

The Impact of Summarization Strategy Training on University ESL Learners' Reading Comprehension

Alireza Karbalaei & K.S.Rajyashree

University of Mysore & Central Institutes of Indian Languages

Abstract

It is speculated that ESL readers need explicit instruction on global strategies to help them become effective readers. The current study aims to research the effectiveness of Summarization instruction on reading comprehension at undergraduate level. A sample of 63 students majoring English, aged 17-25, were selected from four intact classes in three different colleges in India. The effects of summarization instruction were measured by their performance on two reading comprehension texts. Students' performance on a proficiency test was used to group students into high and low levels and functioned as another independent variable in addition to gender. Findings indicated that the explicit instruction was effective in enhancing reading comprehension of Indian students. There was no statistically significant difference between two groups after instruction. The results suggested that students at college can be instructed to develop summarizing ability that promotes their learning by considering gender factor as an effective variable.

Key words: reading strategies, summarization strategies, reading comprehension, strategy intervention, ESL

Introduction

It is generally agreed that a well-developed reading comprehension ability is the key to students' academic success. This comprehension ability is not a passive state which one possesses, but it is an active mental process which needs to be nurtured and improved. According to Resnick (1984), it is a process in which one "uses external information" to construct new knowledge. If the process is to occur, comprehension involves a complicated combination of skills in which students utilize their understanding of various elements, the how of finding main ideas and details and make a distinction between the two. As Clark (1982) believes this kind of active cognitive process of thinking and learning is accompanied by the reconstruction, interpretation, and evaluation of reading materials.

By taking the intricacy of this comprehension into account, educators must cope with the problem of specifying the best method for the purpose of contributing to its development. Some might suppose that summarization as a kind of reading strategies would be an effective strategy to smooth the progress of the cognitive process of comprehension. However, as Taylor (1983) mentions, students are generally told to summarize the text but they are not given enough instruction for making the best use of this strategy, thereby curtailing, or sometimes counteracting the effective use of it. When he asked the students in a college freshman class to summarize a text without any instruction, several skills deficiencies were observed. In contrast to this, Wittrock (1982) came to this conclusion that junior high school students were able to generate summary sentences and double their level of comprehension when they were given specific summarization instruction.

Dole, Duffy, Roehler, and Pearson (1991) describe summarizing as follows:

Often confused with determining importance, summarizing is a broader, more synthetic activity for which determining importance is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition. The ability to summarize information requires readers to sift through large units of text, differentiate important from unimportant ideas, and then synthesize those ideas and create a new coherent text that stands for, by substantive criteria, the original. This sounds difficult, and the research demonstrates that, in fact, it is. (p.244)

Effect of Summarization on Comprehension

Summarization is an intervention for teachers and has been demonstrated to improve reading comprehension (Anderson & Armbruster, 1984; Pearson & Fielding, 1991; Rinehart, Stahl, & Erickson, 1986). Most of the research which has been done on teaching summarization is based on the model of text comprehension developed by Brown and Day (1983) and Kintsch and Van Dijk (1978). Three kinds of operations which take place during reading are taken into account by these models including: (1) the elements of meaning are integrated into a coherent whole; (2) the whole meaning of the text is compressed into its main idea; and (3) the gist is used to modify those elements which have previously been constructed and to have an effect on those yet to be constructed. In other words, readers engage in the comprehension process by constructing a text-based representation of the selection they are reading; they process the individual elements and integrate them for inter-sentence consistency; they mentally summarize all of the elements into a gist and construct a situation model.

Regarding Kintsch and van Dijk's (1978) model of text comprehension, a lot of researchers based teaching summarization as an applicable model (e.g., Brown & Day, 1983; Hare & Borchardt, 1984). According to this model, the students are taught how and why to summarize and to understand that the component skills are essential comprehension operations (Brown, 1978; Brown, Day & Jones, 1983).

As far the relationship between summarization and comprehension is concerned, summarizing cultivates active reading and minimizes passive reading, which influences comprehension (Rinehart, Stahl & Erickson, 1986). Active readers are involved in processing and manipulating information, using their schema or mental semantic network to organize incoming information, retrieve stored information and focus attention on key concepts (Pearson & Fielding, 1991). Summarizing allows readers to differentiate key ideas from supporting or unimportant ideas and to construct logical connections between them. Summarizing is considered as an activity that allows orderly memory searches from a mental semantic network, help readers impose a structure of organization on what appears to be disassociated facts and help them retrieve information from their mental network (Wittrock & Alesandrini, 1990).

