CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter will present an analysis of the data elicited through the resource tools and instruments described in Chapter Three as well as the findings of the study. As this study is mainly qualitative in nature, there will not be any reference to statistical tools of analysis. The data analysis is guided by the three research questions posed at the onset of this study, which are:

1. What are the problems encountered during the summarization process by the high and low proficiency pre-university students?

2. What are the productive and unproductive strategies used by pre-university students in summary-writing namely during the comprehension, condensation and production stages?

3. Are there differences in the selected productive and unproductive strategies used by the high and low proficiency pre-university students?

Firstly, the SILL questionnaire (see Section 3.3.3) was used as an initial tool to gather background information about the subjects' general strategy use in language learning prior to carrying out the study proper. Apart from using it for triangulation purpose, the data collected through the SILL questionnaire established by Oxford (1991), also provided an overview of students' preference and inclination for choice of language learning strategies.

Secondly, the students' written summary scripts were examined individually to discover the differences and similarities between high proficiency and low proficiency subjects in the use of a selected productive strategy (namely 'paraphrasing') and a selected unproductive strategy (namely 'copying'). This analysis was based on idea units. The results were obtained and presented through simple tabulations, extracts from students written summary scripts and percentages helped to address research question 3.

Thirdly, the Modified Think-Aloud-Protocols (MTAP) as described in Chapter 3 (Section 3.3.1) was used to gather data concerning summary writing problems and strategies. Although the problems and the strategies used to solve the problems were mentioned directly by the subjects in their individual interviews, the quality of the strategies, that is whether productive or unproductive was inferred by the researcher using a self-created data analysis instrument termed the Criteria Checklist described in Chapter 3 (Section 3.4.2). Therefore these instruments were jointly used to elicit and analyse the data that could answer research questions 1 and 2.

The data gathered via the different instruments mentioned above were studied individually to identify the issues that were prominent and relevant to the research. Then, those individual issues that were elicited from different instruments were put together so that a 'theme' or a common issue could be raised. Taking the MTAP interviews as the take-off point or the basis for analysis, the data gathered then went through a process of triangulation from the other instruments. Finally, the pattern that emerged was used to address the research questions.

Just like any other form of writing, summary-writing has its toll of problems especially in the ESL context. Every problem has a solution and as cognitive and social beings,

human beings are always trying to find solutions to problems. Similarly in relation to this study, strategy use is one of the solutions found in previous researches to solve the problems faced by ESL learners. There are also many empirical researches, theories, concepts and taxonomies developed to understand and apply strategies in a concerted effort to improve summary writing. This study, however, has attempted to look at the quality of the strategies used by ESL learners in summary-writing. In other words, the study tries to categorize these strategies as either productive or unproductive. This study has also attempted to study the differences in strategy use by high proficiency and low proficiency students.

This attempt to evaluate the strategies used has come about because although there is a tendency among ESL learners to use strategies when faced with problems in summary writing, seldom have these strategies been studied for their efficacy. The role or impact of language proficiency of ESL learners on the kind of strategies used is also a concern of this study.

4.2 Problems Faced in Summary Writing by High and Low Proficiency Students

Appendix B5 gives an overview of the kinds of problems faced by the subjects when faced with the task of writing a summary in English. The problems have been divided into three main categories namely text and task related, teacher related and learner related. One of the obvious patterns gleaned from Appendix B5 is that high proficiency students have reported more problems compared to the low proficiency students. Another interesting feature is that low proficiency students have nothing to say about teacher related problems unlike high proficiency students. One common pattern seen amongst both the high and low proficiency students is the awareness of their own shortcomings where language proficiency is concerned. Knowing the problems is

already a major step towards resolving the issue of ineffective summary-writing. Hence, Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 have listed down three categories of problems faced by ESL pre-university students in summary writing. A total of 43 problems have been raised by both high and low proficiency students, 30 problems by high group and 13 by low group respectively. Amongst the 30 by high group, 7 are text and task related, 9 are teacher related and 14 are learner related. On the other hand, the low proficiency subjects have raised 2 text and task related problems and 11 learner related problems. The low proficiency group did not raise any teacher related problem. All these will be described and discussed at greater length in the respective sections below.

4.2.1 Text/Task Related Problems

Understanding the text and or task is a common problem faced by many ESL writers and many studies have been carried out in both the L1 and L2 context to address this issue. However it remains a daunting problem in the ESL context.

In summary writing, comprehending the text and knowing exactly what the task requires are crucial factors that cannot be overlooked. To comprehend the text, the reader has to have a certain level of linguistic competence and prior knowledge on the subject matter. The reader should be able to analyze the text in order to extract the gist of the text. To analyze the text, the reader should be able to identify what is the thesis statement of the text before proceeding to identify the topic statements which carry the salient points. Prior to all these, the reader should be able to decipher the meaning of keywords in the given task and ascertain what exactly is required by the task. Once this is established, it is easier to look for the salient points. Any breakdown or problem at any part of this process will have a strong bearing on the quality of the summary

produced at the end. The problems are not only faced by low proficiency students but also by the higher proficiency students as the findings of this study show.

Table 4.1: Text /Task related Problems Faced by High & Low Proficiency Students

High Proficiency Students	Low Proficiency Students
1. Don't understand difficult words 2. Need to read 2-3 times before I could get a feel of the passage 3. When I try to paraphrase, sometimes it gets distorted depending on the difficulty of the passage 4. Long passages gets me tensed 5. Time limit is a problem during exams 6. New words are difficult to understand, hence I just copy 7. Have to guess content because no exposure in related field	1 Some parts of passage cannot understand at all because of difficult words 2 Time constraint –take too much time to understand passage. Thus I am stressed.

Table 4.1 above shows that both high and low proficiency students have expressed difficulty in understanding the text. These two groups of students encountered comprehension breakdown due to the level of difficulty of the given text. However, the high proficiency students mentioned more of word level difficulty while low proficiency students experienced text level difficulty. Another related problem highlighted by both groups of students is the time constraint factor whereby time given was not sufficient to read and understand text as there were many difficult words in the text. Therefore high proficiency students needed to read the text at least 2-3 times to understand it. Both groups also mentioned getting stressed when faced with comprehension difficulty. However, high proficiency students also commented that the accuracy of their paraphrasing depended on the difficulty of the text while low proficiency students did not mention anything about paraphrasing. High proficiency students also mentioned that they copied the text when they did not understand the meaning. In addition, high proficiency students also seem to be aware of the importance

of background knowledge or exposure in the related field in order to relate appropriately to the text.

