

EFL UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS' SUMMARIES: THE PRODUCT AND THE RESPONSE

Dina Asia Lidia

English Education, Faculty of Language and Arts, Surabaya State University

dinalidia16020084037@mhs.state.ac.id

Abstrak

Siswa dapat melakukan beberapa cara untuk membantu mereka dalam proses pembelajaran di kelas berbahasa Inggris. Salah satunya adalah membuat kesimpulan/ringkasan dari perkuliahan atau buku. Penelitian ini berfokus pada ringkasan buku yang ditulis oleh mahasiswa. Membuat ringkasan bisa membantu siswa untuk memahami isi dari buku. Oleh karena itu, penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi tipe ringkasan yang digunakan oleh mahasiswa dan untuk mendeskripsikan respon mereka terhadap penulisan ringkasan. Penelitian ini dilaksanakan di sebuah universitas di Surabaya. Peneliti menggunakan dua instrumen untuk mengumpulkan data yang dibutuhkan, yaitu rubrik *Type of Summaries* yang diadaptasi dari Horney (2009) dan diskusi kelompok terarah. Setelah mendapatkan data, hasil dari penelitian dianalisis secara kualitatif menerapkan tiga langkah, yaitu, pengenalan & pengorganisasian, pengkodean & pengurangan, dan penafsiran & penggambaran. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa tipe-tipe ringkasan yang digunakan adalah tipe menyalin satu kalimat, menyalin beberapa kalimat, menggunakan kalimat sendiri, dan kombinasi. Selain itu, hasil juga menunjukkan bahwa mahasiswa memiliki kesulitan Ketika membuat ringkasan. Sebagai kesimpulan, terbukti bahwa siswa masih menjiplak ketika membuat ringkasan dari buku acuan dan mereka tidak tahu bagaimana meringkas secara efektif. Implikasi dari temuan ini dipertimbangkan untuk pendidik agar mengeksplorasi siswa mereka dengan strategi parafrasa.

Kata Kunci: Membuat Ringkasan, Menulis

Abstract

Students can do some ways to help them in the learning process in English class. One of them is summarizing from both lectures or books. This research focuses on the book summarization written by EFL students. Summarizing may help the students to comprehend the materials from the sourcebook. Therefore, this research aimed to identify the type of summaries used by EFL undergraduate students and to describe their responses toward summary writing. This study was conducted in a university in Surabaya. The researcher used two instruments to collect the needed data which were the Type of Summaries rubric proposed by Horney (2009), and the second is focus group discussion. After getting the data, the results were analyzed qualitatively by occupying the three stages; familiarizing & organizing, coding & reducing, and interpreting & representing. The results showed that type of summaries used by the students were copy one sentence, copy multiple sentences, own words, and combination type. Moreover, it is also found that the students had difficulties in the process of summarizing. In conclusion, it is proven that students still plagiarized when summarizing from the source book and, they did not know how to summarize effectively. The implications of these findings are considered for academic individual to explore their students with summarizing and paraphrasing strategies.

Keywords: Summarizing, Writing

INTRODUCTION

Writing summaries may be difficult for authors, but summary is not only a vital component of reading and writing, but also academic and post-academic performance (Jiuliang, 2014). Writing summaries can help to understand and recall choices for reading (Dollins, 2012), and is an important thing to be considered when making essays, papers, presentations, and post-reading activities. Then given the importance of summarization to the learning and post-academic processes, all teachers from different levels regularly ask their students to summarize any information they got (Benzer et al., 2016).

Writing summary can be a complex procedure for the students, because they have to be good at multitasking, especially in using both reading and writing skills to summarize from one or more sources (Mason et al. 2012). There are some steps to do in summarizing process which are interpreting and comprehending a text, identifying the important point, and paraphrasing the critical ideas from the original source. Good writers have to make a new summary version that reflect the main points or ideas from multiple sources (Hidi & Anderson, 1986). Also, the writer must carefully plan, translate and review the summaries to reach the standard competencies (Hayes & Flower, 1986).

Given the complexities involved, there are worthwhile payoffs for engaging in this phase. Summarizing the reading materials requires the students to identify which important information they would like to retain in their summaries, and this activity leads them to comprehend the material more effectively than only reading the text (Hebert et al., 2013; MarzecStawiarska, 2016), while also improving vocabulary and learning in general (Brown et al., 1981; Hidi & Anderson, 1986).

