overSEAS 2015

This thesis was submitted by its author to the School of English and American Studies, Eötvös Loránd University, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts. It was found to be among the best theses submitted in 2015, therefore it was decorated with the School's Outstanding Thesis Award. As such it is published in the form it was submitted in **overSEAS 2015** (http://seas3.elte.hu/overseas/2015.html)

DIPLOMAMUNKA

MA THESIS

Szűcs Ágota

Anglisztika MA

Angol Alkalmazott Nyelvészet

2015

EÖTVÖS LORÁND TUDOMÁNYEGYETEM

Bölcsészettudományi Kar

DIPLOMAMUNKA

MA THESIS

Az első éves BA-s hallgatók angol idegennyelvi tömrítési írásfolyamatai

The Summary Writing Processes of First Year EFL Learner BA Students

Témavezető: Dr. Tankó Gyula adjunktus Anglisztika MA

Készítette: Szűcs Ágota Angol Alkalmazott Nyelvészet

2015

CERTIFICATE OF RESEARCH

By my signature below, I certify that my ELTE MA thesis, entitled……

.....**The Summary Writing Processes of First Year EFL Learner BA Students**…....

is entirely the result of my own work, and that no degree has previously been conferred upon me for this work. In my thesis I have cited all the sources (printed, electronic or oral) I have used faithfully and have always indicated their origin. The electronic version of my thesis (in PDF format) is a true representation (identical copy) of this printed version.

If this pledge is found to be false, I realize that I will be subject to penalties up to and including the forfeiture of the degree earned by my thesis.

Date: **2015. 04. 14.**

Signed: **Szűcs Ágota**

Abstract

The ability to summarize information is the core element of successful information processing. Despite the more than three decades of research tradition on the topic, information available about the highly complex processes underlying summarization and the possible effects of language proficiency and explicit training on summarization processes is still very sparse. To remedy this deficiency, the aim of this thesis is to explore the cognitive, metacognitive, and linguistic aspects of the guided summary writing processes of English major BA students prior to and following explicit training in guided summary writing. The current study is a small scale qualitative exploratory study involving six English major BA students of different English proficiency levels (B2, C1, and C2) whose L1 is Hungarian. The findings indicate that summary writing is a highly complex process which might cause difficulties even for university students, and that even high language proficiency does not seem to compensate for the lack of instruction and practice in L2 written summarization. However, explicit instruction and practice appear to considerably improve both information processing and summarization skills.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

The ability to summarize information is the core element of successful information processing. As Kintsch and van Dijk's (1978) process model suggests, summarization is a very intricate process involving a series of complex underlying mechanisms. Even though their model has its limitations in providing a full explanation of the exact nature of these mechanisms, most researchers of the field agree that the ability of effective summarization is not only connected to text production but is also an indicator of the level of text comprehension.

According to Tankó (2013), "a summary is the condensed version of main ideas borrowed from a source text. The ideas are restated in the summary writer's own words and their source is acknowledged" (p. 41). Despite being an ability widely drawn on in the academic context, research evidence suggests that formal training or direct instruction of summarization in this domain is almost completely neglected by secondary school teachers, even in cases when they assign tasks specifically involving the writing of summaries. As a result, students, regardless of their cognitive abilities, usually struggle with effective summary writing (Hill, 1991; Rose, 2001). The relevance of this issue becomes even more pronounced in tertiary education, where students are constantly exposed to integrative tasks (e.g., listening-into-writing or reading-into-writing tasks) because during the process of acquiring declarative knowledge, note taking, summary writing, and synthesizing skills are all essential. The necessity of these abilities is also confirmed by high-stakes international academic examinations, such as IELTS, Pearson Academic or TOEFL, which practically function as entrance examinations to higher education, and which include tasks that measure summary writing skills.

The need for summarization skills is further re-enforced specifically in the Hungarian context by the fact that the final examination at some Hungarian universities also includes tasks explicitly targeting the students' ability to summarize. For instance, students of the Institute of English and American studies of the University of Debrecen receive a summary writing task in the Language Skill Assessment part of their state examination, where "the examinee is expected to produce a summary of 250-300 words of an original text of 600-800 words." (State examination topics, IEAS). Furthermore, the ability to successfully synthesize information also requires a solid foundation in summary writing (Tankó, 2013), and according to the specification of the BA thesis paper on the website of the School of English and American Studies of Eötvös Loránd University, excellent synthesizing skills constitute a fundamental requirement at the end of the BA studies: "Students must be able to demonstrate a high level of academic achievement in synthesizing the knowledge acquired during their BA studies" (Requirements, SEAS Wiki). Consequently, in order to equip students with the necessary skills, first year BA students are provided a formal training in academic skills (specifically, direct instruction on reading strategies, macrorule use, and academic writing), and they have to pass a guided summary writing test at the end of the first semester. In the second semester, they study synthesis writing and the integration of synthesized information in source-based argumentative essays or mini-literature reviews.

Whereas studies on the topic of summary writing had already been conducted with L1 and L2 speakers of English in different contexts (Mateos, Martin, Villalón, & Luna, 2008; Plakans, 2009; Yang & Shi, 2003), guided summary writing has not been extensively researched yet, either in the Hungarian EFL context, or on an international level.

Furthermore, while it is known that cognitive development has an effect on summary writing (Brown & Day, 1983; Mateos et al., 2008), information available on the effect of language proficiency level on summarization processes is scarce.

As previous research suggests (Brown & Day, 1983; Hill, 1991; Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978; Mateos et al., 2008; Plakans, 2009; Rose, 2001; Yang & Shi, 2003), summary writing is a cognitively challenging and complex process, and especially guided summary writing (a specific subtype of summary writing) draws on skills that students have to successfully apply every day by being constantly exposed to reading-into-writing tasks and reading for specific purposes tasks (Tankó, 2013). Because of the relevance of the issue and the lack of information available on the topic, the aim of this thesis is to contribute to this research niche, and to explore the cognitive, metacognitive and linguistic aspects of the guided summary writing processes of first year EFL learner BA students.

2. Literature review

Research in L1 and L2 summary writing has more than three decades of tradition. For the sake of transparency, in this literature review, relevant studies will be organized under six headings, namely types of summaries and their educational relevance, cognitive and metacognitive processes underlying summary writing, macrorule use in summary writing, the role of cognitive development and explicit instruction in summary writing, taxonomies of cognitive and metacognitive strategies in reading and writing skills, limitations of previous research and the aim of this study.

2.1 Types of summaries and their educational relevance

Johns proposes (1988, p. 79) that "Summary is a superordinate term for a number of discourse types which have in common these relationships with the original: (1) being shortened versions, (2) including only the main ideas, and (in most cases) (3) retaining the original organization and focus". Through summarization, a vast amount of data can be condensed into only a few sentences, and it can also be used to include information from already existing sources into one's own work without over-quoting or committing plagiarism.

Summaries can be categorized according to several criteria (Tankó, 2013). First, they can be stand alone or integrated, depending on their intended use as either an independent, self-contained piece of writing, for example, thesis abstracts; or an embedded part of a larger text, such as a short synopsis of an article in a literature review. Secondly, based on their function, summaries can be descriptive or critical. Descriptive summaries only restate the main ideas of the source text without any further addition or comments; in critical summaries, the writer not only summarizes the main points but also adds comments and reflections, for example, on the usefulness of the ideas included in the summary. Thirdly, formal and informal summaries can be distinguished based on their style: while formal summaries are reader-based summaries following the requirements of academic writing, informal summaries are writer-based notes such as lecture notes, sometimes lacking full grammatical correctness. Fourthly, depending on the way the source text is processed, global and guided summaries can be distinguished. Global summaries include all the main ideas of the source text; guided summaries include only the ideas relevant to the specifically defined reading goal or purpose of the summarization. Lastly, Tankó (2013)

states that summaries can also be categorized based on the purpose of their use. In addition to the summaries used for academic purposes, as the examples mentioned before, there are summaries used for non-academic purposes, for example, executive summaries, headnotes and memos.

Because of their various types and their manifold uses, summary writing skills are widely drawn on both in academic and in non-academic contexts; therefore, it appears that good summarization skills are fundamental for every language user. Besides being an essential information processing and study tool, summarization also has several other beneficial effects. According to Rose (2001), summarization enhances the comprehension and recall of a text. By reorganizing and reflecting on the ideas presented and actively engaging in interaction with the text, students manage to memorize more information than through simply reading the text. Moreover, because during summary writing students have to make conscious decisions about what to include and what to leave out of their summaries, this task also improves their critical thinking. Students have to process, transform and manipulate information in order to be able to write a successful summary, so they have to make inferences and practice critical reading and thinking (Casazza, 1993).

2.2 Cognitive and metacognitive processes underlying summary writing

The ability to summarize information is a very complex skill involving the application of a series of highly intricate cognitive and metacognitive mechanisms, and the successful execution of a summary writing task requires both excellent text comprehension and text production skills.

According to previous studies, both cognition and metacognition refer to a series of conscious or subconscious processes used by the participants in order to successfully accomplish cognitive goals (Phakiti, 2003). While both cognitive and metacognitive strategies are oriented towards achieving cognitive goals, they are slightly different in nature. For instance, metacognitive strategies contain actions that are considered to be conscious, deliberate, and fully intentional, and they are usually used for planning and monitoring one's own task execution (Flavell, 1971). Phakiti (2003) suggests that they are "deliberate mental behaviors for directing and controlling their [language users'] cognitive strategy processing for successful performance. They are conceived as higher order executive processing that provides a cognitive management function in language use and other cognitive activities" (p. 30). In contrast, cognitive strategies refer to the mostly subconscious, ongoing mental processes and actions participants engage in so as to solve the task, using their language skills and knowledge of the world. According to Bachman (2010, p. 49), "language users create and interpret discourse in situationally appropriate ways" through the integration of affective schemata, topical knowledge, and language knowledge. He states that language users rely on metacognitive strategies for goal setting, appraising, and planning and therefore these strategies constitute their strategic competence. Bachman further states that metacognitive strategies have "a management function in language use, as well as in other cognitive activities" (p. 48).

Regardless of the numerous studies investigating the exact distinctions between metacognitive and cognitive strategies, the terminology is still ambiguous. The results of Phakiti's research (2003) suggest that it is highly problematic to label certain actions purely as a cognitive or metacognitive strategy because the same action can belong to either

category depending on the goal it serves. Moreover, cognitive and metacognitive strategies tend to occur mostly in association with each other, forming a continuum instead of following each other linearly. For instance, in a summary writing task, if participants translate parts of the text in order to memorize them for the production phase, translation would be performed as a cognitive strategy; however, if participants use translation to check whether their understanding of the text is correct, translation can be labeled as a metacognitive strategy (Phakiti, 2003).

