

Effects of Teaching Paraphrasing Skills to Students Learning Summary Writing in ESL

S. Chee Choy
Perak Branch Campus
Kolej Tunku Abdul Rahman College, Malaysia

Mun Yee Lee
Perak Branch Campus
Tunku Abdul Rahman College, Malaysia

Abstract

This study examines the effects of teaching paraphrasing skills to students of tertiary level on summary writing. Other studies have found that students have limited paraphrasing skills that they can use to help them complete a task. Other factors such as culture may also play a part. Twenty-two students of lower intermediate level of proficiency in English were used in the study. A piece of summary writing task requires critical thinking skills to produce effective and concise writing. The nature of the task is basically constructing a general conceptual framework from the analysis of the passage and synthesis of specific information from it. This study analyses perceptions of students when handling a summary writing and the awareness of their learning and thinking. Inquiry-based learning (IBL) is used as a strategy to encourage independent thinking when doing summary writing in the classroom. The students in the study found the skills taught to them useful, and they were able to apply them in a limited way. However, the results from the study indicated that the skills did not help the students equally. Students' perception of their confidence in their learning abilities and the task assigned may not accurately reflect their paraphrasing skills.

One of the main problems faced by students learning English as a second language (ESL) is their inability to paraphrase passages. This has effectively hindered their writing skills and ability to express themselves (Ismail & Maasum, 2009). This project hopes to highlight students' perception of the skills taught to them and whether these skills actually helped them become better at paraphrasing.

Summary writing is an important skill for students to learn in ESL. This allows them to paraphrase and summarize what they have read at the same time interpreting what they have understood from the passage. This is an important exercise to enhancing their comprehension skills. Summary writing is perceived

as a challenging task for most students with limited vocabulary. Hood (2008) noted that the process of changing wording seems to be complex when students have to present the same meaning in some other way. Therefore, identifying key concepts of the materials and applying skills of paraphrasing sentence structures to make the end product a precisely condensed summary reflecting the same emphasis is difficult for them. Studies in this area suggest that approaching the process of paraphrasing using a stepwise metacognitive structure (Kirkland & Saunders, 1991) may be effective. However, when relating this to the importance of students becoming aware of how they think, the stepwise process seems prescriptive at best. Further to this, Choy and Cheah (2009) noted in their research that it is important that students learn to begin evolving their thinking process using the higher levels of Blooms taxonomy, that is, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.

In the model of development in reflective thinking (Hamilton, 2002), an area that is critical for reflective thinking is awareness of how one learns. This is the process where individuals reflect on their concepts and misconceptions, knowledge construction, and metacognition, where the individual is able to understand their own learning process. Learners who become reflective in their learning can control the learning process and become more effective learners (Sezer, 2008). Among students learning ESL, Orenella and Reynolds (2008) found that there was a cultural aspect in the manner in which these students learned paraphrasing. Students learning ESL seem to draw on their own native language which can result in the emergence of a hybrid language. It must also be pointed out that during paraphrasing tasks in classrooms students have difficulty putting the task into context as there is no obvious audience.

Teaching Paraphrasing Skills in Summary Writing

It must be noted that learning involves fundamentally three components: affective, behavioural, and cognitive (Sternberg & Williams, 2002). A majority of Malaysian classrooms emphasize the cognitive and behavioural components at the expense of the affective component of learning, which deals with individual awareness of learning (Choy & Cheah, 2009). Inquiry based-learning (IBL) is useful in creating this awareness of what they learn and how they learn (Choy and Oo, 2009). Teachers need to encourage them to be expressive in terms of their thinking and to be participative in the lesson through various strategies of IBL (Windschitl 2002). This requires planning, implementing, and evaluating the ESL lesson to take advantage of their background knowledge and to gradually lead students to be participative in the classroom. Other than that, the IBL also helps in scaffolding (Vygotsky 1978) the learning of a student so as to enable them to become proficient learners. Such an environment would also encourage collaborative learning (Oxford, 1997) where individuals learn by being part of their environment which helps them construct ideas and form new paradigms. This would in turn bring about reflective learning which is an important step towards learning the skills of paraphrasing. Hare and Borchardt (1984) noted that teachers when teaching summary writing tasks must ensure that students are able to take charge of their own writing tasks. As such, teachers must take the time to make explanations clear and model task-specific behaviours, as well as, coping behaviours.