4.2.2 Teacher Related Problems Faced by High and Low Proficiency Students

Teaching is mainly about guiding and facilitating learning, enabling the learner to learn, setting the conditions for learning. This means that the teacher has an influential role to play in the teaching-learning process. However, Wright (1987 cited in Dass 2003) believes that essentially, a teacher has two mutually supportive major roles in the classroom: the enabling or management function and the instructional function. Given that writing is generally perceived as difficult, the writing teacher's attitude towards, and the perception of students as writers, will affect their progress and success (Dass, 2003). In relation to that, the current study has explored to a small extent the effect or influence of teachers (how teachers affect their students' summary writing, from the students' point of view).

Table 4.2:Teacher Related Problems Faced By High and Low Proficiency Students

High Proficiency	Low Proficiency
1. Have not learnt the summary-writing skills so I struggled to write this summary 2. No proper instruction on how to do summary-writing by teachers 3. We don't really study paraphrasing from teachers 4. Can't remember learning any paraphrasing techniques at all. 5. Insufficient exercise given by teacher on summary writing 6. Insufficient guidance in reading skills 7. Teachers are not strict and consistent in follow-up with students on homework 8. Teachers take for granted that English-medium students don't need instruction and guidance in summary-writing 9. Wrong information from teachers (must have 10 content points)	(not reported) (not reported)

From Table 4.2, it can be observed that high proficiency students have reported more teacher-related problems compared to low proficiency students. In fact, low proficiency students have not mentioned any teacher-related problems. This is an interesting phenomenon because high proficiency students, being more confident and expressive are able to articulate their grievances about teachers unlike low proficiency students who lack that ability. It is also apparent from the table above that teachers do not teach students how to paraphrase. Besides that, students also complain that teachers do not guide them on reading skills and summary writing skills, hence contributing to their inability to summarize effectively.

Students also perceive teachers as not being serious about the homework that they give and according to students, teachers fail to follow-up regularly and do not give sufficient exercise on summary-writing. Students also reported that teachers sometimes provide wrong information such as the requirement that every summary should have 10 points, a notion applicable to the SPM level (Form Five) summary writing but not to the MUET level summary as the number of main points in a MUET summary varies from one text to another. The MUET and SPM summary marking schemes differ. (The data collected during this part of the study shows that by using the Modified Think Aloud Protocol (MTAP), the researcher has successfully unearthed issues and problems not directly asked in the semi-structured questionnaire or interview schedule.)

 In addition to all these, teachers also tend to overlook the need to provide even high proficiency students necessary instructions in summary writing in order to write effectively. Students have dejectedly mentioned that some teachers also take it for granted that high proficiency students do not need instruction and guidance in summary-writing. Students also mentioned that insufficient exercises are given for summary writing besides insufficient guidance in reading skills.

71

4.2.3 Learner Related Problems

We cannot deny the fact that English language proficiency in the ESL context is a major problem faced by L2 learners. In ESL summary writing, the L2 writer is not only challenged by the language proficiency issues or rather linguistic competency but also L1 to L2 transfer process issues on top of cultural differences issues which can amount to communicative competency . An L2 summarizer is not only required to comprehend the text well, identify the main ideas correctly, know the thesis statement and the topic statements but he or she also has to possess sufficient summarizing skills through the application of productive strategies and appropriate writing skills to produce an effective summary. Although attaining high proficiency is a tall order for the ESL learner, in summary writing proficiency is indispensable, at least a certain acceptable level of it is required for summarization to take effect.

Table 4.3: Learner Related Problems Faced By High and Low Proficiency Studen

High Proficiency	Low Proficiency
1. Difficulty in making sentence sound grammatically correct 2. Condensation stage – difficult to find suitable synonyms 3. Sometimes can't differentiate between main points and subordinate points 4. I lack in grammar skills 5. Not sure of suitable connectors 6. Need to think for a while for a suitable word 7. Changing given words to own words 8. Easiest stage is comprehension and toughest is paraphrasing 9. Have problem picking the points 10. During reading stage – ambiguous and confusing 11. Making long sentences short – when done in own way, the sentences become distorted 12. Not good at paraphrasing, depends on luck. 13. Don't know how to shorten sentences 14. Lack of speaking skills affects writing	1. Not clear about thesis statement and topic statements 2. Not clear about skimming and scanning 3. Unable to differentiate between main and subordinate points 4. Don't know how to write the points in short sentences 5. Unable to paraphrase 6. Grammar is bad and evident in the production stage; 7. Spelling is no better 8. Didn't use linkers because don't know how to use 9. I feel sad at all the three stages because unable to comprehend passage fully. 10. Not sure which connector to use and how to combine points 11. Unable to write in paragraphs

Table 4.3 above shows that both high and low proficiency students are aware of their proficiency related problems. It is also apparent from the table that low proficiency students face more macro level problems (unable to identify thesis statement, topic statements, do not know how to do skimming and scanning) compared to high proficiency students who face more micro level problems such as grammar, sentence construction, paraphrasing and vocabulary-substitution. Low proficiency students have also expressed their inability to paraphrase.

Among the common problems faced by both groups is their inability to differentiate between main and subordinate points and the uncertainty over the correct use of connectors. High proficiency students also consider lack of speaking skills to have an impact on effective writing. Meanwhile, low proficiency students are aware of their bad grammar and spelling during the writing stage.

From the data presented above, it is evident that both high and low proficiency students face various problems during the three stages of summarization which can be categorized into text-related, teacher-related and student's proficiency–related problems. However, the findings show that there are similarities in the type of problems and differences in the extent or degree of the problems that high and low proficiency students encounter during summary writing. For instance, both high and low groups face problem with paraphrasing but the high group find it the toughest activity while the low group is unable to paraphrase at all. Another example is that a high group member is not sure of suitable connectors while a low group member admits that she did not use any linker because she did not know how to use it.