Because of the ambiguity of the terminology, in the current study the term metacognitive processes will refer to participants' verbalized conscious thoughts about task execution, and metacognitive strategies will denote the actions taken based on these thoughts. In contrast, the cognitive processes will refer to the subconscious mechanisms that influence information processing and text production.

2.3 Macrorule use in summary writing

As Kintsch and van Dijk's (1978) process model suggests, summarization is a rule-governed action, and it can be divided into three major steps. First, the meaning elements are organized into a coherent unity; then information is condensed with the help of macro-operators; and, as a third step, a new coherent text is generated based on the condensed information. These steps are not linear; they occur in a circular fashion, presupposing that some of the processes occur in a parallel instead of a sequential order.

The structure of meaning created by organizing the meaning elements of a text into a coherent unity is called macrostructure. The global meaning of the text (i.e., its macrostructure) is created with the help of four macrorules (Renkema, 2004). The Deletion

rule is used to eliminate irrelevant or redundant (e.g., repeated) propositions. Trivial information that has no value to the task is also deleted during this operation. The Zero rule, another low level processing macro-operation, is used to copy propositional content from the source text without any modification. Both rules draw on the ability to recognize and extract relevant propositional content form the source text. These two rules are supposed to require the lowest level of cognitive processing because research in the field suggests that zero and deletion rules are confidently applied even by elementary school students (Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978).

The Generalization rule and Construction rule are the macro-operators requiring higher level cognitive processing skills. The Generalization rule draws on the ability to categorize propositional content in the source text based on one organizing principle in order to create one general proposition; the Construction rule requires the ability to use background knowledge to identify relevant complementary propositional content and combine it with propositional content from the source text to produce a general proposition. As it can be seen, in order to successfully apply these two macrorules, the writer's world knowledge also has to be engaged. This is the reason why, as research evidence confirms, younger students often find it difficult to use these two rules (Brown & Day, 1983; Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978; Mateos, et al., 2008; Winograd, 1984).

The macro-operators are applied in a cyclical manner, processing the text from left to right, and constantly checking for argument overlaps between the propositions. The first macrorule to be applied is construction followed by generalization. The micropropositions are generalized, then, if they are relevant, they become macropropositions, and if they are considered irrelevant, they get deleted. As macro-operators are applied in several cycles,

macrostructures constitute hierarchical structures (Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978).

Because the ability of effective summarization is not only connected to text production but is also an indicator of the level of text comprehension, the term schematic structure must be introduced. According to Johns, schematic structures, or schemata, are blueprints specified by a set of fixed categories and rules of formation. When encountering a text, readers subconsciously try to relate it to previously read texts and their knowledge of the world in order to comprehend them. With the use of appropriate schemata, they can make valuable inferences that can make text comprehension more effective and more successful. For example, by recognizing the genre, readers can make inferences about the underlying text structure, possible vocabulary items signaling the relationship among the ideas presented in the text, and content slots that must be present in a certain text type (1988).

During text comprehension, Kintsch and van Dijk (1978) suggest that the creation and use of a macroproposition depends on whether the propositional content read in the texts is considered relevant or redundant by the pre-set categories and specifications governing the schematic structure; this way, it is the reader's schema that determines whether a proposition of the source text is considered relevant or irrelevant. This claim presupposes that there is always an identifiable schema governing text comprehension; thus, in cases where the reader lacks a clearly defined reading goal or the text has an unconventional structure, the process of comprehension and the application of macrorules become highly difficult and unpredictable. Kintsch and van Dijk (1978) also highlight that there is a difference between reading a text for global understanding versus reading it with a specific reading goal (e.g., to find positive evaluative comments, to identify instances of

refutation, or to extract specific thematic aspects). Further cognitive challenges might arise when texts are read with a specific purpose. In such cases, the traditional schematic structure of the text is overridden by the necessities of the problem-solving task, and the application of the macro-operators will be guided by this specific purpose. As Kintsch and van Dijk's example (1978) explains, a book, such as Decameron, can be interpreted as a series of interesting stories along the lines of the schematic structures of narratives; but it can also be read with the special purpose of finding information about the representation of the role of women in the 14th century Italy. The resulting two macrostructures constructed by the reader are different yet equally valid because they are the results of naturally occurring reading activities.

2.4 The role of cognitive development and explicit instruction in summary writing

Because language users' mental schemas, topical knowledge, and organizational knowledge largely influence text comprehension and production, students who have more experience with reading and writing tasks should be at an advantage when they have to produce a summary. This presupposition is also supported by the findings of Johns (1985), who investigated summary writing with three different groups of university students. Participants with different levels of experience in academic writing had to summarize a short excerpt from an American history textbook in 100 words, and the analysis of their written products suggested that more experienced students were able to integrate two or more pieces of relevant propositional content into a sentence and were also more successful in paraphrasing them. Moreover, Yang & Shi (2003), who also analyzed the summarization skills of university students, arrived at similar results. Their participants were from the

same background and had similar levels of language knowledge, and based on the analyzed think aloud data, retrospective interviews, and writing samples, the researchers concluded that the subjects with more writing experience were the most efficient summary writers, potentially because they were also able to apply text processing and writing strategies more consciously during task execution. Furthermore, Plakans (2009) arrived at similar results when she investigated the use of discourse synthesis sub-processes of university-level non-native writers of English. The writers who were using writing strategies more consciously managed to overcome language difficulties such as vocabulary use and stylistic concerns emerging during the writing process more successfully.

Given that summary writing is a cognitively highly challenging process, age and the level of cognitive development also have undeniable influence on the quality of the process and on the end product of summarization. Brown and Day (1983) conducted three experiments to investigate how different age groups, involving elementary and high school students in addition to college students and university students, used the macrorules (Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978) when they had to summarize expository texts. Based on their findings, they concluded that college and university students also used the more complex rules of generalization and construction, whereas younger participants relied only on the use of deletion and insertion. These results are in agreement with the findings of Winograd (1984), who also concluded that based on the analysis of their summaries, university students outperformed secondary school students in integration and effective paraphrasing of information.

Mateos et al.'s (2008) study investigating the cognitive and metacognitive summarizing and paraphrasing skills of 15-year-old secondary school students provided

further conclusive evidence that cognitive development plays a crucial role in summary writing. Participants' reading and writing processes were closely monitored in order to get insight into their comprehension and composition, so they were asked to perform think aloud protocols and hand in their written summaries and syntheses. Researchers found that secondary school students lacked the cognitive skills required for the strategic use of reading and writing.

The studies presented above all seem to confirm the idea that the level of cognitive development has a major influence on the ability to successfully summarize information. However, the results of Johns (1985), Plakans (2009), and Yang & Shi (2003) suggest that cognitive development and age are not the most important factors because the summarization skills of students from the same age group and presumably with the same level of cognitive development showed great differences. The only salient difference between the more and less successful participants of these studies was the amount of experience they had in summarization and academic writing.

The beneficial effect of explicit instruction in summary writing is also supported by such research studies as Bean and Steewyck's (1984), where they analyzed the summary writing products of three groups of sixth graders of whom the first group received formal training in rule-governed summarization, the second one in GIST procedure, and the third one had no explicit training. The findings suggest that both strategic reading processes had positive influence on the summarization skills of the participants. Moreover, both groups outperformed the control group. Furthermore, the results of the Pathway Project show similar relationship between explicit instruction and reading and writing skills. Participants receiving a cognitive strategies training significantly outperformed their peers on academic

writing tests (Olson & Land, 2007). These results seem to suggest that summary writing is indeed a skill that can be improved through instruction, awareness raising, and practice.

2.5 Taxonomies of cognitive and metacognitive strategies in reading and writing skills

Research suggests that, even though traditionally reading and writing were initially considered two very distinct processes, they are similar in their essence. Both of them are meaning construction processes that draw on similar or related cognitive and metacognitive strategies to execute the task. Studies also appear to confirm that while solving tasks requiring their reading and writing skills, participants relied on the use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies with more or less success. The only difference between successful and less successful participants originated from the level of their consciousness about their own strategy use. Those students who had an explicit declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge about the use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies in reading and writing tasks performed better than their peers who lacked this explicit knowledge (Baker & Brown, 1984; Block & Pressley, 2002; Langer & Applebee, 1986; Olson & Land, 2007; Paris, Lipson, & Wixon, 1983; Pressley, 2000).

As a result of the extensive research in the area, there are several models describing the strategy use of students in reading and writing tasks (Flower & Hayes, 1981; Olson, 2003; Paris, Wasik, & Turner, 1991; Tierney & Pearson, 1983; Tompkins, 1997;). Despite the minor differences in these taxonomies, they all seem to agree that experienced and successful readers and writers use cognitive and metacognitive strategies consciously and manipulate them freely, applying these strategies recursively instead of in a fixed order. Considering the lack of space available, the current literature review will focus only on the

detailed discussion of Olson's taxonomy of cognitive strategies used in reading and writing tasks, which is based on the works of Flower and Hayes (1981); Paris et al. (1991); Tierney and Pearson (1983); and Tompkins (1997), and which also served as the basis of the coding scheme developed in the current study.

Olson's model, which also provided the foundation for the Pathway Project curriculum (2003), a program targeting students' skills in academic literacy and providing them with explicit training in strategy use in reading and writing task execution, handles strategy use as fluid and cyclical. According to Olson, professional readers and writers are successful because of their capability to access and confidently apply a wide variety of strategies, while also going back and forth between these strategies instead of insisting on a strict order of application (Olson & Land, 2007).

In her cognitive strategies model, Olson (2003) groups strategies into eight major categories, namely Planning and Goal Setting, Tapping Prior Knowledge, Asking Questions and Making Predictions, Constructing the Gist, Monitoring, Revising Meaning, Reflecting and Relating, and Evaluating. Firstly, the category of Planning and Making Predictions refers to students' actions on setting a purpose and establishing the priorities of task execution. Whereas Tapping Prior Knowledge and Reflecting and Relating describe students' attempts to relate the issue to their previous experiences and general knowledge. Secondly, Making Predictions, Constructing the Gist, and Revising Meaning contain groups of strategies participants can apply to focus their attention, organize or re-organize ideas and identify meaning through analysis. Finally, strategies belonging to the category of Evaluating refer to participants' actions that concern review and critical comments on the task (Olson, 2003). Despite its many details, Olson's model could not be used in the

current study in its original form because it only handles cognitive strategies. In order to also accommodate metacognitive strategies, the model had to be adapted.

