present study. Therefore the present study mostly involved college students and foreign language high school students to examine Korean students’ summarizing skills. Two other groups, Korean language instructors and English language experts, also participated as reference groups.

The present study examines the four different groups’ belief and actual performance in summarizing. The first group consisted of 125 college students (CS). They were sophomores at a university and had studied English as a foreign language for at least seven years in public educational settings. Their TOEFL (CBT) scores ranged from 170 to 210. They were drawn from four different undergraduate programs, but none of them majored in English.

The second group was comprised of 30 high school students (HS) at a foreign language high school whose TOEFL (CBT) scores ranged from 240 to 280, higher than those of the CS group. Their language proficiency was higher than that of ordinary high school students and college students.

The third group consisted of 10 Korean language instructors (KLI), who finished their doctoral program of the department of Korean language and literature at a national university. They had taught the Korean language or the Korean literature at colleges for more than 1 year. All of them passed the English test requirement of their department,
which was 600 points on the TEPS (207 on CBT TOEFL).

The last group was a group of 10 English experts (EE) who were advanced English users even though they were not native speakers of English. Eight of them had worked as professional interpreters and translators for more than six years. The other two were doctoral students in the department of English education at a university and were good at both Korean and English. All of the 10 English experts had much experience of writing in English.

The college student (CS) group was randomly divided into four subgroups, from CS 1 to CS 4, for different task orders since the number of the CS was large enough to examine all the task order effect. The number of students in each subgroup was around 30. The other groups (HS, KLI, and EE) were classified at random into two subgroups, HS 1 and HS 2; KLI 1 and KLI 2; EE 1 and EE 2, for different task orders.

2. Materials

1) The Questionnaire

A questionnaire was used to assess their awareness of summarizing rules. The first part of the questionnaire (Items 1 to 9) was to find out the participants’ experience of writing in English as well as summarizing in L1 and L2, and their general ability of English and their scores on standardized tests. The second part of the questionnaire (Items 10 to 17) asked the participants about their concepts and prior knowledge of the rules of summarizing. The rules examined in this study were selected based on the previous research. The present study tested four rules used the most commonly to evaluate students’ summaries: selection, reproduction, intrusion, and transformation. Each rule was asked about twice by a pair of questions, one in a positive way and the other in a negative way, in order to cross-check the participants’ opinion and knowledge precisely. Since the reproduction rule involves two contrastive concepts, copying and paraphrasing, an item about each of the two concepts served to cross check the awareness of the reproduction rule.

The two items in each pair asking about the same rule were separated in the questionnaire. Items 10 and 15 examined the participants’ concept of selection. Items 11 and 14 asked about the concept of reproduction. Item 11 checked the participants’ knowledge about copying and Item 14 asked about their concept of paraphrasing. Items 12 and 16, the intrusion rule, asked whether they thought a summary should include their own opinion or not. Items 13 and 17 asked about their opinion on combining ideas, the transformation rule. Table 1 lists the questionnaire items.
### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>All the content of each paragraph must be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>Comparing all the contents, the summarizer should select more important ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction</td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>The expressions on the original text should be used again without changing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>The original text expression must be restated in the summarizer’s own words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrusion</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>The summarizer’s own thoughts and opinions should be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>The summarizer’s personal thoughts and opinions should not be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Making a new sentence by combining several content ideas is allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>Making a new sentence by combining several content ideas is not allowed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Text

One expository passage was employed for the present study. The possibility of text effects mentioned earlier was controlled, so that the text was not counted as a variable in this study. The text, however, was chosen carefully not to be an obstacle to the task. Since students were not allowed to use dictionaries during the task, the text was set at the level of difficulty that matched that of general college students.

The text was excerpted from a marketing book, consisting of 469 words in 22 sentences and 6 paragraphs. It deals with ‘electronic commerce (e-commerce)’, buying and selling products via the Internet, in business market. Since none of the participants was majoring in marketing, there was little possibility that they had read the text before. The text was new but the topic was familiar to the participants, so it was assumed that participants would have little difficulty with the text due to a lack of prior knowledge.