On the other hand, instructing students to generate summaries of texts has been shown to improve comprehension (Armbruster, Anderson, & Ostertag, 1987; Bean & Steenwyk, 1984; Berkowitz, 1986; Doctorow, Wittrock, & Marks, 1978; Wittrock & Alesandrini, 1990). Wittrock and his colleagues suggested that the process of generating summaries helps readers build relations among concepts contained in a text as well as link these concepts to prior knowledge. Others have suggested that summarization improves comprehension by helping readers to focus attention on the more important information of a text (Anderson & Armbruster, 1984; Pearson & Fielding, 1996). More relevant to the present research, others have suggested that summarization improves comprehension by promoting self-testing during reading (Brown & Day, 1983; Garner, 1982; Palinscar, 1986; Palinscar & Brown, 1984; Paris & Lindauer, 1982), which may signal comprehension breaks and invite readers to initiate fix-up strategies to repair breaks in comprehension (Winne & Hadwin, 1998). Thus, summarizing texts may also improve comprehension by improving metacomprehension accuracy and increasing the effectiveness of self-regulated study.

Teaching students how to write summaries is a task that many teachers view with distaste and even trepidation. Some view it as boring to teach and tedious to grade, so they avoid both as far as possible. However, if teachers become aware of the numerous advantages for students, and of effective methods of teaching it, they might be persuaded to embrace summarization as a crucial skill that their students should practice as often as possible, as part of an integrated reading and writing program.

With respect to this issue, it is important to note, first, that many students, even at college and university level have difficulty writing effective summaries, and second, that few students receive instruction in summary-writing even though the tasks given them require the writing of summaries (Hill, 1991). Indeed, it has been shown that students lack summary-writing skills at all grade levels (Brown & Day, 1983). Many teachers of English-and of other subjects-expect or incorrectly assume that students know how to summarize and do not teach summarization though many of the writing activities students are involved in would benefit from summarization skills. For example, students doing research papers tend to copy from sources verbatim because they know no other method of attacking the task. Knudson (1998) contends that college-bound high school students, in particular, should benefit from explicit summarization instruction, thus reducing or eliminating the need for remedial work at the col-

lege level. The observation that proficiency is not demonstrated either at high school or college level is a strong indication of the need to teach summarization even at the tertiary level.

Summarizing strategy training is especially effective as it has transfer effects to a variety of measures (Baumann, 1984; Bean & Steenwyk, 1984; Taylor & Beach, 1984) such as standardized measures of reading comprehension. There are several factors that may pave the way for these transfer effects to happen. First, "summarization training made children more aware of the structure of ideas within text and of how individual separate ideas relate to each other" (Rinehart, Stahl & Erickson, 1986). Second, summarization training encouraged students to attend to text and improved metacognitive control of the reading processes. This was especially important for poor readers since they tend to be less attentive than good readers (Allington, 1991; Presseley, 1998). Finally, summarization required students to use other cognitive strategies which are necessary to good comprehension such as questioning, predicting, rereading, verifying, and activation of prior knowledge (Brown & Day, 1983; Brown, Day, & Jones, 1983).

As far as it concerned with the know-how of teaching summarization strategy, there are at least two major approaches. First, rule-governed approach which relies heavily on Kintsch and van Dijk's (1978) theoretical model of text comprehension emphasizing macrostructure propositions and Brown and Day's (1983) two sets of macro-rules for producing summaries, especially written summaries. These rules consisted of 6 rules including (1) delete unnecessary information; (2) delete redundant information; (3) compose a word to replace a list of items; (4) compose a word to replace the individual parts of an action; (5) select a topic sentence; and (6) invent a topic sentence if one is not available. In general, some studies show that when students are instructed to apply these rules through direct instruction, they outperform students who have not been instructed using such methods across all age levels. For example, Gajria and Salvia (1992) designed a research to determine the impact of the direct instruction of summary rules on the comprehension of students with disabilities. The subjects were students with Language Disabilities (LD) (N=30) from the sixth through ninth grades randomly assigned to one of the two experimental and control group. The results indicated that after students with LD participated in a summarizing intervention focused on rules, they were able to select more correct answers than students who were not instructed in the rules. Second, Generating Interactions between Schemata and Text (GIST) approach to summarizing text which is more holistic (Cunningham, 1982), students create summaries of 15 or fewer words for increasingly large amounts of text, beginning with single sentences and working incrementally to the whole paragraph. As Cunningham illustrates it, GIST is conducted first as a whole class, then in small groups, and finally on an individual basis.