2.6 Limitations of previous research and the aim of this study

As the literature review suggests, almost three decades of research in summary writing has already addressed important aspects and questions related to summarization. However, it is obvious that some potentially crucial issues have been left out of the discussion. For instance, previous studies appear to focus only on global summaries, being oblivious to the possible differences in the case of subtypes, such as the guided summary. Given that, based on Kintsch and van Dijk's process model (1978), information processing is influenced by schematic structures, it can be assumed that global summarization and guided summarization processes are different. While in the case of both task types writers have to be in possession of high level reading skills in order to be able to accurately understand the source text and apply radical changes to it without distorting the original message, there might be some differences between the processes underlying the creation of the different types of summaries. For example, the intention of the summarizer is radically different in the two cases. In the case of global summary writing, the intention is to include and cover equally every main point discussed in the source text. However, because of the loosely defined rhetoric goal, one of the biggest risks of global summary writing is losing focus and only discussing some of the issues presented in the text, thus failing to create a summary that would be an adequate representation of the original source text in terms of content and rhetorical goals (Tankó, 2013). In contrast, in the case of guided summaries, the intention is to include specific ideas relevant to the rhetorical goal of the summarizer. In

such a task, students have a very well defined rhetorical goal presented in the form of a guiding question that sets a distinct goal for information retrieval. This defined rhetorical goal might help the summarizer to stay focused and might make it easier to avoid missing the identification of relevant source text information.

Moreover, guided and global summaries might also differ in terms of the possible order of application of macro-operations. Global summaries seem to follow Kintch and van Dijk's (1978) original idea about the order of macro-operations. Most probably, when writing a global summary, the summarizer first engages in constructing new propositions or on generalizing all the micropropositions and condensing them into as many macropropositions as needed. Contrariwise, in the case of the guided summary, the rhetorical goal set by the task would place the application of macro- operators into a different perspective. First, summarizers might opt for selecting the ideas relevant to the purpose defined by the task, and only afterwards would they start to generalize the relevant micropropositions.

In addition, despite the abundant data available about the effect of language abilities on the execution of reading tasks (e.g., Purpura, 1997; 1998; 1999), information about the effect of language proficiency on guided summary writing processes is very scarce. Because Purpura suggests that students require a certain level of language knowledge to make use of metacognitive strategies, it can be assumed that language proficiency might also have a notable influence on the cognitive and metacognitive processes underlying guided summary writing. Similarly, the effect of formal training on guided summary writing processes could also be considered.

Taking the above outlined research niches into consideration, the main aim of the

current study is to explore the guided summary writing processes prior to and following explicit training in guided summary writing of English major BA students whose L1 is Hungarian and who study at a Hungarian institution of tertiary education. The study aims at answering the following research questions:

1. What characterizes the metacognitive strategy use prior to and following explicit training in guided summary writing of English major BA students whose L1 is Hungarian?
2. What characterizes the macrorule use prior to and following explicit training in guided summary writing of English major BA students whose L1 is Hungarian?
3. What characterizes the linguistic realization of the written guided summaries of English major BA students whose L1 is Hungarian prior to and following explicit training in guided summary writing?
4. How does language proficiency of English major BA students whose L1 is Hungarian influence their summary writing processes prior to and following explicit training in guided summary writing?

3. Methods

The current study is a small scale qualitative exploratory study whose aim is to explore the cognitive and linguistic aspects of the summary writing processes of English major BA students whose L1 is Hungarian prior to and following explicit training in guided summary writing. The study also attempts to explore the possible effects of language proficiency on the guided summary writing processes. Based on the findings of previously conducted studies, and taking the role of cognitive development on summarization skills

into consideration, the research was conducted with the participation of university students. In order to investigate the raised issues, six English major first year BA students enrolled into a Hungarian university were asked to do two guided summary writing tasks each, the first one prior to and the second one after the explicit training in guided summary writing. The tasks were of equal difficulty, and administered in counterbalanced design. While solving the tasks, the participants were asked to perform metacognitive think aloud, and at the end of the data collection, semi-structured interviews were also conducted. The collected data was analyzed for metacognitive strategy use based on a coding scheme developed from Hayes and Flower's model of cognitive processes in writing (1981) and on Olson's Cognitive Strategies: A Reader's and Writer's Tool Kit (2003). The collected written products were also analyzed for macrorule use and structural and linguistic appropriateness to the rhetorical requirements of guided summary writing.

3.1 Data collection

Data collection was carried out in two parts; the first set of data was recorded during the second week of the autumn semester, before the start of the participants' formal training in guided summary writing; the second set of data was recorded during the first week of December, about two weeks before the end of the semester, after the participants have completed the guided summary writing training. As data collection instruments, two guided summary tasks on similar topics and of matching difficulty level were used. In order to control for method effect, a counterbalanced design was applied, so each student worked with different tasks on both occasions.

Because the study was designed to explore pre- and post-training summarization

processes and the effect of language proficiency on those processes, on both data collection occasions participants met the researcher one-by-one for a 1.5-2 hours long interview. At the first data collection occasion (Phase One), students were notified that the interviews would be audio recorded and were ensured that their privacy would not be compromised. In order to maintain their privacy, they were given pseudonyms before the data analysis. For the sake of convenience, the participants with the same proficiency level were given pseudonyms beginning with the same letter.

As part of Phase One, first, the participants received an approximately 15 minutes long training in metacognitive think aloud, following the procedures described in Bowles (2010), and then they had to do a simple sentence formation task (for a sample of the think-aloud practice task, see Appendix A.). After the training, they were given a guided summary task and instructed to verbalize every thought emerging in their minds, irrespective of whether it was in their L1 or L2, in order to guide the researcher through their task execution process as much as possible. The students were not allowed to use dictionaries or any other external help during their writing processes; however, they were allowed to ask questions concerning minor relevant practicalities (e.g., whether hyphenated words count as one or two words) any time during the interview, and the text they had to summarize was available for them during the whole process. Besides the instructions concerning how to perform the think aloud procedure, they were provided no other input on how to solve the task, and they were asked to execute the tasks as they normally would for their academic writing class. At the end of the first interview conducted after the participants finished the guided summary task, they were asked questions concerning their personal data, language learning history, and previous academic writing experiences.

The second round of data collection (Phase Two) took place in similar fashion. Before the think aloud protocol, participants received a 5 minutes long training to recapitulate how to perform a metacognitive think aloud, and they were given the opportunity to practice with sentence formation exercises. They could proceed to the guided summary task only when they felt ready and adequately familiar with the think aloud method. As in Phase One, no external help besides the source text was available to the participants. On both data collection occasions not only the audio recorded think aloud data was collected from the participants but also their written notes, drafts, and final written products. At the end of the task, they were asked about their training experiences and the number of guided summaries they had to write during the semester.

During both data collection rounds, the language of the source text and the guided summary task was English. The language of the training and the interviews was Hungarian, but for the language of the think aloud procedure participants were allowed to use both English and Hungarian, and they were asked to verbalize their thoughts in the language in which they were thinking while solving the task. Regardless of their language choice for the think aloud, the final guided summaries had to be written in English.

3.1.1 Participants

As the first step of participant selection, the listening and grammar parts of the Oxford Placement test (OPT) and an IELTS academic reading task were administered in two first year Academic Writing groups. Based on the test results, specific students from the groups were approached and asked to take part in the study. However, participation was on voluntary basis; every student who was asked to participate was also free to refuse the

offer. Because the current research also aimed at examining the effect of language proficiency on the process of summary writing, two participants were selected from each proficiency level between levels B2 and C2 of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR).

Based on the results of the placement test and the data gathered from semi-structured interviews conducted with the participants, the following participant profiles emerged:

Table 1

Participant profiles

Name	Brooke	Ben	Alice	Alex	Cole	Chris
Age	19	20	18	20	20	20
Proficiency	B2	B2	C1	C1	C2	C2+
Oxford Placement Test Score(/200)	139	139	166	157	180	191
Has learnt English for(in years):	10	10	13	10	10	14
Has also studied:	German	German	German, French	German, Slovak, Russian	Spanish	German, Swedish

As Table 1 shows, all of the participants were Hungarian native speakers between the ages of 18-20 who learnt English for at least ten years. Besides English, they were all studying

at least one other foreign language. Furthermore, from the semi-structured interviews it emerged that none of the participants received any training in guided summary writing prior to the first data collection and that they had very limited experience in English academic writing.

3.1.2 Instruments

For the purpose of participant selection and training, first, the listening and grammar tasks of the 2004 edition of Oxford Placement Test were administered. A standard IELTS academic reading task was also included because the OPT does not provide information about reading skills. Because of the time limit, only one reading task was administered, which intend to measure the academic reading skills of the participants. Secondly, for the training in metacognitive think aloud, an arithmetic problem and four sentence formation practice tasks were used.

For the actual think-aloud and data collection, two expository texts of equal difficulty were used; both of them had been specifically designed for teaching and assessing the guided summary writing skills of BA students (Tankó, 2013). The selection of the tasks was informed by the course book author's (Tankó, 2013) notes, by pilot-based student feedback collected on the tasks in earlier semesters, and by data obtained with the help of readability formula (see Appendix B.). In the process of task selection, the length and the topic of the reading passages were also taken into consideration. Both texts discussed issues with which first year university students can be expected to be familiar and to which they can relate based on their experiences: Task A, entitled *Responding to student writing*, was a 19 sentence long description of the types and effects of feedback

teachers can give their students; whereas, Task B, *Teaching online*, discussed the problems and challenges of online tutoring. Both assignments required students to write a paragraph of 130 words (+/- 10%), summarizing in their own words specific ideas from the texts.

Following the data collection procedure, interviews were conducted with the students according to a semi-structured interview protocol. The interview questions were focusing on the participants' language learning background and their former experiences with guided summary writing and academic writing in general (see Appendix D.).

3.2 Developing the coding scheme

In order to investigate the metacognitive strategy use of the participants, as the first step of the analysis, the audio recorded think aloud protocols and interviews were listened to twice and notes were taken on them. These notes were searched for emerging themes, and based on the analysis of the first two protocols, a coding scheme was developed. In order to ensure its reliability, these two protocols were coded twice by the researcher with a two months time difference between the codings, and inter-coder agreement was calculated. The inter-coder reliability for the codings was Kappa = 0.79 ($p < .0.001$), 95% CI (0.732 to 0.857). For an example of a transcribed and coded segment, see Appendix F.

