



Journal of Academic Writing
Vol. 1 No 1 Autumn 2011, 191–205

Japanese and Taiwanese University Students' Summaries: A Comparison of Perceptions of Summary Writing

Masumi Ono
University of Essex, UK

Abstract

The study investigated Japanese and Taiwanese postgraduate students' perceptions of summary writing. Eight Japanese and eight Taiwanese students who speak English as a Foreign Language (EFL) at a university in England participated in the summary writing task in English, questionnaires, and follow-up interviews. The questionnaire and interview data were analysed in terms of (a) students' background knowledge on summarising and (b) educational background regarding experiences of summarisation and summary writing instruction taught in classes. The results revealed that the Japanese and Taiwanese students shared similar opinions on definitions of summary writing. The students in both groups tended to be self-taught in L1 summarisation due to little L1 summary writing instruction. ESL/EFL writing teachers should note that students from different countries may have culture-specific summary writing conventions and that students from the same country may have different summarisation experiences and perceptions of textual features.

Introduction

Contrastive rhetoric research has developed across languages in different genres cross-culturally and interculturally. Though it is subject to controversy and warnings (e.g., Canagarajah 2002, Casanave 2004, Kubota 1998, 1999, and 2001, Leki 1991 and Zamel 1997), the notion of 'culture' has been given attention (e.g., Atkinson 2002, Holliday 1999 and Scollon 1997), to establish a new conceptual term 'intercultural rhetoric' (Connor, 2008: 313). In cross-cultural writing research 'the complexity and hybridity of culture' (Spack' 1997: 768) ought to be reflected. Connor (2003) argues that researchers should take into account both cultural and individual factors in contrastive rhetoric research. This view sees writers as members of cultural groups but also as individuals belonging to social groups.

Corresponding to diverse writing-related circumstances, research methods have also been developed. Not only organisational patterns in written products but linguistic, cultural and educational factors can also be considered (Matsuda and Atkinson 2008). A broader view regarding students' L1/L2 writing backgrounds and careful consideration to individual differences seems necessary when assessing whether certain rhetorical features are culture-dependent. The link between rhetorical features and related factors, such as writers' educational and cultural background, can also be an important research focus.

Among task-based writing, little research has been conducted on summary writing in contrastive rhetoric studies although a body of work exists on summary and abstract writing (e.g., Hartely 2003), L1 summarisation strategies (Brown and Day 1983 and Winograd 1984), L2 summary writing operations (Johns and Mayes 1990, Ohno 2005 and 2007, and Ono 2008), L1 and L2 writers' paraphrasing skills (Keck 2006), and the effect of summary writing instruction (e.g., Hare and Borchardt 1984, Rinehart, Stahl and Erickson 1986 and Taylor and Beach 1984). As an example of contrastive rhetoric research on summarisation, Yang and Shi (2003) investigated six native Chinese and English speakers' summary writing strategies using a think-aloud summary task and retrospective interviews. The results revealed that the participants' writing experiences and previous working experiences were significantly related to summarisation strategies and that culturally specific

tendencies were not found in summary writing. This suggests that non-native English speakers, if their L2 proficiency has reached a sufficient level for the task, do not necessarily perform less effectively in summary writing than do native English speakers.

Writing pedagogy in different educational systems has been investigated cross-culturally (e.g., Petrić 2007). For instance, educational backgrounds in Japan and China have been documented; however, the amount of research which offers a comparison between Japan and Taiwan in terms of writing traditions and instruction is scarce. Liebman (1992) looked at Japanese and Arabic speakers' perceptions about L1 instruction in questionnaire-based research, and found that Japanese rhetorical instruction tended to focus on grammar and that Japanese high school students received little L1 writing training. As for Japanese L1 writing conventions, Kobayashi and Rinnert (2001 and 2002) report that Japanese high school students receive relatively little L1 instruction on essay organisation in classrooms and that they experience 'very little writing of any kind' (Kobayashi and Rinnert 2002: 105). Due to insufficient L1 composing instruction throughout academic contexts, Japanese students' knowledge of writing can be called self-taught (Casanave 1998).