A theoretical explanation of how summarizing information promoted deep comprehension and learning was provided by Kintsch and van Dijk's (1978) model of discourse comprehension. Specifically, summarizing contributed to the goal of constructing a solid foundation of factual and conceptual knowledge because it served to reinforce the memory representation of the content beyond that achieved through reading. Writing a summary needs much more conscious thought, judgment and effort. Ideally, the summary writer not only selects the important ideas from the text, but also reconstructs the meaning in a more succinct, generalized form (van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983).

Johns and Mayes (1990) investigated the summarization behaviors of forty students, each of low and high proficiency university-level ESL students. They produced summaries of an expository text chosen from a low-intermediate textbook of English for business students. The results showed that there were a few differences with regard to the rule use across levels, but not so many as the researchers had expected. The low level students used significantly more direct copying of information, while the high level students used more combination of two or three idea units within a paragraph.

Cordero-Ponce (2000) imitated Day's (1980) and Hare and Borchardt's (1984) summarization training studies for students in an L2 reading context. The participants were sixty-four intermediate college-level learners of French as a foreign language. Four intact French language classes were randomly assigned to control and experimental groups. The results showed that the training was effective for the L2 readers.

Compare with a plenty of studies on summary writing in an L1 reading context, few studies involving L2 readers have been conducted. Among the few L2 summarization studies (Cohen, 1994; Cordero-Ponce, 2000; Johns & Mayes, 1990; Kim, 2001), Johns and Mays (1990) was the only study conducted in a second language context, whereas all the other studies involved readers in foreign language contexts.

Regarding lack of research in this area in ESL context, this study was done to investigate more the effect of summarization intervention on reading comprehension test performance of undergraduate students. Regarding this purpose in mind, the following null hypotheses were formulated:

1. There is no statistically significant difference in the reading comprehension achievement of undergraduate students who received summarization instruction as treatment and those did not.
2. There is no statistically significant difference between low and high proficiency groups regarding their performance in reading comprehension after treatment.
3. There is no statistically significant difference between male and female groups regarding their scores on reading comprehension test after treatment.

Methodology

Participants

Participants in this study were 63 undergraduate students majoring English in three colleges in Mysore, India. They were selected from among 120 students in four intact classes. All the participating students had completed 12 years of schooling and had graduated from high school prior to their enrollment in college. The students' ages ranged from 18 to 25. There were 32 males and 31 females. Among these subjects, 32 were coming from urban areas and 31 from rural ones. This selection happened after some of the entire subjects were dropped from the study due to their absence in some treatment sessions or incomplete data.

Materials

The following instruments were used for the purpose of this study:

Language proficiency test (TOFEL). This test comprised of multiple-choice reading passage, vocabulary, and grammar sections. In order to test the reliability of the proficiency test, a pilot study was carried out on 20 students. Its reliability through the K-R21 formula turned out to be .75, which was appropriate to take the next step.

Test of reading comprehension in English. The test of reading comprehension in English was from *Kit of Reading Comprehension* (Rajinder S., 2008.). The time allowed was 20 minutes as determined at the piloting stage. The reading passages used in this study contained a general content, which were of interest to the students.

Going through K-R21 formula, it was indicated that reading comprehension test was reliable enough (.78) for the respective goal in the present study. Then after calculating the correlation coefficient (.70) between the TOEFL proficiency test and the test of reading in English in the piloting stage for the purpose of having a valid test, the test of reading turned out to be suitable for this study.

Background questionnaire. In order to elicit information about participants, a background questionnaire was developed by the investigators. It covered issues such as the subjects' age, gender, place of living, years of studying English, name of college, and medium of instruction (see Appendix 1).

Procedure

The investigator approached the college authorities in Mysore during the three months of January, February, and March. After getting the consent by the authorities, the comprehension pretest and TOEFL proficiency test were piloted by 20 students who were randomly selected among the subjects in the three colleges. During this pilot test, some tests were revised and prepared for the main subjects. Then, the proficiency of the participants was determined by TOEFL proficiency test (Mean= 17 & SD= 5.60). Based on the result of this test, subjects whose scores were one standard deviation above the mean were considered as high and those who got one standard deviation below the mean were considered as low. This extreme groups design resulted in 33 high-ability students and 30 low-ability

students. Data for the students whose scores fell between ± 1 standard deviation were considered for analysis. Then, all subjects were given two reading comprehension tests including 8 multiple-choice questions (see Appendix 2) but only the scores of high- and low-ability students were considered for analysis.