During the analysis, 31 recurring themes were encountered, which were grouped into five main categories: Processing, Planning, Composing, Self-monitoring, and Self-reflection. The coding scheme was mainly developed based on Hayes and Flower's model of cognitive processes in writing (1981) and on Olson's Cognitive Strategies: A Reader's and Writer's Tool Kit (2003). Because the emerging data could not be accommodated and fully described by either of the two models, they had to be adapted. For the complete coding scheme, see Figure 1.

1. **Processing**
    - Reading/re-reading the source text
    - Reading/re-reading the task instruction
    - Interpreting the source text
    - Interpreting the task instruction
    - Speculating about the meaning of a lexical item
2. **Planning**
    - Planning content in L1
    - Planning content in L2
    - Taking notes
    - Considering stylistic issues
    - Planning structure
    - Planning for later editing
    - Checking text length
    - Formulating a guiding question
    - Re-reading own notes
    - Forgetting necessary English lexical item
    - Planning language
3. **Composing**
    - Verbalizing own writing
    - Justifying own composing decision
    - Translating own ideas from L1 to L2
    - Spelling difficult words
    - Avoiding the use of unfamiliar language
    - Attempting to avoid plagiarism
    - Copying (word-for-word form the source text)
    - Looking for a lexical item
    - Positive self-talk
4. **Self-monitoring**

- Re-reading own writing
- Editing own writing
- Checking spelling and orthography

5. **Self-reflection**
    - Personal comments on the issue presented in the text
    - Reflecting on own writing/processing skills
    - Meta-comments on writing in general

Figure 1. The coding scheme used for the analysis of metacognitive strategy use of the participants.

Firstly, the category of Planning follows Hayes and Flower's model (1981) and includes the emerging themes connected to goal-setting, and organization. Similarly to the model of cognitive processes in writing (Hayes & Flower, 1981), Planning describes the processes of how concepts take shape during task execution, and how these concepts are organized into subordinate and superordinate ideas in order to decide their relevance according to the rhetorical goal of the task. Moreover, actions concerning textual presentation also belong here. Secondly, like Planning, the category of Composing was also adapted from the model of cognitive processes in writing (1981). Just as the Translation component of the Hayes-Flower model (1981), it contains the emerging themes that refer to "putting ideas into visible language" (p. 373.). However, because there was an abundant amount of emerging data concerning the translation of the ideas for L1 to L2, in order to avoid ambiguity, the label of the category was changed to Composing. Thirdly, Self-monitoring is a category created from collapsing parts of Olson's (2003) categories of Evaluating and Reflecting and Relating, and parts of Hayes and Flower's (1981) Monitor and Reviewing because it refers both to the revisiting and the revision of the participant's

own written text for lexical, grammatical, or punctuation problems, and to the monitoring of progress. Furthermore, Self-reflection is based on parts of the category of Long-term memory in the Hayes-Flower model (1981), and on parts of the Tapping prior knowledge and Evaluating of the Olson model (2003). In contrast with these models, Self-reflection in the current coding scheme concentrates on the participant's comments about their previous writing experiences and personal opinions presented on the issue. Lastly, Processing is a category that does not appear as a separate one either at Hayes and Flower (1981) or at Olson (2003), but it is included under the headings of Long-term memory (Hayes and Flower, 1981), Taping prior knowledge, and Constructing the gist (Olson, 2003). Because one of the aims of the current thesis is to investigate the cognitive processes underlying guided summary writing, handling the actions of processing the task and the source text as a separate category seemed to be a reasonable and justified decision. For more detailed definitions of the categories and the belonging emerging themes, see Appendix G.

3.3 Data analysis

The data analysis procedures for Phase One and Phase Two were carried out in identical ways. The audio recorded think aloud protocols and the interviews were listened to twice, notes were taken on them, and representative quotes from the participants were transcribed. The notes together with the written guided summaries were subjected to content analysis. The collected data was analyzed for emerging themes, macro rule use, linguistic characteristics, and for structural appropriateness in terms of the rhetorical characteristics of guided summaries.

First, the notes taken on the Phase One think aloud protocols of Brooke and Ben were subjected to content analysis and coded for emerging themes. The coding was done manually by the researcher, and in order to ensure the reliability of the coding these two protocols were coded twice, and Cohen's Kappa was calculated with SPSS 17.0. The coding scheme was developed based on Hayes and Flower's (1981) model of cognitive processes in writing and on Olson's (2003) Cognitive Strategies: A Reader's and Writer's Tool Kit. However, in order to fit every emerging theme, the two models had to be adapted. The rest of the Phase One think aloud protocols were coded based on the emerging coding scheme, and further categories were introduced if it was necessary. After the second data collection phase, the coding scheme had to be further refined, and the subcategory of Formulating a guiding question was introduced under the heading of Planning. The final version of the coding scheme accommodated all the themes that emerged in Phase One and Phase Two. Based on the emerging data, the pre- and post-training metacognitive strategy use of the participants was analyzed.

As the second step of the analysis, the notes taken on the think aloud protocols and the written guided summaries were analyzed together, with close attention to the presence and absence of a predetermined set of propositional content (i.e., content points). The *Teaching online* text contained six preset content points, namely CP1 – setting up the group, CP2 – online tutoring is time consuming and work-intensive, CP3 – implementing institutions underestimate what online tutoring involves, CP4 – not time and place bound, CP5 – the tutor becomes better skilled and has better employment opportunities, CP6 – it makes the tutor feel good to develop professionally; whereas the *Responding to student writing* text contained the following four content points: CP1 – based on feedback on rough

drafts students can attend to important features of their writing, CP2 –in groups students can identify the concerns which should be given priority in the second draft, CP3 – students can write a reflection page on the feedback on their final drafts, CP4 – changes can be made in a later revision or for another paper (Tankó, 2013). For examples of final written guided summaries collected from the participants, see Appendix C.

Furthermore, the participants' skills of information processing and use of macro-operators were measured by operationalizing the macrorule use. On the one hand, the use of zero rule was measured through a count of the content points identified. Similarly, the use of the deletion rule was analyzed by counting the pieces of irrelevant source text information included in the summary. On the other hand, the higher level macrorules require more complex operationalization, so in order to measure the use of the generalization rule, the extent to which propositional content was successfully organized into categories based on one organizing principle was examined. The use of the construction rule was inferred from the presence and quality of the topic sentence, and from extent to which propositional content from different parts of the text was successfully collapsed using complementary propositional information from background knowledge.

Thirdly, the final guided summary products of the participants were analyzed with regard to their linguistic aspects not only by the thesis writer but also by a second researcher, and the findings presented in connection with these aspects are the results of these two analyses. The examined analytical categories included rhetorical features, content, and linguistic features. For the detailed list of the analytical categories, their descriptors, and the scoring system, see Appendix E. The possible influences of proficiency level on metacognitive strategy use, macrorule use and linguistic features were also

considered.

4. Results and discussion

The results of this thesis are organized under three main headings in this chapter, namely metacognitive strategy use, macrorule use, and the linguistic realization of the written guided summaries. This chapter discusses the results and the data collected during Phase One and Phase Two in sparate subsections addressing the first three research questions whereas the the fourth research question (the possible effects of language proficiency on the different aspects of the summary writing processes) is discussed at the end of each section.

4.1 Metacognitive strategy use

4.1.1 Phase One

According to the semi-structured interviews, prior to the first data collection occasion none of the participants had any experience with guided summary writing tasks or the method of metacognitive think aloud. The audio recorded think aloud protocols suggest that initially most of the participants felt rather uncomfortable with the method of metacognitive think aloud and expressed some kind of hesitation in connection with how to execute it. For example, “well, can I read it [the text] silently? Or should I read it out loud?” (Alice). Presumably in order to overcome this problem, all of them started with reading the task or the source text. After the initial hesitation, despite being unfamiliar with guided summary writing, all the participants approached the task relatively confidently, applying planning strategies such as marking the relevant parts of the instruction: “Write a paragraph of 130 words… I circle this in order to remember how much I have to write”

(Brooke). Similarly, while reading the source text, every student underlined parts of it that they deemed important. However, in most cases these parts were simply the not necessarily relevant macropropositions of the source text and not the specific information required by the task. This way, by the end of the task execution, all of them produced texts more similar to global summaries or argumentative essays than to guided summaries.

Most probably, in order to overcome the difficulty imposed on them by the unfamiliarity of the task, the participants tried to heavily rely on their previous writing experiences. This is especially visible in Ben's case, who mentioned his former school experiences with writing tasks several times: "I am going to start my essay with a very good phrase I've learnt form my high school English teacher: To begin with, there are several significant responsibilities that teachers have" (Ben). This quotation might also illustrate how much the participant tried to approximate the task to something familiar in order to find ways to execute it.

Despite reading the task and applying processing steps such as circling or underlining the requirements, during Phase One each participant referred to the piece they were writing as an essay. This fact might support the assumption that text processing is heavily influenced by the schematic structures the learner is familiar with. However, according to previous research, the same text can be interpreted from many different points of view, and in case of reading for specific purposes, the schema the reader imposes on the text should be governed by the rhetorical goal assigned by the task (Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978). In the case of Phase One, the desire to approximate the task to a familiar structure seemed to be so strong that it overrode the rhetorical goal.

Lack of familiarity with the task was also indicated by the length of time spent with reading and re-reading the source text. Frequent returns to the text and re-reading it multiple times were characteristics of every participants' approach. In the data collected form Phase One, the most frequently coded emerging themes were Reading/re-reading the source text and Interpreting the source text. For instance, in the case of Ben's Phase One think aloud protocol, out of the 114 coded segments 36 referred to emerging themes connected to the interpretation of the source text in L1 or re-reading parts of the source text. Moreover, in order to be able to fully comprehend it, he re-read the third paragraph of the source text three times in a row. This recurrence of the Reading/re-reading and Interpreting the source text instances can suggest that because of the lack of the necessary metacognitive reading strategies, students had to rely more on cognitive mechanisms, processing the text more locally with a bottom-up approach.

Another notable emerging feature was the language used by participants during text processing and production. Regardless of their language proficiency level, the participants with the exception of Chris appeared to process and compose content primarily in their L1. For instance, before composing an idea, Brooke translated the relevant parts of the source text into her L1 to check if she understood it correctly, and collected her thoughts on the issue in Hungarian. This is also confirmed by the instances when she forgot necessary English lexical items that she had previously mentioned and planned to use. "Wait…what was that word?... I had a really good English word for this in my mind a couple of minutes ago" (Brooke).