In their investigation of Chinese writing contexts, Mohan and Lo (1985) found that English composition instruction in Hong Kong was oriented to sentence-level instruction such as grammatical accuracy and that a deductive organisational style has been favoured in Chinese writing instruction. It was also suggested that structure of composition is a developmental factor. Although the findings have provided an insight into Chinese instruction it is not clear whether Chinese-speaking countries, such as China, Taiwan and Hong Kong, all share this trend. Nor is it certain what kinds of summary instruction, if any, are provided. In addition, no study has, to our knowledge, explored students' perceptions of summary writing cross-culturally. Therefore, the study aims to investigate Japanese and Taiwanese students' perceptions of summary writing in a British university context and their related educational backgrounds. The research question is whether there are any differences between Japanese and Taiwanese students in terms of their perceptions of summary writing.

Method

Participants

Sixteen Japanese and Taiwanese postgraduate students in the Department of Language and Linguistics at the University of Essex in the United Kingdom (UK) volunteered as the research participants. They consisted of:

- eight native Japanese-speaking students from Japan; there were four PhD students and four master's degree students
- eight native Chinese-speaking students from Taiwan; there was one PhD student and seven master's degree students.

Among the sixteen participants, fourteen were female and two were male, and the length of residence in the UK varied from eight months to six years and one month. The participants' English proficiency was above IELTS 5.5 or TOEFL CBT 213, which reached the departmental language requirement for postgraduate students. Although the number of PhD and master's degree students in the Japanese and Taiwanese groups was different, all were considered capable of pursuing the PhD or master's programme in which they were enrolled. They also shared some common educational experiences, having received primary and secondary education in their home country, either in Japan or Taiwan, where L1 was dominantly used at school. It is likely that the students' perceptions of summary writing are shaped based on the educational and cultural background in their home countries and their studying-abroad experiences in the UK; a range of variables, which do not necessarily have to do with their English proficiency level or academic status (PhD or master's), may affect the way they perceive summarisation and writing conventions in L1 and English. The study primarily intends to draw a picture of diverse perceptions from a cross-cultural point of view. For convenience, the participants were identified as J1–8 in the case of the Japanese students and T1–8 in the case of the Taiwanese. All the data collected through the study were used with the consent of the participants according to the ethical guidelines of the university where the research was conducted.

Research instruments and procedures

Mixed methods were used and involved three research instruments: a summary writing task, questionnaires and interviews.

For the summary writing task, the expository text entitled *Paper Recycling*, which was used in Singhasiri (2001), was selected (see Appendix 1). The passage consisted of 577 words, and the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level and the Flesch Reading Ease, which indicates the readability of the text, were 12.0 and 38.7, respectively (cf., Keck, 2006). The Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level 12.0 means the most difficult level, a level that seems appropriate for students in twelfth grade or above.

The questionnaires used in Singhasiri (2001) and Yang and Shi (2003) were modified for our study, and new questions were added, to create a four-part questionnaire (see Appendix 2). Three postgraduate students piloted this modified questionnaire to check that the questions were appropriate.

1. Questions in Part 1 ask the students' opinions about the summary writing task.
2. Part 2 deals with self-evaluation of the summary product quality.
3. Part 3 asks background knowledge on summarising and covers:
 - a. definitions of summarising
 - b. features of a good summary
 - c. typical mistakes of summaries.
4. Part 4 requests personal information:
 - a. educational background regarding experiences of summarisation
 - b. students' opinions about the process of summarising and the structure of summaries
 - c. students' opinions about summary writing instruction.

Follow-up interviews were unstructured as their role was to supplement answers in the questionnaire, to obtain additional and detailed information about the answers, and to correct responses if participants made mistakes in the questionnaire.

All the procedures of the investigation were monitored by the author. In the phase of the summary task, the participants were provided with the materials of the summary writing task, which included a two-page booklet and scrap paper for taking notes and writing first and final drafts. The participants were allowed, if they needed, to use a dictionary, mark the text, take notes, and refer back to the text during the summary task. Written summaries, notes and drafts were collected after the summary task and a five-page booklet of the questionnaire was given to the participants. As for the follow-up interviews, three Taiwanese participants (T2, T3, and T4) and five Japanese participants (J1, J2, J3, J6, and J7) participated independently, and all the interviews were recorded. The interviews, which took 15 to 25 minutes, were basically conducted in English, whilst three Japanese students responded in Japanese.