The treatment sessions were held in the next procedure within a few days interval. In these sessions, students were shown how to summarize a text based on rule-governed approach which was explained in the introduction section. In addition, a self-made pamphlet was given to the subjects for the purpose of practicing this strategy based on the first approach referred to in "Introduction" section. Summarization strategy was demonstrated and modeled using the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach. This instructional approach was created to help English language learners learn to read English but it was implemented in this study to help ESL students to learn the how of summarizing. This model included five instructional phases. First, the teacher defined summarization strategy in context while reading. Second, the teacher modeled and practiced the strategy for one session. In this instructional phase, the students were given explicit, direct instruction in the use of summarization strategy. Third, the students practiced summarization strategy taught with familiar contexts and familiar tasks which were provided for them by the instructor; in subsequent strategy practice, the researcher encouraged independent strategy use. Also, the teacher provided scaffolding until they became independent. Fourth, the students evaluated their own strategy use immediately after each practice session by checking the strategy they had used and monitoring their understanding. Fifth, to develop a larger repertoire of strategies, the students were asked to apply this strategy to new tasks.

After the treatment sessions which lasted about 2 months brought to an end, the same pretest reading comprehension texts were given to the participants for posttest. Directions were printed for the students to read silently while the instructor read out loud. All subjects were instructed to summarize the passage according to the method which had been taught during intervention process while reading these texts and write the summary of the paragraphs on the back of their answer sheets. When reading and summarizing the texts were completed, comprehension tests were given to the students for the purpose of answering them.

Results

On the basis of their scores from proficiency or prior knowledge test, subjects were first divided into two groups:

high: those subjects who scored 1 Standard deviation above the Mean ($M+1SD$), and

low : those subjects who scored 1 Standard deviation below the Mean ($M-1SD$).

After data were collected, paired T-test and Independent sample test were used to find out the significant difference variables as shown in the following tables.

Table 1: Paired sample statistics for all subjects

	N	Mean	SD	T	Sig
Pretest	63	1.41	.927		
Posttest	63	2.75	.861		
Total	63	-1.333	1.078	-9.821	.000

Note * $p < .01$, ** $p < .005$

Results of data analyses (T-test) in the above table indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between students in reading comprehension performance before treatment (pretest) and after the instruction (posttest) ($t = 9.821$; $p < .01$). In other words, subjects scored higher in posttest ($M = 2.75$, $SD = .861$) than pretest ($M = 1.41$, $SD = .927$). With respect to this point, the first null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 2: Summarization strategy training and ability level effects: A comparison of pretest and posttest scores for two independent variables

	Group	N	Mean	SD	T	Sig
Pretest	Low	30	1.10	.845	-2.677	.010
	High	33	1.70	.918		
	Total	63	.111	.900	.980	.331
	Male	32	1.16	.954	-2.308	.024
	Female	31	1.68	.832		
	Total	63	.079	.921	.684	.497
Posttest	Low	30	2.63	.890	-.991	.326
	High	33	2.85	.834		
	Total	63	-1.222	.941	-10.310	.000
	Male	32	2.34	.745	-4.255	.000
	Female	31	3.16	.779		
	Total	63	-1.254	.761	-13.073	.000

Note * $p < .01$, ** $p < .005$

As expected, high-prior knowledge students scored significantly higher than low-prior knowledge ones on pretest ($t = 2.677$; $p < .001$) as Table 2 indicates. In other words, high-prior knowledge students performed better ($M = 1.70$, $SD = .918$) than low-prior knowledge ones in reading comprehension test ($M = 1.10$, $SD = 0.845$). However, there was not a significant difference between this ability and the presence of summarization training (posttest) ($t = .991$; $p > .005$). That is, high-prior knowledge students did not show significantly more or less of an increase in test scores than low-prior knowledge ones. By taking all these results into account, the second hypothesis formulated in the present paper was accepted.

It was expected that prior knowledge would affect students' ability to differentiate relevant ideas from irrelevant ones resulting in better summary writing and finally better performance on reading comprehension test after intervention on the part of high prior knowledge students. Specifically, it was also supposed that students of this group who had initially scored higher on their pretest (before treatment) in reading would produce higher scores at a level of significance on their posttest (after treatment) than did those in the low prior knowledge group. However, the result of this research showed a different idea. In other words, students in both levels (high vs. low) performed in almost a similar way. This finding was not compatible with previous research (Afflerbach, 1990; Aleven, Stahl, Schworm, Fischer, & Wallace, 2003; Boscolo & Mason, 2000; Pintrich & Garcia, 1994).