As the sample we are using in this study consists of students from a multilingual society who are learning English as a second language, it is important to note that research has shown that it is imperative to use the language spoken by these students outside school and with their families as a tool and bridge to helping them learn and practice paraphrasing skills (Orellana & Reynolds, 2008). It is also important to keep in mind the importance of connecting the cultural influence on how students learn a language. As such, the learning of paraphrasing skills begins with summary writing. The initial stage of summary writing is planning, which includes goal setting, strategy selection, and core idea formulation (Kirkland and Saunders, 1991). The goal of the initial stage is to guide students to see a relationship between the text and the demand of the task. IBL sets in by first guiding students using the top down approach to identify key vocabulary terms through contextual clues that are essential for evaluating a passage. Not only do students have to comprehend and make sense of the passage, they have to make interrelationships between the text and the real world simultaneously (Carrell, 1984). Subsequently, questions are used to guide students to scan for significant key points to meet the demands of the writing task. This helps to organize a condensed representation of the relevant information from the passage given. Further to this, the grammatical correctness, word substitution, phrasal substitution with single words, and elimination of examples and irrelevant details are some of the paraphrasing skills in summarizing of points throughout the composing process. Furthermore, one of the deficiencies of the process might be students' focus on reflecting the subject matter. This could be far less than it is expected as students have shifted most of their attention to paraphrasing the readings (Durst, 1989). As a result, the effectiveness of paraphrasing may be strong; yet, it may cause students to lose sight of the requirement of the task.

Perin et al (2003) in their study on summary writing in college, found that students had difficulty finding the main points in the text. Many of these students tended to look for certain repeated words or phrases as indicator of importance which is often misleading. A majority of the students in this study reproduced sentences that were from the source text. There was no significant paraphrasing of the sentences. Further to this, it was found that students with prior knowledge about the topic they were reading were able to summarize the passage better than those without. Added to this, being ESL learners these students may have been taught how to speak the language orally at the expense of being able to effectively write English (Norris, 1970). This manner of teaching ESL has been a prevalent trend in schools. Keeping in view the various difficulties faced by students paraphrasing using English and learning ESL, the present study will attempt to study the effectiveness of teaching summary writing skills to these students.

The Present Study

In Malaysia students learn ESL, and certain universities and colleges use English as a medium of instruction. This has posed problems for students because they do not have adequate mastery of the language to easily paraphrase text. This has resulted in plagiarism, as well as, rote memorization passages (Ismail & Maasum, 2009). As such, many of these colleges and universities have designed English

courses emphasizing these skills. The need to enhance these skills is a must for most students in Malaysia unlike their counterparts in English speaking countries where it is in the form of remedial courses to be taken by some students that are not native speakers.

This study will highlight the perceptions students have when taught learning skills of summary writing. Little attention has been given to whether students perceived summary writing strategies taught to them as effective and whether they are able to apply them in writing. The two research questions (RQ) that underpin this study are:

RQ1. How do students perceive the effectiveness of the paraphrasing skills that were taught to them during their summary writing classes?

RQ2. Did the results from tests administered to the students reflect their perceptions?

The study was carried out using the qualitative approach where a sample of 22 students, who are enrolled in a two year diploma programme in a Malaysian institution of higher learning, was used. These students are currently in a compulsory English course. They were interviewed as a group after every class to obtain their feedback on the strategies that were taught. These students were encouraged to be vocal with their thoughts on the skills. The teacher teaching them, who was also part of the research team, conducted the interviews. The students had good rapport with their teacher and, as such, they had no hesitations voicing their opinions.