Several researchers have done several studies in the area of summarizing. Rivard (2001) & Yu (2007) investigated the different summary writing results. They found that learners from L1 and L2 vary in their inclusion of main ideas and organization of a description. In addition, Horney (2009) argued that different levels of writers show a variety of skills in paraphrasing and integration.

According to previous studies above, it can be concluded that each student has differences in making a summary. However, the studies by Rivard (2001) & Yu (2007) do not offer a thorough investigation into the source paraphrasing. While Horney (2009), who analyzed the type of summaries in terms of paraphrasing and integrating, only focused on the products of summary writing. To gain further insight into students' responses toward summary writing, more data may be collected through focus group discussion. The researcher is inspired by that cause to explore more the type of summaries written by Indonesian English Department university students.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In line with the explanation above, the present study was conducted in order to answer the following research questions:

1. What type of summaries do EFL students use?
2. How are EFL students' responses toward summary writing?

LITERARY REVIEW

Summarizing: Definition, difficulties, and strategies

Summarizing is stating the main points in a passage with own words (VanderMey, et al., 2007). In summarizing a letter, re-reading the passage and listing a few keywords, there are two important things. The first argument is intended first to comprehend the text before summing up the passage itself. The second is to state the own terms on the main point. That means the writer should be impartial in summarizing a text. After summarizing the text, it is important to check the originality of the summaries by ensuring that any specific

phrases taken from the text have used quotation marks around them.

Summarizing is not a simple process for the students. When making summaries students need to write the brief explanation, include the important information from the source, restate the ideas in own words, and include the points students need to learn (Friend, 2001). Teachers have to expose the students more about summarizing strategies to improve the students' summary quality. Two steps could be done by some students while making the summary. First, they need to highlight the important information. After that, students should rewrite the main ideas using their own words while making the summary. (Wormeli, 2004; Garcia & Michaelis 2001).

Summarizing is not a simple process for the students. When making summaries students need to write the brief explanation, include the important information from the source, restate the ideas in own words, and include the points students need to learn (Friend, 2001). Teachers have to expose the students more about summarizing strategies to improve the students' summary quality. Two steps could be done by some students while making the summary. First, they need to highlight the important information. After that, students should rewrite the main ideas using their own words while making the summary. (Wormeli, 2004; Garcia & Michaelis 2001).

Type of summaries

Horney (2009) found that types of Summaries will reflect the levels of students' learning. He proposed four types to identify the summaries of the students. There are:

1. Copy one sentence

There are exact copies of a paragraph, or part of a paragraph. Many of the text comments replicated provide evidence of a retyping. Most document annotations are the same as the original text, and are probably created using the copying and pasting functionality. The cuts usually occurred at clause breaks in the document comments.

2. Copy multiple sentences.

These summaries are direct copies of a paragraph containing many sentences, and sometimes the entire document. The summaries were most frequently of a section on lines. However, the notes sometimes reflected a repetition of discontinuous sentences (e.g., sentences 2, 4, and 6 in a five-sentence paragraph), and often the sentence order (e.g. sentences 2, 3, and 4) was modified.

3. Own words.

These Summaries are written in terms of the students themselves. This may vary from sentence fragments (constructed by adding a few words from different

sections of a paragraph), to main concept phrases, to full summaries of paragraphs.

4. Other.

This form of summaries doesn't suit any of the above listed categories. Each group contains summaries detailing information relevant to the paragraphs or summaries giving personal views or speculations on the text but not included in it.

Previous studies

Some previous studies have given attention to the field of students' summary writing analysis. After investigating the study by curriculum and language experts, Rivard (2001) developed a rubric including ten variables to score the students' summaries. These variables are divided into three categories. The first category is content including main and secondary ideas, the coherence, and the relevance. The second is language including organisation, style, language use, objectivity, and holistic. The last is quality category.

More recently, a simpler assessment scoring which involves two categories was proposed by Yu (2007). The first scheme awards points to each description based on its adequacy and quality of coverage of the content. The second scheme measures the overall quality of the summaries based on a comprehensive scale that integrates four key indicators: (1) adherence to the source text, (2) the relationships between description and source text, (3) conciseness and accuracy, (4) easiness of comprehension.