For the questionnaire data, content analysis was conducted toward open-ended questions and the number and percentage of each response were compared between the Japanese and the Taiwanese groups using Fisher's exact test. Other types of questions, such as yes/no questions were principally analysed by using the independent sample *t* test. The interview data were transcribed and analysed qualitatively, and some data were translated from Japanese to English. Although mistakes in grammar and spelling in the questionnaires and interviews made by the participants were corrected by the author, the participants' intentions and responses were essentially reflected in the analysis.

Results and Discussion

The analysis of the written summary protocols is covered elsewhere (Ono 2008); questionnaire and interview responses are the focus of the present study. Among the questions in the questionnaire, 1) students' background knowledge on summarising, 2) educational background related to summary writing, 3) students' opinions about process of summarising and the structure of summaries, and 4) students' opinions about summary writing instruction were analysed. Table 1 presents the participants' definitions of summarising.

Table 1: Participants' definitions of summarising

Responses	Japanese (<i>n</i> = 8)	Taiwanese (<i>n</i> = 8)	Sig. (two-tailed)
Finding the main ideas from the text	87.5	100.0	1.000
Paraphrasing	50.0	50.0	1.000
Writing in a compact way	50.0	50.0	1.000
Writing in a logical and clear way	37.5	0.0	0.200
Deleting unnecessary details	12.5	12.5	1.000
Using a different structure from the original text	0.0	12.5	1.000

The two groups of participants gave similar responses; Fisher's exact test showed no significant differences in each group of responses. Finding the main ideas from the original text was the most frequently given response (Japanese: 87.5%; Taiwanese: 100%), suggesting this aspect is the most important in summary writing. Paraphrasing and writing in a compact way were also frequently cited: half of the Japanese and Taiwanese students pointed to these aspects. However, writing in a logical and clear way was perceived by only the Japanese group (37.5%), whilst using a different structure from the original text was the response only of the Taiwanese (12.5%).

Table 2 shows the participants' opinions of the features of a good summary. The most frequent response by both groups is covering the main ideas and concepts (Japanese: 100%; Taiwanese: 62.5%). This indicates the considerable importance of including the central ideas in a successful summary. In the Taiwanese group, being concise is the second most frequent response (62.5%). The Japanese group, on the other hand, perceived being clear (62.5%) as more important than being concise (37.5%).

Table 2: Participants' opinions on the features of a good summary

Responses	Japanese (<i>n</i> = 8)	Taiwanese (<i>n</i> = 8)	Sig. (two-tailed)
Covering the main ideas and concepts	100.0	62.5	0.200
Being concise	37.5	62.5	0.619
Being clear	62.5	0.0	0.026*
Using a different structure from the original text	0.0	50.0	0.077
Paraphrasing	25.0	37.5	1.000
Deleting details	12.5	12.5	1.000

Note: **p* < .05.

It should be emphasised that a significant difference was found between the two groups in the aspect of being clear ($p = .026$). In other words, clarity of summaries was highlighted by the Japanese, suggesting a clear and logical way of writing is desirable. However, the Taiwanese group seem to pay more attention to the structure of summaries; only the Taiwanese group noted using a different structure from the original text (50.0%) which is near significant ($p = .077$) between the two groups. It is also worth noting that both groups shared the idea about the importance of paraphrasing (Japanese: 25.0%; Taiwanese: 37.5%). T4 described the importance of using one's own words in summarising:

Sentence structure [of a good summary] is not too similar to the original text. If you just refer to the original text, it seems like you just copied from the original text and it gives an impression that you plagiarized.

Paraphrasing and rearranging the structure are regarded as crucial. Understanding of plagiarism should also be highlighted in summary writing as well as in academic writing in general in order to prevent writers from copying information from the original. Students' prior experiences of summary writing are provided in Table 3.