At the beginning of the study the students were given a choice to decline participation in the study and were also told that they would be assured anonymity. Those that participated were doing so on their own cognizance.

Method, Design and Procedure

Two tests were administered to each of the students in the sample, the *Myself as a Learner (MALS)* (Burden, 2000) and a teacher made test on summary writing. The *Myself as a Learner* test contains twenty statements relating to students' perceptions as learners and problem solvers. Students were required to choose one out of five possible responses ranging from (a) yes, definitely, to (e) no, definitely not, for each statement. Scores were allocated to each statement on a basis of 1(most negative) to 5(most positive). That is, response (a) received 5 points and response (e) received 1 point, except in cases of negatively worded statements where the scores would be reversed. The final MALS scores were interpreted based on the ten factors. These factors were enjoyment in problem solving, confidence (about work), confidence (about learning ability), taking care with work, (lack of) anxiety, access to and use of vocabulary in problem solving, confidence in dealing with new work, confidence in problem solving ability, verbal ability, and confidence in general ability. Each score obtained under each factor was calculated by adding the scores of different statements.

In the teacher made summary writing test, selections of the text were chosen keeping in mind both the external and internal constraints on the students. The external constraints were familiarity, complexity, and length of a passage.

Students' level of proficiency, background knowledge, and affective domain were the internal factors. Students were required to compose a summary of 50 words based on a 288-word passage within 30 minutes. The same test was used as the pre-test and post-test.

The first MALS was administered in Week 1 according to the academic semester calendar followed by the pre-summary writing test, which was given in Week 2. Students were then taught the paraphrasing strategies and summary writing skills for a total of 10 weeks. At the end of Week 10, they were given the two tests again to determine their progress in acquiring the strategies and skills that were taught to them and changes in their perceptions as learners, if any. After each lesson the students were interviewed as a group, and their statements were recorded and transcribed for further analysis.

The results obtained led to the use of the interpretive approach where total objectivity and neutrality of the analysis and interpretation of the data cannot be claimed. The statements made by students were read and re-read until common themes emerged. These themes were then analyzed so that topics could be grouped under a common category according to the degree of familiarity with the themes (Radnor, 2002). The results from the MALS were also analyzed using a frequency count of the scores obtained by the students for each category. They were then used to answer the research questions.

Results

RQ 1: How do students perceive the effectiveness of the paraphrasing skills that were taught to them during their summary writing classes?

Paraphrasing Skills are Difficult to Learn

All the students perceived that the paraphrasing skills were difficult to learn. This was indirectly expressed in their statements on the exercises given to enhance their paraphrasing skills. The students perceived that the exercises given were challenging for them to paraphrase; although, word cues were given in a separate section to help them along. For example, Student K commented:

The key words were given, but there were some of the sentences that I could not manage to change the structure even with the help of the words.

While Student A commented that he did not know which of the cue words given could be used to replace the original wording in the passage.

I do not know what word to replace with. Even with the help of the key words it was difficult.

Students also found difficulty in picking out the main idea from the passage. This is one of the main skills students have to learn. All the students felt that it was a challenge to paraphrase without altering the original meaning of the passage. For instance, Student S commented:

I did not know which sentences I needed to pick, and what was more difficult was to paraphrase the sentence without affecting its original meaning.

While Student S commented:

Unless guidance is given, I am not sure of the main points to pick in order to make a suitable summary.

The effectiveness of paraphrasing skills may be affected by the students' perception of the level of difficulty of the exercises given. Essentially, the exercises were tools used to help the students practice and use the skills that were taught. Students perceived that they needed to comprehend the passage first and then select the core ideas to paraphrase. This would seem to support the research done by Carrell (1984) who found that students have to comprehend and make sense of the task prior to scanning for significant key points to meet the demands of the writing task. Even though cues were given to help them complete the task, students still found it difficult to apply the skills.