Some of the common problems to both groups are the inability to differentiate between main ideas and subordinate ideas, inability to rewrite the points in shorter sentences,

problem writing grammatically correct sentences and the inability to comprehend the passage fully. The high group is also very much aware of vocabulary, the need to change vocabulary and the importance of knowing synonyms, suitable words, own words and grammatical items. On the other hand, the low group has expressed sad feelings experienced when unable to tackle the summary-writing at all the three stages. In short, it is very clear from the interviews that both high and low proficiency students are very much aware of their main and specific problems.

4.3 Productive and Unproductive Strategies Use in Summary Writing by ESL Students

As mentioned in Section 2.3.2, strategies are employed by learners to overcome problems in learning. The strategies that are useful and bring about the expected change are called productive strategies in the current study while the strategies that are employed by ESL learners that do not bring about positive change or becomes a liability to the learner is called unproductive strategy.

The strategies that students used at the different stages were inferred and identified from the MTAP interviews by the researcher. These strategies were later categorized based on the Criteria Checklist as mentioned earlier in Chapter 3. The Criteria Checklist was specially devised by the researcher to facilitate the categorization of strategies into productive and unproductive strategies. This checklist was also designed based on the MUET Summary assessment guide (Appendix B3) used by examiners as well as the basic principles of summarizing such as conciseness, using own words without changing meaning and inclusion of main points.

Table 4.4: Criteria Checklist to Determine Productive & Unproductive Strategies in Summary Writing

Productive Strategy	Unproductive Strategy
Any strategy that	Any strategy that
(1) contributes to identification of main ideas	(1) causes confusion
(2) helps to cut down number of words	(2) causes semantic distortion
(3) helps to simplify sentences	(3) does not cause any syntactical change
(4) does not cause semantic distortion	(4) does not cause any lexical change
(5) causes syntactical change	(5) includes elaborations
(6) causes lexical change	(6) wastes time
(7) preserves text coherence	(7) does not respond to the question/task
(8) leaves out elaborations	(8) causes run-on sentences
(9) responds to the question / task	(9) reflects comprehension breakdown
(10) supports time-management	(10) reflects low proficiency

As mentioned earlier in Chapter Three, the Criteria Checklist a data analysing tool, is shown in Table 4.4 above, was devised with the purpose of evaluating the strategies used during summarization process as claimed by the subjects in their individual interviews. Since the number of strategies used by both high and low proficiency students were high and not all appeared to show much significance, there seemed a need to draw up criteria for evaluating these strategies. As the researcher could not obtain any suitable instrument in previous researches that could help to measure the effectiveness of the strategies used, an original checklist was drawn-up based on the basic principles of summarizing as well as the MUET Summary Assessment Guide used by examiners. This checklist was later divided into two parts, namely criteria for productive strategies and criteria for unproductive strategies. Henceforth, every strategy that was inferred from the interview scripts was screened using the criteria checklist before determining it as productive or unproductive. During the screening process, every strategy selected

was scrutinized to see if it fulfilled and matched any of the criteria mentioned in the checklist. If the criteria matched, then it was placed under that particular category which was either "productive" or "unproductive".

Table 4.5: Productive and Unproductive Strategies Used by Subjects During the Three Stages of Summarization

Strategies	Productive	Unproductive
Comprehension related	12	5
Condensation related	23	17
Production related	13	11
Total	48	33

There were altogether 81 strategies (as listed in Tables 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8) inferred and categorized by the researcher from the recorded interviews. Using the Criteria Checklist, 48 strategies have been categorized as productive strategies while 33 were categorized as unproductive strategies. Out of the 48 productive strategies, 12 were comprehension-related, 23 were condensation-related while 13 were production-related. Meanwhile out of the 33 unproductive strategies used by the subjects, 5 were comprehension-related, 17 were condensation-related while 11 were production-related. The analysis shows that the subjects employed various strategies at all three stages and relatively more strategies at the condensation stage. However, it must be noted that it is not the number of strategies that is important but the quality of the strategy and is it able to bring about the expected outcome.

4.3.1 Comprehension Stage

This is the most crucial stage because if the reader cannot comprehend the text, he is unable to move on to complete the task effectively. In other words, it would not be wrong to say that a breakdown at this stage would have a domino effect on the other

stages. Many students encounter breakdown at this stage and one of the ways students overcome this problem is by using certain strategies as listed in Table 4.6. The productive strategies such as 'using questions as guide to look for points' involves both cognitive and metacognitive thinking which would contribute to the extraction of the content points while the unproductive strategies such as 'guessing the meaning when cannot understand sentences' would mainly lead to distortion. Awareness of the types of strategies used by students allows the teacher to teach and encourage the use of the productive strategies and replace the unproductive strategies with productive strategies. For example, one of the productive strategies employed by the subjects is using contextual evidence to guess meaning of unknown words in a sentence. This should be encouraged. It should also be taught to students who do not know this strategy and to those who use unproductive strategies.

Table 4.6: Comprehension Related Productive and Unproductive Strategies

<u>Comprehension related Productive Strategies</u>

1. Infer meaning using contextual clues
2. First reading skimmed through; second reading selected points
3. Underlined relevant points
4. Read passage attentively
5. Read sentence by sentence in trying to relate sentence to the given task
6. Read difficult sentence over and over again to understand
7. Looked for key-words in order to identify connection
8. Underlined whole sentence, when unsure of main point and sub-point
9. Used questions as guide to look for point
10. In trying to understand meaning, I referred back to title, task and tried to relate.
11. Circled difficult words and underlined keywords.
12. Guessed meaning of difficult words from the rest of the sentence, other words, whole sentence and own background knowledge.

<u>Comprehension related Unproductive Strategies</u>

1. Included irrelevant points due to comprehension breakdown
2. Tried to guess meaning of sentence
3. Read passage many times to understand. Parts that were not understood were excluded from summary.
4. Circled all unknown words.
5. When cannot understand sentence tried to guess meaning of sentence.

From Table 4.6, we can see that even actions such as underlining relevant points may seem trivial but could bear importance to the students. As described earlier in Chapter 2, section 2.2.4, according to the schema theory, schemata or units of knowledge already exist in individuals. For these schemata to be activated and to make sense of the reading, students need to employ strategies such as the ones mentioned in the table above. Comprehension related productive strategies nos. 1, 5, 7, 9, 10 and 12 are directly involved in activating the schemata and paving the way to comprehension. However, when the schemata is not activated with the use of comprehension related unproductive strategies nos. 1,2 3, and 5, full comprehension does not take place or rather miscomprehension takes place giving rise to distorted and incorrect idea units being used by students to write their summaries. On the other hand, an unproductive strategy like no. 4 – circling of all unknown words - seems to be a time wasting strategy which may not contribute towards comprehension. In fact it may eat into the allocated time for summarization and may cause the student to submit an incomplete piece of work. Therefore such strategies should be avoided and replaced by productive strategies.