The above two researchers identified several valuable parameters for summary writing success of students being profiled. However, neither has given attention to the type of summaries students use in terms of the way the paraphrase and integrate the ideas. Concerning these issues, Horney (2009) has classified the type of students' summaries into four categories: (1) copy one sentence, (2) copy multiple sentence, (3) use your own words, and (4) other types. Nevertheless, this coding scheme concentrates only on the summary writing items.

Based on the previous studies above, there was no research investigating the type of summaries in terms of paraphrasing and integrating that provide further explanation on why students use that type of summaries. Therefore, it inspires the researcher to investigate the type of summaries in EFL contexts, specifically in a university in Surabaya, by focusing on students' summaries and doing focus group discussion.

METHODOLOGY

This study aimed to describe the type of summaries made by Indonesia English Department students and their responses toward the group summary writing. To achieve this goal, qualitative research was used. A qualitative approach is a research technique aimed at explaining a phenomenon by examining it in terms of words and not numbers, and by describing it in a very detailed way. This design is used to obtain a small sample of detailed information (Leavy, 2017).

The subjects of the study were the important point in research since they were the participant for the research. The sampling was a purposive sampling. The researcher here took all 14 students a class who got summary assignment from the lecturer. Every party consisted of 3 to 4 members. Each group were asked by the lecturer to make different summaries from books about the framework to develop EFL materials. The researcher was trying to obtain a more accurate data to show by getting participants from all groups in one class.

The analysis was conducted in a university in Surabaya. The researcher gathered and analyzed the data at mid-semester.

To get the data needed for this study, the researcher used two kinds of instruments. They were the type of summaries rubric and focus group discussion. The first instrument used in this study was type of summaries rubric adapted from Horney (2009) (see table 1). This helped the researcher to analyse and classify the type of summaries found in students' summaries.

Table 1. Type of Summaries Rubric

Type of Summaries	Description
Copy One Sentence	Copying one sentence or part of a sentence in a paragraph directly
Copy Multiple Sentences	Copying several sentences in a paragraph directly
Own Words	Writing in own words
Other	Giving personal opinions or speculations about the text

The second instrument used in this study was focus group discussion. The researcher used the instrument to know how the students' responses toward summary writing. The researcher did focus group discussion after the students made summaries.

To answer the first research question, the data of this research was collected through the documentation by compiling English Department students' summary that they wrote in one class. The researcher asked the summary directly to all groups.

Moreover, for the second research question, researcher obtained the data through focus group discussion which were conducted to get the students' responses toward group summary writing. Although the discussion topics were structured and pre-prepared, the discussion process included an irregular situation to trigger the most real and spontaneous answer by the participants.

After the researcher got all the data needed, it was analysed by documenting all of the data and was interpreted into words as it was a qualitative research. The approach to the analysis of this research was described in three stages which were familiarizing, coding and interpreting (Ary, Jacobs, & Sorensen, 2010)

For the first research question, which the data were gained through document, analysis broke down the summary and transcribed it into a description written data. Then the researcher identified the type of summaries by using rubric proposed by Horney (2009). Last, the type of students' summaries was reported into words.

Meanwhile for the second research question, which was in a form of focus group discussion, the researcher firstly collected all the answers from the participant, transcribed the audiotape, and put it into a narration. Secondly, the answers were coded and reduced to ease the researcher. The last, the results of students' responses toward summary writing were presented in depth.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULTS

The Students' Types of Summaries

The researcher analyzed the summaries of students to address the first research question "What type of summaries do EFL students use?". There were 14 students in the class, and the lecturer assigned the students to write a summary from the book in groups of three or four.