4.1.2 Phase Two

In contrast with Phase One, during Phase Two every participant approached the task with visibly more confidence and ease. During task execution, each one of them appeared to follow a very conscious and practiced routine, solving the task considerably more rapidly and in a more goal-oriented manner than during Phase One. “First of all, I am going to read the task and formulate a guiding question because that will give me an idea about the content points I have to look for in the text” (Ben). Relying on the learnt metacognitive strategies such as formulating a guiding question or techniques of paraphrasing in order to avoid plagiarism were recurring elements of the think aloud data collected during Phase Two.

In addition, coded segments labeled as Meta-comments on writing in general mostly referred to the guided summary writing training experience instead of previous high school English classes. For example, when she started composing her guided summary, Brooke reminded herself that during the class they had discussed several times that in order to avoid plagiarism, the guided summary should contain the author of the source text and the date of publishing.

Furthermore, the participants seemed to follow a more global, top-down text processing approach and applied metacognitive text processing strategies such as scanning for information more frequently and more consciously. The episodes of re-reading of the whole source text became less frequent as the participants were mostly concentrated on the previously selected relevant parts. One of the most notable changes could be observed in connection with Alice’s Phase Two guided summary writing processes. During Phase One she started her process with reading and interpreting the source text and identifying

keywords and relevant pieces of information without consulting the instruction first. Furthermore, she started writing her guided summary without taking any notes (besides underlining parts of the source text) or without creating a first draft. Similarly to Ben, she also frequently went back to the source text to re-read the more complex parts several times (13 out of the 45 coded segments in her protocol referred to re-reading and attempting to interpret the source text in Hungarian); for example, she returned to the second paragraph of the source text altogether three times.

In contrast, her Phase Two think aloud showed a more planned and disciplined approach to guided summary writing. She began with reading the task and formulating a guiding question, which seemed to indeed control her information processing. Next, she started to read the source text and interpret it paragraph-by-paragraph in her L1. When she reached the end of the first paragraph, she claimed: "well, I think there is nothing relevant in this part" (Alice). After reading the second paragraph, she immediately started to underline keywords and half sentences that she deemed relevant. After reading the full text in similar fashion, she only returned to the underlined parts during her second reading, copying out to a clean sheet of paper the content points she found. As the third step of her process, she paraphrased every content point and only started writing her guided summary afterwards. In contrast with her Phase One approach, during the composing phase in Phase Two, she consulted her rough draft of the paraphrased content points instead of the source text. This strategy also characterized the summary writing processes of most participants in Phase Two.

This disciplined and strategic approach to solving the guided summary writing task might suggest that their explicit knowledge of metacognitive reading and writing strategies

enabled the participants to process information more quickly and more effectively, and analyze the text on a global instead of a local level. This finding matches the results of the Pathway Project described by Olson and Land (2007): it seems to confirm the idea that reading and writing are cognitively similar skills that can be both effectively developed by explicit instruction in metacognitive information processing strategies (Olson & Land, 2007). In addition, the results also seem to be in agreement with Kintsch and van Dijk's study (1978): explicit instruction in metacognitive reading strategies appeared to help the participants in developing their skills of reading for specific purposes and in adhering to the rhetorical requirements of the task during the summary writing in the second phase. Despite some pieces of irrelevant information included into their final products, during Phase Two every participant managed to create rhetorically appropriate guided summaries that matched the rhetorical goal of the given task.

The differences between the participants' approaches to solving the task in Phase One and Phase Two also suggest the operation of similar underlying cognitive mechanisms as the ones described in the models of Bachman (2010) and Olson (2003). The results of Phase One and Phase Two appear to confirm that information processing relies on a combination of topical knowledge, language knowledge, and strategic knowledge (Bachman, 2010); and when participants were in possession of the necessary strategic competences, they were considerably more successful in information processing and production than previously. Similarly to the findings of previous research on summary writing (Baker & Brown, 1984; Block & Pressley, 2002; Langer & Applebee, 1986; Olson & Land, 2007; Paris, Lipson, & Wixon, 1983; Pressley, 2000), the major difference between successful and less successful guided summary writing originated from the

presence or absence of explicit declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge about the use of metacognitive reading and writing strategies.

4.1.3 The effect of language proficiency on text processing and text production skills

Comparing the analysed think aloud data of Phase One and Phase Two, the results seem to suggest that guided summary wiritng is a very complex and cognitively highly demanding task, which imposes difficulties on students regardless of their language proficiency level. During Phase One each one of the participants encountered similar problems in connection with text processing, and they seemed to apply similar strategies in order to overcome the difficulties created by the unfamiliar task. Furthermore, B2, C1, and C2 level students took roughly the same amount of time to complete the task, and their final written products did similarly not fit the content requirements of the given task.

In comparison, during Phase Two, each participant applied the same metacognitive strategies and executed the task along the lines of the same method. Moreover, regardless of their language proficiency level, each participant created a final written product, which more or less satisfied the requirements of the given task. The only noticeable difference might be that participants with higher language proficiency (for example, Cole and Chris) seemed to spend less time on composing the text, because paraphrasing appeared to impose less difficulty on them than on other participants both during Phase One and Phase Two. These results might suggest that above a level of language proficiency, effective text processing and production are more influenced by explicit instruction in metacognitive strategies and practice than by language proficiency, and that language proficiency does seem to affect paraphrasing.

4.2 Macrorule use

4.2.1 Phase One

Based on the process model of Kintsch and van Dijk (1978), in both phases of the data collection, the metacognitive strategies used by the participants with the purpose of text processing and text production were probably the manifestations of underlying macrorule use. Therefore, in order to gain further insight into the participants' information processing and summarization processes, the presence of a set of predetermined content points (CP) in the final guided summary products was analysed (for a list of the CPs, see Data analysis). The results are presented in the Table 2.1.

Table 2.1

Content points present in the final guided summaries written on Task A (Phase One)

	CP1	CP2	CP3	CP4	Pieces of irrelevant source text information included	Pieces of extra information included
Ben	I	—	—	I	3	1
Alice	—	D	√	—	2	2
Chris	I	D	√	—	3	0

Note. I = incomplete. D = distorted. Extra information means propositional content included in the summary that does not originate from the source text.

As it is shown in Table 2.1, all the participants, regardless of their language proficiency level struggled with finding the appropriate content points to include in their guided summary. For instance, Ben's final product appeared to be more like a global summary of the source text. Right from the introductory sentence, it was quite obvious that

his information processing was most probably governed by a schema of expository texts. Disregarding the requirements of the task possibly because he was unable to allocate cognitive resources to the superimposition of the guided summary task schema, instead of focusing on the activities students can do based on feedback, Ben summarized the text along the lines of its original rhetorical goals, and wrote about types of feedback and how and why teachers can give feedback to their students. This claim on his approach is also supported by his introductory sentence ("To begin with, there are several significant responsibilities that teachers have."), and by the fact that he included three pieces of irrelevant information into his 140 words long summary. Out of the four content points, he only found some parts of the first and the fourth one, because in a half sentence he mentioned that as a result of the teacher's feedback "students understand their mistakes about their writings", and even though he did not explain the exact advantage of the reflection page for the students, he did mention that "it's advisable to ask for a reflection page". The analyzed think aloud data, his notes, and the drafts all show that right from the beginning, Ben summarized the main points of the original text and focused on the teacher aspects presented, so finding some parts of CP1 (*important features*) and CP4 (*changes in a later revision*) might only be accidental, and not the result of conscious effort.

Similarly to Ben, Alice also wrote a global summary of the text. Her introductory sentence shows that her major concern was *why* teachers should provide feedback ("The task of teachers during the writing process is to give useful and informative feedback to student, so they can be more successful."). The only content point found and fully included is the third one; but CP2 (*identifying priority concerns for second draft*) in a distorted form also seems to appear. She did include that during group work students can identify the

major concerns they should focus on, but her summary of the relevant parts of the original text ("…they will write the second draft together, identifying the concerns") suggests that she read into the text that students write the second draft together, a piece of information that was not contained by the source text. Compared to Ben, she added fewer irrelevant ideas but more extra information in her written product, which suggests that she might have been misinterpreting the text and reading into it information that was not present.

Compared to Ben and Alice, Chris managed to find and include one full and an incomplete content point into his summary. His introductory sentence ("Eventually, any student might need professional feedback in their studies") suggests that during his summarization process he intended to focus on the student aspect of the text. However, his summary contains three pieces of irrelevant information referring to why teachers should provide feedback, instead of what students can do based on the feedback. This fact might suggest that the text comprehension and production of Chris, similarly to Ben and Alice, were highly influenced by his mental schema of expository texts, and during summarization, he attempted not only to summarize the required information but also to give a general overview of the whole source text.

Table 2.2

Content points present in the final guided summaries written on Task B (Phase One)

	CP1	CP2	CP3	CP4	CP5	CP6	Pieces of irrelevant information included	Pieces of extra information included
Brooke	–	√	D	I	I	I	2	0
Alex	√	I	–	D	I	D	2	1
Cole	–	I	D	√	D	√	2	0

Note. I = incomplete. D = distorted. Extra infromation means propositional content included in the summary that does not originate from the source text.

Participants who worked with the *Teaching online* text gave similar performance to the other group. Brooke did manage to focus during writing on the requirements of the guided summary task, but her written product is rather an example of a compare and contrast essay than a guided summary. Although she found one full content point and three incomplete ones in the text, she also included two irrelevant pieces of information which refer to e-learning in general, and one repetition, namely the restatement of CP2 (*time consuming and work-intensive*) presented as a new idea ("The first one is that it takes a lot of time for tutors to constantly update the courses, and it also takes a lot of effort. The other one concentrates on the amount of hours that tutors spend on running a successful online course").

Compared to Brooke, according to his notes and first draft, Alex initially managed to recognize at least some parts of almost all the content points except for CP3 (*institutions underestimate*). However, during the changes between the draft and the final product CP4 (*not time and place bound*) and CP6 (*feels good to develop*) became distorted. For instance, with regard to CP4, in his notes, he marked as an advantage of online teaching that teachers "can work from any location with Internet, at any time". However, by the time he had to handle CP4 in his first draft, the time element disappeared, and he only focused on the information about not being place bound: "The biggest advantage for the tutors is that they can put up new materials from any place that has Internet connection." The final version of his guided summary contained the exact same sentence. As for the structural requirements of guided summary, Alex's writing also showed more the characteristics of a compare and

contrast essay. Even though he did not segment his final product into separate paragraphs, he did include a two sentence introductory piece about online tutoring in general.