4.3.2 Condensation Stage

This is the core of the whole summarizing process. The actual process of summarizing takes place at this stage. Therefore it is pertinent to know what goes on in the minds of students at this stage and what are the strategies they employ in order to write concisely the given text. Table 4.7 reveals 23 productive strategies used by different students during the condensation stage. Table 4.7 also shows that some of the most important strategies of summarizing take place at this stage such as paraphrasing, identification of thesis statement, topic statements, substitution of certain words with synonyms, deletion of sub-points etcetera. In addition to that, it can be observed from Table 4.7 - a high

level of awareness amongst students during the condensation stage. This is evident from the list of condensation related productive strategies whereby strategies 8 to 14 are referring to different types of awareness such as awareness of lack of proper guidance from teachers, awareness of number of words, awareness of time constraint, awareness of tenses used in text, awareness of task, awareness of keywords found in task and awareness of missing important points in the process of shortening the text. Hence, it is not wrong to say that there are a lot of metacognitive strategies used by students during summarization especially during the condensation stage. On the other hand, Table 4.7 also reveals the unproductive strategies that the subjects used which deem their summaries ineffective. From studying the unproductive strategies, it is obvious that the subjects resort to such strategies because of their lack of proficiency in the language. Due to their low proficiency, they are unable to comprehend the text at the first stage (comprehension). To counter this inadequacy, students employ a number of strategies. For instance, the unproductive strategy of using Bahasa Malaysia to replace words in the sentences and copying verbatim does not help in summarizing the text. This inadequate understanding at the first stage (comprehension) coupled with lack of productive strategies at the second stage (condensation) only leads to the production of an ineffective summary.

Table 4.7: Condensation Related Productive and Unproductive Strategies

Condensation Related Productive Strategies

1. identified thesis statement
2. identified topic statements
3. broke-up long sentences
4. deleted sub-points
5. paraphrased
6. substituted certain words with synonyms
7. replaced phrases and clauses with single words or lesser words of similar meaning
8. was aware of lack of proper guidance from teachers
9. was aware of number of words (100 words)
10. was aware of time constraint (40 minutes)
11. was aware of tense/tenses used in text
12. was aware of task
13. was aware of keywords found in the task
14. was aware that one might miss important points or sub-points in the process of shortening
15. was able to discriminate which are points and which are explanations and ruled out the explanations
16. left out words without distorting the meaning of the sentence
17. tried to shorten sentences which are easier to shorten
18. underlined all relevant points.
19. when a previous sentence ends and a new sentence begins on a new idea, that's where I looked for the main point because it sounded like a main point
20. the sentence after a main point which explains and gives examples and gives another point to support the first point – that's the sub-point. I eliminated the sub-points.
21. drew two columns consisting of main points and sub-points. Then I noted down the points in the respective columns and numbered the points
22. wrote points in the margins of the passage itself
23. I broke up the sentences according to main points and sub-points

Condensation Related Unproductive Strategies

1. used Bahasa Malaysia to replace words in text.
2. copied word for word from original text or copied verbatim.
3. 'to paraphrase' was misinterpreted and done by changing the sequence/order of content points.
4. over-confident grammar is okay (responses during interview reflect poor grammar)
5. cut out excess words without considering distortions.
6. while shortening sentences, removed conjunctions, sequence connectors, and combined main points only. Cut off elaborations
7. ended up copying word for word of the entire sentence and because it was too long ended up trimming the sentence here and there until the meaning is distorted.
8. picked up paraphrasing skill through trial and error hence the lack of competency.
9. did not know how to paraphrase correctly and effectively.
10. left out sentences which cannot be shortened
11. didn't paraphrase because points are accurate and by paraphrasing, I would distort the meaning
12. picked sentences randomly and joined them together
13. paraphrasing in my understanding is joining 2 sentences together
14. drew boxes and wrote draft of summary in the boxes without identifying the points. Words that Exceeded the limit were just left out.
15. wrote all the points as in the passage then only I paraphrased. Difficult ones, I left them alone.
16. long sentences – I cut it short or paraphrased. Sometimes, I combined points which I didn't Understand
17. when unsure whether points are relevant or irrelevant, tried to recombine points in one sentence

It is obvious that the subjects in this study have employed the most number of strategies at this stage – the condensation stage. It is also noticeable that not only the productive strategies are the highest amounting to 23 but also the unproductive strategies amounting to 17. This gives rise to the assumption that the condensation stage is not an easy stage and students are confronted with more problems here than the other stages. Yet some critical strategies relevant to summarization as mentioned earlier are used at this stage such as condensation related productive strategies no. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Without these strategies, it is not possible to summarize a reading text. On the contrary, condensation related unproductive strategies are also used by students to tackle their problems but these strategies do not contribute towards the condensation of a reading text into a summary. Condensation related unproductive strategies no. 3, 8, 9, 11, 13 15 and 16 show the seriousness of students' inability to paraphrase appropriately. Similarly, when the other unproductive strategies are scrutinized, it throws light into the areas where students need help especially from the teacher or instructor.

4.3.3 Production Stage

This is the final stage in the summary writing process. The product not only reflects the student's ability to summarize effectively but is also a reflection of the student's proficiency and maturity. In fact, summary-writing is a good test to gauge a student's actual level of proficiency as it not only involves higher order thinking skills but also the use of appropriate strategies so that the product meets all the requirements such as conciseness, use of own words and keeping intact original meaning of the text. In this sense, it acts as a good test of consolidation especially at the end of a course or at the end of secondary schooling whereby it is necessary to evaluate a student's level of achievement such as the MUET (Malaysian University English Test).