3. Procedure

The task was to fill out a questionnaire and to write two summaries (one in English and the other in Korean). There was no time limit for either reading the text or writing summaries. Participants were allowed to look at the original text and revise their

---

3 Item 10 was called for Q10 here after. The following items were called in like manner.
5 Some studies reported that students’ summarizing can be affected by the external constricts such as the purpose and the audience of the assignment, features of the text, time constricts, number of references, and the environment in which the student must function (Hidi & Anderson, 1986; Kirkland & Saunders, 1991).
summaries during the task in order to exclude the possible influence of memory. Dictionaries, however, were not allowed since they could affect the students’ use of the summarizing rules.

In order to offset the task order effect, the subgroups were balanced in the orders of the task. There were four options depending on which task type (questionnaire or summarizing) or language (English or Korean) was given first.

There were four subgroups in the CS group and two subgroups in the other groups. Two subgroups of the CS (CS 1 and CS 2) were given the questionnaire first and then the summarizing task, while the other two subgroups of the CS (CS 3 and CS 4) were given the summarizing task first. Since the questionnaire had items examining the summarizing rules, all groups except two CS subgroups (CS 1 and CS 2) filled out the questionnaires after the summary writing task to avoid any possible influence. If the questionnaire could affect the students’ awareness of the summarizing rules, it would be examined by comparing the results of the CS subgroups. All the other groups received the summarizing task first. The subgroups in each group were also balanced in the orders of summarizing in English and Korean; one subgroup summarized in English first and the other subgroup in Korean first. In the case of CS, CS 1 and CS 3 summarized in Korean first, while CS 2 and CS 4 summarized in English first.

4. Data Analysis

All the analyses were conducted using the SPSS software package, with the significance level set at .05. The specific procedures for obtaining the answers to the research questions are as follows.

The answers on the questionnaires were coded for analysis. The eight items about the use of four summarizing rules assessed the participants’ concepts and prior knowledge of the task of summarizing. The five-point (1-5) Likert-type scale scores on the questionnaire served as the dependent variable. The responses to “I don’t know” (0) were excluded from the analysis. Although a value of “0” was given to “I don’t know”, this value was not mixed with the values 1 through 5 on the Likert-type scale, for the two sets of values were of completely different nature and therefore could not be on the same scale. The principal independent variable was differential groups (the CS, HS, KLI, and EE groups) in characteristic.

The summary protocols were scored to examine the participants’ application of the summarizing rules in their summaries in English and in Korean. The present study employed the criteria adopted from Coffman (1994) and Johns (1985). First, the summary data were split according to the idea unit. Then the participants’ summaries were analyzed by the distribution of idea units on each level of importance. Idea units were used to evaluate the use of four summarizing rules: selection, intrusion, reproduction, and transformation. The summarizing rules used in summaries both in English and Korean were analyzed.
IV. RESULTS

1. Awareness of the Summarizing Rules

The groups showed differences in their awareness of the summarizing rules. Yet there was no significant difference in the conception of summarizing rules among the subgroups of each group.

FIGURE 1
Means of Scale Scores for the Summarizing Rule by Items and Groups

The awareness of summarizing rules by the groups (the CS, HS, KLI, and EE groups) varied except for Q17 (Transformation), as shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2
Summary Table of One-Way ANOVA for the Responses to the Summarizing Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>168.59</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>165.56</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reproduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>94.44</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>8.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>117.79</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrusion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>230.94</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>27.64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>228.41</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>14.92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>8.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>102.02</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The students in the CS group barely understood the difference between the two items of the selection rule (Q10 and Q15), which means that they were not aware of selecting more important ideas when summarizing. The students in the HS group were not quite convinced of the selection rule, while they seemed to believe that a summary can skip some less important ideas. The EE group, however, was fully aware that a summary should not include all the content of each paragraph. The KLI group answered that a summary can include all the content (Q10) but did not show definite opinions about selecting and including only more important ideas (Q15).

The groups showed differences in understanding the two concepts (copying and paraphrasing) of the reproduction rule (Q11 & Q14). The CS and HS groups were less aware of the necessity of paraphrasing in summarizing, whereas the KLI and EE groups were strongly supportive of paraphrasing, and negative about copying.