Based on the analysis done by the researcher using the rubric, it was found that the dominant summary type that students use is copy one sentence. The reason is that most parts of the summaries were direct copies of the sentence or part of a sentence from the book. Another type used by the students is copy multiple sentences. Some parts of the summaries were direct copies of multiple sentences in a paragraph, and sometimes the entire paragraph. Little own words, the combination between copy one sentence and own word, and the combination between copy multiple sentences and own

word types were found in some parts of the summaries. No parts of the summaries showed the use of other types because all students did not record information related to, but not found in, the paragraphs, or give personal opinions or speculations about the text.

a) Copy One Sentence Type

The results of the study showed that all students / groups used to copy one sentence form dominantly when making their summaries. They copied a single sentence in the original text directly from each page. For example, the summaries written by the Group 3 students

Original text:

Mechanical aspects: Mechanical aspects of the writing skill include the ability to form letters (graphology), to spell and to punctuate. It is easy to underestimate the challenge of graphology unless you have learned to use a different script yourself.

Students' summary:

Mechanical aspects: The ability to form letters (graphology), to spell and to punctuate.

From the writings of the students above, it can be seen that the students copied the bold portion from similar original materials. The alteration result only contains the key points from the original text

b) Copy Multiple Sentences Type

When students used style copy multiple sentences, they directly copied several sentences and even the complete paragraph. Quite frequently, the summaries were copied of a section of the paragraph. The example below shows the form of multiple sentences to copy

Original text:

Baleghizadeh (2012) suggests four features for effective listening materials. The first feature of effective listening materials is incorporating both bottom-up and top-down processing. Real-world listening is based on both bottom-up and top-down processing. As a result, listening materials in the second language context should incorporate both processes. **Moreover, listening materials should provide exposures to different types of listening.** Depending on learners' language proficiency level, materials may expose learners to intensive, selective, interactive, extensive, responsive, and autonomous listening. **Furthermore, listening materials should be based on authentic recordings.** It means listening materials used in language classes should match the spoken discourses used by native speakers. **Finally, listening materials should**

improve learners' listening comprehension, not testing it.

Students' summary:

Characteristic of Effective Listening Materials according to Baleghizadeh (2012):

- 1) Incorporating both bottom-up and top-down processing
- 2) Provide exposures to different types of listening
- 3) Based on authentic recordings
- 4) Improve learners' listening comprehension

The writing above shows that students copied directly multiple sentences in a paragraph. The summaries stood for a clone of discontinuous sentences.

c) Own Words Type

The result revealed that only one party used its own words on their summaries to state the entire concept of a paragraph from the original text. This form is often contained only in one part of their description or portion.

Original text:

Spoken corpus research in recent years has shed much light on the nature of spoken language (see O'Keeffe, McCarthy and Carter 2007 for an excellent summary of research findings with potential relevance for ELT). Illustrative examples of this kind of research are provided by Timmis (2013):

- the high frequency of discourse markers such as well, just and right in conversation (O'Keeffe et al. 2007)
- the frequent use of collocation in conversation, e.g you know, a bit, come on (Shin and Nation 2008)
- the frequent use of non-canonical grammatical features such as 'tails' or 'right dislocation' (McCarthy and Carter 1995; Timmis 2012a), e.g. They're changeable, these moors.

Students' summary:

Some research related to the nature of spoken skills have delivered some examples of product, such as the frequent use of grammatical form in conversation.

The students changed the part "*Spoken corpus research in recent years has shed much light on the nature of spoken language...*" with a new phrase "*Some research related to the nature of spoken skills*". They also took only one example "*The frequent use of non-canonical grammatical features...*" and deleted the rest "*The high frequency of discourse markers...*"; "*The frequent use of collocation in conversation...*"

d) Combination Type

To produce a description some groups combined more than one form. The study has found two forms of summaries combinations. The first combination created was the combination of copying one sentence with words of one's own.

Original text:

Post-Task Phase The focus here, as Goh (2007, p. 22) points out, is on "activities that can help learners notice grammar and pronunciation after they have completed fluency-oriented activities". As we noted above, learners can be asked to prepare an oral or written summary of the task or to perform the task in front of the class.

Students' summary: *Post-task, as mentioned by Goh (2007), the focus of post-task phase is on "activities that can help learners notice grammar and pronunciation after they have completed fluency-oriented activities.*

The bold sentences above represent a sentence that students copied directly into their summaries, and the italic sentences showed initial sentences that students used their own words to paraphrase. While, the description of another party reveals the second variation, which is the variation of copy multiple sentences and own words type.