It is apparent from Table 4.8 that working knowledge of grammar, a good repertoire of basic and relevant vocabulary are the basic requirements in order to use production related productive strategies effectively. This is evident from the responses given by the subjects whereby they are clear about the linguistic and grammatical items relevant to restructuring sentences and aware of linkers. On the other hand, Table 4.8 also shows that lack of grammatical knowledge, insufficient vocabulary and the inability to use strategies such as paraphrasing can lead to ineffective summary writing. Therefore, it can be concluded that students use batteries of strategies every time they are faced with problems but whether the strategies are productive or not makes an impact on the effectiveness of the summary.

Table 4.8: Production Related Productive and Unproductive Strategies

Production Related Productive Strategies

1   Changed active sentence to passive
2   Numbered points to follow sequence as in original text
3   Used connectors and conjunctions effectively
4   Used the underlined points, drafted out sentences
5   Drew lines for easy counting of number of words
6   Was aware that writing should be neat to ensure that examiner is able to read my writing
7   Counter-checked that the sentence is not different from source
8   Was aware of distortions during production stage
9   Difficult sentences – copied verbatim and made only minor changes
10   Tried recombining sentences using connectors
11   Drew columns in the first draft and wrote out neatly in the second draft.
12   Edited work.
13   Left out certain words because exceeded word limit, based on 'even without those words, the sentence sounds correct'

Production Related Unproductive Strategies

1   Rarely cross-checked with original sentence/sentences due to time constraint.
2   Copied sentence because don't know how to paraphrase.
3   Of the impression that one is required to write 10 points for a summary
4   Wrote about 3 drafts.
5   Not sure how to use connectors effectively.
8   Wrote summary in more than required number of words.
9   Did not rewrite in own words.
10   Wrote out summary without keeping to word limit (up to 200 words) then struck off the excess words (which may include content points).
11   Didn't connect main points together

Table 4.8 shows a list of productive and unproductive strategies related to the production of a summary. The productive strategies used are are mainly metacognitive in nature whereby they befit the definition of metacognition which is 'thinking about thinking'. Examples of such strategies are:

(i)   Productive Strategy no 2: Numbered points to follow sequence as in original text
     This suggests that the student is already planning the outline of the summary to be written so that the points are in the same order as the original text.

(ii) Productive Strategy no 5: Drew lines for easy counting of number of words
     This strategy suggests that the student is aware of the word limit for the summary and taking precautions not to exceed the word limit and is also using a time-saving strategy.

On the other hand, the unproductive strategies listed in Table 4.8 throw caution on the pitfalls to avoid so that students and teachers are equally aware of wrong moves made in the production of an effective summary. For instance:

(i) Unproductive Strategy no 4: Wrote about three drafts
(ii) Unproductive Strategy no 5: No draft, wrote straightaway

The above mentioned strategies, in the minds of the students may appear as good (no 4) or time-saving (no 5) but in reality both are hazardous strategies. Writing a draft is important in order to gather the salient points in a given text. However, writing three drafts does not necessarily mean that all the correct points will be included. Considering time factor, writing three drafts is time-consuming which means students may not have enough time to complete the summary task which is the main task.

In a nutshell, the total of 81 strategies inferred from the MTAP interview sessions gives a peek into what goes on in the minds of students during the summary writing process. This strategies have been categorized as productive and unproductive strategies which would immensely help writing teachers to plan their summary writing lessons more creatively and effectively.

4.4 Differences in Strategy Use by High and Low Proficiency Students

According to various studies carried out in the L1 context, it is found that students with a higher language proficiency have a higher tendency to use strategies in overcoming their learning problems compared to lower proficiency students. This is because high proficiency students are more likely to have acquired a larger vocabulary and have greater control over manipulation of complex syntactic structures compared to low proficiency students (Johns and Mayes, 1990). Strategy use can also be associated with metacognition. According to Flavell (1979), metacognition refers to learners' automatic awareness of their own knowledge and their ability to understand, control and manipulate their own cognitive processes. Therefore, it is not wrong to say that it is metacognition that activates the part of the memory on the need to use strategy, which strategy for which task, recognizes failure in comprehension and employs repair strategy to rectify the failure. However, it is not true that only the high group uses strategies because the low group too uses them. The contention is whether the student is using the right strategies because he can be using many strategies to solve a problem but they may not be effective.

In order to probe this issue, this study examined if there are differences between high and low proficiency students in the use of a selected productive strategy (paraphrasing)

and a selected unproductive strategy (copying). The results show that there are differences in the type of strategy use between high and low proficiency students.

Table 4.9: An Analysis of Idea Units in the Written Summaries (n=25)

Idea Unit/ Content pt		Para-phrased Idea Unit (productive strategy)								Copied Idea Unit (unproductive strategy)							
Proficiency		High (9)				Low (16)				High (9)				Low (16)			
		Total	c	pc	ic	Total	c	pc	ic	Total	c	pc	ic	Total	c	pc	ic
1	Frequency	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	15	13	2	0
	%	56	44	11	0	0	0	0	0	44	44	0	0	94	81	13	0
2	Frequency	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	10	6	3	1
	%	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	22	0	0	63	38	19	6
3	Frequency	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	9	7	2	0
	%	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	33	0	0	56	44	13	0
4	Frequency	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	13	6	7	0
	%	33	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	0	0	81	38	44	0
5	Frequency	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	7	3	3	1
	%	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	33	0	0	44	19	19	6
6	Frequency	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	5	4	1	0
	%	44	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	22	22	0	0	31	25	6	0
7	Frequency	3	3	0	0	2	1	1	0	4	4	0	0	9	8	1	0
	%	33	33	0	0	13	6	6	0	44	44	0	0	56	50	6	0
8	Frequency	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	10	8	0	2
	%	33	22	11	0	0	0	0	0	33	33	0	0	63	50	0	13
9	Frequency	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	12	6	3	3
	%	33	22	11	0	0	0	0	0	55	55	0	0	75	38	19	19
10	Frequency	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	1	1	0	0
	%	11	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	55	55	0	0	6	6	0	0
11	Frequency	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	4	3	1	0
	%	33	22	11	0	0	0	0	0	33	33	0	0	25	19	6	0

c – correct   pc – partly correct   ic – incorrect

Table 4.9 illustrates the paraphrasing and copying of 11 idea units by a total of 25 students of whom 9 are of high proficiency while 16 are of low proficiency. The table also shows the comparison between two selected strategies i.e. one productive strategy and one unproductive strategy. It is evident that high proficiency students paraphrase more than low proficiency students while low proficiency students almost do not paraphrase. However, low proficiency students copy more than high proficiency students. The findings are discussed in greater detail below.