A similar tendency was found in the awareness of the intrusion rule; the concepts of the intrusion rule (Q12 & Q16) were also polarized. The students in the CS and HS groups considered that a summary should include personal comments although their responses were inconsistent. This suggests that they were not quite sure whether a good summary should include the summary writers’ opinions or not. The KLI and EE groups, however, had clear ideas that a summary should not include a personal comment.

The participants understood the transformation rule better than any other rule. The gap between the mean numbers of Q13 and Q17 was the greatest for the all groups, which means that the participants thought that they could integrate content ideas when summarizing. The KLI and EE groups, as expected, had better understandings than the CS and HS groups.

In sum, the CS and HS groups seemed to be unaware of the summarizing rules; the CS group was not consistent in the responses to the two paired items about any rule, and the HS group was consistent only in their responses to the selection rule. The KLI and EE groups, however, were well aware of the summarizing rules. Their responses to two paired items for each of three rules (reproduction, intrusion, and transformation) were consistent.

2. Patterns of Using the Summarizing Rules

This section presents how Korean English learners actually applied the summarizing rules in their summaries. There was no significant difference in the use of the summarizing rules among the subgroups of each group.
1) Intrusion

The groups’ use of the intrusion rule was analyzed by counting the number of intruded idea units. The means and standard deviations of the intruded idea units included in summaries were computed for the CS, HS, KLI, and EE groups. The number of total idea units was counted, and the number of correct idea units was also calculated by subtracting the number of the intruded idea units from the number of the total idea units. These idea units are presented in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total Idea Units</th>
<th>Correct Idea Units</th>
<th>Intruded Idea Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E_S (Mean, SD)</td>
<td>K_S (Mean, SD)</td>
<td>E_S (Mean, SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>21.10 (4.63)</td>
<td>20.56 (5.03)</td>
<td>19.39 (4.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>21.63 (4.76)</td>
<td>19.71 (5.03)</td>
<td>21.20 (5.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLI</td>
<td>22.40 (4.30)</td>
<td>21.80 (4.66)</td>
<td>22.30 (4.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>15.50 (2.75)</td>
<td>16.60 (4.06)</td>
<td>15.50 (2.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one-way ANOVA revealed that there were significant differences among the means of total, correct, and intruded idea units by the four groups (p=.000). The Tukey HSD test found that the mean number of intruded idea units by the CS group was significantly higher than those of the HS and EE groups.

The CS and KLI groups contained more total idea units than both the HS and EE groups in English summaries and the EE group in Korean summaries. The inclusion of more content idea units in the summary, however, should not be interpreted as better understanding or a better quality of the summary (Kim, 1998). Kim (1998) argued that it should be interpreted as including more unimportant content, and thus, less efficiency in the use of the selection rule.

The numbers of total idea units by the KLI and EE groups were related with their knowledge of the summarizing rules. The summaries of the KLI group contained the largest number of total idea units, while the summaries of the EE group had the smallest number of total idea units. Note that the mean of the KLI group was the greatest of all groups’ means in the question about whether a summary should cover all the information.
of each paragraph. Thus, based on their belief, the writers in the KLI group kept the information of the original text more than the writers in the other groups. The writers in the EE group also did as they thought; they selected and provided a summary with relatively few idea units efficiently.

The number of intruded idea units also decreased in the order of the CS, HS, KLI, and EE groups. Except for one person in the KLI group, none in the KLI or EE groups added personal ideas. The CS group added irrelevant comments in 8% of the total idea units.

The CS group did not have trouble in comprehending the text. Kim (1998) argued that the participants’ "lack of vocabulary knowledge caused the most of inaccurate idea units" (p. 79). Since the text was not quite hard to understand even for students in the CS group, the vocabulary difficulty was not enough to explain their application of intrusion. This speculation seems also supported by the summaries in Korean that demonstrated the students’ correct and full understanding of the English text. They did not have difficulty in reading, but they had a misconception of the intrusion rule.

