

https://dspace.org/

Investigating summary writing and stimulated-recall of college ESL students using a socio-cultural approach in a South African context

Chihobo, Akulina

2016

http://hdl.handle.net/10539/23251

Chihobo, Akulina (2016) Investigating summary writing and stimulated-recall of college ESL students using a socio-cultural approach in a South African context, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, <http://hdl.handle.net/10539/23251>

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

Investigating Summary Writing and Stimulated- Recall of College ESL Students using a Socio-Cultural Approach in a South African Context

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Humanities

University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters

In Applied Language and Literacy Education

By

Akulina Chihobo

November 2016

Acknowledgements

I owe my sincere thanks to my supervisor, Professor Leketi Makalela for his untold support and guidance throughout my research journey. I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to the students that I teach who inspired me to carry out this study. I owe my deepest thanks to my family; Allen, Ishe, Tonde and Karis for their encouragement throughout my studies. Above all, I give honour and glory to the Almighty for keeping me in good health throughout my research journey and for His guidance.

Declaration

I declare that this research paper is my own work. It is submitted in partial fulfilment of the degree of Master of Arts in Applied Language and Literacy Education at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any other degree or examination at any other university.

Akulina Chihobo

Abstract

The research topic for this study is, *An investigation into summary writing and stimulated-recall of College ESL students using a socio-cultural approach in a South African context*. The main research questions that were formulated to guide and frame this study were as follows; 1) What meta-cognitive reflections, students learning English as a second language with an African background engage in to deduce main ideas from a source text? 2) How is comprehension of a source text reflected in written summaries of these students? Two other sub-questions were framed for this study and these were; 1) What do students' responses show about the strategies they use in summary writing? 2) How do African rhetoric systems affect the formation of sentences in summary writing? Theoretical frameworks that informed this study were; translanguaging which is a socio-cultural approach to language teaching in a multilingual setting and the theory of Literacy as a social practice. These two formed the core elements of this study to help address questions raised for the study. In order to address these questions, four participants were purposively sampled. These participants were all registered for a three-year diploma course at a university in Gauteng which could not be named for ethical reasons. The participants were also registered for a compulsory course; Applied Communication skills, which was meant to inculcate in them workplace related communication skills. As part of the course, they were tasked with writing summaries for reports. This task revealed below standards writing skills, which justifies the need to teach summary writing owing to the students' writing skills which were below expected standards. The participants were selected according to their indigenous South African languages which were grouped under Nguni, Sotho, Venda and Tsonga. The methods that were used to collect data in this study were drawn from Ethnographic studies but this does not mean that this study was ethnographic. First, semi-structured interviews were conducted individually, ten minutes after writing the summaries. Secondly, document analysis was undertaken where participants wrote

two summaries translingually. The first summary was written in English whilst the other was written in their first languages. The reason for the summaries being written translingually was to check for understanding of the source text. The interviews were audio recorded after all ethical considerations were addressed, including seeking permission to record the participants. Anonymity could not be guaranteed because the interviews were done face-to-face. However, confidentiality was promised and the participants were assured that personally identifiable information would not be disclosed to unauthorised people and that raw data would be destroyed after a period of five years. In addition, pseudonyms were used on the summaries that the students wrote. Ultimately, the interviews were transcribed and coded using thematic and conceptual analysis methods. (Babbie & Mouton, 2001; Ibrahim, 2012). Emerging themes were taken note of and discussed under the study's findings section. A discussion of the findings was done, situating them within the relevant body of literature to confirm or refute claims of previous research on the study. Conclusions of the study were drawn and recommendations made. Limitations of the study were acknowledged and implications for potential further research were suggested for this under researched area.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 8

CONTEXTUAL BACKGROUND 8

1. BACKGROUND TO STUDY 9

1.1 Statement of the Problem 12

1.1 Research Aim 13

1.3 Objectives 13

1.4 Research Questions 13

1.5 Motivation/Rationale 14

1.6 Significance of the study 15

CHAPTER 2 17

2 LITERATURE REVIEW 17

2.1 Challenges in L2 summary writing 19

2.2 Previous studies on L2 summary writing 19

2.3 Academic genre 21

2.4 The nature of summary writing 22

2.5 Summarizing cognitive skills 24

2.6 A synergy of skills 25

2.7 Language proficiency 26

2.8 Autonomous Vs Ideological models of Literacy 27

2.9 Literacy as a social practice 29

2.10 Primary vs Academic discourse 31

2.11 Culture and Identity 33

2.12 Translanguaging model 34

2.13 Contrastive Rhetoric 37

2.14 Knowledge telling / knowledge transforming 40

2.15 Translanguaging: a tool for learning and teaching 42

CHAPTER 3 51

3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 51

3.1 Sampling and Population 51

3.2 Procedure 53

3.3 Data collection 55
3.4 Data Analysis 58
3.5 Conceptual Analysis 58
3.6 Thematic analysis 58
3.7 Reliability 60
3.8 Trustworthiness 60
3.9 Ethical Considerations 61
CHAPTER 4 63
4 DATA FINDINGS, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION 63
4.1 Enhanced comprehension 64
4.2 Lack of engagement with text 67
4.3 Writing made easy 67
4.4 Lack of summarizing skills 68
4.5 Summary writing a mental process 71
4.6 Lack of formal vocabulary in home language 73
4.7 Writing and Culture 75
4.8 Discussion 78
CHAPTER 5 86
5 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 86
5.1 Conclusions 88
5.2 Recommendations for this study 89
5.3 Recommendations for further research 89
5.4 Limitations to the study 90
5.5 Conclusion 91
REFERENCES 92
Appendix 1 100
Appendix 2 Letter to Campus Principal 101
APPENDIX 3 Participant Consent Letter 102
Appendix 4 English Summaries 103
Appendix 5 Home Language Summaries 107
Appendix 6 English summary translations 111
Appendix 7 Transcribed interviews 115

CHAPTER 1

CONTEXTUAL BACKGROUND

Relevant to this study is a brief discussion on the context of this study as this gives the reader a clear picture and rationale of this study. South Africa is a multilingual nation with several policies that grant official recognition to its various languages. Official status was granted to 9 African Languages for the first time after the democratic elections of 1994. South African population is estimated to 52 million of which 79.2% are indigenous Africans. (Statistics, South Africa, 2012). This political recognition was long overdue as the previous government had not respected black people and all that belonged to them. (Ngcobo, Ndaba, Nyangiwe, Mpungose and Jamal, 2016).

Educational policies in South Africa purport to and promise to promote African Languages as media of communication, instruction and assessment in education but English which is spoken by a mere 8.2% of the population as a home language remains the dominant language of instruction in South Africa, "with devastating results" (Ngcobo,et al, 2016 p. 11). With this background of language use in the South African classroom one can only imagine the double trouble that a second language speaker of English in this context goes through when writing in English, hence a study to investigate how much of their African

language comes into their academic writing and exploring an approach that might address the needs of multilingual students in South Africa.

1. BACKGROUND TO STUDY

Summary writing is a skill that is crucial to academic success of students in higher education (De Silva, 2015). “Of the four language skills, writing is considered as one of the most important skills in an academic setting”. (Lin & Maarof, 2013, p. 599). Yet, it is one of the most difficult skills that second language learners of English (L2 and hereafter) learning English as a second Language (ESL and hereafter) are expected to acquire (Barkaoui, 2007; De, Silva, 2015 and Lin & Maarof, 2013). Resonating with this sentiment, Makalela (2004) adds that “writing among the four macro skills of communication is the most complex skill to acquire in both first language and second language” (p. 368). He emphasizes that the experiences that second language learners of English experience are far deeper than those faced by their counterparts. On the experiences of L2 learners De Silva (2015) echoes the same sentiments, arguing that the task of writing becomes extremely challenging to the writer when the medium of writing is in a second language.

One such academic task that requires that students write in a second language is summary writing, which is a synergy of writing and reading skills. Hood (2008) states that “the practice of summary writing from source texts has long been a core activity in academic writing programs” (p. 351). It is frequently used in academic settings to test for comprehension, metacognitive skills, such as recall (Hee Ko, 2009; Sajedi, 2014; Yang & Shi, 2003). Summary writing is associated with academic success (Hee Ko, 2009; Kim, 2001).Much of the research on summary writing has involved native speakers of English and “relevant research in L2 area is scarce” (Kim, 2001, p. 64). Previous studies on L2 summary writing show that it is a difficult

skill to master because of language related issues highlighted above and that it imposes great cognitive pressure on students (Lin & Maarof, 2013; Sajedi, 2014). L2 summary writing studies have been conducted in China, Korea and some parts of Europe. Findings from these studies have shown that L2 students have difficulty regenerating ideas into their own words, distinguishing main ideas from supporting statements, and they generally rely on the original text (Hill, 1991; Lin & Maarof, 2013; Yang & Shi, 2003). In essence, L2 students lack summary writing skills which are essential to academic success. Summary writing of L2 students is best described by one scholar who says "…their deficiencies in reading and writing might lead to breakdowns at certain points in the process of summary production" (Chin, 2011, p. 285).

This study in L2 summary writing involves L2 students in a South African context. Very little or no research on L2 summary writing has been conducted to understand what happens when L2 students with African background write summaries. Recommendations from earlier studies have resulted from findings related to particular cultures to address challenges in L2 students from those particular cultures and Africa by virtue of being a different culture from those studied may yield different findings and require different recommendations accordingly, hence this study.

The study centres on the theory of literacy as a social practice and moves away from a 'deficiency' mentality and autonomous view of what skills L2 students lack, but builds on the knowledge that L2 students already have. The social practice theory acknowledges the funds of knowledge that L2 students bring to the classroom. (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992).Building on findings of earlier studies of L2 summary writing, this study repositions the 'deficiencies' of L2 students in an African context in an attempt to understand why L2 students with an African background write summaries the way they do. This socio-cultural approach seeks to understand the influence of society and culture in summary writing in order to come up with recommendations on pedagogical approaches best suited to L2 students with African

background.The concept of discourse adopted for the study is pivotal in describing the ways of speaking embedded in an African culture and how rhetorical expressions influence the writing of the students, notwithstanding the fact that "people sometimes fall back on their primary uses of language in inappropriate circumstances when they fail to control the requisite secondary use" (Gee in Zamel & Spack, 1998, p.6). How aspects of the primary discourse end up in secondary (academic) discourse is what the discourse concept will help to address in this research. The overarching question is, how do second language learners of English understand summary writing in English?

In addition to contributing to the large body of literature, this study will prompt more research on summary writing of students with an African background, thus adding knowledge to the existing body of literature. Contribution will also be made to relevant pedagogic approaches, which will be drawn from the findings of the study.

The history of this study has shown that while writing is one of the most important skills, it is not always easy to write in a second language in academic contexts. One such academic genre that shows how second language learners of English grapple with language issues is summary writing, which is a synergy of reading and writing skills. The deficiency approach which is an autonomous view to literacy reflected in the findings of early studies contrasts with the socio-cultural view adopted for this study, a gap that it seeks to fill.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Summary writing has been recognised as a highly important and essential skill, not only in language learning, but also in most areas of a student's academic career. It is a highly useful and sophisticated skill, associated with both reading and writing skills and contributes to academic success (Kim, 2001; Kirkland & Saunders, 1991; Lin & Maarof, 2013; Yuan Ke & Hoey, 2014). Summary writing is also associated with promotion of dialect thinking by forcing students to articulate ideas that are not their own. (Lin & Maarof, 2013).

However, some scholars point out that summarising is a difficult and demanding task. (Lin & Maarof, 2013; Nambiar, 2007). The task becomes more demanding especially to learners of English as a second language, who should face a dual challenge of writing the summary in a second language and comprehending the source text written in a second language (Al Badi, 2015; Makalela, 2004). Othman, 2009 in Lin & Maarof, (2013) found that generally students learning English as a second language are not able to distinguish main ideas from supporting statements in a source text. They cannot regenerate ideas using their own words as they tend to copy from the original text. The general conclusion given by scholars who have studied L2 summary writing is that the students are weak in summary writing.

Second language research on summary writing has largely focused on the autonomous approach to literacy, meaning that it pays more attention to the cognitive skills of summary writing which L2 students lack and strategies to help them master these skills. Much of the studies on L2 summary writing have also focused on students from Saudi Arabian, Chinese, Korean, or European backgrounds and little, if any, research has been conducted on students with an African background.

It is against this background that this study seeks to include the African context in the large body of knowledge on L2 summary writing. This study takes a socio-cultural perspective which sees literacy as a social practice to investigate the influence of African rhetorical expressions on summary writing of L2 students with an African background. The study focuses on selection of main ideas, sentence formation, and text comprehension, similar to prior research conducted in the field. The gap filled by this study lies in the approach which is not a deficit approach that other studies have adopted. It takes cognisance of the funds of knowledge (Moll, Amanti, Neff, Gonzalez 1992) that L2 students bring to the discourse of academic writing.

1.1 Research Aim

The aim of the research is to investigate summary writing and stimulated-recall of college ESL students using a socio-cultural approach in a South African context.

1.3 Objectives

The study is aimed at investigating summary writing of second language learners of English and stimulated-recall using a socio-cultural approach and the following objectives have been designed to fulfil the task:

1. Analyse metacognitive reflections of second language speakers of English ability to deduce main ideas.
2. Analyse students' stimulated-recall after summary writing process.
3. Analyse students' strategies for sentence formation and rhetorical expressions.
4. Gauge the depth or degree to which L2 students understand the source text.

1.4 Research Questions

The following main research questions helped guide and frame the study:

1. What meta-cognitive reflections do L2 students with an African background engage in to deduce main ideas from a source text?
2. How is comprehension of a source text reflected in written summaries of the students?

The sub-questions that were addressed in this study are:

1. What do students' responses show about the strategies they use in summary writing?
2. How do African rhetoric systems affect the formation of sentences in summary writing?

1.5 Motivation/Rationale

The study was prompted by both personal and professional desire to understand why students in general and particularly students learning English as a second language in particular do not do well in summary writing. My teaching experience has shown that summary writing is not top of the list of what students enjoy writing in the academic context. I am teaching a compulsory course which is Applied Communication Skills. The ultimate goal of this course is to inculcate effective communication skills, both oral and written. In this curriculum, writing is the key aspect, as it is a general concern that most students are not able to write well in academic settings, where summary writing is a common activity.

I have generally noted that when students write summaries, they reproduce the original text, plagiarise and cannot show a clear distinction between main ideas and supporting statements from the source text. Upon failing to locate the main ideas from the source text, they resort to copying, relying extensively on the original text and in the process making minor or no changes at all in their summaries (Kim, 2001). Reproducing the source text in this manner has shown me that L2 students have challenges not only in comprehension of source texts but also in distinguishing main points from supporting sentences.

Experience as a language teacher to students of an African background twinned with interest was enough to form a hypothesis about how African discourses can contribute to the writing

of the students and summary writing precisely. Pursuing a study that looks at academic writing of students from an African background, who are in the process of learning English as a second language, makes this study worthwhile because academic writing is a common, daily classroom experience. Looking at issues that affect second language learners of English deeply will not only help us as teachers to understand the students and map ways to help them, but will also help us adopt ways of teaching that suit the demands of the learners. This is why I find this study worthy to pursue.

Being inquisitive about how students with African background write summaries the way they do has led to this study which seeks to analyse the African discourse and how it finds its place in the writing of the students. The modern day classroom has seen an influx of multiple languages and repertoires and I find that it justifies the need to carry out a study that takes the languages of the learners into cognisance as they come to the classroom. This desire has also led to a keen interest into translanguaging a socio-cultural approach and how it can help to address the above concerns hence a deeper research on the concept in this study.

1.6 Significance of the study

The purpose of the study is to explore summary writing of second language learners of English at college level and describe their stimulated-recall using a socio-cultural approach. Considering that there has been a significant amount of research on summary writing and very little on L2 summary writing, this study will contribute immensely to the body of knowledge. The little research on L2 summary writing has focused mainly on Korean and Chinese students and the fact that this study takes an African perspective and specifically a focus on South African students, makes it more worthwhile as little or no research has studied how students with African background write summaries.

The study will also be valuable and will prompt more research with an African perspective, thus adding new knowledge to the body of literature. The aspect of using a socio-cultural approach to summary writing, is arguably new and the study will bring to light the difficulty of students with an African background in summary writing.

In addition to contributing towards an area that has been under-researched in academic writing, this study will stimulate the development and subsequent adoption of pedagogical approaches that integrate the languages of the learners with their academic writing, as it will suggest a model or framework that can be implemented in summary writing of students with an African background.

CHAPTER 2

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the theory that frames this study and discuss how the theory forms the theoretical lens for this research. This study is grounded in a sociocultural theory, which views literacy as a social practice. The aim of the study is to investigate summary writing using a stimulated recall task for college-level ESL students in the South African context. It specifically seeks to explore summary writing of students with an African background because not much has been written about L2 summary writing let alone students from an African background. Scarcity of L2 summary writing research makes it quite difficult to understand what L2 students actually do when they summarise texts (Kim, 2001). The study also seeks to understand how cultural practices like rhetoric expressions influence the summary writing of students from an African background.

The study draws on both recent and old research on L2 summary writing because not much research has been done on the area of L2 summary writing. Some of the old research cited in this study is drawn from as far back as the 90s. While most of these studies look at the question of L2 summary writing in terms of cognitive skills that L2 students lack in summary writing, this study extends this view and looks beyond the cognitive skills to include the socio-cultural aspect of the students that influence the writing of summaries. The study is also informed by various concepts which include autonomous and ideological views to literacy, (Street, 1984),

Discourse (Gee, 1996), Contrastive Rhetoric (Kaplan, 1966) and Translanguaging (Makalela, 2015).

In order to understand summary writing in a socio-cultural perspective, literature that shows a distinction between the autonomous and ideological views to literacy is reviewed in this chapter. This socio-cultural perspective is the gap that this study seeks to fill in order to show the other side of L2 summary writing that has been studied minimally by other researches. This leads into a discussion on 'Discourse' and this study takes the capital 'D' as opposed to discourse with a small letter 'd'.

According to Gee, (1996), Discourse refers to ways of being in the world and this shall be discussed at length in another section of this chapter. Discourse has been included in this study because it promotes the socio-cultural theory of literacy as a social practice and further discussion on Discourse shows that L2 students belong to a particular social grouping that has its own ways of working with texts and how their primary Discourse influences the secondary Discourse where summary writing is done.