Original text:

Hughes (2010, p. 212), for example notes that there is a wealth of research to which ELT specialists can refer when considering materials for developing speaking skills:

- **Study of spoken corpora**
- **Conversation analysis, discourse analysis and pragmatics**
- **Work on affect and creativity**
- **Interactional linguistics**
- **Speech processing and psycholinguistics**

Students' summary:

Timmis in Azarnoosh (2011) points out that materials for developing speaking skills should consider:

1. Study of spoken corpora.
2. Conversation analysis, discourse analysis and pragmatics
3. Work on affect and creativity
4. Interactional linguistics
5. Speech processing and psycholinguistics.

The bold sentences above display some sentences that the students copied directly into their summary and the italic sentence showed the initial

sentence that the students used their own words to paraphrase.

e) Other type

The researcher found that of the four summaries, none matched this style. There was no group that included their background knowledge or personal opinions about the text in their summaries.

Students' Responses toward Summary Writing

As what has been stated in the previous point, the researcher decided to use focus group discussion questions as the main instrument to obtain the data needed to find the students' responses toward summary writing. The focus group discussion questions consist of nine questions in total.

The first question regarding students' opinions about what summary is; "What do you know about summary?" showed that most students believed that overview was a brief description of something or an interpretation. They clarified that summarizing is a method in which a shorter account of the materials or books must be written. Their responses also revealed that when summarizing, they only take the principal or essential points of a document or content. Two students however added different viewpoints on the interpretation of the description. One of them said summarizing is not just about taking the key points of a text or content, but also making sure all the points from start to finish are coherent. Another student said summing up is part of reviewing the method of the materials. The explanation being, he needed to study or re-read what he had learned before making a summary.

After that, the researcher wanted to find out the difficulties that students got when making summaries, and the question is, "What difficulties did you get when making the last summary?" Most students replied that the sourcebooks influenced their process of writing summaries. The sourcebook's marketing organization found reaching the argument difficult because the definition was deemed too alien. Many of them couldn't even find any of the content related knowledge from the novel. When summarizing from more than one sourcebook, they also had a issue. In fact, there were several students in the sourcebook who had a problem while coping with choice of vocabulary or terms. Besides the sourcebook, other students also mentioned that it was a complicated process to narrate and incorporate ideas that they got from the book. They did not know how to convey the ideas in written form because they already had the ideas in mind. Operating in a team or organization often made it difficult for each participant to integrate the various ideas when doing the review.

The next question is about students' difficulties while making a summary. The researcher tried to figure out their strategies in overcoming the difficulties. "What strategies did you do to solve the problems?" For those who had a sourcebook issue, whether the sourcebook consisted of a description too abroad or not having enough detail, they would re-read the book or find another source. They often chatted with other leaders while interacting with various outlets. Within the sourcebook other students also had a vocabulary or word choice problem. And, when they encountered new terms, they tried to locate the synonyms in the dictionary and to read contextually to figure out the true meaning of various meanings. In the meantime, several students participated in a debate when they felt difficult to narrate their minds or communicate their idea in written form. Each participant expressed their opinion and suggestion to choose the right words or phrases for their ideas when summing up. They also search the book or material to recognize keywords relevant to the subject.

Next, after summing up, the answers to the next question about the advantages; "Which advantages did you get after making the last summary?" "Many students in the class reported that summarizing helped them define the content or sourcebook's key points. In addition, some students felt that summing up helped them in learning, analyzing, and recalling the content or the lesson. One student, however, claimed that summing up just gave him little benefit. He said the content was brief enough for summing up.

The following question was placed as a complementary tool for evaluating whether or not the responses of the students were compatible with their summary writing document. The query "How did you come up with the last summary?" "To find out how students render their summaries, the data from the summary writing test showed the different outcomes. The main style of summary writing used was still found to be copying several sentences, so no other forms have been identified. Nonetheless, in their overview two groups who claimed they used their own type of terms did not use that form. Next, the question "Why did you make the last description that way?" "The goal was to find out why the summaries were made by the students on that way. The responses from the students revealed that they used one / multiple sentences to use the time effectively and prevent plagiarism because they didn't copy anything directly. Also the sentences that were too hard to paraphrase were wondering why students wanted to copy one / multiple sentences directly. Those who used their own types of words claimed that the style helped them expand on the concepts that did not appear in the

sourcebook. It has also been noted that no student has opted for other forms.