The misconception of the intrusion rule had probably been reinforced by the instruction the students had received in earlier schooling that encouraged expressing one’s own opinions in writing essays. This instruction effect hypothesis seems to be supported by the fact that comments and opinions were mostly found at the end of summaries. After finishing a piece of summary, students felt that they should add their own opinion to complete the writing.

2) Selection

To find out how the participants selected elements from the original text, the idea units were analyzed on four importance levels. The idea units on level 1 were considered the most important and those on level 4 the least important. Since none of the participants selected idea units that belonged to level 4, this level of idea units was excluded. Table 4 shows the means and standard deviations of the idea units on each level, from level 1 to level 3, by the CS, HS, KLI, and EE groups in both English and Korean summaries.

The use of the selection rule took on two aspects. The CS and KLI groups contained unimportant information more than the HS and EE groups did. When summarizing in English, the CS group selected the fewest idea units on level 1 from the five idea units on level 1 in the original text (M=2.06), whereas the KLI group included the most idea units on level 1 (M=3.00). The CS group chose the idea units on level 2 the least, whereas the HS group included the second important idea units the most. The HS group selected about 17 idea units from the 23 idea units on level 2 in the text. The KLI group included the largest number of idea units on level 2 in their Korean summaries. The CS and KLI groups included more unimportant idea units on level 3 than the other groups. They
Oh, Hee-Jeong selected about 4 from the 28 idea units on level 3 in the original text, when summarizing in English, whereas the EE group rarely selected ideas on level 3 (M=.05).

### TABLE 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>English Summaries</th>
<th>Korean Summaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1 (Mean, SD)</td>
<td>Level 2 (Mean, SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2.06 (.97)</td>
<td>13.17 (4.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.17 (.91)</td>
<td>17.23 (3.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.00 (.94)</td>
<td>15.40 (2.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.30 (.67)</td>
<td>12.70 (2.49)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is included and what is omitted in a summary is of central interest in summarizing. The ability to identify important information was strongly related to the ability to summarize the text (K. Taylor, 1986, Winograd, 1984). Sensitivity to importance refers to identifying structurally important text elements in the selection process. The summaries of the CS and KLI groups were full of examples, whereas those of the HS and EE groups were not. The CS and KLI groups might have had difficulty in judging the relative importance among the information in the English text.

The CS and KLI groups’ less skilled selection, however, did not seem to be due to the lack of comprehension. Note that all groups showed similar tendencies in selecting idea units on each level in both English and Korean summaries. Even though all groups wrote more level 3 idea units in their Korean summaries than in English ones, the CS and KLI groups still included more idea units on level 3 than the HS and EE groups did.

It was found that the concept of relative importance, not the awareness of the selection rule, differed among the groups. Some participants were asked to rate relative importance of each idea unit during the interview. The CS and KLI groups’ opinions of relative importance of information differed from those of the other groups (HS and EE). The CS and KLI groups leveled 1, for almost every first idea unit of each paragraph and 2 or 3 for the examples and details inconsistently. The different concepts of relative importance can explain their difference in selecting ideas in summarizing.
3) Reproduction

The use of the reproduction rule was assessed by the numbers and proportions of the copied and paraphrased idea units. Table 5 presents the means and standard deviations of copied and paraphrased idea units in English summaries by the CS, HS, KLI, and EE groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>KLI</th>
<th>EE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copied Idea Units</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>13.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td>(5.92)</td>
<td>(4.67)</td>
<td>(6.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrased Idea Units</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td>(3.86)</td>
<td>(4.81)</td>
<td>(5.21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences were found in the one-way ANOVA for both copied and paraphrased idea units (p=.000). The CS and KLI groups copied more often than they paraphrased, whereas the HS and EE groups paraphrased more often than they copied. The CS group generously copied, but the EE group rewrote all in their own words.

A closer examination of the reproduced parts found that language proficiency affected paraphrasing. The CS and KLI groups replaced some of the words, keeping the structure of the original text. The HS group, however, changed the sentence structures as well as the original expression. The EE group reproduced the meaning with their own words and structures.