Compared to the other participants, Cole succeeded in finding and including two full and one incomplete content points into his final product. Although he seemed to find both CP3 and CP5 (*better skilled and better employment*) partially, durring paraphrasing the content points were severely distorted. Furthermore, he also included two irrelevant pieces of information (one about the extra financial expenses online tutoring means, which in the text is mentioned as a problem of the students and not of the teachers; and the other about the future of online teaching) and one repetiton of the informational content of CP2. Out of the six guided summaries written in Phase One, Cole's seems to be the most appropriately written in terms of the requirements of the task and the structure of the guided summary.

4.2.2 Phase Two

The data collected during the second phase was subjected to the same analysis as Phase One data. The findings of the analysis are presented in Table 3.1 and Table 3.2.

Table 3.1

Content points present in the final guided summaries of Task A (Phase Two)

	CP1	CP2	CP3	CP4	Pieces of irrelevant information included	Pieces of extra information included
Brooke	—	I	—	√	0	0
Alex	—	√	√	√	1	0
Cole	√	I	√	√	1	0

Note. I = incomplete. Extra infromation means propositional content included in the summary that does not originate from the source text.

According to the findings, all three participants working on Task A managed to find most of the content points. Most of them had difficulties with separating CP1 (*important features in rough draft*) from CP2 (*priority concerns in second draft*). For example, form Brooke's think aloud data it is visible that initially she recognized some parts of CP1 along with the full CP2, but during paraphrasing these separate meanings were lost, and probably because of the inadequate application of the construction rule, these two content points were merged together in the final version of the summary. Similarly, in Cole's case, the construction rule seems to cause difficulties because he chose to express CP1 with two sentences. Moreover, he also seems to focus more on the teacher's role in the different phases of the drafting process than on the activities students can do based on the feedback. This phenomenon might also be the cause of the information distortion in the reformulation of CP2.

Despite the few pieces of irrelevant information appearing in the summaries, participants visibly managed to stay focused on the task more than during Phase One, which shows that they were more successful in applying the task schema. The participants including extra information in this group were Alex, who included propositional content referring to the use of feedback in general, and Cole, who also wrote about what teachers can make students do before giving feedback on their final drafts.

Table 3.2

Content points present in the final guided summaries of Task B (Phase Two)

	CP1	CP2	CP3	CP4	CP5	CP6	Pieces of irrelevant information included	Pieces of extra information included
Ben	√	I	I	√	—	—	0	2
Alice	I	√	D	√	D	—	0	1
Chris	I	√	I	√	I	—	0	0

Note. I = incomplete. D = distorted. Extra infromation means propositional content included in the summary that does not originate from the source text.

Participants working with Task B encountered similar dificulties to the other group. Based on their think alouds, initially they managed to find most of the relevant propositional content, but during paraphrasing and in-between the drafting phases some of the relevant content was lost. For instance, in each one of the final guided summaries CP5 was only partially reproduced, and the ideas of skill development and better employment opportunities were collapsed together. This might be caused either by the inappropriate application of the generalization rule or that of the deletion rule. Similarly, CP1 (*setting up the group*) and CP6 (*feels good to develop*) appeared to be highly problematic. The relevant informational content of CP6 always got deleted already at the beginning of the first drafting phases. As for CP1, both Ben and Chris needed two sentences to express the propositional content.

Similarly to the other group, Ben, Alice, and Chris also managed to add fewer extra pieces of information and no irrelevant ideas to their summaries. For example, even though he could not find CP6, Chris managed to avoid including any irrelevant or extra information into his summary.

4.2.3 Discussion

Comparing the pre- and post training performances of the students, it can be seen that all the participants show notable differences in their summarization skills and ability to use macrorules adequately. First of all, contrary to the first data collection occasion, in Phase Two, all the participants managed to recognize in the initial drafting phases at least parts of most content points. Moreover, they also seemed to be more skilled in wording these CPs accurately in their final written products. Secondly, the improvement of their ability to effectively use macrorules might also be inferred from the amount of irrelevant and extra informational content included in their writing. Contrary to the first occasion, in the second summary only two participants included additional content such as personal remarks, and they also included considerably less irrelevant information. In addition, the more successful use of macrorules and the inclusion of less irrelevant information imply that the participants' ability to think critically also improved considerably. Furthermore, during Phase One, most of the participants wrote more than one paragraph, and they appeared to be strongly influenced by the rhetorical structure of the source text, producing compare and contrast and argumentative essays reflecting the topic and the genre of the source text. In contrast, during Phase Two each participant managed to adhere more closely to the requirements of guided summary writing. The improvements in the structure and in the effectiveness of the ability to paraphrase information suggest that practice and explicit instruction did indeed have a positive and distinct influence on the guided summary writing abilities of the participants.

Although all the participants show notable improvement in their macrorule use and guided summary writing skills, the most conspicuous change can be seen in the summaries

of Ben. His first summary writing process was noticeably determined by his internal schematic structure of expository texts; thus his written product became a compare and contrast essay. In comparison, his second product fits perfectly the requirements of the task; it is a single paragraph, focusing on the rhetorical goal assigned by the instruction. He also managed to reduce the number of irrelevant pieces of propositional content from three to zero, and to recognize and to fully and accurately include CP1 (a content point requiring the correct use of the construction rule) into his final product.

Similar improvements can be observed in the cases of Brooke, Alice and Alex. They all managed to reduce the amount of irrelevant and extra information included as well as the accuracy of presenting the content points. In the first phase, all of them lost a large amount of relevant source text content because of unsuccessful paraphrasing and ineffective use of even lower level macro-operations, like deletion; whereas, in their second summaries these instances were considerably fewer. For instance, Alex's first summary is a perfect example of how lack of practice in paraphrasing can ruin the end product, even if the relevant propositional content is initially found. It is visible from his think aloud, his notes and first draft that he finds CP6 (*feels good to develop*) , as well as the complete CP2 (*time consuming and work-intensive*), CP4 (*not time and place bound*) and CP5 (*better skilled and better employement opportunities*), but because of ineffective paraphrasing, parts of the relevant content disappeared or became distorted in the final version.

Taking this into consideration, it might be concluded, that higher language proficiency does not necessarily result in more successful macrorule use. For instance, even Chris and Cole, the C2 level participants struggled with the application of higher level macrorules as much as the B2 level participants during their first summaries. However, the

fact that Cole manages to preserve more informational content in his final summary than any other participant, might suggest that language proficiency could have an influence on paraphrasing skills.

The findings also match the suggestions of Brown and Day (1983), Johns (1985), and Kintsch and van Dijk (1978): the use of higher order macrorules, that is generalization and construction rule, cause major difficulties even for university students. With regard to construction rule, it could be most adequately measured through the presence of functional topic sentences and the succesful realization of content points, such as CP1 (*setting up the group*) of task B, which had to be assembled from partial propositional content present in different paragraphs. The results are slightly controversial, given that CP1 of task B was only fully realized by two participants during the whole data collection process (by Alex in Phase One, and by Ben in Phase Two). In contrast, while in Phase One only the summaries of Brooke and Alex featured functional topic sentences, by the end of Phase Two ech summary contained fully functional topic sentences. This result could suggest that despite the fact that higher level macrorules seem to impose difficulties even on the students with very high language proficiency levels, after receiving explicit instruction in the topic, each of them managed to master the use of construction rule to some extent. However, the results also seem to suggest that the creation of a functional topic sentence with the help of the construction rule might be less challenging than the realization of a content point with the help of the same macrorule.

4.3 The linguistic realization of the written guided summaries

The examination of the metacognitive strategy use and the analysis of the macrorule use provided insight into the complexity of the cognitive mechanisms underlying guided summary writing. However, the rhetorical features and linguistic requirements of the task are equally important. Therefore, in order to investigate the rhetorical aspects and linguistic complexity of the guided summary products of first year EFL learner English major BA students, the final written guided summaries of the participants from both Phase One and Phase Two were subjected to linguistic analysis. The analysis was carried out based on a set of analytical categories, such as Rhetorical features, Content, and Linguistic realisation. For the detailed list and rating scale, see Appendix E.

The first category, Rhetorical features examines the presence of the topic sentence, signal phrase, and concluding sentence, and whether the written product was constructed as a single paragraph or not. The topic sentences and concluding sentences were evaluated based on their presence and functionality. The three descriptors belonging to the category were present and functional, present and not functional, and absent. In the written guided summaries collected during Phase One only two had fully functional topic sentences and only one of them contained a functional concluding sentence. Furthermore, stucturewise, out of the six writen products only one was edited as a single paragraph (Alice's summary), and none of them contained the necessary signal phrase (neither the author nor the year of publication of the source text were mentioned; therefore, each was an instance of plagiarism).

With regard to the role of language proficiency, it does not seem to have considerable effect on the presence or absence of the therorical features. Regardless of their

proficiency level, in Phase One participants produced guided summaries which did not contain functional topic and concluding sentences. Of the C2 level participants, Cole's summary contained a present but not functional concluding sentence and no topic sentence at all whereas Chris's guided summary contained a non-functional topic sentence and no concluding sentence. The C1 level guided summaries fited the rhetorical requirements slightly more, because Alice's summary had both a present but non-functional topic and concluding sentence; while Alex's summary contained a fully functional topic sentence but no concluding sentence. Similarly to them, the B2 level participants showed diverse results: Ben's summary contained a present but not functional topic sentence and had no concluding sentence whereas despite her lower language proficiency, Brooke's summary achieved the highest score in the category of rhetorical features because it contained both a fully functional topic and concluding sentence.

Compared to the written products of Phase One, the summaries of Phase Two fully corespond to the rhetorical requirements of written guided summaries, except for Ben's, which in the signal phrase only included the author of the source text and the year of publishing is absent. These results seem to suggest that the presence or absence of necessary rhetorical features is influenced rather by the presence or absence of explicit instruction on the topic of guided summary writing than by the students' level of language proficiency. The absence of the rhetorical features in the pre-training summaries might be explained by the participants' lack of familiarity with the rhetorical features of summaries and acadamic writing in general.