About the next question about the reading skills they used when summing up: "What reading skills did you use while making the final summary?" Both students were found to have used skimming and scanning methods when making a description. They skimmed to find the idea of the book by reading the whole paragraph or text quickly. Instead, they scanned the keyword or relevant point they wanted to make a material / lesson-based description. The students preferred the method of skimming and scanning, as they thought these methods were the most relaxed and effective.

In addition, the researcher also tried to find out what writing skills students used when making a summary by posing the question "What writing skills did you use when making the final summary?". Most students replied by describing the specifics in their own terms, by using paraphrasing abilities to expand on the key points. They often used quoting, as they copied certain sentences directly from the sourcebook. However, two groups said they did not have any writing skills because they just copy the text from the sourcebook and paste it on.

In addition, the answers to the last question on position distribution in a team: "How did you break the position in your team when making the final summary?" "There are two different types of distribution of functions. Two groups said first, each of the group's students did their part individually, such as reading various books or different parts. Each participant then merged their writing into a whole description. Third, they addressed to test the combined description. The other two parties, meanwhile, claimed that they only did two steps in the distribution of roles. First, they read specific books or sections by each member. Instead, their findings were compiled into one description, without sharing individual research with other participants.

DISCUSSION

The Students' Types of Summaries

The result of the discussion addressing the first research question; that is about the type of summaries EFL students used are presented here. The discussion is started presenting the result of the analysis using a representation result table in analyzing the type of summaries.

Based on the findings of the student summary review using a rubric introduced by Horney (2009), it has been found that the dominant type of summary used by the students is copying one type of sentence followed by copying several types of sentences. Many of the students'

summaries included explicitly copied sentences or parts in the sourcebook. It is in line with the research by Kwong et al. (2010), which found that approximately 70 per cent of undergraduate students still do a fraud in academic context like referencing the work of others during college studies without proper citation. The students took from the source text only the key points or facts, and omitted the specifics. This is consistent with Wu's (2013) theory that summarizing will enable the L2 learners to highlight the main points from less important information.

In addition, forms of terms of one's own are seldom included in summaries of students. This result is contradictory to the successful summary criterion suggested by Kato (2018), which claimed that after choosing certain sections from the English texts, a summary must be written in words of its own accord. In this analysis, only the beginning of the sentence was modified by the students, and the rest of the summaries were indicated identical to the sourcebook text. This phenomenon was noticed also in the study of Kumalasari (2018). Her analysis found that at the beginning of the text adding occurred in the students' sample, and the remainder of the sentence was exactly the same as the original text. Based on the focus group discussion results, there were two factors that made the students decided to copy the sourcebook directly and not do paraphrasing. The first cause is time limitation. The students thought that one meeting (80 minutes) was not enough to summarize and paraphrase the content from two source books. Copy one sentence/multiple sentences helped them to summarize faster. This reason was supported by Ma et al. (2007) who found that plagiarism happened particularly when students felt the pressure of deadline. The second factor was difficult sentences in the source book. Some sentences in the source book were considered too difficult to be paraphrased, so the students decided to write exactly the same points. Li (2012) stated that lack of knowledge about the content of the sourcebook could be a reason to engage in plagiarism.

In addition, the researcher found that some students used two types of combinations which are the combination of copying one sentence and types of own words, and the combination of copying several sentences and own words. The result is a little different with Horney (2009), who found just one type of combination which is the combination of copying one sentence with copying several types of sentences.

Last, there were no other forms of summaries suggested in summaries of any graduates. The researcher could not find personal comments or additional details from the students relevant to the subject on summaries of the results. Those were verified by Plakans et al., (2019)

who found that the final writing of the participant had just 8.8 per cent of the segments of context information or commentary.

Students' Responses toward Summary Writing

The results of the focus group discussion are discussed here to address the second research question; "How are EFL students' responses toward summary writing?" The discussion is consisting of an explanation about the students' perspectives toward summary writing.