The quality of paraphrasing as well as its quantity differed widely among the groups. The quality of a summary depends on the writing ability as well as text comprehension (Hidi & Anderson, 1986). Yet all these results seem attributable to the difference in their English writing abilities. The mean differences in the paraphrased idea units of summaries in English and in Korean by the groups, as indicated in Figure 2, supported the assumption that the lack of English writing ability, not the lack of reading ability, is the main cause for their difficulty in rewriting the original expression.

Although all groups paraphrased more often in Korean than in English, the proportion of paraphrasing in English summaries increased in the order of the CS, KLI, HS, and EE groups. This result confirmed that the English writing ability played an important role to make the L2 summaries different in quantity and quality.
4) Transformation

Combining content ideas to produce a more concise text is considered a fundamental skill for summarizing. Use of the transformation rule was analyzed by counting the number of integrated ideas. Table 6 presents the means and standard deviations of the frequencies of the transformation rule use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformed Ideas</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>KLI</th>
<th>EE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>0.50 (.77)</td>
<td>1.77 (1.27)</td>
<td>2.90 (1.28)</td>
<td>3.6 (.51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant difference was found in the one-way Anova for the number of transformed ideas (p=.000). The frequencies of the transformation rule use were polarized. The CS and HS groups’ overall use of the transformation rule was significantly less often than the KLI and EE groups’. In fact, the CS group hardly combined ideas (M=.05). The mean number of transformed ideas by the EE group was almost 7 times larger than that of the CS group. The frequency of the transformation rule used in English summaries increased in the order of the CS, HS, KLI, and EE groups.

All groups combined ideas more in Korean summaries than in English ones, which means the writers’ language proficiency affected their integration of ideas. Figure 3 presents the means of the number of the transformed ideas by groups in both types of summaries.
The KLI group combined ideas more often than the EE group in Korean summaries, but the KLI group integrated contents less often than the EE group in English summaries. The quantitative result about the transformation rule differed from the qualitative one. The HS group integrated less frequently, but they showed a higher level of integration than the KLI group did. The CS group used the transformation rule much less often than the KLI group, but the quality of the CS group’s combining ideas was similar to that of the KLI group.

V. CONCLUSION

Ignorance is the mother of all evils or at least of many errors. Korean students’ lack of understanding of the summarizing task resulted in their poor summaries. Not knowing the intrusion rule caused the students to add extraneous ideas. Introducing the rules implicitly could not enhance the rule awareness. Direct instruction on summarizing rules helps students to use the rule properly. According to Cordero-Ponce (2000), the ability to use the summarizing rules significantly improved when the explicit instruction in summarization was given. She found that instruction of the strategies involved in summarization enabled students with relatively low levels of L2 proficiency to write more accurate summaries and to better comprehend foreign language texts. Hidi and Anderson (1986) evaluated notification of the summarizing rules as one of three major trends in teaching summarizing.

This study found that the low level of writing ability was another obstacle to write high
level of summaries. Many Korean students could not fully reflect their knowledge of the summarizing rules in their summaries because of their difficulties in writing in English. The English writing ability played an important role to make the summaries different in quantity and quality. The summary improved as the participant’s writing ability increased.

Many studies show that writing is improved only by writing. L2 writing skill can be improved only by practicing writing in L2. To write an optimal summary, students need to practice writing summaries. Students may benefit from working at the paragraph level, engaging in preparatory work such as underlining important information, writing topic sentences in the margin, and combining sentences within a paragraph (Cordero-Ponce, 2000). Students also need to practice rewriting the content in their own words and combining information across paragraphs.

Second language writing skills cannot be acquired successfully without an understanding of the cultural difference. There is a decidedly English way of handling a topic, of putting the sentences together, and connecting the sentences (Raimes, 1983). A good writer in L1 cannot simply rely on an accurate translation of the L1 sentences into L2, such as English. Kirkland and Saunders (1991) found that international students often focus on specific information in their reading, and overlook the conceptual interrelationships. Some writers in this study also differed from the native speakers in understanding the importance in the L2 text. They selected information differentially because they had different concepts of the importance.