Table 3: Experiences of summary writing in L1 and L2

Type of summary writing	Group	<i>M</i> (%)	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Sig.</i> (two-tailed)
L1 → L1	J	87.5	0.354	0.607	0.554
	T	75.0	0.463		
L1 → L2	J	25.0	0.463	0.000	1.000
	T	25.0	0.463		
L2 → L2	J	87.5	0.354	0.607	0.554
	T	75.0	0.463		
L2 → L1	J	50.0	0.535	1.655	0.124
	T	12.5	0.354		

Note: J stands for Japanese and T stands for Taiwanese. L1→L1 means that reading a text written in L1 (Japanese/Chinese) and writing a summary in L1. L1→L2 means reading a text written in L1 and writing a summary in L2 (English). L2→L2 means reading a text written in English and writing a summary in English. L2→L1 means reading a text written in English and writing a summary in L1.

A *t* test indicated no significant differences between the Japanese and Taiwanese students in terms of experiences of four types of summarisation. As shown in Table 3, L1→L1 and L2→L2 types of summary writing are frequently experienced by both groups; both Japanese and Taiwanese participants experience L1→L1 and L2→L2 types more frequently than L1→L2 and L2→L1 types. In relation to types of summary writing, individual students' frequency of summarisation experience was also asked in the questionnaire. It turned out that each student had a different frequency of summary writing despite the same L1 background.

Students' opinions about the process of summarising and the structure of summaries varied from student to student even within the same L1 group. Regarding the process of L1/L2 summary writing, J5, J4 and J6 described the difficulty of L2 summarisation.

[A]s a non-native speaker of English, writing a summary in English is more difficult because of my limited vocabulary (J5).

In English [...] if the sentence is complicated and difficult to understand, I translate it into Japanese first and summarise in English (J4).

When I use English, I have to put lot more energy and sometimes I need a dictionary and corpus (J6).

It seems that the limited vocabulary increases the difficulties of L2 summary writing and requires extra effort and strategies, which are not necessarily used in L1 summarising. As for the structure of written texts to be summarised, J3 and J5 talked about the features of English and Japanese texts.

English has a clear structure of a paragraph such as topic sentence, supporting sentence etc., but in Japanese it is not so clear (J3).

In Japanese writing, the conclusion or the main concept comes at the end whereas it comes at the beginning in English. The structure might be different (J5).

English texts are seen as clearer than Japanese ones in terms of structure. In addition, the textual organisation is differentiated between the two languages. The students' awareness of textual features, namely, the existence of topic sentences and the location of the important information, seem to serve a vital role in helping students pick out the main points and comprehend the text. From a different perspective, T7 pointed out the different structure of summaries in English and Chinese in relation to language proficiency: 'In Chinese, I can easily organise the summary structure in the way I like. But in English, the structure is limited by my English proficiency' (T7).

Language proficiency seems to affect the structure of summaries to some extent. While relatively low L2 proficiency makes it difficult to rearrange the structure, L1 allows the summarisers to manipulate the summary structure freely with effective language use. This implies that the summary structure is a developmental factor, which is in agreement with the suggestion of Mohan and Lo (1985). Furthermore, T2 and T4 referred to the feature of Chinese summary conventions as follows:

In Chinese, summary writing is very brief. It's a kind of introduction. After summary writing, we usually explain our own thought (T2).

In Chinese, we usually write summaries in one paragraph or a few sentences. We rarely count how many words you wrote. However, in English, we will count words, and you have to write down the main ideas of each paragraph (T4).

Chinese summaries are likely to be shorter than English summaries and the combination of summaries and personal impressions about the text seem to characterise Chinese writing conventions, which may be culture-dependent.

Table 4 shows the students' experiences of summary writing instruction in L1 and L2. Fisher's exact test indicated no significant difference between the two groups. The students in both groups have experienced little L1 summary instruction (Japanese: 12.5%; Taiwanese: 12.5%) whilst they have received more L2 summary instruction (Japanese: 62.5%; Taiwanese: 50%). The lack of L1 summary instruction in both Japan and Taiwan should be emphasised as a negative tendency in writing circumstances in spite of the importance of summary writing skills being required in academic contexts.