Contrastive rhetoric is a concept that connects with the other concepts in this study by showing thought patterns of L2 students and how these patterns reflect in summary writing of L2 students. Translanguaging in this study is discussed first as a model drawn from the Ubuntu translanguaging structure that illustrates the rhetoric practices of African languages in South Africa in order to understand these rhetoric practices that reflect in summaries of students with an African background. Secondly, translanguaging is discussed as a pedagogical tool that promotes literacy as a social practice in the classroom, a tool that this study suggests in order to understand summary writing of L2 students in a socio-cultural context.

2.1 Challenges in L2 summary writing

It is a general concern among researchers that research on L2 summary writing is minimal (Baleghizadeh & Babapour, 2011; Grabe, 2009; Kim, 2001). Research on L2 summary writing is still limited (Hee Ko, 2009, p.126) with the few studies on L2 summary writing having either focused on the cognitive skills of identifying main ideas from a source text, comprehension of the whole text and sentence formation in reconstructing the original text, comparison of L1 and L2 summary writing strategies or on approaches to summary writing instruction (Kim, 2009; Lin & Maarof; 2013; Yu, 2007). Scarcity of L2 summary writing research makes it quite difficult to understand what L2 students actually do when they summarise texts (Kim, 2001). "Yet studies of college students show that as many as 50% cannot generate original sentences to accurately sum up paragraphs of text (Friend, 2001, p. 3). This becomes one reason good enough to call for more research on L2 summary writing in order to help students with the necessary skills. New research on L2 summary writing is building on the few studies that have been conducted way back and this is the reason why most of the citations in this study are not quite recent. Some of the studies on L2 summary writing are cited below.

2.2 Previous studies on L2 summary writing

The few studies that have been selected for this study have all conducted research involving L2 students. These studies have all investigated summary writing of these students in different academic contexts. They have also focused on different aspects of summary writing, making their studies less monotonous and relevant to this particular study. The findings in the studies have also helped to build a better and well informed hypothesis on summary writing of L2 students. This is how this study fits in this body of literature. This study seeks to investigate the summary writing and stimulated recall of college ESL students from an African context using a socio-cultural perspective. This is the perspective that makes this study different from the other studies cited below that have focused more on the deficiency approach of what

cognitive skills L2 students lack in summary writing. Highlighted in the short summaries of their studies below are some of the areas of difficulty that L2 students face in summary writing.

In a study carried out by Yu, (2008) Chinese students were asked to write summaries of extended English texts in both English and Chinese and the aim was to examine the different effects of the use of two languages on summarisation as a measure of reading comprehension. The findings of this study show that the use of different languages has significant effects on both summarisation processes and products. Students wrote significantly longer Chinese summaries but these were rated consistently to be of poorer quality than English summaries. However, Chinese summarisation was found to be a better measure of students' English reading abilities.

In another study, Johns studied summary writing skills of 'underprepared' and 'adept' university students because he believed that it was an understudied area. In this study he focused on the higher order reading skills, identification of main ideas and condensation of text while maintaining the focus of the original. His findings show that underprepared students omit a number of main ideas and include more sentence-level reproductions than combinations of idea units or macro propositions.

Another study by Shi, (2004) examines how first language and the type of writing task affect undergraduates' word usage from source readings in their English readings. This study had English native speakers and Chinese students as participants. Using pre-selected texts, one group completed an opinion task and the other half completed a summary task. These tasks were compared to identify exact or near verbatim retention of strings of words from sources. Findings from the study show that both task and first language had an effect on the amount of words borrowed. The study also found that those who wrote the summary task borrowed more words than those who wrote the opinion task.

In a study conducted by Ashrafzadeh and Nimehchisalem in (2015) they analysed a group of tertiary level students' written samples to diagnose their main areas of difficulty in writing business report summaries. They worked with a group of 69 Malaysian students. The findings from this study show that Malaysian students are in need of summary writing skills in general and paraphrasing skills in particular. Lacking the necessary vocabulary knowledge and the skills to manipulate their vocabulary knowledge efficiently was also part of the findings.

Previous studies on L2 summary writing cited above are limited to the focus of this study which intends to investigate summary writing of L2 students with an African background focusing on their ability to identify main points, comprehension and their use of strategies in summary writing. The studies above highlight some of these challenges that L2 students go through when they write summaries. These are identification of main ideas, sentence reconstruction, the first language effect, strategies to summary writing and comprehension, and this is how their inclusion in this study becomes relevant because these are the areas that this study will focus on.

Many questions can be raised after reviewing the previous studies on L2 summary writing, such questions as 'what then is summary writing' and 'why is it so difficult to write' and 'why L2 students'. These, together with the research questions set for this study will be addressed in this section of the study. The context in which this summary writing is taking place will also be discussed at length together with a proposal of an approach that can be used to help L2 students overcome some of their challenges in academic writing.

2.3 Academic genre

Summary writing is one academic genre that has received significant attention in academic writing. Ashrafzadeh & Nimehchisalem (2015) state that summary writing has a special place and is considered as one of the most important components of teaching writing in business.

Interest in summary writing, "has evolved as researchers have attempted to describe the fundamental processes that take place when readers comprehend and summarize a passage" (Head, Readence, & Buss, 1989, p.1). Summary writing has been known to be a core activity in academic writing programs (Hood, 2008). Scholars have found that it leads to academic success because it helps students to develop vocabulary, promotes critical reading and comprehension and increases information retention. (Hood, 2008; Hee Ko, 2009; Kim, 2001; Kirkland & Saunders, 1991; Lin & Maarof, 2013). Previous studies show that it is a necessary, highly useful and sophisticated skill in academic writing of a student's academic career. (Yang & Shi; 2003). Some surveys prior to this study show that students understand why they should acquire summary writing skills (Hee Ko, 2009). Report writing and comprehending texts are some of the reasons why the skills are necessary to acquire. The few studies in second language (L2) summary writing show that summarising skills are not acquired naturally because they require knowledge on generating main ideas and careful planning of content and culture. (Anderson, & Hidi, 1989).

2.4 The nature of summary writing

Various scholars have given valuable insights on the nature and definition of a summary. And these insights explain better why summary writing is considered to be a challenge especially for L2 students as alluded in the previous studies above. Summarisation has been described as, "the process of determining what content in a passage is most important and transforming it into a succinct statement in one's own words" (Friend, 2001, p. 3). A more simplified definition notes that summarising is the ability to convey the main points concisely (Winograd, 1984). Some definitions consider this skill to include the reduction of a large amount of information to its most important points (Langan, 1993).

The definitions show that it is a process that calls for higher cognitive skills and this is what makes it a demanding task. (Lin & Maarof 2013). "The summary writer must decide what to

include, what to eliminate, how to reword or reorganise information, and how to ensure that the summary is true to the original's meaning" (Anderson, & Hidi, 1989, p. 26). Restructuring the source text requires students to engage with the text and to formulate ideas in their own words. This requires that students "make a shift from being consumers of knowledge to creators of knowledge" (Hood, 2008, p.351). This task calls for active metacognitive skills which are comprehension, evaluation, condensation and frequent transformation of ideas (Hidi & Anderson in Hill, 1991; Yu, 2008). A description of summarising given below indicates that summary writing involves a lot of skills other than comprehension skills as mentioned earlier. It is a description that fits well with the definitions of summary writing given above and what this task entails. Being able to decipher what is important from what is not requires careful judgement on the part of the reader so that he is able to create something new that can 'stand for the original'. Relatedly, Karbalaei & Rajyashree (2010) say that;

> Often confused with determining importance, summarizing is a broader, more synthetic activity for which determining importance is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition. The ability to summarize information requires readers to sift through large units of text, differentiate important from unimportant ideas, and then synthesize those ideas and create a new coherent text that stands for, by substantive criteria, the original. (p. 41)

Considering how summary writing is regarded in the academic settings not only in language teaching but in other fields like business writing shows how important it is for students to acquire these skills in order to succeed in their academic activities. However, as mentioned earlier, these skills do not come naturally for example, besides reading comprehension skills, "reducing a text to its main points is an ability which involves recognizing and deleting irrelevant and unnecessary information from a written text" (Ashrafzadeh & Nimehchisalem,

2015, p. 287). These authors mention that when one is writing a summary he is creating something new from the original text by focusing on its important points, a point that Hood (2008) also raises in the study that she conducted. She asserts that students should make a shift from consumer-based knowledge to creators of research-based knowledge when they write summaries and this is where the challenge comes in for L2 students. For one to create something new from an original text it means that he should engage with the text and use his own strategies to create a new text and this is illustrated by Cho, (2012) who argues that "the difficulty in writing an L2 summary returns to the reader's interpretation of a text through writing a new and summarized version, which is considered an act of composition" (Cho in Hirvela, 2004, p. 9).

2.5 Summarizing cognitive skills

While summary writing is an important skill for students to learn in ESL, it poses a lot of challenges some of which have been highlighted above. Choy & Lee, (2012) state that summary writing is a challenge for most students with limited vocabulary resonating with findings from a study conducted by Ashrafzadeh & Nimehchisalem, (2015) which states that the students lacked vocabulary knowledge. Adding to this notion is Hood, (2008) who posits that the process of changing wording seems to be complex when students have to present the same meaning in some other way. As a result, "identifying key concepts of the materials and applying skills of paraphrasing sentence structures to make the end product a precisely condensed summary reflecting the same emphasis is difficult for them" (Choy & Lee, 2012, p. 78). One other reason why summarising becomes difficult to L2 students is that it involves reading and writing in one instance.

2.6 A synergy of skills

Findings from early research show that summary writing is a demanding and difficult skill to master not only because it is a cognitive activity as discussed above, but also because it is a combination of reading and writing skills (Lin & Maarof, 2013; Nambiar, 2007). A summarising task demands that one reads and understands the original text, identifies its important information, and composes a short text to synthesize the important information (Yuan Ke & Hoey, 2014). Hee Ko (2009) adds that a combination of the two can be effective because the skills can reinforce each other. They facilitate deeper reading comprehension since they are interactive and interrelated.

Adding to this sentiment, Petrosky, in Zamel & Spack, (1998) asserts that both processes of reading and writing are interdependent and they focus on meaning construction. They share the "act of constructing meaning from words, text, prior knowledge and feelings" (p.22). Petrosky (1998) argues that one has to be a better reader in order to become a better writer and adds that any intelligent response to reading begins with an accurate understanding of a text, not just the facts and ideas, but also identifying some of these skills (accurate understanding and identifying the author's intent) are key in summary writing and this becomes a greater challenge to second language learners of English if these skills are tested in English which is a second language to students with an African background.

Even though it is beneficial to have the two skills, reading and writing together because they reinforce each other, some scholars feel that learning to write from textual sources is a challenging skill that requires one to work harder. "L2 students in academic contexts face a wide range of difficulties related to L2 reading/ writing integration" (Grabe & Zhang, 2013, p. 10). Some of these difficulties stem from limited reading and writing proficiency, fluency in reading, reading long passages and limited vocabulary.

2.7 Language proficiency

Findings from previous studies on L2 summary writing show that comprehension of a text is reflected more in summaries written in their first languages (Yu, 2008). Yu (2008) conducted a study in which students were asked to write a summary task translingually, one in English and another in Chinese. One finding was that comprehension was reflected more in the Chinese summaries. His conclusion was that language has an effect on summary writing.

The major emphasis on the challenges on L2 summary writing from previous research has been on comprehension, limited vocabulary and reorganising the text. The reason why L2 students struggle in the mentioned areas of summary writing is language as confirmed by some scholars. They argue that L2 students experience greater challenges if the writing task is in a second language (Makalela, 2004; De, Silva, 2015). Other scholars concur that writing in a second language poses many problems for the majority of the learners and it is complex (Bowen & Mark, 1994; Hyland, 2003; Shukri, 2014; Smith, 2001)

L2 students have a dual task of trying to understand the text written in a second language and writing the given task in a second language. Academic writing requires that students follow the standard writing conventions set by academic gatekeepers and engage in this context using academic discourse, a secondary discourse which is learned and different from their primary discourse and also new to second language learners of English. L2 students grapple for academic vocabulary which is not readily available, resulting in them resorting to copying and relying more on the original text extensively. In the process, they miss the important aspects that they need to identify in a text in order to write a good summary. Ashrafzadeh & Nimehchisalem (2015) contend that "while vocabulary knowledge is not the main reason for comprehension of a written text, lack of this knowledge causes failure to comprehend the text" (p. 287).

When the students fail to produce good summaries after going through these academic battles, findings from early research on L2 summary writing show that this is a result of the students' lack of summary writing skills. In an effort to address these deficiencies in L2 students, Choy and Lee in their study of Malaysia university students noted that "it is imperative to use the language spoken by these students outside school and with their families as a tool and bridge to helping them learn and practice paraphrasing skills" (Choy & Lee, 2012, p. 79) The benefits of this realisation are confirmed in some of the studies cited above that have used the first language of the students to teach summary writing. This realisation also acknowledges the funds of knowledge embedded in the language of the students and boosts the confidence of the students. This realisation again allows students to bring in their identities to the classroom and connects their learning with their culture and in the process, literacy is realised as a social practice.

Literacy as a social practice is described in the context of autonomous and ideological views to literacy in the next discussion. This discussion shows how the traditional view to literacy focuses mainly on the cognitive skills that students have or do not have, thereby making it a 'deficiency' approach. The ideological view is discussed as a model that recognises the funds of knowledge that L2 students bring to the classroom and not only on the cognitive skills that they lack. The argument is that second language learning should consider the language, identity, context and other frames of reference that concern an L2 student and how these influence the way they interact with texts in any literacy event.

2.8 Autonomous Vs Ideological models of Literacy

These are defined as oppositional theoretical positions. Some scholars point out that the autonomous model of literacy works from an assumption that literacy in itself autonomously will have effects on other social and cognitive practices (Heath & Street, 2008). This notion of literacy being neutral or existing independently implies that it is not tied to any social context

and its associated meaning and this is what differentiates the autonomous from the ideological model. Echoing the same sentiments are Street and Heath, (2008) who assert that the autonomous model disguises the cultural and ideological assumptions and presents literacy's values as neutral and universal, a factor that is also raised by Larson (1996). The model also rests on the premise that literacy, "when introduced to an illiterate individual has an effect of enhancing cognitive skills, improving their economic prospects, making them better citizens, regardless of the social and economic conditions that account for their illiteracy in the first place" (Street, 1994, p. 1). Here the cultural and ideological assumptions which underpin the autonomous model of literacy are disguised and presents literacy as neutral, universal, and transparent or given.

In a review where he challenges the autonomous model of literacy, Larson (1996) contends that this model relies on traditional definitions of literacy, "as a reified set of basic skills devoid of social context or political implications" (Larson, 1996, p. 439). He also adds that this model reduces literacy to a neutral set of reading and writing skills and these are the skills that previous studies have always tried to address in summary writing of second language learners of English. These studies have looked at summary writing from an autonomous point of view as their major findings show how second language learners of English lack the cognitive skills to identify main ideas or restructure sentences in summary writing.

This deficient approach to summary writing research disguises the cultural or social contexts in which the writing is taking place, nor the unique linguistic skills of the learner, thus creating the binary great divide between the literate and the illiterate. Mastering the cognitive skills of summary writing is associated with success and individual liberty and this is just a single direction in which literacy can be developed (Street, 1984). A view that challenges this perspective is the ideological one which sees literacy as a social practice. This view recognises

the fact that L2 students do not come to class as 'tabula rasas' or empty handed but bring along knowledge which can be used as resources to their learning.

2.9 Literacy as a social practice

The ideological model of literacy sees literacy as a critical social practice and all the underlying assumptions of literacy as a social process are made explicit (Larson, 1996). It is a view to literacy that is culturally sensitive to literacy practices in the various contexts (Street, 2001). Perry (2012, p. 53) notes that "the ideological model conceptualizes literacy as a set of practices, as opposed to skills, that are grounded in specific contexts and inextricably linked to cultural and power structures in society." Literacy is more than acquiring content and this model locates reading and writing in the social and linguistic practices that give them meaning (Larson, 1996).

These practices are far from being neutral: they are ideological, and they have different meanings for different cultural groups. Gee (1996) argues that the traditional view of literacy, the ability to read and write where reading refers to the ability to decode writing and writing as the ability to code writing into a visual form, "rips literacy out of its socio-cultural contexts" (p. 46). This means that literacy is not simply a technical or neutral skill but together with cognitive skills, literacy is, "always embedded in socially constructed epistemological principles" (Street, 2001, p.2). In this sense, literacy is always contested, both its meanings and its practices. Seeking to understand this relationship between literacy and the cultural practices in summary writing is what lies at the heart of this study. It is the role of this "socialisation process" in literacy that this study seeks to understand.

Summary writing as highlighted earlier is an activity that involves reading and writing, and any activity that involves any of these two skills is said to be a literacy event. Literacy event is, "any occasion in which a piece of writing is integral to the nature of the participants'

interactions and their interpretative processes" (Street & Lefstein, (2007, p. 43). Simply, a literacy event is an activity where literacy has a role, and the basic definition of literacy as given by theorists of literacy as a social practice, is that, "literacy is what people do with reading, writing and texts in real world contexts and why they do it" (Perry, 2012, p. 54). Literacy events are observable as what people do with texts can be seen. Practices must be inferred because they connect to unobservable beliefs, values, attitudes, and power structures. Practices are also shaped by social relationships and these are crucial because, "literacy practices are more usefully understood as existing in the relationships between people, within groups and communities, rather than as a set of properties residing in individuals" (Barton & Hamilton, 2000, p. 8).

This model to literacy acknowledges the fact that when students engage in a literacy event, they do not come empty-handed to the learning environment. They bring along their language, attitudes, values and their identities embedded in their languages and these influence the way they read and write specific sorts of texts (Gee in Rowsell & Pahl, 2015). These ways are also determined by the values and practices of different social and cultural groups. These specific texts could be academic texts in the case of summary writing and they need to be understood and written in specific ways, which also means that L2 students need to be acquainted with the discourse of the academic context.