Regarding gender variable as another independent variable in this research, a significant difference was reported between males and females after summarization strategy was taught (posttest) ($t = 4.255$, $p < .01$) as such difference existed between them before treatment ($t = 2.308$, $p < .005$). Therefore, the third hypothesis presented in this research was rejected.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effects of an instructional program designed to teach students to create written summaries in undergraduate classes at three colleges. The program was designed to employ direct, explicit instruction, including description, modeling, and paired as well as individual practice combined with feedback, to teach students to employ a summarizing strategy, called the "written Summarization Strategy", and summarizing rules to create a written paragraph summary of multiple-paragraph expository passages. Effects were measured with respect to students' performance on two reading comprehension texts.

Results of this investigation support the use of the instructional program for teaching summarization skills, supposed to be the key components of reading comprehension. First, the results of reading

comprehension test revealed that the students learned to follow the steps of the summarizing process to identify topics, main ideas, and details, and to write summaries. Therefore, the students' performance on posttest showed significant results for using this strategy.

Another important result which should be taken into account in this research is that the large majority of the students, whether those of high prior knowledge or low amount of this knowledge, were able to reduce the passages including two or three paragraphs to a single paragraph within a few sentences. They did it after they learned a set of strategies steps in which six rules for summarization were inserted. This result was not compatible with the previous studies (Brown & Day, 1983; Garner, 1985) which mentioned that the combining rules across ideas or paragraphs are difficult to learn and late to develop.

The design of the instructional program is based on Kintsch and van Dijk (1979) theoretical model of text comprehension and also depends on the knowledge acquired by others (e.g., Pressley, 2000), who point to the importance of summarizing as a tool for improving reading comprehension. For years, and more recently, summarizing has been called as an important tool in reading comprehension by the National Reading Panel (2000), and a lot of researchers (Brown et al., 1981; Duke & Pearson, 2002; Graham & Harris, 2005; Pressley & Block 2002; Taylor, 1986).

The increase in scores on the reading comprehension test from pretest to posttest indicated the positive impact of summarization instruction on students' reading comprehension achievement. This intervention was 2 months twice a week. Dedicating less than this amount of time may not be sufficient to sustain a difference in reading achievement.

According Pressley, et al. (1983), students need to be able to practice the strategy over a long period of time. In addition, frequent and extensive re-explanations are absolutely essential for students to be able to understand and use strategies. Effective strategy instruction which leads to an increase in reading comprehension depends largely on diagnosing what it is that students do not understand, followed by explanation focusing on points of difficulty and re-explanation appropriate to the level of understanding of the students (Dole, Duffy, Roehler, & Pearson, 1991; Pressley, 2002). This is an important point which should be kept in mind by the teachers if they are keen on practicing this strategy, in particular, and other reading strategies, in general, in their classrooms. However, without considering time constraints, student practice should be incessant, along with re-explanation which can continue as long as necessary for the students to acquire the strategic procedure to a high level of confidence (Palinscar, 1986; Palinscar & Brown, 1984).

Many researchers (Winograd & Bridge, 1986) have claimed that summarization instruction improves comprehension of text because it may force students to pay more attention to the text while making a summary. Although both groups, including students with high and low prior knowledge, had improvement on their performance on reading comprehension test after instruction, in comparison to their performance on pretest, the low prior knowledge students in this study had a tendency to produce minimal summary statements throughout most of the intervention. In addition, their summary included both relevant and irrelevant information, as well as more elaborate details about events and actions vis-à-vis high prior knowledge group. Add to it, their summaries were not consisted of all important information in the text which was consistent with the research done by Garner (1987) and Winograd and Bridge (1986). Therefore, the level of proficiency and understanding can play a role in producing summary statements. Regarding what less-skilled reader have written in their summary, another justification can be this fact that they could not process all the needed skills at the same time to produce summary including comprehension, establishing connections between the text, deleting irrelevant information, and identifying important information.

Another important factor which should be taken into consideration on the part of the instructor is the amount of positive motivation which is given to the students by him/her when they are constructing summary statement. As Borokowski et al. (1987) believe, changing belief about the self as a learner can have a profound effect on comprehension strategy instruction. Also, students' motivation to produce a summary increased when they came to believe that they were capable of acquiring strategies and when they made use of those strategies to produce adequate summaries (McKenna, Kear, and Ellsworth, 1995).

Beliefs about the reading results influence students' motivation in this study to decide on whether they should continue the summarization tasks or not. For example, if a student comes to this conclusion that the more he or she utilizes reading comprehension strategies, the better his or her reading skills

will become, it is likely that a student's attitude toward reading will be measured (Wigfield & Eccles, 2002).

