Developing Summary Writing Abilities of Korean EFL University Students Through Teaching Summarizing Skills

Soojin Ahn[*]

The study investigated if teaching summarizing skills could improve the summary skills of Korean EFL university students. This study involved 38 university freshmen in a required English course and were randomly chosen as the control and experimental groups. The experimental group was taught through summarizing rules, while the control group was engaged in other lessons during the intervention period. The students' summaries were analyzed as to how effectively the participants paraphrased and integrated the main ideas, the major supporting details, and accurate information from source text into their summaries. The results show that a significant instruction effect was observed in the summary writing performance of the experimental group, in identifying main ideas and major details and paraphrasing and integrating ideas, compared to the control group, which showed a significant change between the first and second summaries only on the accuracy measure. The results are also supported by the questionnaire on students' perceptions of the instruction.

Keywords: Korean EFL university students, teaching summarizing skills, summary writing

[*]Author: Soojin Ahn, Professor, Liberal Art Institute, Incheon National University; 119 Academy-ro, Yeonsu-gu, Incheon 22012, Korea; Email: sjahn@inu.ac.kr

1. INTRODUCTION

Kintsch and Van Dijk (1978) proposed that a summary involves three processes: comprehend the original text, condense the ideas of the text, and reproduce them in one's own words. Writing a good summary is important in academic writing, especially for university students who are required to produce various summary assignments (Kirkland & Saunders, 1991). Writing a summary requires the ability to identify the meaningful propositions in a text and to restate them succinctly and coherently, so summary writing skills are difficult to develop for even native English university students, not to mention English as a foreign language (EFL) learner (Taylor, 1984). Moreover, all the propositions are not the same at importance levels: Some propositions are more important than others, so students are asked to identify important and unimportant ideas. In these aspects, summarization is "one of the most demanding and challenging academic activities" (Hosseinpur, 2015, p. 70) for EFL students because of their lack of skills in English reading and writing.

Therefore, many researchers and practitioners recommend instruction and suggest that effective summarization skills do not develop naturally (Casazza, 1993; Keck, 2006). According to Casazza (1993), direct strategy instruction can be the scaffolding to improve students' summary writing skills. she states that a good summary requires students' macro processing skills in which they should extract ideas across the whole text, not just partial ideas at the sentence level. Besides this study, many studies (Chen & Su, 2012; Choy & Lee, 2012; Hosseinpur, 2015; McDonough, Crawford, & De Vleeschauwer, 2014) have reported the positive effect of summarization instruction, suggesting that the students' overall summary writing ability improves after learning summarizing strategies: Not knowing the summary strategy is the main reason for writing a wrong summary.

Despite the importance of English summary writing and its difficulties for EFL students, little research has been carried out in second language (L2) learning and there is a paucity of research in the Korean context. Hence, there is a pressing need for a study that would investigate the effect of the instruction in summarizing strategies, and this study was undertaken to address these gaps. The purpose of this study, therefore, was to investigate whether teaching summary strategies could improve the summary writing abilities of Korean EFL university students. Indeed, more empirical research should be conducted to better understand how to improve summary writing skills. The purpose of this study, therefore, was twofold.

1. What summarizing skills did the students develop after the instruction?
2. What were the students' perceptions of the summarization instruction?

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Factors Influencing Summary Writing

There can be numerous factors that influence students' summary writing: task loading or text complexity can be external factors, and an individual's language, academic, cognitive, or affective skills are examples of internal factors. These factors interact with each other and affect students' summarization performance. According to previous studies (Kim, 2001; Sun, 2012), as the features affecting the cognitive load of the summary task, the length, genre, readability, and complexity of the text to be summarized are considered. That is, the more complex a text to be summarized is, the higher the cognitive burden. They reported that even adult participants tended to generate a summary of partial ideas rather than complete ideas across the whole text when summarizing a complex text. Sun (2012) also examined whether text readability played an important role in Taiwanese EFL students' paraphrasing. She concluded that students made substantial changes when paraphrasing the 'low readability text' than the 'high readability text.'

Also, previous research (Kang, 2018; Lee & Lee, 2011) proposes that proficient readers are more capable of finding main ideas and supporting details. They can summarize the most important points from the source text succinctly. Less proficient readers, on the other hand, fail to extract important information from the source text and include trivial and unimportant ideas in their summary writing. Readers at a low level also tend to copy more from the source text in their summaries. Besides these factors, a good summary requires a reader to comprehend the source text effectively, and they can strengthen the comprehension by connecting prior knowledge with the new information in the source text. Depending on how well you activate your pre-existing knowledge can improve or hinder the summary (Ambrose, Bridges, DiPietro, Lovett, & Norman, 2010).