It is interesting to note that even though the task set for the students was based on a stepwise process towards acquiring the skills needed for paraphrasing as suggested by Kirkland and Saunders (1991), and also used the strategies IBL as suggested by Windschitl (2002), students on the whole had difficulty applying the skills that were taught.

Paraphrasing Skills Are Helpful

Only 36% of the students found that the skills were helpful to them when paraphrasing without changing the meaning of the original sentence. According to the students, after several exercises of paraphrasing were given, they learned more on how to paraphrase. For example, Student G commented:

It is helpful for me to handle my summary writing task; although, I managed to try paraphrasing only some of the sentences.

Likewise, Student D commented:

I had improved in paraphrasing when I was doing the exercises. But I am still limited.

Student J noted that he found difficulties when he was doing the synonym exercises which were part of the skills intended to help with paraphrasing. He noted that limited vocabulary had disadvantaged him.

This part is difficult to manage because of my limited vocabulary; I could not think of any replacement words, so I could not complete the exercise. I do not know what I can do about this.

Paraphrasing Skills Are Not Helpful

Another 30% of the students did not find the paraphrasing skills useful, as they did not perceive any improvement when paraphrasing passages. For instance Student R commented:

I did not improve in my summary writing. I still do not know how to use the synonym skill to help me in my writing. I copied most of the sentences directly without using the skills that were taught.

When students paraphrase core points in a passage, the ability to use synonyms to express the points briefly is needed. In this task, which requires students to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information given, higher order thinking is needed. Students had difficulty performing the task even though some of them thought they perceived that the skills taught to them were useful. This would seem to support the research done by Choy and Cheah (2009) who found that students begin to evolve their thinking processes when using higher order thinking skills. Instead of copying from the original passage, students began using the paraphrasing skills they had learned, albeit with difficulty, to do the exercises. Hamilton (2002) noted that one critical area to developing higher order thinking was an awareness of how one learns, that is, strategizing how to learn, which could help students master the skill. Even though the responses of the students showed that they were aware that inadequate vocabulary hindered them when paraphrasing, they did not seem to know how to overcome this inadequacy as reflected in their answers.

Further to this, Perin et al (2003) noted that when doing summary writing many students tend to copy text from the passage thinking that it is important. They also used repeated words in the text as an indicator of importance. Students in the study also used similar strategies. This may be the reason students did not find the skills taught useful. They were not able to pick the important ideas from the passage and merely repeated the phrases which were unimportant.

Inadequate Practice of the Skills

All the students perceived that they needed more practice to enhance their paraphrasing skills. They perceived that with more practice, they could improve themselves in writing. However, they were not able to point to specific skills that they needed to practice in order to help them improve further. For instance, Student M commented:

I need more of such practice so that I can write a sentence in a different way.

Similarly, Student A said:

The paraphrasing exercises done in the class have helped me to apply it into any writing tasks, but I need more to improve my vocabulary and writing skill.

All students perceived that with more practice of the skill, they would improve in their writing. They were, however, not able to specify the skills they needed to practise. Further to this, students perceived that they needed to enhance not only their writing skills but also to improve their vocabulary. Increasing their vocabulary would help in their writing but not necessarily their paraphrasing. This seems to reflect the finding of Durst (1989) that students when practising paraphrasing were expected to reflect on the subject matter to help better comprehension and internalize the skills learned, but they tended to be more concerned with the paraphrasing process.

Confusion on How to Apply the Skill

Thirty-eight percent of the students were not able to apply paraphrasing skills into the summary writing test. They were confused about how to use the skills that were taught. This was reflected in what Student R said:

I did not improve in my summary writing. I did not know how to use the skills to help me in the summary given. Instead, I copied most of the sentences directly. I am confused whether the sentence is correct even after I have paraphrased that sentence. I am not sure whether the words I have used would have distorted the meaning of the sentence. This exercise is very difficult. I am very confused.

Student K also commented:

I need some clues to guide me in choosing the correct sentences to paraphrase. It does help when the teacher guides me to highlight the core ideas and later, how to paraphrase with the key words provided. It is easier for me to paraphrase a short paragraph. The vocabulary in the passage is difficult and to apply the technique is difficult.