Discourse is a socio-cultural approach that is suggested by Gee (1996) after realising that literacy should not be taken out of its context. This approach defines language and literacy in terms of Discourses. Gee, (1996) uses the term 'Discourses' with a capital 'D' to refer to ways of being in the world as opposed to 'discourse' which refers to linguistic units. Gee describes a Discourse as a "socially accepted association among ways of using language, other symbolic expressions, and 'artefacts' of thinking, feeling, believing, valuing and acting" which can be used to identify someone as a member of a social grouping (Gee, 1996, p. 31). He further

explains that different people can read the world differently just as they can read different types of texts differently, "…what determines this is your own experience in interacting with other people who are members of various sorts of social groups" (Gee, 2003, p. 2). In addition, he says that through their social practices, these different groups work to encourage people to think in certain ways about certain sorts of texts.

Noted from the arguments above is that people operate in different Discourses that are socially acceptable and in those Discourses there are also agreed ways on how to interact with texts or use language. Below, is a discussion that shows a distinction between primary and secondary Discourses. These are just two different social groups that one can belong to, and in each one of them, one is expected to use language and interact with texts in ways that are agreed upon. This discussion gives an explanation of how the primary Discourse that the learner is bringing to the Secondary Discourse that is, the academic Discourse influences the learner's writing.

2.10 Primary vs Academic discourse

Gee in Zarmel & Spack (1988) explains that the primary discourse is acquired at birth and this is, "our socio-culturally determined ways of using our native language in face to face communication with inmates" (Gee, 1998, p. 5). He describes secondary discourses as discourses beyond the primary discourse which are developed in association with secondary institutions like schools, workplaces, stores, churches and others. The language used in secondary discourse be it oral or written goes beyond the primary discourse and he calls these, 'secondary uses of language'. When L2 students write summaries, they are expected to make a shift from their primary uses of language to secondary uses of language that are suitable for an academic context. The students may not use vocabulary from their languages per se but the way they engage with the texts may be heavily influenced by their primary discourse practices.

Academic discourse has been defined as a specialised form of reading, writing, and thinking all done in 'the academy' (Zamel, in Zamel & Spack; 1998). It has also been defined as the "peculiar ways of knowing, selecting, evaluating, reporting, concluding and arguing that define the discourse of our community" (Bartholomae, in Zamel & Spack, 1998, p. 4). "Because it appears to require a kind of language with its own vocabulary, norms, sets of conventions, and modes of inquiry, academic discourse has come to characterize a separate culture, one within which each discipline may represent a separate cultural community" (Bartholomae, in Zamel & Spack, 1998 , p. 5). It is from this notion of a separate culture that we get the terms discourse or interpretive community. It is these 'formalized' and 'peculiar' ways of this academic community that L2 students need to familiarise with because it is a learned discourse different from their acquired primary discourse. Navigating through the academic discourse in summary writing does not come easily for L2 students because their ways of using language and interacting with texts in the primary discourse are different and these ways have a tendency of showing up in the academic discourse.

It is true that there are times when students fail to control the primary discourse because it is their dominant discourse. Relying on students' primary uses of language in inappropriate circumstances has been a concern and is the greatest challenge of L2 students in summary writing. When they 'fall back', they bring in values, attitudes and other practices from their primary discourse and these are not socially accepted in the secondary Discourse. It therefore becomes unfair to judge their incompetency based only on cognitive skills and mastery of the academic Discourse conventions and paying no attention to other factors that come into play in academic writing like the social context in which the writing is taking place. Taking literacy as a social practice entails considering the literacy practices that are informed by the culture, language and context of the students, as learning resources and in the process the gap between

primary and secondary Discourses is closed allowing home and school literacy practices to interrelate.

The following is a discussion on culture and identity and how they relate to L2 writing. This discussion also describes the working definition of culture that is relevant to this study. The way culture is defined in the first instance echoes the same point raised by Gee in his definition of Discourse where he says Discourse refers to ways of being in the world. In other words, when we talk of Discourse we are also talking of culture in the sense that it is 'the entire way of life of people' which includes how they talk, think, read or write and how this informs our identity as people belonging to different social groupings. The discussion shows how these cultural differences that show in the academic Discourse can be tapped on and seen as resources; a point that has been emphasised earlier.

2.11 Culture and Identity


In this study, the definition of culture is adapted from Barakat in Shukri, (2014). He identifies three aspects of culture. Firstly, it is the entire or total way of life of people, including a shared social heritage, visions of social reality, value, orientations, beliefs, customs, norms, traditions, skills and the like. Secondly, culture includes the artistic achievements, and lastly culture involves knowledge or thought and the sciences. (Shukri, 2014). Cultural factors are some of the reasons for writing differences and there are numerous ways to form meanings (Hyland, 2003). Hyland emphasises that an appreciation for writing differences can facilitate cross cultural understandings that can help to understand that writing difficulties are not problems inherent in students themselves. By openly addressing students' L1 writing experiences, rhetorical styles and contrasting them with the expectations of target writing communities like the academic community can help teachers to make informed pedagogical decisions in the classroom.

Another perception of culture by Hofstede, (1980) sees culture and its traditions as, “learned thinking habits in the form of collective programming of the mind which sets an individual group in contrast to another and it is this programming that causes people to react differently in similar situations” (Shukri, 2014, p.194). Together with this perception, he proposes four cultural framework dimensions which are; power distance, collectivism versus individualism, femininity versus masculinity, and uncertainty avoidance. Of great interest to this study is the individualism versus the collectivism which will be discussed later under the translanguaging model. This dimension posits that people of a particular community feel more comfortable when they are in unified situations rather than individualistic ones and this dimension stems from family dynamics and radiates into the educational system and this resonates with the interdependence concept of the Ubuntu translanguaging model. (Makalela, 2016). This model illustrates the rhetorical practices of the African languages in South Africa.

2.12 Translanguaging model

This model has been adapted from Makalela (2016) in his paper on the framework of Ubuntu Translanguaging model. This model illustrates the nature of a primary Discourse in the African language. Understanding the rhetoric systems of an African language gives a clear understanding of how they function and end up showing in the writing of academic texts. Several aspects that relate to the African rhetoric expressions are highlighted in this model.

Figure 1: Ubuntu Translanguaging Model



Adapted from Makalela, 2016

The shape of the model is circular which resembles the wholeness in rhetorical systems of an African language. The model shows that there is very little room for "I" in the way that people speak because it causes discontinuity of existence. The concept drawn from this is that one of interdependence where the growth of one depends on the other whether vertical or horizontal. Continuity is only possible with the existence of others. "I am because we are" is a theory that thrives in African rhetoric systems because one does not live in a vacuum. Gee (1998) emphasises that primary communities function as extended families and the extension stretches to their livestock and their environment because the livestock and the environment form part of their existence. Confirming the interpretation of the translanguaging model in relation to rhetoric systems is Shen (1998) who notes that in the Chinese rhetorical systems, the identity

of the self “I” is subordinated to “We” as “I” is considered to be selfish, individualistic, disrespectful, and boastful. When it comes to academic writing, L2 learners of English try as much as they can to avoid their representation and distance themselves from their own writing, making them less assertive, voiceless and seemingly absent. This concept is carried over in academic writing and is evident when students treat the whole text as one whole idea and breaking it into small ideas would be like breaking the continuity of the whole text.

Shen further shows how the essential rules in both Chinese and English differ in academic writing. She points out that the essential rule for the logical piece of writing is the use of a topic sentence and in Chinese composition “from surface to core” is the rule which means that “one ought to reach a topic gradually and systematically instead of abruptly” (Shen in Zamel & Spack, 1998, p.128). Similarly, in the African rhetoric systems, sensitive issues are not talked about directly; rather, interlocutors go around and around before they can hit on the real issue. There is so much circumlocution in the way they speak. This way of speaking in this particular primary discourse creeps into the secondary discourse and is evident when students engage with academic texts. When they read texts they do not normally expect to get the main idea from the beginning of a text. If they are told in summary instruction that they will get the main idea of a paragraph from the topic sentence, they will look for the topic sentence towards the end of the paragraph, and this is how they find it difficult to identify the main points for summary writing.

The above is also raised by one scholar who argues that a Chinese writer, “often clears the surrounding bushes before attacking the real target” (Shen in Zamel & Spack, 1998, p. 128). In her words she writes, “the writing is like the peeling of an onion; layer after layer is removed until the reader finally arrives at the central point, the core” (Shen in Zamel & Spack, 1998, p.128). Previous studies clearly demonstrate that what Shen is discussing above is what makes ESL writers different from their NS counterparts. The way they connect ideas is different. ESL

students are described as always repeating themselves pointlessly or arguing the same point in slightly different ways, paragraph after paragraph and each paragraph becoming a modest addition or alteration of given information (Land & Whitley in Zamel & Spack, 1998).

Ahmed‘s study quoted in Shukri, (2014) reports that Egyptian students face writing difficulties in topic sentences, transitioning of ideas, and the sequencing of ideas. This could be attributed to what has been discussed above, in relation to rhetorical systems of L2 students. Another study shows that the writing problems of Jordanian Arab university students lay at the sentence and paragraph level and also on content (Doushaq, 1986). These levels have also been spelt out by early research on L2 summary writing and the research questions that frame this study also aim to address them as they keep coming up in academic writing of L2 learners.

An argument put forth by some scholars shows that ESL students write the way they do because of their membership in distinct rhetorical communities (Land & Whitley, in Zamel & Spack, 1998). They call them rhetorical communities, to focus more on the rhetorical systems. Earlier, Gee, (1998) referred to these as primary communities. These communities as mentioned earlier have their own ways of thinking, regarding reading and writing of texts. One scholar explains in the studies that he carried out why he thinks L2 students write the way they do. He links their writing to thought which links the discussion above and his theory described in the discussion below.

2.13 Contrastive Rhetoric

This concept was first proposed by Kaplan, in 1966 as a pedagogical tool to the problem of L2 organizational structures. (Matsuda, 1997). Contrastive rhetoric is defined by Connor in Shukri, (2014) as,

> An area of research in second language acquisition
> that identifies problems in composition encountered


> by second language writers and by referring to the rhetorical strategies of the first language, attempts to explain them--- contrastive rhetoric maintains that language and writing are cultural phenomena. As a direct consequence, each language has rhetorical conventions to it. (p. 195)

The above definition confirms that writing and language are cultural phenomena and this is why the concept of contrastive rhetoric becomes relevant to this study that adopts the socio-cultural perspective on summary writing and worth investigating. The premise of contrastive rhetoric is that each language and culture has unique rhetorical conventions and that when ESL/ EFL students write in English, some of their first language rhetorical conventions appear in their target language writing. (Hamadouche, 2013).

Adding to the above definition, Purves argues that ESL students should first comprehend the rhetorical patterns of their native language to better understand the rhetorical patterns of the English language (Shukri, 2014). This brings an awareness of the differences in the rhetorical patterns of their native language and the target language which are key to their success in academic writing. This comprehensive approach will not only look at what L2 students lack, but at a wide array of knowledge and skills they bring to the classroom in the form of language. An example given shows that Japanese' discourse patterns are inductive, indirect and non-linear (Kubota, 2004). This example also describes the writing of most ESL writers which is said to be less linear and more tolerant of digressions (Petric, 2005).

Examples cited above resonate with Kaplan's findings in his study of 600 L2 student essays (Kaplan, 1966). In his study, he claims that English writing is characterised by directness and deductive reasoning, while other languages (Oriental languages and Arabic) favour indirectness and inductive reasoning as shown in the illustration. (Xinghua, 2011) (See Figure 2 below)

Figure 2: Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education



Source: Kaplan, Robert. In McKay, Sandra (Ed.) Composing in a Second Language, 1984.

He found that students from different backgrounds systematically identified and developed their ideas in ways different to English native speakers and links this to their different cultures and thought patterns and this initiated a new research area which is contrastive rhetoric but this work has highly been contested because of some of this theory' limitations. One such limitation is that it is focused solely on discourse organization in L1/L2 writing.

Compared with the essentially linear pattern of English paragraphs, he suggested that Arabic speakers produced texts based on a series of parallel coordinate 'oriental' clauses, used an indirect approach, and come to the point only at the end (Shukri, 2014). Echoing the same sentiment is Shen (1998) who says that a Chinese writer often clears the surrounding bushes before attacking the real target and similarly the writing of African students has been described as 'beating about the bush'. In describing the writing of the Arabic, another scholar states that repetition, overemphasis, stylistic elaboration, and stylistic exaggeration characterise their

rhetoric (Patai in Shukri, 2014). Discussions earlier on show that these styles of writing run across L2 students of any background.

2.14 Knowledge telling / knowledge transforming

The thought patterns described above resonate with some scholars who have been cited earlier in this study. Hood (2008) maintains that in summary writing, students should be seen to be creators of knowledge; in other words, they should demonstrate an ability to transform given information and move from being consumers to transformers of knowledge. That Arab writers writing in English are knowledge tellers could be a microcosm for second language learners of English because of their cultural rhetoric systems. Mentioned earlier is the dimension of 'power dimension' from Hofstede's model of culture. This dimension implies that the author of a text is regarded as more powerful and should never be challenged, and when students approach a text with this mentality, they have high regard for knowledge conservation and avoid by all means to contaminate the existing knowledge.

As a result, students end up reproducing existing knowledge by memorization and imitation, and this is regarded as copying, plagiarism and memorization - problematic areas cited by earlier studies on summary writing of ESL students. In a cultural conception of self, this shows that ESL students who insist more on a sense of community cannot fully divorce their writing from existing knowledge; they find it difficult first to separate from the whole text, single ideas that make up the whole text as in showing distinction between main ideas and supporting sentences in summary writing. Secondly, they fail to separate themselves from the existing knowledge to become transformers and creators of new knowledge fully independent and expressing themselves in the writing. This individualistic stance in writing is regarded as selfish and boastful in L2 cultural rhetoric and students will try as much as they can to avoid standing out as a unique voice in any writing.

The concepts that have been included in this discussion to define literacy as a social practice which are; Discourse, culture, contrastive rhetoric and translanguaging model have highlighted the need to treat an L2 student as a whole being. This means recognising among others the language of the student and cultural practices that influence the way they interact with texts. The review in this chapter has started by highlighting the challenges that L2 students face in summary writing, drawing some examples from previous research. Further research on the socio-cultural aspect of summary writing emphasised in the concepts discussed above has also shown that focusing on the cognitive skills of L2 students only is short changing them and the way they write summaries is not a problem inherent in them but an issue that needs to be addressed at culture level.

These concepts have also highlighted the cultural practices of L2 students and their thinking patterns that end up reflecting in their L2 writing causing them to copy everything in a source text in summary writing, fail to distinguish main ideas from supporting sentences to name just but a few of the challenges of L2 students in summary writing. Stating the challenges of L2 summary writing and highlighting culture influence in their writing and ending there would not do justice to the study. The study aims to investigate the summary writing and stimulated recall of College ESL students using a socio-cultural approach in a South African context. The socio-cultural approach is complete with a suggestion of a pedagogical tool that can be adopted in a second language learning classroom in order to realize summary writing as a social practice, thereby tucking in the aim of the study.

Below is a discussion on translanguaging as a pedagogical tool. In this study, translanguaging is embracing all the concepts that have been highlighted above as elements that make up an L2 student. The approach is one that acknowledges the fact that an L2 student does not come to the learning space empty-handed, it is an approach that taps on the knowledge that these

students bring to the classroom. This approach comes as a suggestion in the teaching of L2 summary writing to see how far it goes in addressing some of the challenges of L2 students.

2.15 Translanguaging: a tool for learning and teaching

A teaching and learning approach that in this study is developed from the translanguaging model of Ubuntu mentioned earlier can be considered as an option in the teaching of summary writing to L2 students in a South African context. This approach connects with the view of literacy as a social practice which is the theoretical framework of this study. Below is a detailed discussion on the work that various scholars have done to explain the relevance of this approach in the classroom. Their studies have been explicitly stated to ease understanding on how this new phenomenon operates in the classroom and how their studies were conducted.

Translanguaging which is known to be a pedagogical tool in multilingual classrooms has emerged as a teaching and learning strategy to challenge the monolingual orientation in the school curricula. (Childs, 2016; Makalela, 2015). This concept of translanguaging was coined by Williams in the 1980s to refer to, "the planned and systematic use of two languages in the same lesson" (Lasagabaster & Garcia, 2014, p. 558). Another scholar shows that it is purposive alternation of languages of input and output (Makalela, 2015). According to Makalela (ibid) an extended view of this strategy shows that translanguaging, "is based on language practices that break traditional linguistic codes in favour of fluid mobile and multiple discursive resources" (p. 276). Other scholars add that translanguaging has been opted as an alternative strategy for super-diverse multilingual classrooms. (Creese & Blackledge 2010; Garcia 2009; Hornberger & Link 2012; Makalela, 2014). It is in this light of definition that the discussion on literature below rests upon.

The introduction that Childs, (2016) gives as an opening note summarises the main points of her article. She says that: "Students' humanity-its existence and expansion is at the heart of a

humanizing pedagogy. All students and all teachers are human beings and equal in their humanity. We are all in the process of becoming. “The purposes of education are to extend this humanity through opportunities for creativity, imagination and interaction with others and the world” (Zinn & Rodgers, 2012, p. 87).

Drawn from the quotation above, the suggestion is that translanguaging is a humanizing pedagogy that enables access to knowledge and the crafting of socio-cultural identities. She also points out that learners who are not skilled in the dominant language of the classroom appear to be seen as less able and less worthy and the treasures of language and culture that they bring to the classroom are forced to remain outside the classroom door. This can result in a sense of humiliation at the rejection of vital aspects of human being (Salazar, 2013). Her study seeks to understand how translanguaging can be used to provide humanizing experiences for learners and teachers in primary school classrooms.

Adding to the notion of that which students bring to the classroom, Moll, Amanti, Neff and Gonzalez (1992) speak of funds of knowledge. In their words, ‘funds of knowledge’ refer to “These historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well-being” (p. 133). They add that their view of funds of knowledge specifically refers to strategic knowledge pertaining to the social, economic, and productive activities of people in a local region not culture in its broader sense. It is these funds of knowledge that Childs (2016) refers to in her study which need to be acknowledged in second language classrooms and not assume that L2 students come to the classroom without knowledge of anything.She laments the education system in South Africa that sees languages as separate entities. She says that languages are conceived of as Home language, first additional language, second additional language and this system sets languages apart and not integrated.