2.2. Effectiveness of Summarization Instruction

Apart from these factors, teaching summarizing strategies also plays an important role in enhancing summary writing performance. Chen and Su (2012) reported the positive impact of teaching summary writing on Taiwan university students. They were given pre-and post-summary writing tests and evaluated in terms of content, organization, vocabulary, and language use. The students were explicitly taught how to write a summary of a narrative text: they were invited to comment on content and organization and asked to delete redundant information, add more details, and check the spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors. The results showed that the participants produced more skilled summary writing after the instruction and that the development was remarkable in the

content and organization of the summaries.

Choy and Lee (2012) studied the effects of explicit summarization instruction on Malaysian university students at a low intermediate level. The learners were trained to substitute words and phrases and avoid copying the sentences directly from the source text. The results demonstrated that the learners partially benefited from the instruction: 36% of students perceived that the paraphrasing skills taught were helpful, but all students perceived that substituting words for those having the same meaning was challenging because of their limited vocabulary. All the students perceived that they needed more practice to enhance their paraphrasing skills.

Hosseinpur (2015) investigated how cognitive developments occur while the Iranian EFL learners received summary writing instruction for eight weeks. They were required to write five summaries during the first, second, fourth, sixth, and eighth sessions. The participants' summaries were analyzed in terms of deletion, sentence combination, topic sentence selection, syntactic transformation, paraphrasing, generalization, invention, minor verbatim copying, and major verbatim copying. The findings revealed that on summarization strategies such as invention, syntactic transformation, and generalization, development occurs at later stages while other strategies like topic sentence selection, deletion, and sentence combination are not challenging strategies in summary writing. Moreover, minor verbatim copying still appeared in their summary writing although major verbatim copying decreased a lot.

Previous studies identified summarizing strategies as follows: The selection strategy is used to determine what is the main idea or important ideas from the original text. The deletion strategy is used to remove trivial and unimportant ideas in a summary. Sentence combination/integration is used to combine one or more sentences from the original text in a summary. Paraphrasing refers to rewriting the source sentences into one's own words without changing the original meaning of the sentences. The generalization strategy is to replace similar items with a general term. The generalization which is like synonyms for paraphrase was included in the paraphrase and integration skill in this study. The invention is to construct a topic sentence that is not available on the surface structure. The invention was included in the selection strategy in this study.

McDonough, Crawford, and De Vleeschauwer (2014) also taught summarization strategies to Thai EFL university students for 17 weeks period. They analyzed the students' summaries in terms of explicit reference to a source text and the incidence of verbatim copying of original text. They concluded that the learners significantly reduced their use of copied word strings and increased the occurrence of explicit reference and modified word strings. Finally, in the Korean context, Ko (2009) aimed to investigate if summary writing instruction has a positive impact on 12 Korean EFL students' awareness of how to write a summary in English. The results showed that the students' scores in summary writing have

increased, and they have gained confidence in writing a summary and learned how to avoid plagiarism.

Indeed, few studies have explored whether summary writing instruction leads to improved summary performance. Since the fundamental interest is the effects of summary strategy instruction, this study does not use text difficulty and participants' English proficiency as intervening variables: The texts to be summarized in this study were roughly equivalent to text readability calculated with Coh-Metrix (Sung, 2014) and the group homogeneity was confirmed by evaluating participants' summary writing.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Participants

The participants in the present study are thirty-eight Korean university freshmen who took a required English course at a local university in Korea in the fall semester of 2020 taught by the researcher who met them one time a week for 100 minutes in a 15-week semester. This course aimed to develop students' English reading and writing skills. This empirical study was carried out in two classes. All the participants were freshmen from various majors. They had had no experience living in an English-speaking country and had received 6 years of compulsory English education in Korea. The participants did not take any standardized tests of English proficiency before the instruction, which means their English proficiency was not used as a variable in this study. As a homogeneity test, however, all the summaries written before the instruction were scored by a native English teacher. Thus, only students who had not learned summary writing before and with no difference in summary scores were chosen as the participants in this study. Finally, a total of 38 were recruited for this study. They were assigned to two groups randomly: 19 in the control group and 19 in the experimental group, respectively. Group homogeneity of variance was equal between the groups ($t = 1.549$, $p > .05$).

3.2. Materials

In this study, the summaries submitted by students were analyzed using criteria as in Table 1, partially adapted from previous research (Chin, 2013; Kang, 2018; Kim, 2001; Oh, 2007): content idea units (Content IU), idea units at four levels of importance, accuracy, paraphrase and integration (P & I), and intrusion.