Students perceived that they were confused with how to apply the paraphrasing skill when no keywords were provided. They would rather lift the sentences directly from the original passage than to paraphrase them. The confusion hindered them from taking risk when using the paraphrasing skills. This finding seemed to support the research done by Hood (2008) who found that the paraphrasing exercise could be a complex process of what seems to be a straightforward task. When students considered any paraphrasing necessary to emphasize the same meaning in some way, they were confused about how to use the skills because of the complexity involved in the process of paraphrasing. This finding did not support the research by Kirkland and Saunders (1991) who suggested that a stepwise metacognitive structure may be effective when teaching paraphrasing.

Students' Limited Vocabulary Influenced Effectiveness of Skills

All students perceived that the exercises on vocabulary substitution were challenging because of their limited vocabulary. The effectiveness of the paraphrasing skills may have been influenced by this as reflected by the comments of Student J:

The vocabulary substitution part was almost unmanageable. I could not think of any words to replace a phrase as my vocabulary is limited. That is why I do not know how to replace a phrase with a word to make the sentence more concise. In fact, I couldn't do most of the questions.

While Student Z commented:

I do not understand the meaning of the sentences; maybe my vocabulary is no enough.

Student H commented likewise:

Because of my poor vocabulary, I do not know how to paraphrase a sentence. Sometimes I chose to copy a sentence directly from the original passage as I was not able to paraphrase the sentence.

The poor vocabulary was a constraint for all of the students when paraphrasing. They perceived that the exercises on vocabulary substitution were difficult and could not do most of the questions. Students felt that they needed to identify and evaluate the core ideas using the key vocabulary terms before they could paraphrase. This seemed to support the research done by Kirkland and Saunders (1991) who found that identifying key vocabulary terms are essential for evaluating a passage. Further to this, some of the students may not have been able to relate the content of the passage to the real world which Carrell (1984) noted was important to effectively paraphrase a passage. As a result, students perceived that because of their limited vocabulary, they were not able to paraphrase.

RQ 2: Did the results from the tests administered to the students reflect their perceptions?

The results of the students' performances in the summary writing tests and MALS were grouped into three categories as follows:

1) Student with Improved Summary Writing and MALS Scores

	Average Summary Writing Score (%)	Average MALS Score									
		Factor									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Pre-test	55	14	15	12	6	6	5	6	3	3	6
Post test	65	17	17	15	7	6	6	6	3	3	7

Table 1: Students with improved summary writing and MALS scores

- Factor 1: Enjoyment in problem solving
- Factor 2: Confidence about schoolwork (Academic self-efficacy)
- Factor 3: Confidence about learning ability (Learning self-efficacy)
- Factor 4: Taking care with work
- Factor 5: Lack of anxiety
- Factor 6: Access to and use of vocabulary in problem-solving
- Factor 7: Confidence in dealing with new work

Factor 8: Confidence in problem solving ability

Factor 9: Verbal ability/fluency

Factor 10: Confidence in general ability

As shown on Table 1, there were 36% of students who performed better in their post test. This is reflected in the 36% of students who perceived that the paraphrasing skills taught were helpful. There was an improvement in their post test scores by 10%. This seems to show that students' perceptions of the usefulness of skills taught to them would be reflected in their ability to use it as an aid to summary writing.

The results of MALS showed that there were on average few changes with the exception of Factor 1 where there was an increase in their perception of enjoyment in problem solving and Factor 3 where student perceived they had increased their confidence in learning the skill. However, only 36% of the students interviewed perceived that the skills were helpful to them and that they had improved. This could be the influence of culture, in that, students may not totally comprehend what is being taught to them as they are learning ESL (Orellana & Reynolds, 2008), and they may not be aware that the skills had actually helped them because they were not reflective about how they learned as noted by Hamilton (2002). It would seem to suggest that by the end of the semester these students, to a certain extent, internalized the skills and were applying them which could possibly explain the greater confidence in their learning abilities and the new found enjoyment in doing the paraphrasing exercises as reflected in the results obtained. Further research would be needed to determine the levels of internalization of the skills they learned.