The second category investigated by the linguistic analysis considered the Linguistic realisation of the pre- and post-training written guided summaries. This category

examined coherence and cohesion, punctuation, grammar, vocabulary, paraphrasing, style, and lenght (i.e., the participants' ability to express themselves succinctly). Coherence and cohesion were evaluated based on the criteria of a summary being both coherent and cohesive, being either coherent or cohesive, and being neither coherent nor cohesive; while punctuation, grammar, and vocabulary were assessed based on percentages (for detailed information, see Appendix E.). Style was awarded 2 points if it matched the requirement of formal, semi-formal, or neutral style of academic writing. Mixed style and completely informal style were given 1 and 0 points respectively because they do not meet the stylistic requirements of an academic text. In addition, the appropriateness of length (*yes* or *no* categories) and the success of paraphrasing were also considered, few matches or no matches being the desired outcome.

The initial hypothesis of the linguistic analysis was that language proficiency must have a prominent influence on the category of Linguistic realization of the final written guided summaries. This expectation was only partially met. Considering punctuation, the summaries of higher proficiency level students seem to meet the requirements better in Phase One. For instance, the punctuation of the summaries written by Alice, Chris, and Cole were slightly more correct than the punctuation of those written by Ben, Brooke, and Alex. Contrariwise, in case of style, for instance, the summaries of Chris (C2) and Alice (C1) indeed met the requirements perfectly, while the writings of Ben (B2) and Brooke (B2) were written in a mixed style; but a consistent pattern cannot be considered, because Cole's summary (C2) also displays the sings of mixed formal and informal features, and Alex's summary (C1) was written fully in an informal style. Similarly, grammar, coherence and cohesion, vocabulary, length or paraphrasing show no particular pattern regarding

language proficiency level. Moreover, in Phase Two all the guided summaries met every linguistic requirement of the task perfectly. Therefore, the results appear to suggest, that even though initially language proficiency might have an influence on certain aspects of the linguistic realization, with the help of targeted training in academic writing and explicit instruction about guided summary writing these possible effects can be completely counterbalanced. Helping participants become aware of and able to control the task schema seemed to free up cognitive resources for language form.

5. Conclusion

The aim of the current research was to explore the metacognitive and linguistic aspects of the guided summary writing processes of first year EFL BA students with different levels of English language proficiency prior to and following explicit training in guided summary writing. In order to investigate the issue, metacognitive think aloud protocols and semi-formal interviews were carried out with the participants, and in addition to the audio recorded data, written notes, drafts, and finalized written guided summaries were also collected from them. This thesis attempted to investigate the aforementioned phenomena with close attention to how metacognitive strategies and macrorules were used by the participants during the pre- and post-training phases of the data collection. Moreover, the linguistic features of the final written guided summaries and the possible effect of language proficiency on the guided summary writing processes were also examined.

In connection with the first research question, the results of the current study suggest that the conscious application of metacognitive reading strategies can provide a

highly beneficial aid for students during the execution of a reading-into-writing tasks. Considering the fact that during the first phase of the data collection procedure students appeared to rely on a bottom-up local reading method instead of a top-down more global approach, the results seem to suggest that formal instruction in metacognitive text comprehension and production strategies should be part of the teaching curriculum.

Regarding macrorule use, compared to the first data set, the summaries produced in Phase Two show that during the first semester all the participants became better skilled in guided summary writing. Regardless of their language proficiency level, all students included less irrelevant or extra information in their final products than in the first phase of data collection. Furthermore, they all managed to find content points more accurately than before, and their final written products all fit to the structural requirements and expected content of the guided summary task.

As for the linguistic aspects of the written guided summaries, similarly to macrorule use, explicit instruction on the linguistic and structural requirements of guided summaries appear to have a notably beneficial effect. During Phase One, regardeless of the language proficiency of the participant, none of the written guided summaries managed to fully to meet the structural, stylistic and linguistic requirements of the task; whereas in Phase Two all the guided summaries fulfilled these criteria almost perfectly.

Based on the results, language proficiency does not seem to play an important role either in the use of metacognitive strategies in general or in macrorule use. Initially, most of the participants were highly influenced by their internal schematic structures and processed information and produced summaries according to these schemata; whereas, during the second data collection, they all managed to produce guided summaries that were

appropriate both in terms of content and structure. They seem to have managed to recognise and effectively apply the task schema, performing the goal readjustment described by Kintsch and van Dijk (1978). Moreover, during Phase One, regardless of their language proficiency levels, students seemed to rely more on a bottom-up text processing approach than on the conscious application of metacognitive text processing strategies. Therefore, practice and instruction in guided summary writing seem to be required for the improvement of guided summary writing skills regardless of the students' levels of language proficiency. However, language proficiency appeared to play an important role in the effectiveness of paraphrasing because students with higher language proficiency were more successful in accurately reformulating and preserving the meaning of propositional content throughout the different phases of the summarization process.

The results of the current study appear to confirm the findings of previous research. Summary writing is a highly complex process and even guided summary writing, which theoretically should be less challenging than global summary writing because of the clearly defined task schema or rhetorical goal, imposes great difficulties on students. Even high language proficiency does not seem to compensate for the lack of instruction, practice and familiarity with the guided summary writing task. Thus, the processes involved in the completion of a guided summary writing task are most probably not inherent automatic abilities of students, but a skill that seems to impove considerably by practice. Furthermore, explicit training seems to have a beneficial effect on the developement of summarization skills.

6. Pedagogical implications

The ability to summarize information is an essential skill in both academic and non-academic context. Because it involves complex underlying cognitive and metacognitive text processing mechanisms, summary writing not only enhances the cognitive abilities and critical thinking of the students, as shown by the improvements in the quality of summaries found in the Second Phase, but it is also a reliable method of assessing the level of text comprehension and the students' abilities to successfully manipulate linguistic information.

The results of the current study suggest that direct training in guided summary writing and explicit instruction regarding the metacognitive reading and writing strategies can considerably improve the information processing and summarization skills of the students. Consequently, the development of summarization skills should be purposefully targeted given that making guided summary writing part of the high school and early tertiary curriculum might lead to improvement in students' abilities of information processing, critical reading and thinking.

7. Limitations and further research

The current study is a small scale qualitative research featuring only six participants, so the outcomes are not generalizable. Large-scale data collection and analysis of metacognitive strategy use and the realization of macrorule use in guided summary writing might prove to be helpful but not wide-spread as earlier research shows. Moreover, only the linguistic analysis was done by two researchers and the think aloud data was double coded only by the thesis writer, so the coding of a second researcher might offer a different point of view and improve the outcomes. Lastly, this study is not an intervention

study because the data collection context did not allow for the use of a control group in a standard treatment, no treatment or placebo group constellation. Carrying out a proper intervention study in the topic might result with more insights into the cognitive and metacognitive processes underlying guided summary writing.

References

Bachman, L., & Palmer, A. (2010). *Language assessment in practice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Baker, L., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Metacognitive skills and reading. In P. D. Pearson, M. Kamil, R. Barr & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 1, pp. 353–394). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Bean, T. W., & Steewyck, F. L. (1984). The effect of three forms of summarization instruction on sixth graders' summary writing and comprehension. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *16*(4), 297–306.

Block, C. C., & Pressley, M. (2002). Comprehension instruction: Research-based instruction. New York, NY: Guilford.

Bowles, M. (2010). The think-aloud controversy in second language research. New York, NY: Routledge.

Brown, A., & Day, J. (1983). Macrorules for summarizing texts: The development of expertise. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, *22*, 1–14.

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

Flavell, J. H. (1971). First discussant's comments: What is memory development the development of? *Human Development*, *14*, 272–78.

Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. S. (1981). Identifying the organization of writing processes. In L. W. Gregg & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing* (pp. 3–30). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hill, M. (1991). Writing summaries promotes thinking and learning across the curriculum: But why are they so difficult to write? *Journal of Reading*, *10*, 536–539.

IEAS. State exam topics / BA programme. (n.d.). Retrieved January 5, 2015, from IEAS http://ieas.unideb.hu/index.php?p=207&l=en

Johns, A. M. (1985). Summary protocols of "underprepared" and "adept" university students: Replication and distortions of the original. *Language Learning*, *35*, 495–517.

Johns, A. M. (1988). Reading for summarizing: An approach to text orientation and processing. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, *4*, 79–90.

Kintsch, W., & Dijk, T. (1978). Toward a model of text comprehension and production. *Psychological Review*, 363–394.

Langer, A. J., & Applebee, A. N. (1986). Reading and writing instruction: Toward a theory of teaching and learning. In E. Z. Rothkopf (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (Vol. 13, pp. 171–197). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Mateos, M., Martin, E., Villalón, R., & Luna, M. (2008). Reading and writing to learn in secondary education: Online processing activity and written products in summarizing and synthesizing tasks. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, *21*, 675–697.

Olson, C. B. (2003). The reading/writing connection: Strategies for teaching and learning in the secondary classroom. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Olson, C. B., & Land, R. (2007). A cognitive strategies approach to reading and writing instruction for English language learners in secondary school. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *41*(3), 269–303.

Paris, S. G., Lipson, M. Y., & Wixon, K. K. (1983). Becoming a strategic reader. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *8*, 293–316.

Paris, S. G., Wasik, B. A., & Turner, J. C. (1991). The development of strategic readers. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*, (Vol. 2, pp. 609–640). New York, NY: Longman.

Phakiti, A. (2003). A closer look at the relationship of cognitive and metacognitive strategy use to EFL reading achievement test performance. *Language Testing*, *20*(1), 26–56.

Plakans, L. (2009). Discourse synthesis in integrated second language writing assessment. *Language Testing*, *26*(4), 561–587.

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* (Vol. 3, pp. 545–561). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Purpura, J. E. (1997). An analysis of the relationships between test-takers' cognitive and metacognitive strategy use and second language test performance. *Language Learning*, *47*, 289–325.

Purpura, J. E. (1998). Investigating the effects of strategy use and second language test performance with high- and low-ability test-takers: A structural equation modeling approach. *Language Testing*, *15*, 333–379.

Purpura, J. E. (1999). Learner strategy use and performance on language tests: A structural equation modeling approach. Cambridge, UK: University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and Cambridge University Press.

Renkema J. (2004). Introduction to discourse studies. Amsterdam & Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Rose, M. St. (2001). In defence of summarization. *College of The Bahamas Research Journal*, *10*, 29–34.

SEAS. Requirements. (n.d.). Retrieved September 26, 2014, from Seas Wiki http://seaswiki.elte.hu/studies/BA/major/graduation/thesis/requirements

Tankó, Gy. (2013). *Paraphrasing, summarising and synthesising skills for academic writers: Theory and practice*. Budapest: Eötvös University Press.