TABLE 1
Summary of Eight Criteria

Criteria	Definition
Content IU	A subject and predicate in a sentence including restrictive clauses. Sentences with compound predicates are divided into separate idea units.
Level 1	The content idea units are ranked based on their levels of importance: the main ideas are rated into Level 1
Level 2	The major supporting details into Level 2
Level 3	The minor supporting details into Level 3
Level 4	The least important ideas and inaccurate or irrelevant information were rated into Level 4.
Accuracy	The presence of inaccurate or irrelevant information in the summary
P & I	How effectively the participants paraphrase and integrate information from the source text into their summaries.
Intrusion	How much the participants include personal comments in their summaries.

First, Content IU by importance levels of source texts was calculated. To identify the main ideas in the texts, the two raters referred to the publisher's teacher guidebook. The two raters worked together with the importance ratings of content idea units in the source texts and reached an agreement. Table 2 shows Content IU by importance levels of the two source texts. The Appendix shows some examples of importance levels in Text A.

TABLE 2
Comparison of Content Idea Units by Importance Levels Between the Texts

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total Content Idea Units
Source text A of the 1st summary	11	22	14	7	54
Source text B of the 2nd summary	9	20	20	9	58

Developing Summary Writing Abilities of Korean EFL University Students Through Teaching Summarizing Skills

The scores for Content IU at different levels of importance of each participant were then calculated as follows: For example, as seen in Table 2, there are 11 idea units at Level 1 in the source text A of the first summary and a student included 6 idea units at Level 1 in his/her summary. Then, it is calculated as $6/11 = 0.54$. Accuracy was analyzed as follows: For example, if a student's summary contains a total of 20 content idea units and the units without inaccurate information are 15, it is calculated as $15/20 = 0.75$. A high value indicates a more accurate text. The scores for P & I were determined by the coding scheme used in Chin (2013) as seen in Table 3.

TABLE 3
Coding Scheme for Paraphrase and Integration (P & I)

P & I Coding Categories	Definition	Points
Verbatim replication	Copying the whole sentence or more than five consecutive words from a sentence in the source text	0
Unsuccessful reproduction	A single sentence poorly rewritten	1
Successful reproduction	A single sentence well rewritten	3
Unsuccessful integration	Two or more sentences (from one or more than one paragraph) poorly integrated	2
Successful integration	Two or more sentences (from one or more than one paragraph) well integrated	4

The individual scores for P & I were then calculated by dividing the total points acquired by the total number of Content IU in the summary. Content IU judged as extraneous ideas was excluded from scoring. The following examples show how to calculate the points.

(1) Original
To *future geologists*, Zalasiewicz says, *our impact may look as sudden and profound as that of an asteroid*.

Example from the control group
He says to *future geologists* that *our impact may look as sudden and profound as asteroid*. (0 point)

(2) Original
Zara is one of the hottest fashion chains […] the secret to Zara's success is that Zara excels in supply chain management. In fact, Zara succeeds by first breaking and then rewriting industry rules.

Example from the experimental group
Zara is the most popular fashion brands that broke the industry rules and makes supply chain management. (2 points)

    Thus, if a summary was scored 27 points for P & I and included a total of 18 Content IU, it was calculated as 27/18 = 1.5. The higher points on this variable, the more skillful at reformulating the ideas from the source text. Lastly, the intrusion was counted by dividing the intruded idea units by the total number of Content IU in the summary. A high value indicates more personal comments included in the summary.

3.3. Data Collection and Procedure

    The students in the control and experimental groups were asked to write two summaries with a length of about 200 words as homework – one prior to three weeks of lessons and one after the lessons. A total of 76 summaries were produced by the thirty-eight participants as shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4
Essays and Words in the Sample by Korean EFL learners

Group	Total # of Essays	Mean # of Words per Essay	Total # of Words in Sample
Control (*N* = 19)	38	157	5,966
Experimental (*N* = 19)	38	160	6,080
Total	76	230	12,046

    The entire experiment took 5 weeks. In the second and sixth weeks, all the students were asked to write a summary of expository English texts taken from the English reading book for college students (the title of source text A: 'The Human Age'; the title of source text B: 'Changing Fashion'). The texts are roughly equivalent to readability criteria. The intervention period took place during weeks 3-5. About 50 minutes of the 100-minute class per week were devoted to summary practice. In the first two weeks, students in the experimental group were taught summarization rules like finding main ideas and

supporting details and deleting extraneous ideas, inaccurate statements, and personal opinions. The first summary written before the instruction was used as a material for the instruction. In the fifth week, students in the experimental group were taught on paraphrase and integration strategy. The control group was engaged in other lessons during the intervention period. The intervention was followed by the second summary writing and a questionnaire. The instruction session and questionnaire were not given to the students in the control group, and they were just asked to write summary writings on the second and sixth weeks.