2) Students with Lower Summary Writing Scores and Improved MALS Scores

	Average Summary Writing Test Score (%)	Average MALS Score									
		Factor									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Pre-test	70	16	16	14	7	5	5	6	2	4	6
Post test	60	17	18	16	8	7	6	6	3	4	7

Table 2: Students without improvement in summary writing scores but improved MALS scores

Forty-one percent of the students did not show improvement in their summary writing post test, but there was improvement on average in their MALS score as shown on Table 2. Thirty percent of students perceived that the paraphrasing skills taught did not help them in their summary writing. This is reflected in the performance of students who obtained a lower score in the post test than the pretest. The decrease in scores was about 10% on average. This, again, suggests that perceptions of the usefulness of a skill would influence performance in their task.

The MALS scores of Factor 2, confidence about schoolwork, and Factor 3, confidence about learning ability, both showing aspects of self-efficacy, revealed the most increment among other factors. The students perceived that they had more confidence about the assigned exercises and their learning ability. Although

they perceived that they had more confidence, these perceptions did not translate into actual performance in their post test. It is also important to note that the MALS was a test to measure their perceptions about themselves as learners in general and not specifically about summary writing. It could be, after one semester of going through various courses, the students had learned more information, which in turn, increased their self-efficacy about what they were learning. However, this may not necessarily be true about their perception of summary writing.

3) Students with No Improvement in Their Summary Writing and MALS Scores

	Average Summary Writing Score (%)	Average MALS Score									
		Factor									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Pre-test	55	18	17	15	8	7	6	6	3	3	6
Post test	50	18	16	15	8	6	6	7	2	3	7

Table 3: Students without improvement in summary writing and MALS scores

Five students, or 23%, did not show improvement in either Summary Writing or MALS scores (Refer to Table 3). There was a decrease in their average scores by 5% in their post test. These students were the weakest, having the lowest score of the whole student sample.

These students perceived that they had less confidence about the assigned exercises and their problem solving abilities. The results, reflected in MALS, where students had less confidence about the assigned exercises and their problem solving abilities, could be the reasons for their poor performance in their post test. This group of students could be among the 38% of students who found the paraphrasing skills confusing and did not know how to apply them.

Conclusion

The paraphrasing skills did not seem to help all the students equally. Only 36% perceived they had benefited from learning the skills which was demonstrated in an improvement of their post test scores. Although 77% had improved MALS Scores, it cannot be concluded that this is the result of learning the paraphrasing skills, as other factors, such as students enhancing their self-efficacy as a result of their other courses, cannot be ruled out. In addition to this, the influence of the cultural context of the text passages cannot be ignored. Further studies have been carried out on this aspect but will be discussed in a future article.

The average Factor scores in MALS showed students had more confidence in their learning abilities and enjoyment of the tasks assigned to them. However, this was not reflected in the post test results. The results showed that only 42% of the students showed improvement. Students did not seem able to translate their perceived improved learning abilities into actual performance during the paraphrasing test. Other factors, such as examination anxiety and low self-efficacy towards performing a task, may also play a role; however, this was not established. As these students are learning ESL, it cannot be ruled out that culture played a part in influencing their performance when carrying out the

paraphrasing tasks (Orellana & Reynol, 2008). Their ability to comprehend the passage has not been investigated. Future studies may have to take into consideration the influence these factors may have on the performance of students.