Finally, she states that a humanizing pedagogy is important for both teachers and learners and translanguaging allows that fluid movement between the home and the school language offering a more human experience.Childs hence adopts a qualitative design and poetic inquiry to be more precise. “This approach provides new ways of being in dialogue with research findings and new ways of working with people in vulnerable situations to name ‘what it is like’” (Childs, 2016, p. 27). Data was gathered in the form of poetry and photographs. She draws on what she calls vox autobiographia and vox theoria to reflect on her own experiences.In her findings, she confirms that translanguaging offers a means of working towards good use of the Language of learning and teaching while allowing the home language to continue to grow. Excluding the home language of learners places them at a disadvantage and referred to the deficit view of ‘subordinate students’ and this experience can be dehumanizing. This view is resonated by Choy & Lee, (2012) who say that,

> It is important to note that research has shown that it is
> Imperative to use the language spoken by these students
> Outside school and with their families as a tool and bridge
> To helping them learn and practice paraphrasing skills. (p. 79)

Another article, ‘Breaking African language barriers by Makalela, (2015) supports the notion of using translanguaging as a strategy for teaching and learning. A metaphor derived from Garcia provides the basis of his arguments in this article. He says that the discursive resources in an expanded view of translanguaging are, “more like an all-terrain vehicle whose wheels extend and contract, flex and stretch, making possible, over highly uneven ground, movement forward that is bumpy and irregular but also sustained and effective” (Garcia, 2009 in Makalela, 2015, p. 277). To unpack this metaphor, Makalela asserts that the process of

translanguaging may not look so attractive or beneficial just like an all-terrain vehicle but its outcomes are effective for speakers to make sense of the world around them and their identity. This view of translanguaging reflects a pedagogy that embraces all semiotic modes that multilingual students bring to the classroom.

Another notable idea raised in Makalela's article is emphasized in Garcia's quote which reads, "two often bilingual students who translanguage suffer linguistic shame because they have been burdened with monoglossic ideologies that value only monolingualism---. And too often bilingual teachers hide their natural translanguaging practices from administrators and others because they have taught to believe that only monolingual ways of speaking are 'good' and 'valuable', yet they know that to teach effectively in bilingual classrooms, they must translanguage" (Garcia, 2009, in Makalela, 2015, p. 278).

The above assertion shows that despite the multilingual realities in the classrooms, monolingualism is still dominant and teachers are not free to use other linguistic resources for fear of being caught by their superiors. Makalela hence points out that translanguaging is more complex, it is speaker oriented and includes processes of going between and beyond languages and encompasses all other meaning making semiotic modes. Allowing varieties of meaning making semiotic modes in the classroom embraces the Multiliteracies' concept of Multimodality which gives a learner the human experience in the classroom context. Some of the questions he seeks to answer are: the effectiveness of translanguaging in classroom situations where more than two languages are utilized and the benefits of using translanguaging as a teachable strategy for Nguni Multilingual speakers.

Relatedly, in a study where he works with 15 students, he uses interviews to collect metalanguaging data. The interview allowed participants to reflect on their learning journey and also based on the lecture's notes to reflect on the successes of experimenting with the

translanguaging teaching model. Open ended questions were used and the interviews lasted for 3 days with each session taking approximately 50- 70 minutes. His findings show that translanguaging as a teaching strategy enhances metalinguistic awareness, breaks language and cultural enclaves, expands the sense of self and creates desire to progress in the new language. Linguistic pluralism is another concept that emanates from his findings, meaning that instead of looking at languages as separate, languages should be seen as 'leaking into one another'.

In another article by Makalela (2015) entitled, "Translanguaging as a vehicle for epistemic access", he explores the efficacy of alternating languages of input and output in the same lessons in order to disable the one language for all concept dominant in monolingual classrooms. He reiterates that schools have adopted a monolingual approach where one language is pitted against the other and teachers protecting languages from getting contaminated with the other. He adds that the emergence of super-diverse settings in the 21st century has caused a shift that requires," classroom practices to build on the multiple repertoires of the learners and to acknowledge the linguistic fluidities that overlap into one another" (Makalela, 2015, p. 16). He further points out that when one language is used to access the same content, learners develop a deeper understanding of the subject matter and in language classes translanguaging becomes a, "useful strategy to develop a weaker language through cross transfer of skills between the linguistic repertoires that students already possess" (Makalela, 2015, p. 16). This resonates what Childs raises in her article about seeing languages as integrated and not as separate entities. (Childs, 2016).He uses a quote from Baker to show the advantages of translanguaging. It says: "It is possible in a monolingual teaching situation for students to answer questions or write an essay about a subject without fully understanding it. Processing for meaning may not have occurred. Whole sentences or paragraphs can be copied or adapted out of a text book, from the internet or from dictation by the teacher without real understanding. It is 'less' easy to do this with translanguaging. To read and discuss a topic

in one language and then to write about it in another language, means that the subject matter has to be processed and 'digested'. (Baker in Makalela, 2015, p. 17). This quote shows that translanguaging allows learners to engage more actively with the text and that this enhances comprehension of the content.

The article on Translanguaging as a vehicle for epistemic access seeks to answer the following questions: What are the effects of translanguaging techniques on reading comprehension in primary schools? What is the role of translanguaging techniques in the teaching of African languages to speakers of other African languages in South Africa?The study carried out involves two case studies whereby one investigates the efficacy of translanguaging as a teachable strategy in higher education and primary schools in South Africa and the second case involves the use of translanguaging techniques to facilitate reading development in home language (Sepedi) and additional language (English) in a primary school at a rural area. In the first case, 24 university students were enrolled for a Sepedi class as an additional language. They had no prior exposure to reading and writing Sepedi and this course was meant to prepare them for multilingual classrooms. Oral and text-based approaches were used to provide students with opportunities to practice the use of the language through input-output alternation. A communicative approach was also used which included thorough engagement with cultural content and included topics on greetings, requests, autobiographies among others. In discussion groups using other languages was encouraged.

The second case of 60 grade six learners followed a three-phased experimental procedure namely, pre-test, treatment and post-test. A translanguaging workshop for learners included alternation of languages in vocabulary induction exercises, silent reading of comprehension, read aloud protocols and development of print environment in both languages. The findings from this qualitative design shows that experience with translanguaging involved changing negative attitudes towards African languages and realizing and appreciating multilingualism as

natural and language learning as an identity investment. The findings also show that translanguaging strategies increase epistemic access to bilingual and multilingual learners and students in both cases. The other finding which shows the efficacy of translanguaging in enhancing multiple identities is the knowledge and association with native speakers of Sepedi that the learners added to their repertoire.

In another article entitled, Translanguaging: towards a dynamic model of bilingualism at school, the authors Lasagabaster & Garcia describe how translanguaging can be employed in the classroom as a pedagogical tool that encourages a simultaneous use of two or more languages in one classroom at the same time. This description comes as a response to school trends that treat languages separately to avoid one from affecting the other.

Their main argument is that translanguaging should be seen as a process or strategy to help implement a dynamic model of bilingualism and not just an educational theory. (Lasagabaster & Garcia, 2014). Their article is based on a case study where translanguaging is seen in action in a real classroom practice and they confirm how using Spanish and English at the same time helps students to understand the content being taught. Findings drawn from their case study show that the weaker language can be developed by using the stronger one, a view that is shared by (Makalela, 2015 ; Childs, 2016). The findings also confirm that translanguaging is a holistic approach to education where no one language prevails over the others.

The authors employed the quantitative design for their study and prepared a questionnaire with questions that centred on their research questions raised above and was divided into three sections. In their study they worked with 201 students from two universities in the Western Cape and the languages they focused on were Afrikaans, isiXhosa and English as home languages.Their findings show that students perceive English to be very important, whether in terms of general use or its use in education. However, in another section of the questionnaire,

findings show that their home languages which are not English are important for successful studies. Further, the findings show that students do not seem to favour English as it requires more effort to learn it than their home languages. Students only want English to get a qualification or job but as an entry to a community or culture they want to be identified with their home languages.

In summary, the cited readings above hammer on major issues which they all agree on. The first one is the acknowledgement of an education system that promotes a monolingual approach to teaching and learning in a multilingual environment. They also agree that the translanguaging model comes in as an alternative to monoglossic approaches that prescribe a monolingual way of making meaning. Their main argument is that this monolingual approach has a tendency of treating languages as separate entities thereby confining learners to linguistic boxes for fear of having other languages contaminating the other. This view implies that some languages are considered superior over others.

The readings further show how translanguaging can benefit the bilingual and multilingual learners to access knowledge in different languages and making them creative and active learners who are not limited or inhibited by a language. Even though English has been upheld as a hegemonous language, findings in another reading have shown that students desire to have their languages as languages of instruction and be at par with English. Lastly, the authors of these readings show that translanguaging should not just be the worry of the teacher only but the curriculum as a system should adopt this strategy so that it can be implemented officially across the teaching fraternity.

The socio-cultural approach to summary writing of second language learners of English adopted in this study embraces these issues that relate to the culture and rhetorical systems of the languages that the students are bringing to the classroom. This is an approach that this study

advocates for instead of the deficient approach that focuses on the mastery of cognitive skills of summary writing, an approach that is evident in most early studies of L2 summary writing.

Understanding these cultural values and rhetorical systems particularly for students with an African background, which is the focus of this study, will help both the students and the teachers to identify pedagogical strategies that will help them to cross cultural boundaries from primary to academic communities without themselves feeling deficient.

The theory of literacy as a social practice which underpins this study has been discussed. Several other concepts drawn in from cultural studies that promote the theoretical framework of this study have been discussed together with their relevance to the study. Findings from previous research have been highlighted and discussed at length showing the indicated problem areas of L2 summary writing. Differences between the traditional model of literacy and the ideological model have also been discussed. The way L2 students engage and read texts has been explained linking this to the thought patterns of L2 students. Rhetorical expressions have been discussed through an illustration of translanguaging Ubuntu model and similarities of these expressions have been drawn from other L2 languages. The socio-cultural aspect of the L2 student has been discussed and this has explained why L2 students write their summaries in the way that has been described by previous research earlier in this chapter. To complete the socio-cultural investigation of L2 students' summary writing, a pedagogical tool that promotes the socio-cultural theory of literacy as a social practice has been suggested. This tool has been described in detail showing what previous research has said about how it operates in the classroom and how it benefits the student. The following chapter discusses the methods that have been used to collect data for this study and why those methods have been selected.

CHAPTER 3

3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the methods that have been employed in this study and discuss why they have been selected for this particular study. The study falls under the qualitative studies approach and this approach has been described as, “An approach for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem” (Creswell, 2014, p. 110). The study aims to describe and understand how students with an African background write summaries.

The research problem that this study aims to explore displays some of the features that characterise a qualitative study as described by Creswell (2014). He posits that the concept in a research problem that falls under the qualitative approach is immature because there is lack of theory and previous research. True to this is that the issue of summary writing of second language learners of English is an area that has limited research as confirmed by (Hee Ko; 2009 and Kim;2001). There is also little or no research on summary writing of second language learners of English with an African background.

3.1 Sampling and Population

The unit of analysis for this study was four participants who were purposively sampled on the basis of the African language that they speak as home language. This was done to ensure that all the languages in South Africa categorised under Nguni, Sotho, Tshivenda and Xitsonga are fully represented in the analysis of summaries written in the first language. Circumstances beyond my control forced me to work with two participants of Nguni speaking languages and these were IsiZulu and Sepedi because there were student protests over fee increases and this resulted in most of the students leaving the campus often much earlier than anticipated and I could not get a Sotho speaking participant on time. Purposive sampling was preferred over

others because it allowed me to maximise the range of specific information which I could obtain from the selected participants that had different languages. The table below shows the demographic information of the participants.

Figure 3: Demographic Table

Name	**Age**	**Gender**	**Home Language**
Participant 1	19	Female	Sepedi
Participant 2	19	Male	IsiZulu
Participant 3	24	Male	Tsonga
Participant 4	20	Female	Tshivenda

These participants were all registered for a three-year diploma course in Tourism at a local university in Gauteng. They were also registered for Applied Communication Skills, a compulsory course which had a component of English for Academic Purposes. Even though the ultimate goal for this course was to inculcate in students good communication skills both oral and written, writing skills formed the basis for this course as it had been a general concern that students lacked good writing skills. The course was also aimed at equipping them with writing skills in preparation for the workplace and summary writing was a common activity in this course with participants having written summaries before.

The mean age of the participants was twenty-one years and both male and female participants took part in the study to avoid any gender bias. All the selected participants had a South African background because the context of this study was South Africa. The participants selected had one of the South African languages as their home language. It was made clear to the students that participation in the study was purely voluntary and they were not coerced to take part in

the study. They were also told that not participating in the study would not have any negative repercussions in any way.

3.2 Procedure

Explicit instruction on summary writing was given to the participants. They were told to observe academic conventions such as writing a prose summary with complete sentences and indicating the number of words used in the summary. They were given a source text entitled "The various communicative methods practiced by animals in the veld" adapted from www.caribexams.org/node/842 . The text was on animal communication. The author described how different animals and birds communicated through singing, colours and the various sounds that they make. The text was divided into seven short paragraphs. The text was selected for various reasons. The first one was that it was an expository text which matched much of the academic texts that they come across in their academic contexts.

According to Purnamasari, Diem & Vianty (2014), an expository text is written to inform the reader about a specific subject. They add that these texts are different from those of narrative text, and most students regardless of their reading ability struggle at times with expository text. "Expository text contains vocabulary that is both challenging and new, words are often outside students' everyday knowledge, topics are ones students have never experienced personally" (Purnamasari, Diem & Vianty , 2014, p. 45). They state that an expository text contains an explicit or implicit topic sentence with the main idea and the supporting sentences and these ideas are organised into text structures such as describing characteristics of ideas. The text on animal communication that was set for this study was only on a single subject of animal communication. The vocabulary in the text included words like **conspicuously and gaudy**(See Appendix 1 for source text). These are words that students rarely meet in their everyday language and can only use skills like inference to get their meanings. The text was suitable for the summary writing task because there were main ideas and the supporting sentences stated

and it was based on one subject and they needed to identify these main ideas in their summary. An expository text would also allow them to employ various strategies like inference mentioned earlier in order to comprehend the text. In addition to the above, Iwai, (2007) states that expository texts allow students to engage in higher cognitive skills. Furthermore, he argues that, "authors of informational texts assume that readers already have some prior knowledge of the topic" (Iwai, 2007, p. 2). The text on animal communication activated the participants' background knowledge that allowed them to tap their schemata to gather information regarding animal communication.

The second reason why this text was chosen was that the content was within the curriculum parameters of what they were doing in the compulsory course, which is Applied Communication Skills. The text would boost their interest and add to their knowledge of communication and not only human communication and thus benefiting from the task. This text on animal communication enabled participants to share some of the ways of communication practiced in their communities for example when speaking to elders and this insight gave the desired information relevant for this study. The text was 380 words long and the participants were asked to summarise the text translingually in not more than 120 words first in English and then in their home language and were given one hour to complete the tasks.

The rationale behind writing the summaries in English first and then their home language was to compare how they expressed their ideas in both languages. Secondly, it was done to analyse whether there were any writing styles or strategies linked to culture especially in their English summaries. This exercise would also help to show the strategies that participants from different languages used to understand a source text to answer the second research question for this study. It was made clear to the participants that they would not be penalised for any language errors like grammar or spellings. The idea of picking a short text was meant to keep the interest of the participants and to allow them to finish the tasks.Ten minutes after the exercise on

summary writing, the participants were individually engaged in a stimulated- recall interview to reflect on the processes of summary writing in both languages in order to have a full understanding of these metacognitive reflections and what they mean to the participants and the researcher-teacher. These interviews took an average of 9 minutes with each participant.

3.3 Data collection

This study drew its methods from an ethnography design but it is not an ethnographic study out rightly. However, an aspect of ethnography put across by Babbie and Mouton (2001), that an ethnography means learning from people is one central idea that holds this current study. The study aims to learn from students with an African background how their rhetoric expressions influence the way they write their summaries.One method drawn from the ethnography design was interviews.

To address the first research question for this study which seeks to understand the metacognitive reflections of the students of summary writing, semi structured interviews were conducted. According to Harding (2013), "Interviews provide an opportunity for the researcher to listen to the views or experiences of one respondent for an extended period of time and to ask probing questions to explore ideas further" (p. 22). Furthermore, semi-structured interview allows for a degree of freedom in terms of how the questions are sequenced, the wording of sentences and the time taken on particular topics. (Robson, 1993). This type of interview enabled the researcher to collect rich data from the participants themselves because the questions were open-ended and that allowed for extension of the questions in order to get the necessary information.

However, one setback with this face-to-face interview was that participants took time to describe their experiences with summary writing in a relaxed manner because of the lecturer-student relationship in everyday circumstances. As a researcher-teacher, the researcher tried to

give them more time to relax and to build a new relationship where they could talk freely. Another setback with this method was that most of the participants had a challenge of oral communication in the second language and so this was difficult to describe their experiences fully and it affected the volume of information they gave. One of the shortest interviews was five minutes long because the participant could not speak well. Unfortunately, the only common language between the participants and the researcher was English and this was limiting in a big way, but google translate was used to translate the participants' home language summaries.

The interviews were conducted soon after writing the summary tasks to collect as much information as possible while they still remembered everything. These responses were audio-recorded after permission was granted by the participants. The interviews were later transcribed word for word. The other method used to collect data was personal documents, and in this study the personal documents were the English and the home language summaries that the participants wrote.

According to Babbie and Mouton (2001), "A human or personal document is one in which the human and personal characteristics of somebody who is in some sense the author of the document find expression, so that through its means the reader of the document comes to know the author and his views of events with which the document is concerned" (p. 300). Adding to these sentiments, Silverman (2014) states the advantages of textual data which are: "richness, relevant, effective, naturally occurring and available" (p. 276). When these texts are analysed, they reveal presentational subtleties and skills and they are a reflection of what participants are actually doing and this is why this method was selected for this particular study. The summaries helped the researcher see beyond the 'authors' who were the participants and understand how through their different African languages they understood academic texts. The researcher also

looked for translations of the home language summaries that the participants had written from google translate to check if they reflected any understanding of the text.