4.4.1 Selected Productive Strategy - Paraphrase

Table 4.10: Analysis of Idea Units Paraphrased Correctly, Partly Correct or Incorrectly

Idea Unit/ content point		Para-phrased Idea Unit (productive strategy)							
		High (9)				Low (16)			
		Total	correct	Partly correct	incorrect	Total	correct	Partly correct	incorrect
1	Frequency	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	0
	%	56	44	11	0	0	0	0	0
2	Frequency	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	Frequency	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Frequency	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	33	33	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Frequency	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	Frequency	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
	%	44	22	22	0	0	0	0	0
7	Frequency	3	3	0	0	2	1	1	0
	%	33	33	0	0	13	6	6	0
8	Frequency	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
	%	33	22	11	0	0	0	0	0
9	Frequency	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
	%	33	22	11	0	0	0	0	0
10	Frequency	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
	%	11	0	11	0	0	0	0	0
11	Frequency	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
	%	33	22	11	0	0	0	0	0

Table 4.10 clearly illustrates that all the attempts to paraphrase were done by high proficiency students while none of the low proficiency students have attempted to paraphrase. Out of the 30 attempts to paraphrase by the high proficiency students, 23 were paraphrased correctly while 7 attempts were partly correct. There was no incorrect paraphrasing of idea units by the high group. Meanwhile there were only two attempts to paraphrase by the low group whereby one was correct and the other was partly correct. This shows that paraphrasing is an important productive strategy in summary-writing which is more frequently used by high proficiency students compared to low proficiency students. This also shows that proficiency plays an important role in the choice of productive strategies.

In relation to the problems faced by students (see Table 4.2), it was highlighted by the high proficiency group that they were not systematically taught how to paraphrase in the

classroom by teachers. Despite that, almost 30 percent of the students from the high group have used paraphrasing successfully. Systematic instruction on paraphrasing and other productive strategy use coupled with proficiency promoting activities would definitely contribute to the production of more effective summaries.

Furthermore, it is evident from the data that when high proficiency students employ the productive strategy of paraphrasing, they either get the idea unit correct or partly correct, never incorrect. However, those who have employed this strategy from the high proficiency group only consist of less than 50 percent which is about 3 to 4 out of the total of 9 subjects. Therefore only those who are sure of the strategy have used it effectively. On the other hand, the low group did not show any evidence of using the paraphrase strategy although they are capable of producing distorted or incorrect idea units. This also supports the claim made by the subjects that they do not know how to paraphrase as they were not taught how to do so.

Paraphrasing trains a student's mind to think, reflect, evaluate and make choices of which word or synonym to use. It also helps the student to identify the main ideas and supporting ideas and the thesis statement in a given text. Paraphrasing helps to keep in view the main ideas and the theme of a text before it is written in different words and structures thus facilitating the process of summarizing. Inversely, frequent practice in paraphrasing helps to build one's repertoire of words and grammar. Therefore, paraphrasing is considered as a highly productive strategy by the researcher and it ought to be encouraged and instructed systematically in the ESL classroom.

4.4.2 Selected Unproductive Strategy – Copying or Lifting

Copying or lifting in summary-writing is an unproductive strategy whereby if left unchecked at the secondary school level can manifest as plagiarism at the higher

education level. According to the findings of the current study not only do low proficiency subjects resort to copying but also a substantial number of the high proficiency ESL subjects too resorted to lifting as it is safer than writing distorted sentences of their own.

According to the data in Table 4.11, it is rather striking to know that 100 percent of the high proficiency students' attempts to copy idea units turned out to be correct idea units. Therefore, comprehension has taken place correctly and fully. However, it is not the same with the low proficiency group. Although there have been greater attempts by this group to lift, only about 30 percent managed to get correct idea units while the rest were partly correct or incorrect idea units.

Table 4.11: An Analysis of Idea Units Copied Correctly, Partly Correct or Incorrectly

IdeaUnit/ Content Point		Copied Idea Unit (unproductive strategy)							
		High (9)				Low (16)			
		Total	correct	Partly correct	incorrect	Total	correct	Partly correct	incorrect
1	Frequency	4	4	0	0	15	13	2	0
	%	44	44	0	0	94	81	13	0
2	Frequency	2	2	0	0	10	6	3	1
	%	22	22	0	0	63	38	19	6
3	Frequency	3	3	0	0	9	7	2	0
	%	33	33	0	0	56	44	13	0
4	Frequency	1	1	0	0	13	6	7	0
	%	11	11	0	0	81	38	44	0
5	Frequency	3	3	0	0	7	3	3	1
	%	33	33	0	0	44	19	19	6
6	Frequency	2	2	0	0	5	4	1	0
	%	22	22	0	0	31	25	6	0
7	Frequency	4	4	0	0	9	8	1	0
	%	44	44	0	0	56	50	6	0
8	Frequency	3	3	0	0	10	8	0	2
	%	33	33	0	0	63	50	0	13
9	Frequency	5	5	0	0	12	6	3	3
	%	55	55	0	0	75	38	19	19
10	Frequency	5	5	0	0	1	1	0	0
	%	55	55	0	0	6	6	0	0
11	Frequency	3	3	0	0	4	3	1	0
	%	33	33	0	0	25	19	6	0

Conciseness and brevity are important features of a summary. When students copy verbatim, they are not able to secure all the content points within the word limit given thus failing to provide an effective summary. Apart from that, cohesiveness is just as important in a summary as in any other prose. When students copy verbatim, the result is patchwork or 'cut-and-paste' form of distorted writing. With the lack of cohesion and cohesiveness, there is a great tendency to deviate from the meaning of the original text, thus rendering it as an ineffective summary. In addition, a student who is used to copying or lifting is actually being conditioned to plagiarize because it is easy, fast and leads to correct idea units. When points obtained in this manner are accepted and awarded marks in a summary-writing test, it sanctions lifting and later plagiarizing. It discourages the student from using his or her own words and rewriting in own sentences. It does not train the student's mind to rethink, reflect and evaluate the points. Hence, copying is considered by the researcher as an unproductive strategy whereby students should be penalised heavily if they lift.