According to Tierney & Readence (2005), teachers need to support, guide and show students how and why the use of strategies assist them to understand the text, thus enhancing their reading comprehension abilities. Such kind of understanding paves the way for students to create a sense of self-efficacy to have success and a sense of competence with metacognitive strategies.

Instructional Implications

The concept of "The Summarization Strategy" is new to Indian context and the findings suggest that strategies can be taught, which will help ESL students improve their reading comprehension ability. As a result, this study offers momentum for the idea that reading strategy training can indeed acquire superior reading ability to what may be encountered in an ongoing and real ESL reading classroom.

Given that one of the most important goals of teaching reading is to help student develop as strategic and independent readers, several suggestions for ESL reading teachers can be made on the basis of the findings of the study. First, strategies should be taught through direct explanation, explicit teacher modeling, and extensive feedback. In addition, students should never be in doubt as to what the strategies are, where and when they can be used, and how they are used. More importantly, they should be informed of the value and usefulness of strategies in L2 reading. Second, ESL readers, particularly less capable ESL readers, should be given intensive and direct strategy training for a long period. As Gaskins (1994) claims, teaching of strategies without direct explanation and explicit teacher modeling for a short period would not have a long-term effect on students and effectively help them develop as strategic readers. In conclusion, the results of the study suggest that second language reading pedagogy, especially for adult students in academic settings, would benefit from the inclusion of explicit and direct strategy training.

Improving reading ability takes time and it is a gradual process that requires continuous efforts. Therefore, as language teachers, we should help our students become strategic readers so that they can continue to make improvement outside of the classroom. In the environment of English as a second language in Indian, the sufficient supply of English input and English practice opportunities are needed for the learners to become immersed. Language teachers must not simply teach the language. Rather, we should train learners how to use the language as a tool to reach their own individual achievement.

References

- Afflerbach, P. (1990). The influence of prior knowledge on expert readers' main idea construction strategies, *Reading Research Quarterly*, 25(1), 31-46.
- Aleven, V., Stahl, E., Schworm, S., Fischer, F., & Wallace, R., (2003). Help seeking and help design in intensive learning environments. *Review of Educational Research*, 7(3), 277-320.
- Armbruster, B.B., Anderson, T.H., & Ostertag, J. (1987). Does text structure / summarization instruction facilitate learning from expository text? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 22(3), 331- 346.
- Bean, T.W., & Steenwyk, F. (1984). The effect of three forms of summarization on sixth graders' summary writing and comprehension. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 16, 297-307.
- Berkowitz, S. J. (1986). Effects of instruction in text organization on sixth-grade students' memory for expository reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21, 161-178.
- Block, E. (1986). The comprehension strategies of second language readers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 163-494.
- Block, E. L. (1992). See how they read: comprehension monitoring of L1 and L2 readers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26 (2), 319-342.
- Borokowski, J.G., Carr, M., Rellinger, R. & Pressley, M. (1987). The dependence of self-regulated strategy use on attributional beliefs, self-esteem, and metacognition. In B.F. Jones & Idol