Collecting data using these self-created documents alone would not have helped to address research questions set for this study because on their own they are not interactive and are only limited to the topics that they cover and the researcher does not have the opportunity to seek clarification or further information. (Harding, 2013). This is why the researcher thought that personal documents as a method for collecting data blended well with the stimulated recall interviews where follow-ups were made and clarifications sought.

The last method used to collect data is one best described by Maykut and Morehouse (1994) when they posit that, "the qualitative researcher has the added responsibility of being both the collector of relevant data and the culler of meaning from that data" (p. 46). The researcher used observation as a method of data collection to check mainly on the non-verbal cues that participants showed when writing the two summaries.

In addition, the researcher checked on the time they took to complete each task and what that meant about the tasks at hand. The participants were not offset by my presence while they were writing the tasks because they are used to having me to invigilate and check if they are not copying during normal classroom assessments. This meant that the participants were in their natural settings and they behaved normally and this allowed me to check if there were any cues that could be saying something about their tasks. The researcher did not participate in what they were doing, but instead was a complete observer. Using this method of observation the researcher noted that participants struggled to have a normal conversation in the second language during the interviews and the limiting factor was that the common language for the researcher and the participants was the second language. Also observed was that participants took much longer time with home language summaries than the English summary.

3.4 Data Analysis

The purpose of this study was to explore the summary writing of second language learners of English at college level and analyse their stimulated-recall using a socio-cultural approach. To achieve this purpose, data was collected through interviews, observation and documents which was subsequently analysed using the conceptual analysis method together with thematic analysis.

3.5 Conceptual Analysis

Conceptual analysis has been described by Babbie and Mouton (2001) as a method which,

> "examines words or phrases within a wide range of texts, including books, book chapters, essays, interviews and speeches as well as informal conversation and headlines. By examining the presence or repetition of certain words and phrases in these texts, a researcher is able to make inferences about the philosophical assumptions of a writer, a written piece---, and even the culture and time in which the text is embedded. (p. 491)

The authors cited above show that in conceptual analysis every tiny bit of information that a respondent gives should be taken into account because every statement is valid in understanding a single concept or ones shared with other statements. These concepts will then be constructed to give the full picture of the participants' views.

3.6 Thematic analysis

According to Ibrahim, 2012, thematic analysis is a type of qualitative analysis which is used to analyse classifications and present themes (patterns) that relate to the data. It is considered the most appropriate for any study that seeks to discover using interpretations. Ibrahim (2012) asserts that:

> Thematic moves beyond counting explicit words or phrases
> And focuses on identifying and describing both implicit and
> Explicit ideas. Codes developed for ideas or themes are then
> Applied or linked to raw data as summary markers for later
> Analysis which may include comparing the relative frequencies
> Of themes or topics within a data set, looking for code occurrence
> Or graphically displaying code relationships. (p. 40)

Thematic analysis provides rich, detailed and complex data which assists the readers to get a sense of the predominant and important themes from the data. (Ibrahim, 2012). The quotation above shows that thematic analysis goes into deeper interpretation of the content and at times the interpretation can be inferred.

These two methods of analysis complemented well and overlapped into each other. Using the two methods meant that it was necessary to code my data very closely using codes, a process that is described below. The researcher had the English summaries that the participants had written together with the transcriptions from the stimulated recall interviews that needed to be analysed. The researcher did not however code the home language summaries because of language barriers and also because it was not necessary for the purposes of this study. The coding with the English summaries was as rigorous as the interview transcriptions because summaries were being checked for writing strategies to see if they matched with what the respondents said during the interviews.

Coding is known to assist in the identification of commonalities and differences in datasets. (Harding, 2013). Quoted in Harding, (2013), Charmaz (2006), "suggests that coding is a process of selecting, separating and sorting data; identifying categories is a major part of the separating and sorting" (p. 45). Adding to this is Saldana (2009) who says that, "a code is a word or a short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence capturing, and/

or evocating attribute for a portion of language- based or visual data"(p. 3). To get this salient or essence capturing attribute required that the researcher coded every word in the interview transcriptions to get the best out of them.

This was the most crucial part of the study to make sure that common themes or any repetitions were identified to ensure a credible report in the findings of the study. Coding was done on transcribed interviews and the English summaries to check if there was anything that corresponded with the interview sessions. All new codes were recorded up to a point of data saturation where no new information could be found in the transcriptions.

3.7 Reliability

The researcher used triangulation, thus different methods to collect data for this study which included interviews, documents and observation to ensure that if this study were to be carried out by other researchers using the same methods and tools that have been used in this study, the findings would be the same. These methods were selected for their interrelatedness to ensure some consistency and avoid factors like personal bias that could have negatively affected my findings. The transcribed interviews were also given back to the participants to allow them to read through the transcriptions and endorse whether they were a true record of what they had said during the interview by signing them off, and this was meant to increase reliability and authenticity of the study.

3.8 Trustworthiness

According to Maykut and Morehouse (1994), "trustworthiness is the term used by Lincoln and Guba to refer to the believability of a researcher's findings" (p. 64). To ensure that the findings of this study are believable, the researcher tried to maintain the purpose of the study in the interviews, transcriptions and the documents. Employing various methods of collecting the

data also helped increase the probability of the research measuring what the study intended to measure.

3.9 Ethical Considerations

The participants who took part in this study were above the age of 18 years and so did not require permission from their parents to participate. However, they were given participant consent letters that explained the purpose of the research and that their participation should they agree would be voluntary and that they were free to withdraw from the study at any point. All the four participants agreed and signed the letters. (See Appendix 3 for participant consent letter). The Principal of the site also gave his permission to allow the researcher to work with students from his campus, signed a permission letter and to allow the study to be conducted on the campus (See Appendix 2 for permission letter).

The methods of data collection employed in this study required that the participants engage face-to-face with the researcher making anonymity of participants impossible. Their real names appeared on the summaries for easy identification but, these real names were not used in the analysis of the data. Pseudonyms were created for the participants. In this case, participants were numbered as participant 1, 2, 3 and 4. Even though anonymity was not fully guaranteed in this study, confidentiality was promised that all their documents which are the two summaries and the interview transcriptions would be kept safe for a period of at least five years after which the data once analysed would be discarded so that it would not fall into the hands of other researchers who might misappropriate it (Creswell, 2014). The participants were also assured that all the data would not be published without their permission. The site of the research has also not been named for ethical reasons. This is the reason why the home summaries were translated using the computer and not given to neutral people to do the translations.

The design and the approach of the study have been discussed in this chapter. The methods that were used to collect data for this study were also discussed at length to explain why those methods were ideal for the study. The population for the study has also been defined, including the step by step description of the data collection procedure. The two methods of data analysis which are conceptual and thematic analysis used in this study have also been discussed in order to explain in detail how data was analysed using those methods. This led to a discussion on reliability, trustworthiness and ethical considerations. The findings or results that were gathered from the analysis of data in this study are discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 4

4 DATA FINDINGS, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the data results, analysis and discussion that answer the following main research questions. 1) “What metacognitive reflections do L2 students with an African background engage in to deduce main ideas from a source text?” 2) How is comprehension of a source text reflected in written summaries of the students?” The data also address two sub-questions dealing with strategies in summary writing and rhetorical expressions. Data analysed and presented in this chapter were collected using qualitative methods which included personal documents analysis, observation and semi-structured interviews.

The goal of personal document analysis was to explore the strategies that L2 students used when they wrote summaries and to check how comprehension of the source text was reflected in those summaries. The research question that guided the document analysis was, “How is comprehension of a source text reflected in written summaries of the students” and another research sub-question on what strategies the students use to identify the main ideas. The task of summary writing was conducted translingually where participants wrote one summary in English and another in their first language. The source text on communication helped participants to open up on how they communicated in their different cultures giving a background of their rhetoric expressions which helped to relate their writing to these rhetoric expressions.

The goal of semi-structured interviews was to explore the mental processes that L2 students with an African background go through in summary writing. The research question that guided the semi-structured interviews was, “What meta-cognitive reflections do L2 students with an African background engage in to deduce main ideas from a source text?” The interviews also

guided the research sub-question which says," What do students' responses show about the strategies they use in summary writing?"

The semi-structured interviews were conducted ten minutes after the summary writing process in order to capture the stimulated recall of the summary writing process. The questions were open-ended but had key questions that guided the whole interview process. Participants were asked to describe their experiences of writing summaries in both languages. They were also asked to describe what they do when they write a summary in both languages. Further, participants were asked to identify the ways that they used to come up with main ideas and tell whether they were the same for both summaries. Finally, participants were asked to describe what was culture-related in their English summaries. However, some probing questions were asked and these differed from each participant as they depended more on the responses given.

The goal of observation was to check for any non-verbal cues that the participants showed during the process of summary writing and also during the interview. Observation was also done to check on the time taken to write both summaries. The collected information from observation was either used to complement or dispute findings from summaries and interviews. Data from the interviews was transcribed and rigorously coded according to conceptual and thematic analyses and emerging themes were matched with what was on the summaries and below are some of the themes that came up.

4.1 Enhanced comprehension

Comprehension of the source text was only evident in the summaries written in the participants' home languages. For the purposes of cross-examination these summaries in the home language were later translated to English to check if what they had written reflected what was in the original source text. (See Appendix 6 for translated summaries) The researcher worked with google translate in order to translate the home language summaries to English. The translated

summaries were not longer than a page. Even though the home language summary was merely narrative, because it had been translated from English, evidence of comprehension was present because they had the main points of the source text. During the interviews, all the participants agreed that they had understood the source text.

The English summaries showed that the participants had relied on the text and for some it had been a matter of copying and pasting. In other words, the English summary was a second version of the source text and this is what prompted for a translation of their home language summaries to see if they reflected any understanding of the text. Extracts from participants' English summaries below show how the participants relied on the source text. Only the first paragraph of the text has been extracted.

Source text

Communication is part of our everyday life. We greet one another, smile or frown, depending on our moods. Animals too, communicate, much to our surprise. Just like us, interaction among animals can be both verbal or non-verbal.

Participant 1

Communication is part of our everyday life. Animals also communicate much to our surprise. Just like humans, interaction between animals is verbal and non-verbal.

Participant 2

Communication is part of our everyday life. Just like animals to. Interact among other in sound and body language.

Participant 3

Communication is part of our everyday life. Animals also communicate. Interaction among animals can be both verbal or non-verbal.

Participant 4

People greet each other. Smile or frown depending on their moods. Male blackbirds mostly use their melodious songs to grap attention of the females.

The extracts above showed how much the participants relied on the text with some making a few changes like participant 4.This enhanced comprehension could also have been possible because of the nature of the text. The text was on animal communication, and this content could have activated the background knowledge of the participants and then they tapped on the schemata on animal communication that they had. This activation of the schemata then allowed participants to connect this new information to the old information of what they already knew about animal communication and this improved their comprehension of the text significantly. One participant from the study had the following to say:

Participant 3: Like when the zebras, yaa in our culture we know that zebras they Always stay together, not easy to find zebras alone, it's not easy to Hunt zebras.

An excerpt from the original source text says:

> **When grazing safely, their (zebras) stripes are all**
> **Lined up neatly so that none of them loses track**
> **Of their friends. However, when danger such as a**
> **Hungry lion approaches, the zebras would dart out**
> **In various directions, making it difficult for the lion**
> **To choose his target. (Paragraph 6).**

What participant 3 said above showed that he had previous knowledge from his background that allowed him to draw information on animal communication in order to understand the text. Even though his English summary was a replica of the original text, his home language summary showed that he understood the text.

4.2 Lack of engagement with text

The fact that all the participants copied and pasted the source text into their English summaries making minor or no changes at all was interpreted in a number of ways. Firstly, it meant that the participants did not fully engage with the text. (Compare Appendix 1 for source text and Appendix 4 for English summaries). Engaging with the text meant being able to understand the text and being able to distinguish main ideas from supporting sentences. Using the translations of the home language summaries, they showed this lack of critical engagement with the text because the home language summaries were a narration of the text just like the English summaries. If the participants had fully engaged with the text they would not have used translation as a way of writing the home language summaries because translation meant writing the same content in a different language. Secondly, it meant that participants engaged with the text, understood the text as shown above but the language through which they could express these ideas was difficult for them. A discussion below explains this finding in detail.

4.3 Writing made easy

Fifty percent of the participants had the following to say about writing in their home languages.

Participant 2: Yes, Yes, that's what I mean. It's very much easier to summarize in your own language because that's my language, I can talk it and I can express it.

Participant 3: In my home language it is easy. I know some of the words easy to use.

Drawn from these responses is the sense that writing in one's own language made summary writing easier. The participants who took part in this study wrote summaries in IsiZulu, Tshivenda, Sepedi and Xitsonga which were their home languages. They expressed views that showed that writing in one's own language gives confidence. They said that they were able to use alternative words that is, in their home language summaries to avoid using the same words in the source text and they managed to structure their sentences differently something that they could not freely do with the English summary.

Participant 3: I changed them (words) in Tsonga because I'm comfortable in the language.

Participant 2: I can say it's a construction of sentences. I did them differently from the English one.

The summaries in the home languages showed that the participants flowed well in their own languages although this was mere narration of the source text. The participants took longer time with the home language summaries than with the English summaries which could mean that extra effort was put into these than English summaries. Below is a part of the translation of the English summary of participant 4 from Venda language.

Heading: Different ways in which animals communicate.

Black male birds sing to attract female birds. Same animals like fish whistle to be had by other animals who can here them in 100kms.

The translation showed that in the home languages, participants were able even to restructure the heading of the text and use different words in a language that they understood better.

4.4 Lack of summarizing skills

Evidenced in the two summaries that the participants wrote is that regardless of language, participants lacked conventional summary writing strategies like paraphrasing skills. Noted in

these summaries was that even though they flowed well in their languages, they still did not focus on the main ideas of the text. In the Home Language summaries, most of the participants merely translated the English source text into their languages thereby presenting a narration of the source text, in another language without fully engaging with the source text to come up with main ideas.

No strategies were employed when writing the English summary, not one participant used any summarizing strategy in their English summaries. This showed that participants had little knowledge on summarising strategies that could help them to write better summaries. Noted from the interview sessions is that participants were not sure what summary writing strategies were. The way they avoided the question that asked them to state the strategies they had used in summary writing showed that they did not understand what these were. One participant had the following to say:

Interviewer: Can you tell what strategies you used in writing the two Summaries?

Participant 2: I start with some of the words I've used in English, I put them at End of the sentence.

The response by the participant showed that he understood strategies to mean changing the word order of the sentences. This could be the reason why no one participant managed to use a single strategy in their summary writing. The assumption made was that participants knew what strategies were and that they would use them in writing summaries.

The main ideas in the summaries were not explicitly shown because the participants were not able to sift the important ideas from the rest, instead they wrote everything they could about the source text. This showed that picking out main ideas from a source text remains a challenge that needs to be addressed. If these summaries were to be assessed the students would score

low points because the main points in their summaries were not explicitly stated. The reader had to hunt for the main ideas because they had not been separated from the supporting sentences. If participants had probably written the summaries in the absence of the source text, a rating scale would have been effective. (Compare appendix 9 with memo for summary and Appendix 4 for English summaries) Below are some of the main points explicitly stated in a paragraph form that participants were supposed to write in their English summaries.

Animals make use of various kinds of communicative methods. Male blackbirds sing to attract female ones and also to keep other blackbirds off their dwellings. Mammals in the oceans like whales, sing to interact with their mates far away too.

Overall, the main points from the text were six but these were not clear in the participants' summaries.

In the case of English summaries, participants showed that they lacked vocabulary knowledge which could have helped them to avoid copying from the source text and use their own words. Understanding a source text only is not enough especially in a task where students are required to reorganize the text in their own words because if they do not have a wide vocabulary base they rely heavily on the source text. To support this claim, one participant said the following in the interview session:

Participant 2: No, no, no, eh <u>critically</u> I was using the same words in English
But in the Zulu one I've used my other words like for instance
To <u>swipe</u> the meaning.

The underlined words in the above statement have been used incorrectly and probably in the first instance he wanted to say 'actually' and then in the second instance 'swop' or another word. This lack of vocabulary knowledge becomes the limiting factor when L2 students write

in a second language. The easiest thing that they would do was to copy everything like they did in the English summary.

4.5 Summary writing a mental process

Participants agreed that summary writing in a second language which in this case was English, required a lot of reading and the emphasis on reading meant that it was not just reading but reading with understanding. The emphasis meant that they had to read with understanding and reading several times as mentioned by one participant during the interview.

Interviewer: What about the issue of using your first language in summary writing?

Participant 2: In Zulu I wrote as I think, what I think I just wrote it. I write what's on my mind. Then in English I have to read and reread again to get the point.

All the participants also described the same mental processes that they went through when reading a text in English. They said that they translated what they read in English into their different home languages in order for them to understand. Like in all bilingual students, the two languages that is the home language and the target language become quite active during this translation process. All of the participants had the following to say:

Interviewer: When you were summarizing, did you express yourself in the same way

Participant 4: Because I was taking it to my own language some of the words you can find, they are difficult for me to translate.

Interviewer: How did you express your main ideas in both languages?

Participant 3: In English I changed them to Tsonga because I'm comfortable in

the language.

Interviewer: When you were writing the two summaries, can you just describe your experiences?

Participant 1: I would say writing, translating from English to Sepedi.

Interviewer: Would you say that this experience helped you to understand the text better?

Participant 2: Yes,yes, because when I translate the English to my language. that's where I start to get the meaning of the text.

All these responses served as evidence that summary writing was quite a rigorous process which required one to have active cognitive skills and more demanding if the summary was written in a second language. The burden of second language learners of English is doubled when they have to read a text in English and write the summary in English again because they are fighting to understand the language as well as thinking of better ways to express their ideas in this second language.The summaries written in English also showed that summary writing was a process that required one to have a rich vocabulary bank in order to replace words in the source text with other different words that had the same meaning (similes) to avoid plagiarism. This skill of using two different words was absent in the English summary but in the home language summary, participants said they could think of other different words with similar meanings. For example, one participant had 123 words in the English summary and had 94 words in his home language summary. The reason that he gave for this great difference was that he could think of other ways to express his ideas more in his own language than English.