To get the mean score of each participant for eight criteria, the summaries were assessed by the researcher of the study and the other rater who is a Korean English teacher and majors in English education. The scores of the two raters were combined and divided into two. To measure interrater reliability, random scores for the eight criteria were compared, which showed a strong agreement between the two raters (Cohen's kappa = 0.80). SPSS version 18 was used to compute all the data. This study chose a *t*-test with an alpha set at .05 to investigate a statistical difference in the mean scores of the eight summary skills for the experimental group before and after the instruction concerning the effect of teaching summary skills on improving summary writing abilities. This study also conducted analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to see if there was a difference in the mean scores for the eight summary skills between the control and the experimental groups after the instruction. To supplement the quantitative data, a questionnaire - 7-item Likert scale questions and an open-ended question - was also used asking how the summarization performance of the students in the experimental group changed after the instruction (6 items) and if learning summarizing skills was helpful on their summary writings (1 item). The questionnaire used in Özdemir's (2018) study was modified for the present study. As seen in Table 7, the students were asked to check each statement on a five-point scale: strongly agree; agree; partially agree; disagree; strongly disagree. An open-ended question is also summarized in Table 8. This question asked students to express themselves freely about their experiences and opinions with the instruction.

4. FINDINGS

4.1. What Summarizing Skills did the Students Develop after the Instruction?

Table 5 below displays if there is a statistically significant difference at ($p < .05$) in the mean scores of the eight summary skills for the experimental group before and after the instruction.

TABLE 5
T-test Results for Experimental Group Before and After Instruction

Skills	Before Instruction		After Instruction			
	M	SD	M	SD	t	p
Content IU	.16	.05	.18	.03	-1.451	.156
Level 1	.16	.13	.51	.22	-5.917	.000*
Level 2	.13	.10	.18	.06	-2.025	.046*
Level 3	.13	.10	.08	.06	1.648	.109
Level 4	.14	.17	.18	.16	-.640	.527
Accuracy	.81	.16	.80	.20	.272	.787
Paraphrase&Integration	.65	.41	1.10	.52	-2.832	.008*
Intrusion	.09	.11	.05	.06	1.355	.184

*$p < .05$

Table 5 shows that a comparison of the mean scores for the eight summary skills of the experimental group before and after the instruction showed significant overall improvement in the three variables (idea units at Level 1 and 2 and P & I) while the control group did in one variable (accuracy). On the idea units at Level 1, the mean scores of the experimental group before and after the instruction were .16 and .51, respectively, indicating an increase in the mean score after the instruction. A significant instruction effect was observed on the summary skill ($t = $ -5.917, $p < .05$). After instruction, a significant change in the mean score of idea units at Level 2 also occurred in the experimental group ($t = $ -2.025, $p < .05$). The mean score of idea units at Level 2 of the experimental group increased from .13 to .18 after the intervention. The following examples show the effectiveness of instruction.

(3) Example from the experimental group in pre-summary writing

In the 1870s, Anthropozoic was ignored. (Level 3) But in 2002, Anthropocene struck a chord. (Copying) It is because human impact on planet gets bigger. (Level 1) Kolbert suggests cities, farming, deforestation, and composition of atmosphere as four main areas of human impacts. (Level 2) Due to our impacts on planet, natural environment is worsening increasingly. (Intrusion)

(4) Example from the experimental group in post-summary writing

Zara runs differently from other clothing companies, so they could succeed. (Level 1) Most companies try to avoid running out of stock, (Level 2) but ZARA offers customers a short opportunity to buy a limited amount of goods. (Level 2) ZARA has established a super-response supply chain to make and deliver new clothes quickly. (Level 1)

As seen in the examples above, the students performed better in their post summary by improving their skills of identifying main ideas and major supporting details.

The effect of summary instruction on paraphrasing and integrating information was also significant for the experimental group ($t = -2.832$, $p < .05$). They appear to successfully paraphrase the sources into their summaries after the instruction ($M = .65$; $M = 1.10$) as shown in the following examples.

(5) Original
    Human have also transformed ***the world through*** farming; some of the effects that seem most significant today-runoff ***from the use of fertilizers*** on *fields*, for example-***will leave*** behind ***only subtle traces at best.***

    Example from the experimental group in pre-summary writing
    In addition, although humans have changed the world through agriculture, spills from the use of fertilizers in the fields will leave only subtle traces at best. (P & I: 0 points)

(6) Original
    Stores like Gap and H&M pay other companies to make their products, sometimes in places far away from their headquarters. However, outsourcing production (mostly to Asia) requires a long lead time – usually several months. In contrast, Zara concentrates more than half of its production in house. Zara has developed a super-responsive supply chain. This means it can ***design***, produce, and ***deliver*** a ***new*** item of clothing to its stores in a mere 15 days.