- (Eds.), *Dimensions of thinking: Review of research*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum & Associates.
- Boscolo, P. & Mason, L. (2000, April). *Prior knowledge text coherence, and interest : How they interact in learning from instructional texts*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Brown, A.L. (1978). Knowing when, where, and how to remember: A problem of metacognition. In R. Glaser (Ed.), *Advances in Instructional Psychology*, 1, pp.77-165.
- Brown, A., Day, J., Jones, R. (1983). The development of plans for summarizing texts. *Child Development*, 54(4), 968-979.
- Brown, A.L., Campione, J., & Day, J. (1981). Learning to learn: On training students to learn from texts. *Educational Researcher*, 10, 14-21.
- Brown, A. L., & Day, J. D. (1983). Macro-rules for summarizing texts: The development of expertise. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 22, 1-14.
- Clark, C.H.(1982). Assessing free recall, *The Reading Teacher*, 35, 434-439.
- Cohen, A. D. (1994). English for academic purposes in Brazil: the use of summary tasks. In Hill, C. & Parry, K. (Eds.), *From testing to assessment: English as an international language*. London: Longman.
- Cordero-Ponce, W.L. (2000). Summarization instruction: effects of foreign language comprehension and summarization of expository texts. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 29(4), 329-350.
- Cunningham, J.W. (1982). Generating interactions between schemata and text. In J.A. Niles & L.A. Harris (Eds.), *New inquiries in reading research and instruction* (pp. 42-47). Rochester, NY: National Reading Conference.
- Day, J.D. (1980). Teaching summarization skills: A comparison of training methods. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana.
- Doctorow, M. J., Wittrock, M. C., & Marks, C. B. (1978). Generative processes in reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70, 109-118.
- Dole, J.A., Duffy, G.G., Roehler, L.R., & Pearson, P.D. (1991). "Moving From the Old to the New: Research on Reading Comprehension Instruction." *Review of Educational Research*, 61, 239-264.
- Duke, N.K., & Pearson, D. (2002). Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. In A.E. Farstrup & J.J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction*, (pp.205-242). Delaware: IRA.
- Gajria, M., & Salvia, J. (1992). The effects of summarization instruction on text comprehension of students with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 58(6), 508-516.
- Garner, R. (1982). Efficient text summarization—costs and benefits. *Journal of Educational Research*, 75, 275-279.
- Garner, R. (1985). Text summarization deficiencies among older students: Awareness or production ability? *American Educational Research Journal*, 22(4), 549-560.
- Garner, R. (1987). *Metacognition and reading comprehension*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Gaskins, I. (1994). Classroom applications of cognitive science: Teaching poor readers how to learn, think, and problem solve. In K. McGilly (Ed.), *Classroom Lessons: Integrating cognitive theory and classroom practice* (pp.129-154). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Graham, S., & Harris, K.R. (2005). Improving the writing performance of young struggling writers: Theoretical and programmatic research from the centre on accelerating student learning. *The Journal of Special Education*, 39(1), 19-33.
- Hare, V.C. & Borchardt, K.M. (1984). Direct instruction of summarization skills. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 20(1), 62-78.

- Jimenez, R.T., Garcia, G.E. & Pearson, P.D. (1995). Three children, two languages, and strategic reading: Case studies in bilingual/monolingual reading. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(1), 67-97.
- 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 production. *Psychological Review*, 85(5), 363-394.
- McKenna, M., Kear, D., & Ellsworth, R. (1995). Children's attitude toward reading: A national survey. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30, 934-956.
- National Reading Panel. (2002). Report of the national reading panel: Teaching children to read. Bethesda, MD: *National Institute of Child Health and Human Development*.
- Palinscar, A. S. (1986). Metacognitive strategy instruction. *Exceptional Children*, 53, 118-124.
- Palinscar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction*, 1, 117-175.
- Paris, S. G., & Lindauer, B. K. (1982). The development of cognitive skills during childhood. In B. R. Wolman (Ed.), *The handbook of developmental psychology*, (pp. 333-349). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Pearson, P. D. , & Fielding, L. (1991). Comprehension instruction. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research*, 2, (pp. 815-860). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Pintrich, P. R., & Garcia, T. (1994). Self-regulated learning in college students: knowledge, strategies, and motivation. In P.R. Pintrich, D.R. Brown, & C. Weinstein (Eds.), *Student motivation, cognition, and learning* (pp. 113-133). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pressley, M. (2000). What should comprehension instruction be the instruction of? In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research*. 3, 545-561. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Pressley, M. (2002). Comprehension strategies instruction: A turn-of-the-century status report. In C.C. Block & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices* (pp. 11-27). New York: Guilford.
- Pressley, M. & Block, C.C. (2002). Summing up: what comprehension instruction could be. In C.C. Block, & Pressley, M. (Eds.) *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices* (pp. 383-392). New York: Guilford.
- Resnick, L.B. (1984). Comparing and learning: Implications for a cognitive theory of instruction. In H. Mandl, N.L. Stein, & T. Trabasso (Eds.), *Learning and Comprehension of Text*. (431-443). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Rinehart, S.D., Stahl, S.A., & Erickson, L.G. (1986). Some effects of summarization training on reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21(4), 422-435.
- Taylor, K. (1983). Can college students summarize? *Journal of Reading*, 26, 524-528.
- Taylor, K. (1986). Summary writing by young children. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21(2), 193-208.
- Tierney, R. & Readence, J. (2005). *Reading Strategies and practices*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Wigfield, A. & Eccles, J. (2002). Introduction. In A. Wigfield, & J. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation*, (pp. 1-11). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Winne, P. H., & Hadwin, A. F. (1998). Studying as self-regulated learning. In D. J. Hacker, J. Dunlosky, & A. C. Graesser (Eds.), *Metacognition in educational theory and practice* (pp. 277-304). Hillsdale, NJ: LEA.
- Winograd, P.N. & Bridge, C.A. (1986). The comprehension of important information in written prose. In J.F. Baumann (Eds.), *Teaching main idea comprehension* (pp. 18-48). Newark, DE: *International Reading Association*.