This mental process as shown by the participants in the interviews also invoked the schemata that readers of a text have in order to make meaning of the text. Participants showed that they could relate the passage to their past experiences only when they were using their home

language to write. Their schemata was activated only in their own language and their imagination of the text grew showing a relationship between language and thought. The home language summaries showed that relating an English text to past experiences enhanced the participants' understanding of the source text. An example from the interview sessions showed one participant who could relate his experiences by telling how animals communicate and even confirmed and elaborated on what the author said in the source text. He said that this imagination connecting with his past experiences gave him a better picture of the source text and could express himself better in his own language than in English.

4.6 Lack of formal vocabulary in home language

Even though fifty percent of the participants agreed that writing a summary in their home language made the task easier, the other fifty percent felt that the home languages lacked much of the formal vocabulary that they would want to use in formal spaces like academic writing. One participant had the following to say:

Interviewer: How does writing become more difficult in your language than speaking?

Participant 4: Writing is quite difficult because here we are writing something formal and then when we speak mostly, we don't use formal words.

In addition to the above, the response given above by the respondent showed that as students, they are aware that academic spaces have their own words, specifically for that particular space which is different from other informal spaces or the way people talk in everyday lives. This means that they may not have had the correct words of describing these words like primary and secondary Discourse, but they were aware of them.

This view that there is lack of formal words in the home languages made the other participants to prefer writing a summary in English because it is a language that they have always associated

academic writing with. Preferring to write in English could also mean that they do not want to struggle with engaging with the text because they copied everything word for word from the source text unlike in the home language where they needed at least some form of engagement with the text in order to think of better ways of expressing their ideas. This view also showed that this preference to write in English may not really be an issue of lack of vocabulary in the home language but that the home language has been relegated to oral and informal use and has no place in the academic spheres. The more a language is used in academic spaces, the more the academic vocabulary in that particular language. This has been confirmed by one participant who said the following:

Interviewer: So in other words, you are saying you don't have those formal words in your language?

Participant 4: We have, but these youths of university students, they don't take it that much important.

This showed that English as a language could still be enjoying the hegemonous status in South Africa's tertiary institutions and home languages have been side-lined in the academic spaces. University students could also be shying away from their home languages because the English language is synonymous with success and high class. This view is supported by the constant repetition of the following in addition to the above response by the same participant:

We don't take <u>it</u> that much important
These youths of university students, they don't take <u>it</u> that much Important
Because we don't take <u>them</u> that much serious.

The underlined words refer to the use of words in the first language which means that the first language has lost its importance and the students do not see why they should be serious about using the first language.

4.7 Writing and Culture

This theme was inferred during the interviews when all the participants said their writing was not linked in any way to culture. Noted was that, this literacy act of reading a text and writing a summary involved the writer of the text, the reader and the text only. During the interview sessions, contrastingly the participants showed that they were aware that they belonged to a particular culture with particular ways of communicating but could not relate this culture with their writing explicitly. They gave examples of how they communicate in their cultures. One participant explained how he had changed the word 'sex' in the source text which originally meant gender but he understood it to mean 'sexual act' to a more respectable word for the reader showing an extended gesture to accommodate others, a concept that thrives in African communication. The participant had the following to say:

Interviewer: Would you say that your English summary was in any way influenced by your culture?

Participant 2: Yes, for instance some words are very eish unusual in our culture words like sex Yabo, so I've changed the word into a respectable word which can suit others who will read the text.

This showed that participants are aware that when they write, they write for an audience which is out there and that informs how they write. This awareness showed that participants are conscious and skilled with the ability to modify, create, and add words that fit syntactically and morphologically. This is awareness that they belonged to a particular culture and awareness of the practices of that culture. For example, when he changed the word sex. In his own language he found a better way of saying it that is acceptable in his culture and avoided the direct word.

Another example drawn from the interview sessions showed that in a particular culture when one has an issue to address with people in authority like parents, they don't approach them directly but say it indirectly in circles. Below is what the participant said.

Interviewer: How do you communicate in your language?

Participant 2: If you want to tell someone older about the wrong that he did, you don't just tell straight that you did this, this wrong, Yabo, just go around and around until you get way of telling but not straight.

The summaries both English and home language written by the participants showed this element of circumlocution described above resulting in them writing almost everything that was in the source text because before getting to the important point they had to say other things which were not important or necessary for this task. For example, instead of writing the main point as 'Mammals in the oceans like whales, 'sing' to interact with their mates far away too', one participant wrote the following:

Participant 3: Singing is another way of animals to communicate, the songs are usually rich in notes variation, encoding various kinds of messages. These sounds are received by other mates as far as possible.

The above excerpt showed that participants said a lot of unnecessary information to put across a main point.

Closely linked to the above is the use of vernacular pauses during the interview sessions. Participants used words like:

Neh which means right like when one wants affirmation in IsiZulu

Yabo means You see in IsiZulu

Yabona means the same as Yabo

Ore means I meant to say

Kini means what like when one is trying to remember something in Sepedi

The use of these pauses has been interpreted in a number of ways in this study. Firstly, this is a way of communicating in their various languages and also a way to check if the listener is following. If the listener is following, then he can add in a word or two that the speaker may be trying to remember so that the conversation flows smoothly. It is a way of communicating that unconsciously comes in during a conversation which is an indication that culture has a way of showing up in the academic spaces.

Mentioned earlier is a point that stated that when L2 students write, they are aware that they are writing for an audience. They are very cautious about the words that they use because they have the audience in mind. In oral interviews, the use of these pauses may also mean that they are aware that they are communicating with someone and would want to pull the other person into the conversation now and again making sure that that they are moving together. This way of communicating may be traced in their writing of English summaries where instances of incomplete sentences are picked up as in the following sentences:

Animal also communicate.

Just like animals to.

Zebras which have unique stripes for mate to recognise them and confuse prediators.

Smile or frown depending on their moods.

This way of writing incomplete sentences may be a result of the way that they communicate in African languages and when they write they are like in a conversation with someone who must come in the conversation now and again with a word or two. Or it may simply be primary discourse finding its way into academic discourse.

4.8 Discussion

This section discusses the study's findings and relates them to previous research that has been done in the area of L2 summary writing. This study was aimed at investigating summary writing and stimulated-recall of College ESL students using a socio-cultural approach in a South African context.Previous research on summary writing of second language learners of English has been very minimal. According to Hee, Ko (2009), "Research on L2 summary writing is still limited" (p. 126). Echoing the same sentiments is Kim, 2009 who argues that the scarcity of summary writing research makes it difficult to understand what L2 students actually do when they summarise texts. Of the few studies on L2 summary writing, not much or none have focused on L2 students with an African background. This is one gap that this study aimed to fill together with the socio-cultural perspective to summary writing that this study adopts. Much of the research done on L2 summary writing placed much emphasis on the lack of cognitive skills of summary writing and sort of overlooked the cultural aspect of the L2 students and how this influenced their summary writing. A few studies have studied L2 students of Arabic, Chinese and Japanese backgrounds but so far no study on students with an African background has come to my attention.

Findings from this study have shown that when students write a summary text translingually, comprehension is enhanced. In this study, participants wrote two summaries one in English and the other one in their first language. Comprehension of the source text was reflected more in the first language summary. A similar study was carried by Yu (2008) when he asked students to write summaries in English and Chinese to check on reading comprehension. The findings from the study showed that the use of the different languages had significant effects on both summarization processes and products. Chinese summarization was found to be a

better measure of students' English reading abilities. This study conducted by Yu (2008) confirmed the findings of the current study.

The current study concluded that when students read an English text and fail to write a good summary in English it does not mean that they have failed to understand the text. They may have understood the text but failed to express the ideas well in English. These findings also showed that it became less easy for students to copy and paste the original text in their summaries when they write in a different language because that would require them to process and 'digest' the information before they can summarise.

The translation that the participants did showed that they could now understand the English source text as it was now in their own language. The participants confirmed during the interview session that whenever they read an English text they first translated it into their own language in order to understand. This time they did not only translate from English to home language and back to English in order to write an English summary but were writing in their own language. This means that they were writing as the translation was taking place avoiding the back and forth that happens when the summary task should be written in English.

Regarding the use of the students' first language in the classroom, research has found that it increases confidence, comprehension and constructs a better identity of the students. (Childs, 2016). The findings from numerous studies conducted on translanguaging have shown that when one language is used to access the same content, learners develop a deeper understanding of the subject matter (Makalela, 2015). In a study conducted by Choy, & Lee (2012), they noted that using the language of the students to teach paraphrasing skills would help them to learn and master the concepts better.

One other finding in the current study was that there was lack of formal vocabulary in the first languages. If these languages are constantly used in the classroom, formal vocabulary will be developed and continually reviewed so that it can be used in more content areas like science and engineering. This will also change the negative attitudes that students have towards their own languages. (Childs, 2016). Translanguaging as a pedagogical tool came to disable the one language for all concept dominant in many monolingual classes that are operating in multilingual societies. This finding in the current study showed that students in higher learning institutions still revere English as a language of status.

The other finding in the current study showed that students lacked summary writing skills. Summary writing skills entail that students identify the main points, use various strategies to express their ideas use the appropriate vocabulary and reconstruct the text using their own words. These are some of the areas identified in previous research to be problematic with L2 students. Research on L2 summary writing has shown that L2 students have difficulty in finding and expressing the main points in the source text. (Karbalaei & Rajyashree, 2010; Othman, 2009; Perin, 2003). The current research has also shown that students have no idea what these strategies are and they cannot separate main ideas from supporting sentences and they also rely heavily on the source text because they lack the proper vocabulary. This means that instruction in summary writing has to be done explicitly. As long as L2 students are writing a summary whether in English or home language, summary writing should be prioritised. Writing a summary translingually in this study has shown that language is not the big issue, but students must be taught how to identify main ideas, how to reconstruct sentences and what strategies to use that will help them with full comprehension of the text and write better summaries in either language.

Another challenge that has been highlighted earlier by previous research is the lack of vocabulary knowledge. (Ashrafzadeh & Nimehchisalem, 2015). Failing to use the appropriate

vocabulary constitutes to lack of summarizing skills and L2 students grapple for academic vocabulary which is not readily available and they resort to copying and relying more on the source text as evidenced in the English summaries. The English summaries of the participants in this study were merely a copy and paste procedure and this has been interpreted as failure to comprehend a text in previous studies. Even though they copied and pasted in the English summary, the home language summary had evidence that the participants had understood the text even though this does not show in the English summary because it was copied and pasted. The only problem was that they did not show the main ideas explicitly and this showed on both summaries emphasising on the need for explicit summary writing instruction mentioned earlier.

What makes this study stand out from some of the previous studies is the issue of a socio-cultural approach. Writing a translingual task has also been an effort to explore the cultural aspect of summary writing of which language forms part of. The translingual task has shown that African languages in South Africa have been marginalised in the academic contexts. The English language has dominated the academic settings especially in South African Universities to an extent that students feel that their first languages have no place in the classrooms. The first languages have been left for oral and informal spaces and as such L2 students have no knowledge of the formal vocabulary in their first languages.

The issue of culture also looked at the rhetoric expressions in the L2 languages and how they find themselves in academic writing. Writing long, unwinding summaries in this study, has confirmed the results in Shukri, (2014) and Shen, (1998) who in their studies of Arabic and Chinese students respectively found out that these L2 students, ‘often clear the surrounding bushes’ before attacking the real target which in the African culture is described as ‘beating about the bush’. This shows that L2 students irrespective of cultural background have a circular way of communicating that is not as direct as the English language that is linear, and these rhetoric expressions show unconsciously in their writing and instead of writing straight to the

point, they write in circles. (Shen in Zamel & Spack, 1998). One participant confirmed this circular way of communicating during the interview and mentioned that one has to go round and round before coming to the real target and this also confirms what Kaplan, said in the illustration about circular thinking in some languages different from English. (Kaplan, 1966).

Bringing cultural awareness to L2 students should not be left to chance as this is one way towards redressing the issue of L2 students and their culture in academic writing. The fact that this happens unconsciously when they write shows that the students are not even aware of it that is why they said they did not think that their writing was in any way influenced by their culture. Some of the examples of culture influence in writing noted in this study are circumlocution which has been mentioned earlier which is also writing in circles and another one is writing everything from the source text which generates from the notion of interdependence in the African culture rhetorics so when students write they understand that an idea cannot fully make sense on its own without the 'others'. Another example is that of making pauses when communicating and how this results in the students writing incomplete sentences in the summary.

Second language learning classrooms should then be platforms where students are made aware of these cultural practices and how they can be avoided in academic writing. (Shukri, 2014). The idea of writing everything in the source text is also linked to cultural framework dimensions designed by Hofstede (1980). The dimension of power implies that the author of a text is regarded as a powerful authority and so when L2 students approach a text with this mind-set they try as much as they can not to tamper with the author's words or contaminate the text with their own words and they end up writing everything. When L2 students get the right

orientation with texts they will learn to engage critically with a text and begin to see a text as a point of view and not source of information. (Yang & Shi, 2003).

A pedagogic approach like translanguaging that has been discussed at length above, that allows students to use more than one language in formal academic spaces can be considered to help L2 learners in academic writing. Some of the benefits of using Translanguaging as a teaching and learning tool in the classroom are best described below. Working with more than one language can help L2 students to use their first languages and promote their status in academic contexts. An approach like translanguaging will help students to put their first languages together with English at the same level and be able to transfer skills from one language to another for example if they understand the concept of identifying main ideas in their first language, they can easily use the same strategy in another language.

Translanguaging which has been called a humanizing pedagogy embraces the student as a whole being and allows that student to function in a space where he is able to make meaning of the world in various ways. (Childs, 2016). This approach will also help educators not to focus only on the cognitive aspects in summary writing but will consider the funds of knowledge that students bring to the classroom which includes their language, history and context around a text, making literacy a social practice. This way will allow L2 students to become aware and employ the necessary literacy practices appropriately in their different historical contexts. This approach can also help to create a larger volume of formal vocabulary in the first languages which can be used in academic spaces. This concept of literacy as a social practice which is the theoretical framework of this study should not be inferred in any literacy act. Any writing or reading (Literacy event) (Heath, 1982) that happens in or outside the classroom should be governed by practices that surround it. Considering the text, its function, social purpose and context according to Perry (2012) should be explicitly done in order to understand the individual taking part in the literacy event. This is to say that the success of any

summary writing that L2 students engage in should not be measured only on cognitive levels as in the autonomous model of literacy but should consider the literacy practices, (Street;1984) that surround this event of summary writing and how they influence this event.

The purpose of this chapter was to present the results of the study, analyse them and discuss them in relation to literature. The results presented in this study confirmed what previous studies had done on L2 summary writing. The major findings of previous research were centred on main idea identification, sentence structuring and comprehension of the source text. These were the same areas that this study focused on with a few added but taking a socio-cultural perspective on South African L2 students. The results in this current study showed that L2 students of a South African background cannot distinguish main ideas from the rest of the text, instead they write everything and the reader will have to search for the main ideas.

Another finding was that these students relied more on the text copying and pasting and this made it difficult to tell whether they were able to restructure sentences from a source text because they did not use their own words but something that could be inferred from the interviews was that the participants found it easier to reconstruct sentences when they were writing the home language summary which meant that sentence construction in English was a challenge. On the issue of comprehension, the finding in this regard showed that students went through rigorous mental processes in order to translate the source text into their first language and then figure out how to express those ideas in English. This study concluded that when students read in one language and write in another, their comprehension of the source text is enhanced which is why there was a recommendation in this study to use a pedagogic approach like translanguaging to help L2 students in summary writing.

The study findings also confirmed what other researchers in the field said about summary writing instruction. Writing in one's own language did not make the participants write better

summaries, though comprehension was enhanced, because they lacked the summarising skills which came through instruction and it is also a recommendation of this study that explicit summary writing instruction should be given to L2 students. To fully develop the L2 student, cultural practices should be addressed in the academic spaces so that students do not end up going back to primary Discourse in academic contexts. If they are made aware of these practices they develop strategies to avoid them consciously in academic platforms while at the same time they learn to appreciate and value the cultural capital that they bring to the classroom. Overall, this study has shown that summary writing just like any literacy event happens successfully in a space where literacy is seen as a social practice.

CHAPTER 5

5 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations based on the data analysed in the previous chapter. Limitations to this study have also been included in this chapter.

The focus of the study was to investigate summary writing and stimulated recall of College ESL students using a socio-cultural approach in a South African context. Literature on previous studies done on summary writing have shown that summary writing is a core activity in academic writing programs and summarizing skills are essential to academic success. Literature has also shown that L2 summary writing is an under-researched area and much of the research done has involved Chinese, Japanese, Malaysia and other countries and little or none on African students.

The research problem for this study is that L2 students lack summarizing skills. These summarizing skills include the ability to distinguish main ideas from supporting sentences, reorganizing the text using their own words and lack of appropriate vocabulary knowledge because of language proficiency in English which is a second language.

The theoretical framework for this study draws from a socio-cultural theory which sees literacy as a social practice, (Street, 1984). Several concepts have also been discussed in the study and these are; Discourse, (Gee, 1996) Contrastive Rhetoric, (Kaplan, 1966) and Translanguaging (Makalela, 2015). Discourse is a concept that suggests a socio-cultural approach to literacy and it has been included in this study to give a deeper understanding of how L2 students engage with texts in their different communities. Contrastive Rhetoric becomes relevant to this study by showing and describing the thought patterns of L2 students and how that is reflected in their writing. Translanguaging is described firstly as a model that illustrates the rhetoric systems of

the African languages in South Africa and secondly as an alternative pedagogical tool that allows literacy to function as a social practice in the second language learning classroom. These concepts are all linked to the theoretical framework and connected to each other and this is how their inclusion in this study is relevant.

The literature review was done in Chapter Two where a review of other studies that have been done on L2 summary writing was also done. The previous research reviewed involve studies on summary writing of L2 students from Asian countries and their findings have shown a lack of summarizing skills on L2 students.

The objectives that were set for this study are listed below.

- To analyse metacognitive reflections of second language speakers of English's ability to deduce main ideas.
- To analyse students' stimulated-recall after summary writing.
- To analyse students strategies for sentence formation and rhetorical expressions.
- To gauge the depth or degree to which L2 students understand the source text.

The research approach that was used in this study was a qualitative one. Data for this study were gathered from semi-structured interviews, self- created documents which were summaries written by participants and observation. The interviews were conducted individually and they were conducted at the campus were these participants were students. The interviews were transcribed and hand-coded for easy analysis. The findings from the data collected were presented and discussed in Chapter Four.