    Example from the experimental group in post-summary writing
    Fourth, Zara quickly ***designs*** and ***delivers new*** clothes by making products in nearby countries, rather than producing goods for cheaper production in Asia. (P & I: 4 points)

On the idea units at Level 3 ($M = .13$; $M = .08$) and intrusion ($M = .9$; $M = .5$) measures, the mean scores of the experimental group decreased after the instruction, indicating the awareness-raising related to these skills although the difference was not statistically significant.

Next, the findings revealed that some summarization strategies like reducing idea units at Level 4 and increasing accuracy were still problematic after the instruction. As seen in Table 5, the experimental group had the higher mean scores for idea units at Level 4 in the second summary ($M = .14$; $M = .18$) even though they had been taught to reduce trivial and unnecessary ideas in summary writing. This study also failed to demonstrate the effectiveness of instruction on accuracy: the experimental group did not reduce inaccurate statements in their second summary after the instruction ($M = .81$; $M = .80$).

Using the mean scores before the instruction as the covariate, this study also conducted ANCOVA to compare the mean scores for the eight summary skills between the control and the experimental groups after the instruction as in Table 6. Before the analysis, the normality for all dependent variables was satisfied by performing the Shapiro-Wilk test.

TABLE 6
Differences for the Eight Summary Skills Between the Groups After Instruction

Skills	Control (N=19)		Experimental (N = 19)		F	p
	M	SD	M	SD		
Content IU	.21	.05	.18	.03	1.113	.299
Level 1	.38	.12	.51	.22	8.905	.005*
Level 2	.19	.11	.18	.06	1.419	.242
Level 3	.22	.20	.08	.06	9.736	.004*
Level 4	.08	.08	.18	.16	2.855	.101
Accuracy	.89	.10	.80	.20	8.230	.007*
Paraphrase &Integration	1.17	.57	1.10	.52	.096	.758
Intrusion	.09	.12	.05	.06	3.780	.060

    * $p < .05$

Table 6 shows there exists a statistically significant difference between the group in the mean scores of idea units at Level 1, Level 3, Accuracy, and Intrusion. After the instruction, the mean score of idea units at Level 1 of the experimental group sharply increased, which shows a significant instruction effect. The summaries of the experimental group included more main ideas, compared to those written by the control group (F = 8.905, p < .05). Moreover, the experimental group seems to be aware of the need to put aside minor details to come up with an appropriate summary: the mean score of idea units at Level 3 of the experimental group decreased after the instruction, indicating a significant difference between the groups (F = 9.736, p < .05). There is also a statistically significant but small difference in the mean score of intrusion between the groups (F = 3.780, p < .10). On the intrusion measure, the mean scores of the experimental group decreased after the instruction, indicating that the students in the experimental group may be aware that a summary should not include personal opinions through explicit instruction. Interestingly, on the accuracy measure, the second summary of the control group, which was not available to the same instruction, included more accurate content idea units from the source text than the first summary while the experimental group tended to make few changes in the mean score for the summary skill between the first and second summaries (F = 8.230, p < .05).

4.2. What were the Students' Perceptions of the Summarization Instruction?

The second research question is what the students' perceptions were toward the summarization instruction and to answer it, qualitative analysis was used. To supplement the quantitative data, this study used a questionnaire, which contained 7-item Likert scale questions and an open-ended question. The questionnaire was only given to the students in the experimental group. The data from the questionnaire was summarized around the 7 questions as shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7
Summary of Student Responses (Likert Scale Questions)

	SA (%)	A (%)	PA (%)	DA (%)	SD (%)
After the instruction about summarization strategies, I tried to determine the main ideas in the reading.	55%	45%			
After the instruction, I formed brief information notes to use in the summary.	33.3%	42.9%	19%	4.8%	
After the instruction, I tried to specify supporting details that support the main idea in every paragraph.	33.3%	57.1%	9.5%		
After the instruction, I underlined keywords in every paragraph.	33.3%	28.6%	28.6%	9.5%	
After the instruction, if there is any sentence that is out of text or contains unnecessary information, I tried to eliminate it.	66.7%	23.8%	9.5%		
After the instruction, I tried to paraphrase it into my own words, not just copy the text.	57.1%	23.8%	19%		
Do you think the instruction about summarization strategies helped you improve your summary writing?	71.4%	28.6%			

SA: Strongly agree; A: Agree; PA: Partially agree; DA: Don't agree; SD: Strongly disagree