In summary, the data in tables 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 4.12a and 4.12b show the production of idea units by subjects in their written summaries using two summarizing strategies, namely paraphrasing and copying. It is clear that all correctly paraphrased idea units are by high proficiency students while all incorrectly copied idea units are by low proficiency students. Meanwhile, both the high and low groups have correct and partly correct copied idea units. Therefore the differences between the high and low group is that high group has a greater tendency to use the productive strategy paraphrasing effectively while the low group does not use productive strategy such as paraphrasing at all. In fact, the low group has a greater tendency to use unproductive strategy such as copying. Surprisingly the data shows that the high group too has resorted to copying. However, the quality of idea units varies between the high and low groups. High group

has secured mostly correct idea units while the low group has a combination of correct, partly correct and incorrect idea units. The subjects who have resorted to this strategy have also omitted several idea units which render their summaries as incomplete and ineffective.

4.4.3 Similarities and Differences in Strategy Use by High and Low Groups

Table 4.12a provides a summary of paraphrased and copied idea units; either correctly, partly correct or incorrectly by high and low proficiency students. Adapting and sourcing from Johns Scale for Summary Protocols (see Appendix B4), paraphrased or copied correct idea units in this study refer to correct replication or reproduction of idea units at idea unit (IU) level, combinations of two or more IUs and or at macro-propositions level which are accurate writer-invented statements which provide the gist of a paragraph or reading. Partly correct idea units refer to distortions such as noun phrase appropriate but verb phrase deviant or vice-versa; or essential information has been deleted. Incorrect idea units refer to the copied or paraphrased idea units to which information has been added or deleted, thus distorting the meaning of the original.

From the analysis of the written summaries (n=25) shown in Table 4.12a, it is evident that for the high proficiency students, out of a total of 99 attempts; 23 were correct paraphrasing, 7 were partly correct paraphrasing, 35 were correct copying while there were no incorrect paraphrasing, copying or partly correct copying. This shows that high proficiency subjects did not have much problem understanding the text. However, the higher attempt to copy than paraphrase shows that in order to paraphrase correctly, besides having better language proficiency, a student also has to be given proper class instruction. This part of the findings correlates with the teacher related problems faced

by high proficiency subjects (see Table 4.2) whereby they mentioned that they were not taught how to paraphrase.

On the contrary, the low proficiency subjects have not attempted to paraphrase but they have copied correctly. In a total of 176 attempts, 65 copied correctly, 23 copied partly correctly and 7 copied incorrectly while almost none have paraphrased. This shows that low proficiency subjects have a greater tendency to use unproductive strategies than productive strategies. This also correlates with the findings of the first research question (see Table 4.3) whereby students of low proficiency have mentioned that they (no 5) - do not know how to paraphrase and that they are (no 2) - unclear about skimming and scanning.

Table 4.12a: Differences In Paraphrasing and Copying by High and Low Groups

Subjects	Total Attempts (11 IUs)n	Paraphrasing			Copying		
		c	pc	ic	c	pc	ic
High Group (n=9)	99	23/99	7/99	0/99	35/99	0/99	0/99
Low Group (n=16)	176	1/176	1/176	0/176	65/176	23/176	7/176

c – correct   pc – partly correct   ic –incorrect

Table 4.12b: A summary of Idea Units Written by High and Low Proficiency Students

Paraphrased idea unit	High
Copied idea unit	High and Low
Correct idea unit	High and low
Partly correct idea unit	High and Low
Incorrect idea unit	Low

It is evident in Table 4.12b that the differences in strategy use are that only the high proficiency students have employed the paraphrasing strategy while only the low proficiency students have copied incorrect idea units. The similarities in strategy use are that both high and low proficiency students have copied idea units, and also that they have copied both correct and partly correct idea units.

Table 4.13: Summary Points: Extracts from Students' Summary Scripts

	Main Points/ Idea Units	**Original version from text**	Paraphrased or Copied Correctly **Student's version**	Paraphrased/ Copied Partly Correct **Student's version**	Paraphrased/ Copied Incorrectly Or In Distorted Manner **Student's version**
1	<u>Controlling Idea</u> Mass media – <u>influence/ manipulate/affe ct</u> audiences/ have an important role in influencing public / plays an important role	The mass media play a key role in providing ideas and images which people use to interpret and understand much of their everyday experience, and they shape people's ideas, attitudes and actions. The mass media, therefore, have an important role in forming public opinion.	**S1** The mass media influence their audiences by providing ideas which <u>audiences</u> use to understand <u>daily</u> experiences. **S2** The mass media play an important role in forming public opinion and … **S3** The mass media influence their audiences by providing ideas and images to them. **S5** The mass media influence their audiences <u>as most people use and trust mass media …</u> **S6** Mass media is important in bringing realization among people <u>and in carving public opinion.</u>	**S4** Mass media play an important character in providing information to the public. **S13** The television is one of influence to audiences … **S16** The way the mass media influence their audience is …	**S14** The mass media influence their audiences the way to encouraged to view stories. **S24** The mass media influences their audiences by the misguided.
2	Mass media <u>select</u> facts/ contents/ selection process carried out and <u>put</u> an interpretation on them	They select facts and put an interpretation on them	**S1** The mass media also influence audiences by acting as a social control agency <u>because selected facts are interpreted by the mass media</u> **S19** The mass media … by not just show the facts but also they give their opinion about the news.	**S13** … the mass media do not show the fact but select facts and put an interpretation. **S25** They select facts to ….	**S16** … and the people select the fact