The findings revealed that L2 students from an African background understand the subject matter better if they use their first languages to write. The summary task that the participants undertook was written translingually one in English and another in their first languages. Comprehension of the source text was reflected more in the first language summaries because

there they could not copy and paste like they did in the English summaries. The English summaries did little to show comprehension of the text because they were copied and pasted.Another finding revealed that First languages lack the appropriate academic vocabulary that can be used in academic spaces especially in institutions of Higher learning. This showed that first languages are still marginalised and the English language is enjoying the monopoly of dominating in second language learning classrooms. This caused students to develop a negative attitude towards their first languages and relegate them to oral use in informal spaces only.

The other finding was that L2 students lacked summarizing skills. The summaries written by participants showed that students had no idea of what summarizing strategies were since they did not use any of them with the exception of a simile that was used once. Participants in this study did not paraphrase the ideas of the author, instead they wrote everything that the author said and their own words were minimal in the English summaries. This also showed that the participants lacked appropriate vocabulary knowledge that was needed to write the English summaries in their own words. Main points in the summaries were not explicitly shown because the participants included the supporting sentences as well.

The research also found that the culture of students does influence their writing in the second language. The English summaries of the participants showed cultural traits drawn from their rhetorical expressions in their first languages and the participants were not aware of them.

5.1 Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings stated above.

- L2 students cannot distinguish main points from supporting sentences.
- L2 students have no idea what summary writing strategies are, and how they can be applied to summary writing.

- L2 students from an African background lack the appropriate vocabulary knowledge when writing in a second language.
- L2 students have negative attitudes towards their African languages because the languages lack formal vocabulary that can be used in academic spaces.
- L2 students are not aware that rhetorical practices from their culture can influence their writing.

5.2 Recommendations for this study

Following the conclusions given above it is therefore recommended that;

- Summary writing instruction be prioritized and given explicitly so that students can transfer the skills to other languages.
- A pedagogical approach like translanguaging, which allows students to use their first languages in more formal spaces should be adopted so that L2 students appreciate the value in their languages and so as to develop academic vocabulary in these languages.
- Second language classrooms should be used as platforms to bring cultural awareness to students so that they know their cultural practices and devise strategies to avoid them in academic writing.
- Any literacy event that involves reading and writing should be taught using an approach that views literacy as a social practice in order to tap on the funds of knowledge that L2 students bring to the classroom.

5.3 Recommendations for further research

This study was not an end in itself. Further research that refutes the claims made in this study or support and develop the scope further can be generated. Because research on summary writing of L2 students from an African background is minimal, further research could look into studies that focus on summary writing in the absence of the source text to check if that would

increase their comprehension, minimise their heavy reliance on the source text, increase their use of summary writing strategies and sharpen their ability to identify main points of the text.

5.4 Limitations to the study

This study focused on a minimum number of participants and maybe if more participants had been included in the study, more information could have been gathered and increased the scope of the study.The language barrier was another limitation in this study. The common language between the researcher and the participants was English. English was a second language to all the participants. Participants in the study struggled to speak during the interview sessions because of language proficiency. Participants did not perform to their best in this language and that limited the volume of the information that they gave. Here and there some participants used pauses in their first languages if they were trying to remember something. This affected the length of the interviews and the shortest interview recorded was five minutes long.

The other limitation was time. The timing for data collection of this study was concluded as bad timing. Interviews and summaries were conducted at a time when rumours of student protests over fee increase were looming and some students did not want to be caught up in the protests so they were leaving for their rural homes. The participants that finally took part were those staying around the campus.

This chapter has given a summary of the study background, a short discussion on the previous studies done on L2 summary writing and has highlighted the findings of the study drawn from the data that was collected from interviews and self-created documents. Conclusions emanating from the findings have been drawn and recommendations to this study have also been given. Finally the limitations and their impact to the study were explained and discussed.

5.5 Conclusion

The aim of this study was to investigate summary writing and stimulated-recall of College ESL students using a socio-cultural approach in a South African context. This study was situated within a socio-cultural theory that sees literacy as a social practice. Several other concepts that supported this theory and elaborated it further were discussed. This study was not conducted outside a body of literature but views were drawn from previous research that was conducted with L2 students outside the South African context and their findings were discussed in relation to the scope of this study. The findings of this study confirmed and refuted some of the findings of previous research adding knowledge about the African background that lacked in the body of literature. Several recommendations to the study from which the conclusions of this study were drawn, were discussed and recommendations for further research on the area of summary writing of L2 students closed the discussions of the study but opened new areas of summary writing that can be explored.

REFERENCES

Al Badi, I. A. H. (2015). *Academic writing difficulties of ESL Learners*. The West East Institute International Academic Conference, Barcelona: Colleges of Applied Sciences.

Anderson, V. & Hidi, S. (1989). Teaching Students to Summarize. *Educational Leadership,* 26-28. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Ashrafzadeh, A. & Nimehchisalem, V. (2015). Vocabulary knowledge: Malaysian tertiary level learners' major problem in summary writing. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6 (2), 286-291.

Babbie, E. & Mouton,J. (2001). *The Practice of Social Research.* Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Badenhorst, C. (2008). *Dissertation writing: A research journey*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Baleghizadeh, S. & Babapour, M. (2011). The effect of summary writing on reading comprehension and recall of EFL students. *New England Reading Association Journal,* 47 (1). 44-49.

Barkaoui, K. (2007). Teaching writing to second language learners: Insights from theory and Research. *TESL Reporter*, 40 (1). 35-48.

Barton, D., Hamilton, M. & Ivanic, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Situated Literacies: Reading and Writing in context*. London: Routledge.

Charmaz , K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory. A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

Childs, M. (2016). Reflecting on Translanguaging in Multilingual Classrooms: Harnessing the Power of Poetry and Photography. *Educational Research for Social Change*, 5(1), 22-40.

Chin, S. J. (2011). Investigating the Summary Writing Performance of University Students in Taiwan. 26th Conference of English Teaching and Learning in the R.O.C. *The Language Training and Testing Centre*. 285-301

Choy, S. & Lee, M. (2012). Effects of teaching paraphrasing skills to students learning summary writing in ESL. *Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 8 (2). 77-89.

Creese,A. & Blackledge,A. (2010). Translanguaging in the Bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103-115.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative & Mixed Methods Approaches*. London: Sage Publications.

CSEC English. *A summary writing: Sample exercises*.www.caribexams.org/node/842.

De Silva, R. (2015). Writing strategy instruction: Its impact on writing in a second language for academic purposes. *Language Teaching Research*, 19 (3).301-323.

Friend, R. (2001). Effects of strategy instruction on summary writing of college students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 26. 3-24.

Garcia, O. (2009). Education, Multilingualism and Translanguaging in the 21st Century. In *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Local*, Mohanty, A., Panda, M., Phillipson, R. & Kangas, T. S. (eds.). New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.

Gee, J. P. (2015). The New Literacy Studies. In Rowsell, J. & Pahl, K. (Eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of literacy studies.* New York: Routledge.

Gee, J. (2003*). What video games have to teach us about learning and Literacy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gee, J. P. (1998). What is literacy? In Zarmel, V. & Spack, R. (Eds.). *Negotiating Academic Literacies: Teaching and Learning across languages and cultures.* New York: Routledge

Gee, J. (1996). *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Grabe, W. & Zhang, C. (2013). Reading and Writing together: A critical component of English for Academic Purposes Teaching and Learning. *TESOL Journal*, 4 (1).9-24.

Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a Second Language: Moving from Theory to Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hamadouche, M. (2013). *The impact of Native Culture on Foreign Language Writing*. Conference Paper. University of Constantine. Gee, J. (2003*). What video games have to teach us about learning and Literacy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Harding, J. (2013). *Qualitative Data Analysis: from start to finish*. London: Sage.

Head, M. H., Readence, J.E. & Buss, R.R. (1989). An examination of summary writing as a measure of reading comprehension. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 28 (4). 1-11.

Heath,S. B. & Street, B. V. (2008). *Ethnography: Approaches to Language and Literacy Research*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Heath, S. B. (1982). What no bedtime story means: Narrative Skills at home and school. *Language in Society*, 11(01), 49-76.

Hee Ko, M. (2009). Summary writing Instruction to University students and their learning outcomes. *English Teaching*, 64 (2). 125-149.

Hill, M. (1991). Writing summaries promotes thinking and learning across the curriculum: But why are they so difficult to write? *Journal of Reading*, 34 (7),536-539.

Hirvela, A. (2004). *Connecting reading and writing in second language writing instruction*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hood, S. (2008). Summary writing in academic contexts. Implicating meaning in processes of change. *Linguistics and Education,* 19. 351-365.

Hornberger,N. H. & Link, H. (2012). *Translanguaging and transnational literacies in Multilingual classrooms: a biliteracy lens*. London: Routledge.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ibrahim, A. M. (2012). Thematic analysis: A critical Review of Its process and Evaluation. *West East Journal of Social Sciences*, 1 (1). 39-47.

Iwai, Y. (2007). Developing ESL/ EFL Learners' Reading Comprehension of Expository Texts. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 13 (7) 1-5.

Johns, A. M. (1985). Summary protocols of 'underprepared' and 'adept' university students: Replications and distortions of the original. *San Diego State University.* 35 (4). 495-512.

Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. Language Learning, 16, 1-20.

Karbalaei, A. & Rajyashree, K. S. (2010). The impact of summarization strategy training on University ESL Learners' reading comprehension. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture*, 30. 41-53.

Kim, S. A. (2001). Characteristics of EFL Readers' Summary writing: A study with Korean University Students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 34 (6). 569-581.

Kim, S. A. (1998). An analysis of Korean EFL Readers' summarization of L2 texts. *English Teaching*, 53 (4). 63-91.

Kirkland, M.R. & Saunders, M. A. P. (1991). Maximising student performance in summary writing: Managing the cognitive load. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25. 105-121.

Kubota, R., & Lehner, A. (2004). Toward Critical Contrastive Rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 7-27

Larson, J. (1996). Challenging autonomous models of Literacy: Street's call to action. *Linguistics and Education*, 8, 439-445.

Langan, J. (1993). *Ten Steps to Building College Reading Skills*, Form a, Townsend Pr.

Lin, O. P. & Maarof, N. (2013). Collaborative writing in summary writing: Student perceptions and problems. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 90. 599-606.

Makalela, L. (2016). Bilingualism in South Africa: Reconnecting with Ubuntu translanguaging In Garcia,O. and Lin, A. (eds). *Encyclopaedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. New York: Springer Science/ Business Media LLC, 1-13.

Makalela, L. (2015). Breaking African Language Boundaries: Student Teachers' Reflections on Translanguaging Practices. *Language Matters*, 46(2), 275-292.

Makalela, L. (2015). Moving out of Linguistic Boxes: the effects of translanguaging strategies for multilingual classrooms. *Language and Education*, 29(3), 200-217.

Makalela, L. (2004). Differential Error Types in Second Language Students' Written and Spoken texts: Implications for Instruction in writing. *Written Communication*, 22 (4). 368-385.

Maykut, P. & Morehouse, R. (1994). *Beginning Qualitative Research: A Philosophic and Practical Guide*. London: Falmer Press.

Matsuda, P. K. (1997). Contrastive rhetoric in context: A dynamic model of L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6 (1). 45-60.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into practice*, 31 (2). 132-141.

Nambiar, R. M. K. (2007).Enhancing academic literacy among tertiary learners: A Malaysian experience. *Journal of Language Teaching, Linguistics and Literature,* 13

Ngcobo, S., Ndaba, N., Nyangiwe, B., Mpungose, N., & Jamal, R. (2016). Translanguaging as an approach to address language inequality in South African higher education: Summary writing skills development. *Critical Studies in Teaching and Learning* 4 (2), 10-27

Othman, N. (2009). Teaching and assessing three types of direct writing in Malaysian ESL classrooms –a survey of ESL teachers' opinions. *English Language Journal,* 3, 102-114.

Perin, D., Keselman, A., & Monopoli, M. (2003). The academic writing of community college remedial students: Text and Learner Variables. *Higher Education*, 45 (1),

Perry, K. H. (2012). What is Literacy? A critical Overview of Socio-cultural Perspectives. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education,* 8 (1). 50-71.

Petric, B. (2005). Contrastive rhetoric in the writing classroom: a case study. *English for Specific Purposes*, 213-228.

Purnamasari, J., Diem, C.D. & Vianty, M. (2014). Using Text Feature walk to help students comprehend expository texts. *Journal of English Literacy Education,* 1(1). 38-51.

Purves, A. C. (1988). Introduction. In Purves, A. C. (ed.). *Writing Across Languages and Cultures.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Robson, C. (1993). *Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner Researchers*. London: Blackwell.

Rowsell, J., & Pahl, K. (Eds.). (2015). *The Routledge handbook of Literacy Studies*. Routledge.

Sajedi, S. P. (2014). Collaborative summary writing and EFL students' L2 development. *Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 98. 1650-1657.

Shen, F. (1989). "The Classroom and the Wider Culture: Identity as a Key to Learning English Composition". *College Composition and Communication*, 40

Shi, L. (2004). Textual borrowing in second- language writing. *Written Communication*, 21 (2). 171-200.

Shukri, N. A. (2014). Second language writing and culture: Issues and challenges from the Saudi learners' perspective. *Arab World English Journal*, 5 (3). 190-207.

Silverman, D. (2014). *Interpreting Data.* London: Sage Publications.

Smit, U. (1996). On Status, roles and attitudes to English in South Africa. *English World Wide*. 17 (1), 77-109.

Statistics South, 2012. Census 2011 Statistical Release (Revised). Pretoria: South Africa.

Street, B. V. & Lefstein, A. (2007*). Literacy: An advanced Resource Book*. New York: Routledge.

Street, B. (2001). Contexts for Literacy Work: The "new orders" and the "new literacy studies". *Powerful Literacies.* Leicester: NIACE

Street, B. (1994). Cross Cultural Perspectives on Literacy. Functional Literacy*: Theoretical Issues and Educational Implications*, 95-111.

Street, B. (Ed.). (1993). *Cross cultural Approaches to literacy*. Oakleigh: Cambridge University Press.

Street, B. V. (1984). *Literacy in Theory and Practice*. New York: Press Syndicate University of Cambridge.

Winograd, P. N. (1984). Strategic difficulties in summarizing texts. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 19 (4).404-425.

Xinghua, L. (2011). Directions in contrastive rhetoric research. *Language Studies Working Papers*, 3. 58-65.

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

Yu, G. (2008). Reading to summarize in English and Chinese: A tale of two languages? *Language Testing*, 25 (4).521-551.

Yuan, ke, L. & Hoey, M. (2014). Strategies of writing summaries for hard news texts: A text analysis approach. *Discourse studies*, 16 (1). 89-105.

Zamel, V. & Spack, R. (Eds.) (1998). Negotiating academic literacies: Teaching and learning across languages and cultures. New York: Routledge.

Zinn, D., & Rodgers, C. (2012). A Humanising Pedagogy: Getting beneath the Rhetoric. *Perspectives in Education*, 30 (4),

Appendix 1

Source Text

Summarize in not more than 120 words, the various communicative methods practiced by animals in the wild.

Communication is part of our everyday life. We greet one another, smile or frown, depending on our moods. Animals too, communicate, much to our surprise. Just like us, interaction among animals can be both verbal or non-verbal.

Singing is one way in which animals can interact with one another. Male blackbirds often use their melodious songs to catch the attention of the females. These songs are usually rich in notes variation, encoding various kinds of messages. Songs are also used to warn and keep off other blackbirds from their territory, usually a place where they **dwell** and reproduce.

Large mammals in the oceans sing too, according to adventurous sailors. Enormous whales groan and grunt while smaller dolphins and porpoises produce pings, whistles and clicks. These sounds are surprisingly received by other mates as far as several hundred kilometers away.

Besides singing, body language also forms a large part of animals' communication tactics. Dominant hyenas exhibit their power by raising the fur hackles on their necks and shoulders, while the submissive ones normally "surrender" to the powerful parties by crouching their heads low and curling their lips a little, revealing their teeth in friendly smiles.

Colors, which are most **conspicuously** found on animals are also important means of interaction among animals. Male birds of paradise, which have the most **gaudy** colored feathers often hang themselves upside down from branches, among fluffing plumes, displaying proudly their feathers, attracting the opposite sex.

The alternating black and white striped coats of zebras have their roles to play too. Each zebra is born with a unique set of stripes which enables its mates to recognize them. When grazing safely, their stripes are all lined up neatly so that none of them loses track of their friends. However, when danger such as a hungry lion approaches, the zebras would dart out in various directions, making it difficult for the lion to choose his target.

Insects such as the wasps, armed with poisonous bites or stings, normally have brightly painted bodies to remind other predators of their power. Hoverflies and other harmless insects also make use of this fact and colored their bodies brightly in attempts to fool their predators into thinking that they are as dangerous and harmful as the wasps too.

Appendix 2 Letter to Campus Principal

Letter to the Campus Principal

Dear Principal

My name is Akulina Chihobo. I am a Masters student at the University of the Witwatersrand, currently conducting research to obtain my Masters degree in Applied Languages and Literacy Education. I would like to invite four first year Marketing students from your campus to participate in my research study.

My research is on investigating summary writing of second language learners of English at college level using a socio-cultural approach. I would like to explore how the rhetorical expressions of students who speak African languages in South Africa, influence their summary writing.

The tasks will comprise two summary tasks and an interview of not more than twenty minutes with each student. One summary will be in English and the other one will be in their African languages. A comparison will be made to check the strategies used in both summaries to identify the main ideas. The interview will be a stimulated recall interview meant to allow students to describe their experiences with summary writing in both languages.

Learners will be made aware that the summaries are not for marks and will not affect the students in any negative way. The summaries and the interviews are tools that I will be using for my research. The results are confidential and will not be shown to anyone and no students will be harmed in any way during the process. The name of the campus will not be revealed in the study as well as the names of the students.

The campus has the right to withdraw from participation without penalty as your participation is voluntary.

The campus' participation in this study will be greatly appreciated. This research will contribute to a larger body of knowledge.

Kind regards

Akulina Chihobo (Researcher).