Respondents selected the top choice (strongly agree) for the #1, 4, 5, 6, and 7 statements. 55% of the respondents strongly agree with the #1 statement that "After the instruction about summarization strategies, I tried to determine the main ideas in the reading." The fact that all the respondents answered positively this statement (55% "strongly agree" and 45% "agree") supports the quantitative result where the students made significant progress in finding main ideas and major supporting details (idea units at Level 1 and 2) after the instruction. 33.3% of the respondents strongly agree with the #4 statement that "After the instruction, I underlined keywords in every paragraph." Unlike the other statements, a lower percentage of respondents marked strongly agree with this statement. A high

percentage of respondents (66.7%) strongly agree with the #5 statement that "After the instruction, if there is any sentence that is out of text or contains unnecessary information, I tried to eliminate it." It is of interest that despite this positive response, the mean score for idea units at Level 4 of the experimental groups was significantly higher than the control group even after the instruction, which needs to be considered in future research.

57.1% of the respondents strongly agree with the #6 statement that "After the instruction, I tried to paraphrase it into my own words, not just copy the text." As seen in Table 5, the students significantly improved in the use of paraphrase and integration after the instruction, and this is supported by the response in the questionnaire that most respondents (57.1% "strongly agree" and 23.8% "agree") paid attention to rewriting the text into their own words. The highest percentage of respondents (71.4%) strongly agree with the #7 statement that "Do you think the instruction about summarization strategies helped you improve your summary writing?" This response seems to support the quantitative result that a significant instruction effect was observed on three summarizing skills.

Respondents selected the next top choice (agree) for the #2 and 3 statements. For the #2 statement that "After the instruction, I formed brief information notes to use in summary," 42.9% of the respondents preferred to marking agree. 57.1% of respondents also tend to agree with the #3 statement that "After the instruction, I tried to specify supporting details that support the main idea in every paragraph." Overall, no one selected answer options of disagreeing or strongly disagreeing except the #2 and 4 statements. 4.8% of the respondents disagree with the #2 statement that "After the instruction, I formed brief information notes to use in the summary." 9.5% of respondents also tend to disagree with the #4 statement that "After the instruction, I underlined keywords in every paragraph."

Respondents were given an additional open-ended question about whether the summary strategy instruction was effective in summary writing. A summary of an open-ended question is given in Table 8 below. The Korean responses were translated into English.

TABLE 8
Summary of Student Responses (an Open-Ended Question)

Anything to add? You can answer it in both Korean and English.

Perceived changes in identifying main ideas and major supporting details

- 메인 아이디어를 찾는게 굉장히 도움되었습니다. 처음 요약문쓰기에서는 메인 아이디어가 무엇인지 제대로 파악하지않고 문단 하나하나마다 paraphrase 하는 것에만 신경썼었는데 두번째부터는 전체적인 main idea 를 파악하고 거기서부터 출발하여 써내려가니까 훨씬 요약문을 쓰는 것이 수월해지고 글이 지저분해지지 않는 느낌이였습니다 (It was very helpful to find the main idea. In the first summary, I didn't understand what the main idea was, but after the summary class, I figured out the overall main idea and started writing from there, so it was much easier and less messy).
- 요약문에서의 주제문을 뒷받침하는 근거들 또한 주제문만큼 중요하며 요약문에 빠져서는 안될 요소라는 사실을 알게 되었습니다. 그래서 강의를 들은 후 요약문 작성을 진행하면서 이러한 요소들을 고려하며 글을 작성하였습니다 (I learned that the supporting details in the summary are also as important as the main ideas and an indispensable element in the summary. So, after taking the instruction, I wrote a summary while considering this factor).

Perceived changes in attitudes

- 여태까지 요약에 대해서 한 번도 공부해본 적이 없어서 요약이 어려웠습니다. 그러나 이번 기회를 통해서 요약에 대해서 많은 부분을 배웠고, 적용할 수 있게 되었습니다 (I've been never taught summary strategies before. However, through this instruction, I learned a lot about summary writing and now I was able to apply it).
- Based on this instruction, if I read various contents of English texts and repeat writing a summary, I will be able to write a good summary later.
- 전략 수업을 듣고 난 뒤에 요약문을 작성하는 것도 전보다 수월하게 했던 것 같습니다 (The training through summarizing a text helped me to write better sentences).