Based on the findings of the focus group discussion, it can be inferred that most students consider a summary to be a concise overview or clarification of something. I clarified that summarizing is a method in which a shorter account of the materials or books must be written. Our responses also revealed that when summarizing, they only take the principal or essential points of a document or content. This is in line with VanderMey et al. (2014), who said summing up is condensing the key points in a paragraph, in your own words. The students also reported that summarizing helped them recognise the key points, understand, analyze and remember the material or the lesson since Senemoglu (2001) claimed in his study that when students summarize the material, they would be able to understand the content, recognize the important information, and remember the point longer.

The analysis of the students' answers to the focus group discussion also revealed that students had specific challenges to solve the issues when making summaries and their own methods. Many students who had a sourcebook issue whether the sourcebook consisted of a description too abroad or it didn't have enough detail, would re-read the book or find another source. Some students have had a debate with their party while dealing with various outlets. Contextually discovering the synonyms in dictionary reading were things they did when creating foreign terms or multiple-meaning terms. In the meantime, several students participated in a debate when they felt difficult to narrate their minds or communicate their idea in written form. They also search the book or material to recognize keywords relevant to the subject. These are in line with the Chimbganda theory (2006), which suggested that pre-reading techniques and techniques for summing up should be taught. The fact that there is a link between reading and writing strategies to construct a summary suggested teaching summarizing strategy can also be useful in writing by spreading the studies related to summarizing teaching strategies and also disclosing their effect on reading understanding and summary writing.

In addition, paraphrasing and quoting were found to be writing skills that most students appeared to

be using. The specific things students did when summing up are skimming and searching for the reading ability. These were supported by Chimbganda (2006) who believed that to construct a description, reading and writing cannot be separated from it.

The last, the responses of the students to the discussion of the focus group also showed that for each participant, the students have three stages of role distribution. First, each individual student in the group did their part, such as reading different books or different parts. Each participant then merged their writing into a whole description. Third, they addressed to test the combined description. It can be shown that each community already knew how to assign its member positions. Rao & Chen (2019) stated that ambiguous distribution of roles in team teaching had impeded smooth collaboration between individuals. They noted that it was vitally important for the member as a team to be aware of their respective roles within one group.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

CONCLUSION

Concerning the student summary analysis using rubric aimed at answering the first research question about the form of summaries, it can be concluded that there are four types of summaries developed by the students in the class. There are multiple sentences copying, one sentence copying, words of one's own and forms of combinations. The prevalent form used is a replication of one form of sentence in which students explicitly copied one sentence from a paragraph in the sourcebook. In addition, students have used copying different types of sentences by copying certain sentences directly from the sourcebook. Furthermore, the least form used by students is own words. It can be seen from the paraphrased paragraph, contained only once in one of the summaries of the classes. Lastly, it is also found that the students used combination type which is a combination of copying one sentence form with the own word form and a combination of copying multiple sentence type with the own word type.

Second, it can be inferred from the findings of the focus group discussion that the students have specific answers to summary writing. Most students believed that a summary is a brief overview of something or an interpretation. The findings also showed that students fail to manage the sourcebook and to narrate or mix ideas. They addressed the issues by re-reading the text, seeking other sources and talking to other members. It can also be seen that summaries gave the students some advantages

that recognize the key points, comprehend, analyze and remember the content. In addition, the students also use both reading and writing skills while making the summaries. The most skills used by the students were quoting, paraphrasing, skimming, and scanning. The students have split the work for each member into three stages that they perform, merge, and address individually.

To conclude, it is proven that students were still copying without paraphrasing directly from the sourcebook. The explanation for this is that their product description writing contained several sentences that were similar to the sourcebook. Furthermore, students still did not know how to summarize effectively, so they still found difficult to summarize.

SUGGESTIONS

Because of the outcome of this report, the researcher gives some recommendations for potential researchers, teachers at EFL and students at EFL. First, a further study on this topic should be undertaken by future researchers. Since this research is restricted to examining summaries of the students by doing document review and focus group discussion, potential researchers may perform more comprehensive research by studying the summary writing process of the students. Second, it is suggested that the EFL teachers enrich their knowledge of summarization and begin to acquaint students with it, considering its relevance to the learning processes of the students. The last, the EFL students are suggested to gain more knowledge about summary writing because, obviously, there are many Indonesian students who have no idea how to effectively summarize and how important it is to their leaning process.