Table 4: Learning Experiences of Summary Writing in L1 and English

Summary Type	Japanese (<i>n</i> = 8)	Taiwanese (<i>n</i> = 8)	Sig. (two-tailed)
L1(Japanese/Chinese)	12.5	12.5	1.000
English	62.5	50.0	1.000
L1 and English	25.0	25.0	1.000
'I have not been taught'	0.0	12.5	1.000

This result supports Kobayashi and Rinnert (2002), who revealed that Japanese students receive little L1 writing instruction in classes. Despite most of the Japanese and Taiwanese students studying both L1 and L2 summary writing (see Table 3), they have not received sufficient L1 summary instruction. The students' summary writing experience without teachers' guidance is regarded as self-taught, as Casanave (1998) points out. In other words, the Japanese and Taiwanese students seem to write L1 summaries without adequate instruction from teachers in classroom settings.

Compared to L1 summary instruction, L2 summary instruction tends to be provided more often in classes. The students' opinions about teachers' L2 summary instruction revealed that the most common instructions in both groups were finding the main ideas in the text (Japanese: 62.5%; Taiwanese: 37.5%) and paraphrasing (Japanese: 62.5%; Taiwanese: 37.5%). However, little instruction was provided in constructing the structure of summaries, which suggests that the Japanese and Taiwanese students did not seem to explicitly learn the structure of summaries. Due to the lack of L1 summary instruction, the process of L1 summary writing and written summaries may be affected by L2 summary instruction and prior experiences of L1/L2 summarisation. It is assumed that the students may apply L2 summary instruction to L1 summary writing intentionally or unintentionally as transferable operations.

Conclusion

The findings indicated that there were more similarities than differences in the students' background knowledge on summarisation, experiences of summary writing, and instruction on summarising between the Japanese and Taiwanese groups. Both groups perceived that finding the main ideas and paraphrasing are crucial in summary writing, whilst clarity of summaries was emphasised by the Japanese group. With regard to the students' perceptions of L1/L2 summary writing in terms of the process, the difficulties of L2 summarisation seem attributable to insufficient L2 proficiency. A limited L2 vocabulary also seems to restrict summarisers' abilities to rearrange the structure of summaries, which suggests that the structure of L2 summary can be regarded as a developmental factor rather than a cultural factor. Another finding was that the Japanese noted different textual features of Japanese and English texts to be summarised whereas the Taiwanese perceived that Chinese summary conventions were different from English ones. Although the students in both groups have experienced L1 and L2 summaries, amounts of summarisation experience differed from student to student. In addition, the students have received little L1 summarisation instruction, which implies that L1 summary writing is predominantly self-taught due to the lack of L1 instruction in Japan and Taiwan.

As pedagogical implications of the research, ESL/EFL writing teachers should note the following three points:

1. despite the same L1 background, different students have varying amounts of summarisation experience
2. students may not have received enough summary writing instruction in their home country in either L1 or L2

3. students from different countries seem to have different culture-dependent writing conventions.

Therefore, teachers need to become as conscious as possible of textual features of a target language, as well as students' L1, in order to teach textual structure and raise students' awareness of rhetorical features. This seems helpful for students in becoming conscious of language-specific features of written discourse across languages in different genres. In teaching L2 summary writing, teachers should check students' L2 proficiency, summary writing experiences and skills. They should also give students appropriate summarisation training with their explicit instruction, according to individual students' needs.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Bojana Petrić and two anonymous reviewers for their feedback on an early version of this paper.