Wittrock, M.C. (1982). Three studies of generative reading comprehension. In J.A. Niles & L.A. Harsanyi (Eds.), *New Inquiries in Reading Research and Instruction. Thirty-first Yearbook of the National Reading Conference*. Virginia: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 85-88.

Wittrock, M. C., & Alesandrini, K. (1990). Generation of summaries and analogies and analytic and holistic abilities. *American Educational Research Journal*, 27, 489-502.

Appendix 1

Students Pro forma

Attention: Please answer the questions honestly. We keep them strictly confidential.

1. Name of the student:.....
2. age:.....
3. Gender.....
4. Name of college.....
5. Class studying: :.....
6. Medium of instruction.....
7. I havefamiliarity with English language.
 - a. complete b. average c. a little
8. How many years have you been studying English except the usual classes in guidance school and high school? years months
9. What is your purpose of learning English?
 - a. continue education b. travelling c. finding a good job
 - d. competing with other students e. job promotion d. others (please write)
10. My attitude toward English is.....
 - a. positive b. negative c. no comment
11. My attitude toward European people, especially English-speaking ones is.....
 - a. positive b. negative c. no comment

Appendix 2

Passage 1

Today the game reserves of East Africa are facing a number of threats. Although they earn considerable revenue by attracting tourists, they take up land which is necessarily sought by the local people. While these reserves feed and protect animals, they are in danger of turning into barren areas or deserts. Trees, shrubs and grass are gradually being eaten by grazing herds.

Another problem is to be found in the changing attitudes of the animals themselves. Many of them are losing their hereditary fear of man. In this way they may become a danger to visitors and thus to themselves. Attacks on vehicles are beginning to increase, and it is possible that the problem will become serious in a few years' time.

The problem of shortage of land is not a simple one. As the population increases, more and more look hungrily at the land set aside for game reserves. They claim that a Government's first duty is to its inhabitants and not to tourists or to wild animals. Despite the income obtained from tourism, this is an argument which it is difficult to answer satisfactorily.

1. Many local people look hungrily at the game reserves because.....

- a. they may seek land for their own cultivation
 - b. the animals may be a danger to them and their villages
 - c. they may dislike living in a deserted place
 - d. they may be hungry and want to eat the animals
2. What is causing soil erosion in the game reserves?
 - a. the disappearance of vegetation which is eaten by the animals
 - b. the tropical heat
 - c. the violent storms which are caused by grazing herds
 - d. the animals are losing their hereditary fear of man
 3. According to the passage, the Government bothers to maintain game reserves to.....
 - a. stop the people using the land
 - b. keep the vegetation under control
 - c. obtain income from tourism
 - d. make the country beautiful
 4. The attitude of the animals in relation to the game reserves in a few years' time is that they may.....
 - a. become only a danger to visitors
 - b. become too shy to be seen
 - c. hunt every visitor who enters a game reserve
 - d. become friendly with the local people

Passage 2

We do not adequately realize to what extent our minds are mould by books we read especially in youth. We have several means by which we acquire knowledge today, i.e. radio, cinema, newspaper, and television, and etc., but reading the books is the most ancient and effective of them all. Reading a book is different from mechanized instruction. We are never alone when we have books as our companion.

A great writer has said that religion is what man does with his solitude. It is not merely religion but art and literature, scientific discovery and technological invention that are the outcome of what a man does with his privacy. In the modern world, we tend to be gregarious beings. When we have a little leisure, we run to parties, clubs or other social activities. We are afraid to be alone with ourselves, afraid to stand and stare, much less to sit and think. We are happy with others not with ourselves. Pascal tells us that all the evils of the world arise from the fact that men are unable to sit still in a room. Reading a book gives us the habit of solitary reflection and true enjoyment.

5. The main idea of this passage is the importance of.....
 - a. reading a book
 - b. acquiring knowledge
 - c. solitude
 - d. good habits
6. Books read in your youth are useful because they.....
 - a. are interesting
 - b. keep us indoors

- c. mould our mind
- d. are ancient means of acquiring knowledge
- 7. The author considers man's solitude as.....
 - a. something fearful
 - b. the source of something good
 - c. something unimportant for us
 - d. the reflection of bad habits
- 8. According to the passage, a modern man usually prefers.....
 - a. to stay home
 - b. moving out with friends
 - c. reading books in a library
 - d. to reflect in solitude