Teaching how to write in English can enhance the students’ English writing ability. Students need help not only in learning how to write, but also in understanding how texts are shaped by the topic, the audience, the purpose, and the cultural norms (Hyland, 2003). Knowledge of the L2 text structure can facilitate L2 content understanding and writing in L2. Summary writing is one of the effective activities to improve students’ L2 reading and writing abilities.

A summary, however, is not appropriate for testing comprehension, at least in L2 situations. It is true that reading comprehension is the first requirement to complete the summarizing task. Writing ability, not reading ability, played a more important role in summarizing. One of the problems in summarizing is that writing a summary is possible without a full understanding of the text. Many studies cast some doubt about the significance of the role of reading in the process of writing a summary (Lee, 1986; K. Taylor, 1986). Lee (1986) posited that the L2 comprehension ability was typically greater than its production ability. Hence, summary writing is recommended for teaching text structures and improving the text comprehension, not for checking it.
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APPENDIX

Questionnaire

♦ The purpose of this questionnaire is to investigate the Korean English learners’ concept and knowledge of the task of summarizing in English. There is no right answer. Please indicate your own thoughts freely. It will be used only for the study and your privacy is guaranteed.

1. Name:                                                  2. School:

3. Mark all the writings that you have written in Korean
   ① essay ( )   ② literature review ( )   ③ research paper ( )
   ④ summary ( )   ⑤ drafts of the speech ( )   ⑥ critique ( )
   ⑦ others (   )

4. Mark all the writings that you have written in English.
   ① outlining ( )   ② literature review ( )   ③ research paper ( )
   ④ summary writing ( )   ⑤ writing something for personal purposes ( )
   ⑥ others (   )

5. Check where you believe your English ability is.
   ① listening ( advanced / intermediate / beginning )
   ② speaking ( advanced / intermediate / beginning )
   ③ reading ( advanced / intermediate / beginning )
   ④ writing ( advanced / intermediate / beginning )
6. If you have any official English record, write the scores.
   TOEIC (       )   TEPS (     )   TOEFL (       )   etc. (       )
7. Have you ever written summaries in Korean? (   Yes  /   No  )
   7-1. If you have, when, where, how many times have you done them?
   7-2. Describe the task in detail.
   7-3. What was the most difficult thing in summarizing?
8. Have you ever written summaries in English? ( Yes  /  No  )
   8-1. If you have, when, where, how many times have you done them?
   8-2. Describe the task in detail.
   8-3. What was the most difficult thing in summarizing?
9. Have you ever learned how to summarize either in Korean or in English? If you have, where did you learn it?

♦ The following statements describe the rules related to the task of summarizing in English after reading an English text (one A4 size). On each statement, mark √ on one of the 5 point scales from “Strongly disagree” to “Strongly agree”. If you do not know the scale because you have never thought about it, check √ on “I don’t know”

10. All the content of each paragraph must be included.
   I don’t know: __   Strongly disagree :____:____:____:____:____: Strongly agree
11. The expressions on the original text should be used again without changing.
   I don’t know: __   Strongly disagree :____:____:____:____:____: Strongly agree
12. The summarizer’s own thoughts and opinions should be included.
   I don’t know: __   Strongly disagree :____:____:____:____:____: Strongly agree
13. Making a new sentence by combining several content ideas is allowed.
   I don’t know: __   Strongly disagree :____:____:____:____:____: Strongly agree
14. The original text expression must be restated in the summarizer’s own words.
   I don’t know: __   Strongly disagree :____:____:____:____:____: Strongly agree
15. Comparing all the contents, the summarizer should select more important ones.
   I don’t know: __   Strongly disagree :____:____:____:____:____: Strongly agree
16. The summarizer’s personal thoughts and opinions should not be included.
   I don’t know: __ Strongly disagree :____:____:____:____:____: Strongly agree

17. Making a new sentence by combining several content ideas is not allowed.
   I don’t know: __ Strongly disagree :____:____:____:____:____: Strongly agree

Applicable levels: college and adult
Key words: summary, summarizing, summarizing rules, rule awareness, L2 writing
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