References

- Atkinson, D. (2002) 'Writing and Culture in the Post-process Era'. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 12, 49–63
- Brown, A. L., and Day, J. D. (1983) 'Macrorules for Summarizing Texts: The Development of Expertise'. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 22, 1–14
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2002) *Critical Academic Writing and Multilingual Students*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press
- Casanave, C. P. (1998) 'Transitions: The Balancing Act of Bilingual Academics'. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 7, 175–203
- Casanave, C. P. (2004) *Controversies in Second Language Writing: Dilemmas and Decisions in Research and Introduction*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press
- Connor, U. (2003) 'Changing Currents in Contrastive Rhetoric: Implications for Teaching and Research'. in *Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing*. ed. by Kroll, B. Cambridge: Cambridge of University Press, 218–241
- Connor, U. (2008). 'Mapping Multidimensional Aspects of Research: Reaching to Intercultural Rhetoric'. in *Contrastive Rhetoric: Reaching Intercultural Rhetoric*. ed. by Connor, U., Nagelhout, E. and Rozycki, W. V. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 299–315
- Hare, V. C., and Borchardt, K. M. (1984) 'Direct Instruction of Summarization Skills'. *Reading Research Quarterly* 20, 62–78
- Hartley, J. (2003) 'Improving the Clarity of Journal Abstracts in Psychology: The Case for Structure'. *Science Communication* 24, 366–379
- Holliday, A. (1999) 'Small Cultures'. *Applied Linguistics* 20, 237–264
- Johns, A. and Mayes, P. (1990) 'An Analysis of Summary Protocols of University ESL Students'. *Applied Linguistics* 11, 253–271
- Keck, C. (2006) 'The Use of Paraphrase in Summary Writing: A Comparison of L1 and L2 Writers'. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 15, 261–278
- Kobayashi, H. and Rinnert, C. (2001) *The Role of Academic Writing in Higher Education in Japan: Current Status and Future Perspectives*. Report for the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, Research Grant No. 11680263. Hiroshima: Hiroshima University, Faculty of Integrated Arts and Science
- Kobayashi, H. and Rinnert, C. (2002) 'High School Student Perceptions of First Language Literacy Instruction: Implications for Second Language Writing'. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 11, 91–116
- Kubota, R. (1998) 'An Investigation of L1-L2 Transfer in Writing among Japanese University Students: Implications for Contrastive Rhetoric'. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 7, 69–100
- Kubota, R. (1999) 'Japanese Cultures Constructed by Discourses: Implications for Applied Linguistics Research and ELT'. *TESOL Quarterly* 33, 9–35
- Kubota, R. (2001) 'Discursive Construction of the Images of US Classrooms'. *TESOL Quarterly* 35, 9–37
- Leki, I. (1991) 'Twenty-five Years of Contrastive Rhetoric: Text Analysis and Writing Pedagogies'. *TESOL Quarterly* 25, 123–143

- Liebman, J. D. (1992) 'Toward a New Contrastive Rhetoric: Differences between Arabic and Japanese Rhetoric Instruction'. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 1, 141–165
- Matsuda, P. K. and Atkinson, D. (2008) 'A Conversation on Contrastive Rhetoric: Dwight Atkinson and Paul Kei Matsuda Talk about Issues, Conceptualizations, and the Future of Contrastive Rhetoric'. in *Contrastive Rhetoric: Reaching Intercultural Rhetoric*. ed. by Connor, U., Nagelhout, E., and Rozycki, W. V. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 277–298
- Mohan, B. A. and Lo, W. A. (1985) 'Academic Writing and Chinese Students: Transfer and Developmental Factors'. *TESOL Quarterly* 19, 515–534
- Ohno, M. (2005) *Relationships between L2 Reading Proficiency and Applications of Macrorules in Summary Writing of Japanese High School Students*. Unpublished master's dissertation. Tsukuba: University of Tsukuba
- Ohno, M. (2007). 'Relationships between L2 Reading Proficiency and Applications of Macrorules in Summary Writing of Japanese High School Students'. *JABAET Journal* 11, 103–124
- Ono, M. (2008) *Japanese and Taiwanese University Students' Summaries: A Comparison of Applications of Operations, the Structure, and Perceptions of Summary Writing*. Unpublished Master's dissertation. Colchester: University of Essex.
- Petrić, B. (2007) "'This English Writing Thing": Students' Perceptions of their Writing Experiences at an English-medium University'. *Porta Linguarum* 7, 45–55
- Rinehart, S. D., Stahl, S. A., and Erickson, L. G. (1986) 'Some Effects of Summarization Training on Reading and Studying'. *Reading Research Quarterly* 21, 422–438
- Scollon, R. (1997) 'Contrastive Rhetoric, Contrastive Poetics, or Perhaps Something Else?'. *TESOL Quarterly* 31, 352–358
- Singhasiri, W. (2001) *The Effects of Reading and Writing Strategies on Summaries Written by Thai University Students*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Colchester: University of Essex
- Spack, R. (1997) 'The Rhetorical Construction of Multilingual Students'. *TESOL Quarterly* 31, 765–774
- Taylor, B. M. and Beach, R. W. (1984) 'The Effects of Text Structure Instruction on Middle-grade Students' Comprehension and Production of Expository Text'. *Reading Research Quarterly* 19, 132–146
- Winograd, P. N. (1984) 'Strategic Difficulties in Summarizing Texts'. *Reading Research Quarterly* 19, 404–425
- Yang, L. and Shi, L. (2003). 'Exploring Six MBA Students' Summary Writing by Introspection'. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 2, 165–192
- Zamel, V. (1997) 'Toward a Model of Transculturation'. *TESOL Quarterly* 31, 341–352