Therefore, what students perceive of the assigned tasks and their learning abilities of the task may not be an accurate indicator of the actual performance. Since perception is the selection, organizing, and interpretation of input from the external environment, the actual manner in which these are processed has not been established. In this study we were only able to generalize the perceptions of students based on our interpretations of their test and MALS scores. This would explain why teaching paraphrasing skills may only be effective for some students when it comes to actual performance of the task. Although the study was conducted using IBL as the foremost strategy, the effectiveness could have been tainted by students' lack of command of the language. Further research needs to be carried out on how well students can learn the skills and retain them over a period of time. In addition, a study could be carried out on the effects of different teaching methodologies that could best be used for helping students. The limitations of this study must be noted in that the sample size was relatively small and confined to only one population, namely, Malaysia. However, it is hoped that the results obtained here may also be applicable to other similar situations.

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge the contribution of Frances A. Bryant to this paper.

References

- Anderson, V., & Hidi, S. (1988/1989). Teaching students to summarize. *Educational Leadership*, 46, 26-28.
- Burden, R. (2000). *Myself as a Learner Scale*. Berkshire: NFER-Nelson
- Carrell, P. L. (1984a). The effects of rhetorical organization on ESL readers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18(2), 441-469.
- Choy, S. C., & Cheah, P. K. (2009). Teacher perception of critical thinking among students and its influence on higher education. *International Journal of teaching and learning in Higher Education*, 20(2), 198-206.
- Choy, S. C., & Oo, P. S. (2009). Reflective thinking among teachers: A way of incorporating critical thinking in the classroom. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Durst, R. K. (1989). Monitoring processes in analytic and summary writing. *Written Communication*, 6(3), 340-363.
- Hamilton, S. J. (2005). *Development in Reflective Thinking*. Retrieved October 19, 2009, from [http://www.reap.ac.uk/reap07/portals/2/csl/trydy%20banta/Development in Reflection Thinking.pdf](http://www.reap.ac.uk/reap07/portals/2/csl/trydy%20banta/Development%20in%20Reflection%20Thinking.pdf)
- Hare, V. C., & Borchardt, K. M. (1984). Direct Instruction of Summarization Skills. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 20(1), 62-78.
- Hood, S. (2008). Linguistics and education: *An International Research Journal*, 19(4), 351-365.
- Ismail, S., & Maasum, N. R. (2009). The effects of cooperative learning in enhancing writing. *SOLLS.INTEC 09 International Conference*. Putrajaya, University Kebangsaan Malaysia
- Kirkland, M. R., & Saunders, M. A. (1991). Maximising student performance in summary writing: Managing cognitive load. *TESOL Quarterly*, 105-121.
- Norris, W. E. (1970). Teaching second language reading at the advanced level: Goals, techniques,

- and procedures. *TESOL Quarterly*, 4(1), 17-35
- Orellana, M. F., & Reynol, J. F. (2008). Cultural modeling: Leveraging bilingual skills for school paraphrasing tasks. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(1), 48-65.
- Oxford, R. L. (1997). Cooperative learning, collaborative learning, and interaction: Three communicative strands in the language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(4), 443-456.
- Perin, D., Keselman, A., & Monopoli, M. (2003). The academic writing of community college remedial students: Text and learner variables. *Higher Education*, 45(1), 19-42.
- Radnor, H. A. (2002). Researching your professional practice: *Doing interpretive research. Doing qualitative research in educational settings*. London: Open University Press
- Sezer, R. (2008). Integration of critical thinking skills into elementary school teacher education courses in mathematics. *Education*, 128(3), 349-362.
- Sternberg, R. J & Williams, W. M. (2002). *Educational Psychology*. Boston: Pearson Education Company.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*.
- Windschitl, M. (2002). Framing construction in practice as the negotiation of dilemmas, An analysis of the conceptual, pedagogical, cultural and political challenges facing teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 72, 131-175.
- Woolfolk, A. (2007). *Education Psychology*. London: Pearson Education International.

S. Chee Choy is an administrator and teacher training facilitator in an institute of higher learning and is currently attached to Tunku Abdul Rahman College. She is currently activity pursuing research in the areas of perceptions, attitudes, and reflective teaching.

Mun Yee Lee is teaching English language in Tunku Abdul Rahman College. She is currently actively participating in education research work. Her areas of interest are in language teaching and classroom management.