REFERENCES

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L., & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education* (8th ed.). Wadsworth.
- Benzer, A., Sefer, A., Oren, Z., & Konuk, S. (2016). A Student-focused study: Strategy of text summary writing and assessment rubric. *E itim ve Bilim*, 41, 163–183.
- Brown, A. L., Campione, J. C., & Day, J. D. (1981). Learning to learn: On training students to learn from texts. *Center for The Study of Reading*, 10(2), 14–21.
- Chimbqanda, A. (2006). *A Study of the Summarization Strategies Used by ESL First Year Science Students at the University of Botswana*. University of Botswana.
- Dollins, C. (2012). Comprehending expository texts: Scaffolding students through writing summaries. *The California Reader*, 45(2), 22–28.
- Friend, R. (2001). Teaching summarization as a content area reading strategy. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 44(4), 320.
- Garcia, J., & Michaelis, J. . (2001). *Social Studies for Children a Guide to Basic Instruction*. Pearson Education.
- Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. S. (1986). Writing research and the writer. *American Psychologist*, 41(10), 1106–1113.
- Hebert, M., Gillespie, A., & Graham, S. (2013). Comparing effects of different writing activities on reading comprehension: A meta-analysis. *Reading and Writing*, 26(1), 111–138.
- Hidi, S., & Anderson, V. (1986). Producing written summaries: Task demands, cognitive operations, and implications for instruction. *Review of Educational Research*, 56(4), 473–493.
- Horney, M. A., Anderson-inman, L., Terrazas-arellanes, F., Schulte, W., Mundorf, J., Wiseman, S., Schools, C. C., County, C., Katz-buonincontro, J., & Frisbee, M. L. (2009). Student Comprehension of Science Texts. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 24(3), 45–61.
- Kato, M. (2018). Good and poor summary writers' strategies: The case of Japanese high school EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 9(6), 1199–1208.
- Kumalasari, Y. (2018). Patchwriting in English Department Students' Academic Writing. *Jurnal Mahasiswa Unesa*, 6.
- Kwong, T., Ng, H.-M., Mark, K.-P., & Wong, E. Y. . (2010). Students' and faculty's perception of academic integrity in Hong Kong. *Campus-Wide Information Systems*, 27(5), 341–355.
- Li, J. (2014). Examining genre effects on test takers' summary writing performance. *Assessing Writing*, 22, 75–90.
- Li, Y. (2012). "I have no time to find out where the sentences came from; I just rebuild them": A biochemistry professor eliminating novice's textual borrowing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 59–70.
- Ma, H., Lu, E., Turner, S., & Wan, G. (2007). An empirical investigation of digital cheating and plagiarism among middle school students. *American Secondary Education*. 35(2), 69–82.
- MarzecStawiarska, M. (2016). The influence of summary writing on the development of reading skills in a foreign language. *System*, 59, 90–99.
- Mason, L., Reid, R., & Hagaman, J. (2012). *Building Comprehension in Adolescents: Powerful Strategies for Improving Reading and Writing in Content Areas* (1st ed.). Brookes Publishing.

- Plakans, L., Liao J.-T., & Wang, F. (2019). "I should summarize this whole paragraph": Shared processes of reading and writing in iterative integrated assessment tasks. *Assessing Writing*, 40, 14–26.
- Rao, Z., & Chen, H. (2019). Teachers' perceptions of difficulties in team teaching between local- and native-English speaking teachers in EFL teaching. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–15.
- Rivard, L. P. (2001). Summary writing: A multi-grade study of french-immersion and francophone secondary students. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 14(2), 171–186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908310108666620>
- Senemoglu. (2001). *Gelisim Ogrenme Ve Ogretim*. Ertem Matbaacilik.
- VanderMey, R., Meyer, V., Rys, J. Van, & Sebranek, P. (2014). *The College Writer : A Guide to Thinking, Writing, and Researching*. Cengage Learning.
- Wormeli, R. (2004). *Summarization in Any Subject: 50 Techniques to Improve Student Learning*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Wu, C.-P. (2013). Writing performance, strategy use and students' perceptions of Wiki-based collaborative summary writing in an EFL context. *International Journal of Arts and Commerce*, 2(6).
- Yu, G. (2007). Students' voices in the evaluation of their written summaries: Empowerment and democracy for test takers? *Language Testing*, 24(4), 539–572. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532207080780>