Perceptions before and after differences

- As I learned through the instruction, I can leave only necessary sentences and select important ideas from the source text without personal opinion.
- Through the feedback on the randomly selected summaries of the students, I got a point of view to judge a good summary objectively.
- 요약문 글쓰기 전략에 관련한 수업을 듣고 난 후, 객관적인 관점으로 요약문을 바라보며 요약문에 필요 없는 문장을 삭제할 수 있는 능력이 함양되었음. 또한, 전보다 글의 내용을 자신의 말로 풀어낼 수 있는 기술을 향상함 (The ability to delete unnecessary ideas and paraphrase the ideas of the original text in my own words has been enhanced than before).
- 주제 문장을 선별하는 능력이 조금씩 늘어나면서 지문의 이해도도 함께 높아졌습니다 (As the ability to select main ideas gradually increased, reading comprehension also increased).
- 국어 요약문은 많이 연습해봤지만 영어 요약문은 이번 수업에서 처음 해보게 된 수업 유형이었습니다. 수업을 듣는 것 외에 제가 직접 읽고 직접 요약하는 것은 글의 전반적인 내용을 파악하는 데에 정말 많은 도움이 되었습니다 (I have practiced Korean summary a lot, but English summary was the new type of practice I first tried in this class. Reading and summarizing the source text helped me a lot to understand the overall content of the reading).
- 본문에 제시된 단어를 그대로 사용하지 않기 위한 단어 공부의 필요성을 느끼게 되었습니다 (I felt the need to study vocabulary in order not to use the same words presented in the text).

Challenges with instruction

- 요약문 작성은 영어문장이냐 한글문장이냐의 문제보다는 요약을 어떻게 해야 하는지를 배울수 있어서 꼭 필요한 수업이었다. 다만 영어라서 힘들었다 (Writing a summary is a necessary skill in any academic field, so the instruction was really helpful, but it was hard to write it in English).
- 요약문을 쓰는 능력이 수업을 듣기 전보다는 확실히 향상했습니다. 하지만 아직은 본문의 난이도에 따라 main idea 나 inaccurate statements 를 찾는데 어려움이 있는 것 같습니다 (My ability to write a summary has improved compared to before I took the instruction. However, it seems that there are still difficulties in finding the main idea or inaccurate statements).

As seen in Table 8, the students responded that the instruction was helpful for them in terms of paraphrasing and finding the main ideas. Almost all students directly expressed that the summary strategy instruction enhanced their summarization skills. This is consistent with the results of the Likert scale questions that the highest percentage of respondents (71.4%) strongly agree with the statement "Do you think the instruction about summarization strategies helped you improve your summary writing?" There was little or no negative response to the summary strategy instruction: some students expressed it was hard to write a summary in English and there were still difficulties in finding the main idea or inaccurate statements after the instruction.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Most EFL learners have not been exposed to any type of summary instruction in English classes. Thus, the main purpose of the study was to investigate whether teaching summary skills could improve the summary writing abilities of Korean EFL university students. The summary writing improvements of the experimental group after the instruction were examined in terms of the eight summary skills. The findings suggest that teaching summarizing skills facilitated and enhanced the summary writing performance of the experimental group in terms of finding idea units at Levels 1 and 2 and paraphrasing and integrating ideas.

The most notable finding of this study was the effectiveness of instruction in stimulating the experimental group's finding main ideas (idea units at Level 1): the summaries of the experimental group included more main ideas as the result of instruction, compared to those written by the control group. This finding is in line with Hosseinpur (2015), which found that the occurrence of topic sentence selection increased after the instruction.

Paraphrase and integration were the next most effective strategy for the experimental group after the instruction: they were successfully instructed to replace the source text with their own words using synonyms and changing the structure of sentences. While this finding supports McDonough et al. (2014), which found that the participants' use of copied word strings decreased after the instruction, it contrasts with Choy and Lee (2012) in which

the participants still found paraphrasing skills challenging even after the instruction. The instruction also improved the skills in finding major supporting details (idea units at Level 2) for the experimental group in this study: after the instruction, they are more likely to identify major supporting details in the source text.

Besides these findings, although the difference was not statistically significant, the increase of the mean score for content idea units and decrease of the mean scores for idea units at Level 3 and intrusion indicates that after the instruction, they seem to be aware of how to write an appropriate summary. Overall, the findings provide good evidence that teaching summarizing skills was able to help the experimental group to use effective strategies in the process of summarizing a text. Compared to their counterparts, the control group with no treatment tended to make few changes in the mean scores for the eight summary skills between the first and second summaries: only on the accuracy measure, there was a significant change between the first and second summaries for the control group.

The qualitative data on the students' perception of the instruction lends further support to the effectiveness of the summarization instruction for improving students' summary writing. Concerning students' perception of learning summary skills, the data generally showed positive responses. The experimental group expressed an interest in learning such skills because they could directly apply the summary skills like paraphrasing and finding main ideas when writing another summary.