Appendix 1: A Summary Writing Task

Summary Writing Task

Instruction: Please read a passage on the next page very carefully and then write a summary in English within 60 minutes. The word limit of the summary is 170 ~ 210 words.

Notes:

1. You can use a dictionary.
2. You can write anything down on the text.
3. You can take notes if you need.
4. Please write a word count at the end of your summary.

Name: _____ Date: _____

Paper Recycling

Paper is different from other waste produce because it comes from a sustainable resource: trees. Unlike the minerals and oil used to make plastics and metals, trees are replaceable. Paper is also biodegradable, so it does not pose as much threat to the environment when it is discarded. While 45 out of every 100 tones of wood fibre used to make paper in Australia comes from waste paper, the rest comes directly from virgin fibre from forests and plantations. By world standards this is a good performance since the world-wide average is 33% waste paper. Governments have encouraged waste paper collection and sorting schemes and at the same time, the paper industry has responded by developing new recycling technologies that have paved the way for even greater utilisation of used fibre. As a result, industry's use of recycled fibres is expected to increase at twice the rate of virgin fibre over the coming years.

Already, waste paper constitutes 70% of paper used for packaging and advances in the technology required to remove ink from the paper have allowed a higher recycled content in newsprint and writing paper. To achieve the benefits of recycling, the community must also contribute. We need to accept a change in the quality of paper products; for example stationery may be less white and of a rougher texture. There also needs to be support from the community for waste paper collection programs. Not only do we need to make the paper available to collectors but it also needs to be separated into different types and sorted from contaminants such as staples, paperclips, string and other miscellaneous items.

There are technical limitations to the amount of paper which can be recycled and some paper products cannot be collected for re-use. These include paper in the form of books and permanent records, photographic paper and paper which is badly contaminated. The four most common sources of paper for recycling are factories and retail stores which gather large amounts of packaging material in which goods are delivered, also offices which have unwanted business documents and computer output, paper converters and printers and lastly households which discard newspapers and packaging material. The paper manufacturer pays a price for the paper and may also incur the collection cost.

Once collected, the paper has to be sorted by hand by people trained to recognise various types of paper. This is necessary because some types of paper can only be made from particular kinds of recycled fibre. The sorted paper then has to be repulped or mixed with water and broken down into its individual fibres. This mixture is called *stock* and may contain a wide variety of contaminating materials, particularly if it is made from mixed waste paper which has little sorting. Various machinery is used to remove other materials from the stock. After passing through the repulping process, the fibres from printed waste paper are grey in colour because the printing ink has soaked into the individual fibres. This recycled material can only be used in products where the grey colour does not matter, such as cardboard boxes but if the grey colour is not acceptable, the fibres must be de-inked. This involves adding chemicals such as caustic soda or other alkalis, soaps and detergents, water-hardening agents such as calcium chloride, frothing agents and bleaching agents. Before the recycled fibres can be made into paper they must be refined or treated in such a way they bond together.
(577 words)

Appendix 2: A Questionnaire for Japanese Participants

Objectives: This questionnaire aims to investigate students' perception of summaries. It is not used for evaluating your ability but it aims to study how you learn to summarise. Please read the questions very carefully and answer them clearly as much as you can.

Instructions:

1. This questionnaire has 4 parts:
Part 1: Student's Opinions about the Passage
Part 2: Self-evaluation of the Summary Product Quality
Part 3: Background Knowledge on Summarising
Part 4: Personal Details
2. Please read and follow the instruction of each part very carefully.
3. Please answer every question and do it honestly.