Tierney, R. J., & Pearson, P. D. (1983). Toward a composing model of reading. *Language Arts, 60*, 568–580.

Tompkins, G. E. (1997). Literacy for the 21st century: A balanced approach. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Yang, L., & Shi, L. (2003). Exploring six MBA students' summary writing by introspection. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *2*, 165–192.

Winograd, P. N. (1984). Strategic difficulties in summarizing texts. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *19*, 404–425.

Appendix A.

Metacognitive think aloud training practice task

Alkoss az alábbi összekevert szavakból az összes szó felhasználásával egy értelmes és nyelvtanilag helyes angol mondatot. Közben amennyire lehet, kérlek, verbalizáld minden gondolatodat úgy, mintha megpróbálnál végigvezetni engem a megoldási folyamaton. Gondolataidat angolul vagy magyarul is verbalizálhatod. Kérlek, használd azt a nyelvet, amelyiken a gondolat megfogalmazódik a fejedben.

bundle doorstep that same immediately truly Jane Ricky flowers her on her of When just loved realized she that and she him found the loves a

When Jane found a bundle of flowers on her doorstep, she immediately realized that Rick truly loves her, and that she loved him just the same.

Appendix B.

Table 4

Readability formulas

Responding to student writing	Teaching Online
Flesch-Kincaid Reading Ease – 34.4	Flesch-Kincaid Reading Ease – 41.1
Average Grade Level ─ 15.2	Average Grade Level ─ 14.9

Appendix C.

Samples of final written guided summary products

Ben – Phase One

To begin with, there are several significant responsibilities that teachers have. They need to assist students in a helpful and informative manner, for instance, throughout feedbacks, which not only need to adjust to the mentor's purposes but also must consider the student's development.

Certain methods exist to increase the students' chances of complete the task, like brainstorming, giving topics that students fancy or name places where they can acquire information.

It's also important to take into account the first draft that individuals create. In this way, teachers have an opportunity of helping students understand their mistakes about their writings. As a result, the second draft might consists more information.

Finally, mentors can have their feedbacks both instructional and evaluation on the final draft. It's advisable to ask for a reflection page too, which summarizes their experiences while doing their assignment.

Ben – Phase Two

According to Hockly and Dudeney, online teaching has both advantages and disadvantages. The first benefit is that teaching online can take place at various times and places. Furthermore, the importance of online tutoring is a result of the increasing popularity of e-learning. As for the disadvantages, the first one is that creating a group takes up more time virtually than it would take in person-to-person teaching. Secondly, not

only the likelihood of being misled by the text is high, but also preparations for the lesson needs more time. Finally, the prestige of teaching online is not at its peak. In conclusion, e-learning has several beneficial and less advantageous features.

Alex – Phase One

Online tutoring, a new method for tutors, is not so different from the traditional tutoring. Most of the time the only significant difference is, that the learners meet not so often. As most things, online tutoring has its own advantages and disadvantages, too. The biggest advantage for the tutors is that they can put up new materials from any place that has Internet connection. Another great advantage is that tutors who teach online can learn new skills and develop themselves rewardingly. On the other hand one of the biggest disadvantages is that teachers must sacrifice a lot from their time to create the online material, if they don't have it yet. Secondly, in online tutoring it's harder to achieve the same relationships than in a traditional group. Unfortunately some institutions consider it as a cheap method, but nowadays their numbers are decreasing.

Alex – Phase Two

According to Grabe and Kaplan (1996), there are several activities students can do based on the feedback they got from the teacher on their first and final drafts. Firstly, they can organize information in many ways, and they can search for more information in numerous places as well. Secondly, students can join their classmates to discuss in groups the mistakes in their first drafts which should be given attention in their further written texts. Finally, students are given the chance to list on a reflection page their writing experiences,

the teacher's feedback and the possible improvements they want to make in later assignments. To sum it up, students can do different activities based on the feedback they got from the teacher on their first and final drafts.

Chris – Phase One

Eventually, any student might need professional feedback in their studies. So, their mentors can give advice concerning where to locate more information. Also, they can engender creativity via class discussions and teamwork. Additional methods of organizing acquired info are helpful as well. On the other hand, peers can also be asked to offer feedback as in their own mistakes or opinions. Working in conjunction with one's fellows, one can bring the most commonly encountered issues to the fore, thereby alerting the teacher that some specifics have yet to be discussed.

As for the final draft, some additional feedback might still be needed. For instance, a student can write a retrospective evaluation of their past work, thereby recalling their erstwhile problems and why they were problematic.

Chris – Phase Two

According to Hockly and Dudeney (2005), online teaching entails a number of benefits and difficulties for teachers of online courses. On the one hand, it is a very demanding task, requiring a great deal of effort, money, creativity and diligence. One must also imitate a lifelike relationship with one's students, lest they feel isolated from the course. Since teaching online is regarded as inferior to conventional courses, online tutors might be placed under great pressure because they must run a course within a limited time frame. On

the other hand, one can teach wherever and whenever one wants. It is also a way of furthering one's professional career. To conclude, teaching online is both advantageous and difficult for tutors.

Appendix D.

Semi-formal interview questions

Phase One

1. How old are you?
2. When did you start learning English?
3. What other foreign languages do you speak?
4. What are your previous experiences with academic writing?
5. Have you ever written a guided summary?

Phase Two

1. How many guided summaries did you write during the semester?
2. Please tell me about your experiences with guided summary writing in this semester.

Appendix E.

Analytical categories

Descriptor		Points	Awarded
Rhetorical features			
Topic sentence:	present and functional	2	
	present & not functional	1	
	absent	0	
Concluding sentence:	present and functional	2	
	present & not functional	1	
	absent	0	
One paragraph:	yes	1	
	no	0	

Signal phrase:	author AND year	2	
	author OR year	1	
	absent	0	
Content			
Content points:	included – complete	2	
	included – incomplete	1	
	included – distorted	0	
	not included	0	
Added information:	evaluative comments	-1	
	irrelevant source text content	-1	
	repeated content	-1	
Linguistic realisation			
Coherence & cohesion:	coherent **and** cohesive	2	
	coherent **or** cohesive	1	
	not coherent and not cohesive	0	
Punctuation[1]:	mostly correct	2	
	average	1	
	mostly incorrect	0	
Grammar[1]:	mostly correct	2	
	average	1	
	mostly incorrect	0	
Vocabulary[1, 2]:	mostly correct	2	
	average	1	
	mostly incorrect	0	
Paraphrasing:	few/no matches	2	
	some matches	1	
	several matches	0	
	quoted content	-1	
Style:	formal/semi-formal/neutral	2	
	mixed formal & informal	1	
	informal	0	
Length:	yes	1	
	no	0	
SCORE			

[1] mostly correct (67-100%); average (34-66%); mostly incorrect (0-33%)
[2] spelling included

Appendix F.

An example of a coded segment

Ben – Phase One

Rendben. Elolvasom a feladatot, ugyanis abból fogok rájönni, hogy miről kell írnom.**[planning content in L1]** Write a paragraph of százharminc words, plusz minusz tíz százalék. **[reading the task instruction]** Ez már nekem fontos, gyakori problémám az, hogy többet írok **[reflecting on own writing skills],** úgyhogy felírom magamnak a lapra, hogy maximum egy szárnegyven szót írhatok **[taking notes].** A másik a minuszjelet nem írom fel, mert az az az a nem szokott előfordulni **[reflecting on own writing skills]**, de ugye ha esetleg úgy alakul majd akkor azt is tudom majd ebből követni **[planning for later editing].** In which you summarize in your own words the activity students can do based on feedback they get from the teacher on their first and final drafts, which are discussed in the reading passage below **[reading the task instruction]**. Rendben, elolvasom újra ezt a részét mert… mert ebből tudok majd címet adni meg ebből fogom az egész…az egészet felépíteni és tudni, hogy miről szól a szöveg **[planning content in L1].** Szóval, the activities students can do based on feedback **[re-reading the task instruction].** A feedback szó az azt jelenti, hogy forrást ad, forrást adva **[interpreting the source text]**…öööe…de itt…de itt van a definíció…comments learners receive from their teachers **[reading the source text],** tehát a tanári, öööe…tanári…a tanári véleményt jelenti **[speculating about the meaning of a lexical item].**

Appendix G.

Coding scheme

1. **Processing**
    - Reading/re-reading the source text
    - Reading/re-reading the task instruction
    - Interpreting the source text – *making sense of the text*
    - Interpreting the task instruction – *making sense of the instructions*
    - Speculating about the meaning of a lexical item – *trying to guess the meaning of a word from the context*
2. **Planning**
    - Planning content in L1 – *conceptualizing ideas in Hungarian*
    - Planning content in L2 – *conceptualizing ideas in English*
    - Taking notes – *underlining relevant parts in the text and writing down keywords*
    - Considering stylistic issues – *planning the stylistic aspects of the summary*
    - Planning structure – *considering the structural aspects of the summary*
    - Planning for later editing – *comments about future changes in the summary*
    - Checking text length – *considering the number of words*
    - Formulating a guiding question – *creating a guiding question from the relevant parts of the task instructions*
    - Re-reading own notes
    - Forgetting necessary English lexical item – *forgetting a word that the participant previously considered using*
    - Planning language – *considering the use of particular words or structures*
3. **Composing**
    - Verbalizing own writing – *saying out loud what they are writing at that moment*
    - Justifying own composing decision – *explaining the rational behind writing decisions*

- Translating own ideas from L1 to L2 – *conceptualizing an idea in Hungarian first, and then translating it into English*
- Spelling difficult words – *spelling word letter-by-letter while writing them down*
- Avoiding the use of unfamiliar language – *avoiding the use of unfamiliar words, expressions, and structures*
- Attempting to avoid plagiarism – *actions taken in order to avoid word-for-word copying*
- Copying (word-for-word form the source text) – *borrowing parts of the source text word-for-word*
- Looking for a lexical item – *searching for the appropriate word or expression*
- Positive self-talk – *motivating themselves with encouraging remarks*

4. Self-monitoring

- Re-reading own writing – *the participant reads through the text created so far*
- Editing own writing – *changing words, phrases, or structures*
- Checking spelling and orthography – *reviewing the text and correcting punctuation*

5. Self-reflection

- Personal comments on the issue presented in the text – *expressing personal opinion about the topic of the source text*
- Reflecting on own writing/processing skills – *the participant is commenting on his or her own writing abilities or writing habits*
- Meta-comments on writing in general – *general remarks about writing as a process*