However, the results showed no significant differences in the mean scores before and after the instruction of the summary skills like idea units at Level 4 and accuracy. The experimental group failed to realize that just detailed, trivial, and redundant information should be deleted in summary writing, even after the instruction. This result doesn't support Hosseinpur (2015) who found it much easier to develop summarization strategies like deleting trivial ideas and selecting the main idea than paraphrasing and integrating ideas. In his study, all the participants successfully employed the deletion strategy after the instruction. In this study, the accuracy rate was also not increased in the second summary of the experimental group after the instruction. This implies that the experimental group needs more practice on this skill. According to Enser (2020), it will take a considerable amount of time to write an effective summary because finding important points and removing unnecessary information compared to other learning strategies will require learners to engage in all the cognitive processes.

Finally, this study was conducted on a small scale for Korean EFL university students. Therefore, future research should explore whether the results can be verified with larger and different student groups at different levels of English proficiency. How well students retain the acquired skills over time also needs to be considered in future research. Notwithstanding this limitation, it is hoped that this study can provide effective scaffolding

to help Korean EFL university students to improve their summary skills. This study may suggest that for institutional implications, instructors should remember that students need to receive explicit instruction in summary writing, and students' summarization skills do not develop naturally.

Applicable level: Tertiary

REFERENCES

Ambrose, S. A., Bridges, M. W., DiPietro, M., Lovett, M. C., & Norman, M. K. (2010). *How learning works: Seven research-based principles for smart teaching*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Casazza, M. E. (1993). Using a model of direct instruction to teach summary writing in a college reading class. *Journal of Reading, 37*(3), 202–208.

Chen, Y., & Su, S. (2012). A genre-based approach to teaching EFL summary writing. *ELT Journal, 66*(2), 184–192.

Chin, S. J. (2013). Investigating the summary writing performance of university students in Taiwan. *26th Conference of English Teaching and Learning in the R.O.C.* (pp. 285-301). Taipei: The Crane Publishing Co.

Choy, S., & Lee, M. (2012). Effects of teaching paraphrasing skills to students learning summary writing in ESL. *Journal of Teaching and Learning, 8*(2), 77-89.

Enser, Z. (2020). *Fiorella & Mayer's generative learning in action*. Woodbridge, UK: John Catt Education Ltd.

Hosseinpur, M. R. (2015). The impact of teaching summarizing on EFL learners' microgenetic development of summary writing. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS), 7*(2), 69-92.

Kang, K. M. (2018). An analysis of English summary writing of Korean low level college students. *The Modern English Education Society, 19*(3), 35-47.

Keck, C. (2006). The use of paraphrase in summary writing: A comparison of L1 and L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15*(4), 261–78.

Kim, S. A. (2001). Characteristics of EFL readers' summary writing: A study with Korean university students. *Foreign Language Annals, 34*(6), 569-581.

Kintsch, W., & Van Dijk, T. A. (1978). Toward a model of text comprehension and productions. *Psychological Review, 85*(5), 363–394.

Kirkland, M. R., & Saunders, M. A. (1991). Maximizing student performance in summary writing: Managing cognitive load. *TESOL Quarterly*, *25*(1), 105-121.

Ko, M. H. (2009). Summary writing instruction and student learning outcomes. *English Teaching, 64*(2), 125-149.

Lee, J. H., & Lee, H. K. (2011). An analysis of summary writing of English texts written by Korean college freshmen. *English Teaching, 66*(2), 307-333.

McDonough, K., Crawford, W. J., & De Vleeschauwer, J. (2014). Summary writing in a Thai EFL university context. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 24*(1), 20-32.

Oh, H. J. (2007). Korean students' awareness and the use of the summarizing rules in English. *English Teaching, 62*(2), 123-145.

Özdemir, S. (2018). Effect of summarization strategies teaching on strategy usage and narrative text summarization success. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 6*(10), 2199-2209.

Sun, Y. C. (2012). Does text readability matter? A study of paraphrasing and plagiarism in English as a foreign language writing context. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 21*(2), 296–306.

Sung, I. (2014). An analysis of Korean high school English textbooks through readability formulae and Coh-Metrix. *Studies in English Language & Literature, 40*(4), 299-320.

Taylor, K. K. (1984). The different summary skills of inexperienced and professional writers. *Journal of Reading, 27*(8), 691-699.

APPENDIX
Examples of Content IU by Importance Levels in Text A

"The most significant change, from a geologic perspective, is one that's invisible to us-the change in the composition of the atmosphere." (Level 1: main idea)

"Their warming effects could easily push global temperatures to levels that have not been seen for millions of years." (Level 2: major supporting detail)

"If current trends continue, the rate may soon be tens of thousands of times higher." (Level 3: minor supporting detail)

"Crutzen, who shared a Nobel Prize for discovering the effects of ozone-depleting compounds, was sitting at a scientific conference one day." (Level 4: the least important idea or irrelevant information)