3	<u>Acts</u> as an agent of social control / agency of control	The mass media can then be said to act as an agency of social control.	**S1** The mass media influences audiences by <u>acting as a social control agency</u> because selected facts are interpreted by the mass media. **S13** … be said to act as an agency of social control **S6** It is also known as an agency of social control.	**S11** First, it act as any agency of social control. **S22** The mass media has agency of social control.	
4	Reporters/journalists <u>decide/select/make / amplify</u> contents of mass media (not mass media)	It is jounalists who basically select what is news and decide on the style of presentation. News values guide jounalists in deciding what to report and what to leave out and how what they choose should be presented.	**S5** Normally, jounalists select and present news deemed newsworthy	**S17** make news more newsworthy	
5	Mass media give/ present/ highlight partial view of the world/ part of the news/ events	The features affecting the content of the media suggest that the mass media present, at best, only a partial view of the world.			**S23** The must brought important issues to public attention. **S12** Some events are simply brought to public attention
6	I influence behaviour of society <u>/ shape</u> people's ideas, attitudes and actions / mind / mindset	What the public should or should not be concerned about or what should or should not be regarded as 'normal' behaviour in society.		**S20** Mass media must decide the important issues may influencing the way people encouraged to view stories	
7	They <u>decide how to present</u> / positioning of news / style of news (Journalists/ M / Media /The way news (IC) (no mention of who presents it))	The way news items are presented may be important in influencing the way people are encouraged to view stories.	**S4** Audience tend to read the news items according to the ways they are presented. **S13** … they decide the style of presentation		

| 8 | Actual images / pictures used in news / films may also affect viewers/ readers/ creates bias/biasness | Where film is used the pictures shown are always selected from the total footage shot and may not accurately reflect the event. The actual images used in news films may themselves have a hidden bias. | S4 Images that are put together with the news items would be misjudge as an important items by the public. | | S23 This make employers calm dan reasonable.

S24 Finally, always selected footage and not accurately event. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9 | Language used also may affect/ shape readers/viewers /creates bias and false/inaccurate impression/ thinking /attitude | The media can also create false or biased impressions by the kind of language used in news reporting. | S4 Language used to describe stories create false impressions | S12 The media also create false or biased impressions. | S14 The impression that mass media used is the kind of language that used in news reporting.

S19 The mass media had shown a pictures

and use false or wrong language |
| 10 | Inaccurate reporting/ incorrect reporting/ inexact reporting | Other sources of bias lie in inaccurate reporting, because important details of a story may be incorrect. | | S9 The important details of story may be incorrect | |
| 11 | False reporting/ untrue reporting | False reporting through either completely making up stories or inventing a few details and the media's tendency to dramatize events out of all proportions to their actual significance in society are devices used to make a story 'more interesting'. | S4 Jounalists intend to add in unnecessary elements or facts in order to make the stories more interesting. | | |

Key (Table 4.13):
S1–S25   refers to the subjects who took part in this study
S1-S9   high proficiency students
S10 – S25   low proficiency students

Table 4.13 above gives a complete summary of all the 11 content points used in this part of the study and examples of   students' actual writing showing the correct, partly correct and incorrect versions in comparison to the original version of the given text. It is evident that high group students who have used paraphrasing as a strategy have come up with different versions of their own writing without distorting the original meaning. This is evident from the way subjects S1, S2, S3, S5 and S6 (high proficiency) have paraphrased content point 1 using own words and structure.

Examples: original word/phrase   paraphrased

people   audience

everyday   daily

plays a key role   influences

forming public opinion   carving public opinion

Another clear example of paraphrasing is how cleverly S5 has paraphrased a 38 words long statement (content point 4) into a 8-word statement while keeping the meaning intact. Similarly S4 has reduced content point 9 from 18 words to 8 words without changing the meaning.

Sample 1

Original version   Paraphrased correctly

Content point 4	**S5**
It is journalists who basically select what is news and decide on the style of presentation. News values guide journalists in deciding what to report and what to leave out and how what they choose should be presented.	Normally, journalists select and present news deemed newsworthy.
(38 words)	(8 words)

Sample 2

Content point 9	S4
The media can also create false or biased impressions by the kind of language used in news reporting. (18 words)	Language used to describe stories create false impressions. (8 words)

On the other hand, the partly correct and incorrect or distorted versions reflect the inability of students to summarize due to their lack of language proficiency and not knowing how to paraphrase. Spelling and grammatical errors reign while structural errors are rampant resulting in distortions. Examples of such versions by students can be seen in Table 4.13. With reference to Table 4.13, the partly correct version shows that subjects have not understood the source text fully hence they were only able to produce part of the idea units correctly.

Sample 3

Content point 2   Original version   Partly Correct version

| Mass media <u>select</u> facts/ contents/ selection process carried out and <u>put an interpretation on them</u> | They select facts and put an interpretation on them | **S13**
… the mass media do not show the fact but <u>select facts and put an interpretation.</u>

S25
They select facts to …. | **S16**
... and the people select the fact |

In the example above, 'select facts and put an interpretation' has been copied correctly by subject S13 but the first part 'the mass media do not show the fact' is incorrect giving a wrong interpretation to the whole idea unit. Another subject (S25) has only managed to capture the first part of the idea unit leaving out the other part thus extracting an incomplete idea unit. A more serious case is the distorted version whereby subject S16 has given the idea unit a totally different meaning by stating

that 'the people select the fact' instead of 'the mass media selects the facts and puts an interpretation'. The rest of the data speak for itself.

In conclusion, this part of the research supports and complements the findings of research questions 1 and 2 in that the problems highlighted by the subjects in their interviews and the strategies that were inferred from their interviews are evident in their summary-writing task. This study also points out that the effectiveness of a summary does not only depend on the subject's proficiency but also on the use of productive and unproductive strategies. Therefore, it is pertinent that systematic instruction and training is given in the use of productive strategies and serious measures taken to wean out the unproductive strategies. In a nutshell, this data analysis implies that both proficiency and use of productive strategies are equally important for effective summary writing.

Table 4.14: Analysis of Data collected through SILL Questionnaire

(Reliability Coefficients)

Type of Strategy	N of Cases	N of Items	Reliability Coefficients
Memory	25	9	.7231
Cognitive	25	9	.7600
Compensation	25	6	.5373
Metacognitive	25	9	.7600
Affective	25	6	.3265
Social	25	6	.5023

Last but not least, the SILL Questionnaire was distributed at the onset of this study to have an overview of the types of strategies that students often use in their ESL writing class. Table 4.14 shows that memory, cognitive and metacognitive strategies

are more significantly used than the other strategies. This fact has been proven by the data analyzed for research questions 2 and 3. The strategies that has been identify for research question 2 were mainly cognitive and metacognitive in nature. However, this information is not sufficient because students use hundreds of strategies to resolve a writing issue. Hence, this led to a more definite probe to find out which are the productive strategies and which are not.

In conclusion, this chapter has seen through the analysis of a large collection of rich data which has been reduced and analyzed and the findings used to answer the 3 research questions which were put forward at the onset of this research. The triangulation process too has helped to validate the reliability of the data and the findings.