0743370020


Chihobo.jackie411@gmail.com

Supervisor

Prof. L. Makalela

Leketi.Makalela@wits.ac.za

+27 11 717 3002

Principal's signature  Date 26/09/2016

APPENDIX 3 Participant Consent Letter

APPENDIX 3

Participant consent form

I Mashavhela Fhulufhedzani Veronica. understand that participation in this research is voluntary.

- My signature on this document shows that the researcher has briefed me about the nature of the study and what it is about, has been explained before completing the summary task and the interview.

- Pseudonyms will be used and all the information concerning the study will be kept confidential. I understand that the information given in these interviews will be analysed and compiled into a report that the Wits School of Education will have access to.

- All the two summaries and the interview will be confidential and not dispensed to other parties that are not part of the research.

- The interviews will be audio recorded for accuracy, validity and transcription.
- Participation in the study is completely voluntary and as such withdrawal at any time will not result in any penalties.
- Should you feel psychologically burdened as a result of this research, please take down the contact details at the bottom of the participant information sheet.

Signature: Masha Date: 01 - 10 - 2016

Contact Person

Akulina Chihobo

0743370020

chihobo.jackie411@gmail.com

154 Saxon Hof

1 Eland Street

Appendix 4 English Summaries

PARTICIPANT 1

ENGLISH SUMMARY

The various communication methods practiced by animals in the wild

Communication is part of our everyday life. Animals also communicate much to our surprise. Just like humans interaction between animals is verbal and non-verbal. Singing is one way which animals interact with one another. Blackbirds use their melodious songs to catch attention from the female blackbirds and to keep of other blackbirds from their territory. Large mammals in the oceans sings too. Whales groan when smaller dolphins and porpoises produce pings, wistles and clicks. Besides singing body language forms a large part of communication in animals life. Hyenas exhibit their power by raising fur hackles on their necks. Male birds of paradise hang themselves upside down attracting the opposite sex. Zebras use their stripe coat to confuse hungry lions. Insects with poisons use the colour of their bodies to remind predators of their power.

135 words.

PARTICIPANT 2

ENGLISH SUMMARY

The various communication methods practiced by animals in the world

Communication is part of our everyday life. Just like animals to. Interact among other in sound and body language. As blackbird often use sound to attract the opposite sex and convey setern message. Whales and dolphins produsedpings, whistles and clicks sounds that can reach other mate hundreds kilometres away. Hyenas shows their strength by raising fur heckles on their neck and shoulders to their opponent which is the body language. Colours which are also used by birds to get attention of opposite sex. Zebras, which have unique stripes for mate to recognize them and confuse prediators. And insect armed with poisonous bite or strings have setern coloured bodies to exhibit their powers.

113 words.

PARTICIPANT 3

ENGLISH SUMMARY

The various communication methods practiced by animals in the wild

Communication is part of our everyday life. Animal also communicate. Interaction among animals can be both verbal or non-verbal. Singing is another way of animals to communicate. The songs are usually rich in notes variation, encoding various kinds of messages. These sounds are received by other mates as far as possible. Body language also forms part of animals communication tactics. Colours are most conspicuously found on animals are also important in interaction among animals. Zebras have roles to play too, zebra is born with a unique set of strips which they recognize them. When there is danger they are able to protect themselves and alert other animals. Insects have painted body with poisonous to remind other predator of their power.

121 words.

PARTICIPANT 4

ENGLISH SUMMARY

Various communication methods

People greet each other. Smile or frown, depending on their moods. Male blackbirds mostly use their melodious songs to grap attention of the females. Enormous whales groan and grunt where as small dolphin and porpoises produce pings whistles and clicks that can be head by other mates as far as 100km away. Dominant hyenas exhibit their power by raising the fur hackles of their necks and shoulder. Submissive ones normally surrender by crouching their heads low and culling their lips a little. Gaudy male birds of paradise often hang themselves upside down from branches attracting females. Insects armed with poisonous bites or stings. Normally have brightly painted bodies to remind other predators of their power.

115 words.

Appendix 5 Home Language Summaries

SEPEDI SUMMARY BY PARTICIPANT 1

Poledišano ke karolo ya maphelo arena kamehla. Diphoofolo letšona di boledišana ka mokgwa o mokatšang. Go opela ke mokgwa o itseng yo eleng gore diboledišana ka gona. Dinonyana tše ntso tšadi poo di opelela dinonyana tšadi tsodi dikgohliša, lego tloša tšedingwe dihlageng tša tšona. Dihlapi tšona dia omana. ge hlapi tše nyane di letša melodi. Melodi ya gona ekwa ke tšedingwe tšadi hlapi dile kgore lega tšedingwe. Ntle lego opela diphofolo di kgona go boledišana ka mebele ya tšona. Di phiri tšona di emiša boya bja tsona bja molala le magetla go bontša matla atšona. Dinonyana tse dingwe di lekelela ka hlogo fase go kgahiša dinonyana tšadi tsadi. Di tonki dikgona go hlakahlakantša di tau geditšaba ka mebala ya tšona ye meso le mešweu. Di gokgo tsa tšhefi di bontša matla a tšona ka mebala ya mmele wa tšona.

IsiZulu summary by Participant 2

Izindlela ezahlukene zokukhuluma ezisetshenziswa izilwane emhlabeni

Ukukhuluma kuyinto eyenzeka mihla yonke empilweni. Kanjalo nasezilwaneni okungaba umsindo ophuma emlonyeni noma ukusebenzisa umzimba okuthumela umlayezo thile. Izinyoni zikhipa umsindo noma umculo uku heha ezinye noma ukuzixwayisa ngokuthile. Kanti ezasemanzini nazo zenza umsindo othile ongahamha ibanga elingamakhilomitha angamakhulu ayizinkulungwani. Izinye zezilwani ezisebanzisa izitho zomzimba kungabalwa ingwa, yona esukumisa uboya bayo ukukhombisa amandla nobungozi enabo kulena elwa nayo. Kube nezinyoni ezinemibala emihle eziyigakazisayo ukuheha ezinye zobulili ebulhukile. Igule lona elinemivimbo emhlophe nomnyama engafani neyamanye, okuyona ehlukanisayo kwezinye,futhi edida lezinye izilane ezihlase ukuhlasela. Bese kubakhon nezinye izilwane ezincane njengezintutwane namashongololo ezinobungozi, ezibubonisa ngombala wonzimba

Amagama 94

Tsonga summary by Participant 3

Ti ndlela to hambana hambana to vulavulisana ka swihari e nhoveni.

Ku vulavurisani swi hlangana na vutami bya hina hima siku hintswawo. Swihari na swona swa vulavurisana, kufana na hina swinga endleka ku hiku kombetela kumbe hi marito. Ku yimbelela indlela yinwana yo vulavurisana ka swi horhi. Swihari leswikulu swa yimbelela na swona. Mpfumawulo lowu swiwu endlaka wu suka kule swinene. Handle ka ku tirhisa kumbe kuyimbelela swihari swi tirhisa miri. Mimbalo ya swihari yi tlanga ndzima ya nkoka eka ku vulavula kaswona. Ti ngwenyama ti tswaliwa na mibala yo hambana, tiyi tirhisa ku baleka loko kuri na ngozi. Switsotswana naswona swi na tindlela ta swona to swi sirhelela, leswaku swihari swinwana swinga koti ku swifekelela.

107 yamarito

Venda Summary by Participant 4

Zwiṅoni zwa muvhala mutswu zwa zwiduna zwi imbelela u itela u kunga zwiṅoni zwa sadzi. Zwipuka zwiwanalaho ngomu lwanzheni zwingaho dzi khovhe ngweṇa. Zwi lidza miludzi u davhidzana na zwine zwine zwanga pfala nga zwinwe zwine zwavha kule nga khilomithara dza dana. Nga nṇda ha uimba dziphukha dza daka dzingaho haina dzi tsitsela mahada namukulo fhasi ngeno dzinwe dzitshi shavha ngau kweta thoho nau muṇedza milomo. Zwiṅoni zwa phadaisi zwa muvhala wa gaudy kha mathenga zwi di ṇembeledza zwitshiya ṇtha na fhasi hu uitela u kunga zwa tshisadzi. Madidingwe a shavhela fhetu ho fhambanaho musi ndau itshida huu itela u di tsireledza kana u dadisa ndau. Nzie dzone dzina magwendo ane a ṭhavha a a thusa khau di tsireledza kha zwivhanda.

123 maipfi

Appendix 6 English summary translations

Participant 1 Sepedi

Communication is part of our everyday life. Animals as well, they communicate in a strange way. Singing is one of the ways in which they communicate. The black male birds sing for the female birds to attract them and to scare away other birds. The old fish shout at each other and small fish sing melodies. Those melodies are heard by some other fish while they are far from each other. Apart from singing animals can communicate with the movement of their bodies. Hyenas use the neck and the shoulder to show their powers. The male birds hang down with their heads to impress female birds. Zebras confuse lions when they run with their black and white stripes. The small insects show their powers with the colours of their body.

Participant 2 IsiZulu

Different ways of talking that are used by the animals on earth.

Communication is a usual thing on a daily basis. Even in animals, any sound coming out of mouth, even if it's using body language to send different messages. Birds send out noise or melody to attract or to alert about something. Even animals that live under water do make certain sounds that can be measured to a distance of a one-hundred kilometres. Other animals that use body language can be leopard that raises its fur to show off its power and how dangerous it can be towards its opponent. Then there are birds that show off its beautiful colours to attract other birds with different gender. Then there is a zebra that has black and white stripes that are different to other animals, that makes a difference to other animals and confuses other animals that try to attack. Then there are small insects like ants and millipedes that can be a danger, by showing colour of its skin.

Words: 161

Participant 3 Tsonga

Different ways in which animals communicate in the wilderness/veld

Communication is part of our everyday life. Just like us, animals also communicate with words, symbols, or gestures. Singing (or animal sounds) is another way in which animals communicate. Big animals also sing (make animal sounds). The sound they make can be from very far. Besides making sounds, animals also use their bodies. The colours of animal bodies play an important role in their communication. Crocodiles are born with different and unique colours, these colours help them to disappear when there is danger. Insects also have their own way of protecting themselves, so that other animals cannot reach them.

Participant 4 Venda

Different ways in which animals communicate

Black male birds sing to attract female birds. Some animals like fish whistle to be heard by other animals who can hear them in 100kms. Besides singing, other jungle animals like hyena their shoulder and neck will be low some will be scared by scratching their heads and licking their lips. Paradise birds with gold colour on their feathers they will fly high and low to attract female. Leopards run to different directions when the elephants come to confuse the leopards and to protect themselves. Locusts use their behind leg with tons to protect themselves.

Appendix 7 Transcribed interviews

Participant 1

Can you describe your experiences with summary writing today?

I didn't know that animals have different ways of communicating and also communicate in body language.

What can you say about writing the summaries in two languages?

The home language one was a bit difficult because I'm not confident in it when it comes to writing. I would say writing translating from English to Sepedi.

Which language are you confident in?

English.

But you can speak your home language well?

Yes, but I can't write.

Did you have a chance of writing in your language at school?

Umm in high school I was doing Afrikaans and English and Sepedi back in primary.

Can you describe what you do when you write a summary in your own language?

Uh uh it's not. It's different because you have to think of your other words of Sepedi in English, how you are going to put the sentences together because you can't copy everything from the English one to the Sepedi one like sentence- the way you structure your sentences they are not the same as in English. In Sepedi we don't have some words that match the English one exactly.

Can you give an example of what you are saying?

I wouldn't say it's verbal and non-verbal in my home language. I have to use other words that is different. I don't think there are other words that you can use as verbal and non-verbal. I have used another word but in Sepedi it just means they communicate.

Did this exercise help you to understand the text?

Yes, it did because us we just know that animals have their own way of communicating but we don't know how.

How did you come up with main points for both summaries?

Just read and wrote what was coming to mind. I translated from English to Sepedi but not direct translation.

Would you say your writing was in any way influenced by your culture?

I would say that about the structuring and words because it's part of our everyday life and that's how we communicate. I was cutting words in Sepedi because I don't know the other words in English. I don't know much about my culture.

Participant 2

Can you tell me anything unusual about the way you wrote your summaries today?

Umm there was nothing unusual because there is nothing that was a problem in summarizing as I am used to summarizing.

And what about the issue of using your first language in summary writing?

Ahh it became simple for me because that's the language that I mostly understand and I can express it, I can talk it fluently-eish so it's ok.

So in other words you are saying with your experiences with summary writing you found the one in your home language easier.

Yes, yes, that's what I mean it's very much easier to summarize in your own language because it's where you can like for instance let's take the one we were writing today. Before I summarize it even in English, I started by translating other words into my language which is Zulu to get the actual meaning of a word. In Zulu I wrote as I think, what I think I just wrote it, I write what's on my mind. Then in English I have to read and reread again to get the point.

So writing in Zulu was much easier?

Yes,Yes that's what I'm trying to say.

When you were writing the two summaries did you come to the main points in the same way?

No, no, no eh, critically I was using the same words in English but in the Zulu one I've used my other words like for instance to swipe (swop) the meaning of words not actually the meaning but the pronunciation for instance there are some other words which are very much to write in English but in Zulu they are, I find it easier to write them.

Can you pick out examples from your summaries?

Like ok I'm gonna take this sentence (quotes sentence from source text) "Songs are used to warn and to keep other black birds from their territory usually a place where they dwell and reproduce". Neh then in Zulu I tried to make it sound like in a simple form that's what I mean, in a simple form yes.

Could it be the reason why I see in the English summary you have 123 words and in your Zulu summary you have got 94?

I have managed to summarize other words in Zulu yes.

Have you structured your sentences the same way in both languages?

No it's not the same for instance, there are some of the words I have used in English, I've started with but in IsiZulu maybe eh I changed it and put them at the end of the sentence.

Did this experience help you to understand this text better?

Yes,Yes much better, much better.

Can you explain further?

Because when I translate the English to my language that's where I start to get the meaning of the text.

Did you use the same ways to come up with the main ideas for both summaries?

I did it the same way. I can say it's a construction of sentences I did them differently from the English one.

Can you explain the difference?

For instance with the English one I've maybe mostly in the text they have started by telling what kind of animal it is, what it used to communicate but in Zulu I can start by saying eh, the communication which is used by a certain animal. You get what I mean?

Would you say your English summary was influenced in any way by your culture?

Yes, for instance some words are very eish unusual in our culture for instance words like sex yabo. If you say some words in my culture you usually disrespecting or what so I've tried to change but the meaning is still the same. To change the word into a respectable word which can suit others who will read the text.

So how did you change this word?

I've tried to change like eh as I said the word 'sex' in my Zulu like it is 'ubulile' Yabona, Yes which is more respectful.

How else do you say something which you can't say directly?

For instance maybe if you have something which you want to tell your parents and maybe you think it will be like it's disrespecting them maybe you can consult your older brother who can communicate well with your parents tell him what you want to tell to your parents- he will maybe talk to them politely in a mature way.

Do you think this way of communicating influences the way you write?

Yaa in some for instance if you want to write a letter to someone you don't just tell maybe if he/she is older than him tell him/her about the wrong that he did you don't just tell straight that you did this,this, wrong yabo, just go around and around until you get way of telling but not straight to the point of that thing.

Participant 3

What was unusual about your summary writing today?

The different was quite abroad and that we write our summary. It was not simple as what we do in class.

Which part would you say was difficult?

Because some were they are talking about the zebras and you have to summarise it, they are just telling you what they do, it's not simple to summarise because they just tell you what they do, what they live like. They are talking about animals, zebras, insects and it's not simple how to summarise that part because they are telling you how they are living and what they do.

In which language was that difficult for you?

English. In my home language it is easy. I know some of the easy words easy to use.

How did you come up with the main ideas in both summaries?

In English I changed them to Tsonga because I'm comfortable in the language. I use some words here in English some words is difficult. I know how they live in my language it's simple to say.

Did you find anything that is culture related in the way you wrote the summaries?

Yes. Like when the zebras, yaa in our culture we know that zebras they always stay together, not easy to find zebras alone, it's not easy to hunt zebras.

Participant 4

Can you describe your experiences with the summary writing task?

In these two summaries, what I experienced is that the English one it was quite simple but the Venda one was quite difficult.

What was difficult and easy?

I can say English is quite simple than our own language to write and to understand more especially our language is quite difficult.

What's more difficult in Venda when you write?

Eh, like some of the words in English you, even when we speak in our own language we use those words in English we don't really know the meaning of them in our own language, some of the words, but it's not like they don't have their own words, they have but we don't understand them because we don't take them that much serious. Writing is quite difficult because here we are writing something simple, something formal and then when we speak mostly we don't use formal words when we speak.

Are you saying you don't have formal words in your language?

We have but these youths of like university students they don't take it that much important as long as they can communicate and understand each other that's fine.

When you wrote here did you use those formal words?

Yes I tried but some of them I just used as a whole not a one word because in one word I was not able to understand what it was saying, so like when I'm saying the animals, I use some of the names of the animals, we don't know ore (vernacular) which this animal in our language is what.

Can you pick an example from the text?

The example is eh,eh, zebra in our own language I really don't know (ore) what a zebra is.

Do you have zebras in your home area?

We have, but I really forgot what to call it we don't take it that much important.

Did you construct your sentences in the same way for both summaries?

No, in English when I was summarising, like a passage like this one, it was simple to take the point, the methods of communicating. But in my own, constructing it to my own language it was difficult.

Would you say your writing was influenced somehow by your culture?

Yes, like when they were saying sometimes you can just communicate by smiling to someone you really like even if I'm seeing you for the first time I show my sad face so I don't like you at all so you can communicate using the smiles.

Did you express your main points in the same manner?

In English it was so direct because I was taking it to my own language some of the words you can find (ore) they are difficult for me to translate.

Appendix 8 Memorandum for summary text

Answer

Animals make use of various kinds of communicative methods. Male blackbirds sing to attract female ones and also to keep other blackbirds off their dwellings. Mammals in the oceans like whales, 'sing' to interact with their mates far away too. Dominating hyenas raise their fur hackles in attempts to exhibit power while submissive ones crouch their heads and 'smile' to express respects. Birds of paradise attract female partners by displaying their colorful feathers while the stripes of zebras not only enable them to recognize each other, but also divert the predator's attention in times of danger. Finally, dangerous wasps are brightly colored to warn off others while some harmless ones try to fool their predators by using the same principle. (119 words