Name: Date:

Part 1: Student's Opinions about the Passage

To what extent do you agree with the following statements? Please read each of them carefully and then rate it according to the scale below.

not at all = 1, a little = 2, somewhat = 3, much = 4, very much = 5

Passage Title: Paper Recycling

List of the Features of the Text	1	2	3	4	5
1. The text was long					
2. Vocabulary was difficult					
3. Sentence structure was difficult					
4. Organisation was complicated					
5. Concepts and ideas were complicated					
6. Concepts and ideas were familiar to me					
List of the Features of the Task	1	2	3	4	5
7. The task was difficult					
8. Finding the main ideas was difficult					
9. Paraphrasing was difficult					
10. Combining the information was difficult					
11. Structuring my own text (summary) was difficult					
12. Revising was difficult					

13. It was difficult to follow the word limit					
14. It was difficult to follow the time limit					
15. Summary writing is familiar to me					

Part 2: Self-evaluating on the Summary Product Quality

Please evaluate your summary by:

(1) Put a tick in brackets.

1.very poor 2. poor 3. fair 4. good 5.very good

(2) Then give your reasons why you rate yourself like that by giving strengths and weaknesses to your work.

Strengths	Weaknesses

Part 3: Background Knowledge on Summarising

1. Please define the word 'summarising', what does it mean in your opinion?

2. In your opinion, what are the features of a good summary?

3. What are typical mistakes in summary writing?

4. What are the purposes of summary writing? Please write all the purposes.

5. Have you ever written summaries before in the past?

Please put a tick in brackets below. You can choose more than one.

- 1. Yes, I have read a Japanese passage and summarised it in Japanese.
- 2. Yes, I have read a Japanese passage and summarised it in English.
- 3. Yes, I have read an English passage and summarised in English.
- 4. Yes, I have read an English passage and summarised in Japanese.
- 5. Never.

6. How many summaries approximately have you written in Japanese and English?

Please put a tick in a table below.

Language	Place	Frequency of writing summaries			
		0	1- 5	6 - 10	more than 10
Japanese	Elementary school				
	Junior high school				
	High school				
	University / College				
	Cram school				
English	Elementary school				
	Junior high school				
	High school				
	University / College				
	Cram school				
	Pre-sessional course at the University of Essex				

7. Is the process of summary writing in Japanese the same as that in English?
Please put a tick in brackets.

1. Yes. 2. No.

8. Please explain in what ways they are the same / different.

9. Is the structure of your summary in Japanese the same as that in English?
Please put a tick in brackets.

1. Yes. 2. No.

10. Please explain in what ways they are the same / different.

11. For what purposes have you written summaries? Please put a tick in brackets.
You can choose more than one.

- 1. As a test of comprehension of a text.
- 2. As a memory task after reading a text.
- 3. As an exercise of academic writing (e.g. paraphrasing).
- 4. For my learning purposes (for myself).
- 5. It was a requirement for the course.
- 6. Other

12. Have you been taught how to write summaries either in Japanese or in English?
Please put a tick in brackets below.

- 1. Yes, in Japanese.
- 2. Yes, in English.
- 3. Yes, both in Japanese and English.
- 4. No, I have not been taught.

13. Please describe briefly how the teacher taught you how to write summaries.

(1) In Japanese

(2) In English

Part 4: Personal Details

14. Please put a tick in brackets. 1. MA student 2. PhD student
If you are a PhD student, what year are you in?year

15. Gender: Please put a tick in brackets. 1. Male 2. Female

16. Age: Please put a tick in brackets.
 (1) 21-25 (2) 26-30 (3) 31-35 (4) 36-40 (5) 41-45 (6) 46-50

17. What is the highest degree which you have obtained in education?
(e.g., BA, BSc, MA, MSc)

18. Previous Occupation(s):

19. Years of working:

20. How many years have you learnt English in your home country?years

21. What kinds of text have you written in English? Please put a tick in brackets.
You can choose more than one.
 1. Essay 2. Journal article 3. Short story 4. Case report 5. Lab report 6. Letter
 7. E-mail 8. Diary 9. Dissertation 10. Research proposal 11. Other

22. English proficiency: Please write your score.
TOEFL: IELTS:

23. How long have you lived in England?years.....months

24. If you have other comments, please add below.

Thank you very much!