Full Length Research Paper

A study on creating writing strategy and evaluation tool for book summary

Sümeyye Konuk, Zeyneb Ören, Ahmet Benzer and Ayşegül Sefer*

Department of Turkish Language Teaching, Atatürk Education Faculty, Marmara University, Turkey.

Summarizing is restating the most important ideas from an original text briefly. Students often need summary writing skill along the education life since it provides understanding and remembering the reading material. This study aims to apply book summary writing strategy which is based on in-class implementations, and to develop the students book summary writing skill with education. With this aim, to determine students' book summary writing skill and analyze the development of their book summary writing skill, researchers have developed a book summary writing strategy and also a rubric to evaluate the written summaries. While developing the book summary writing strategy, researchers have conducted the study with 44 university students studying at Turkish language teaching department in the third grade. The study lasted for 11 weeks, and the education period is implemented as one week education and one week summary writing implementation. The strategy and rubric have been updated with the students' views, feedbacks and researchers' notes during the education process. In the study, of the qualitative research methods, grounded theory was used. At the end of the study, it is stated that students have been successful in writing a book summary, tagging and taking notes, isolating from trivial details and also, they could write the summaries in a shorter time. The study findings revealed the usable book summary writing strategy and the rubric for book summary evaluation.

Key words: Book summary, summary writing skill, rubric, writing.

INTRODUCTION

Summarizing is retaining required information from an original text and restating these information in a shorter version. During the education life, teachers want students to read a number of texts and summarize them. When we analysed the definitions of the term 'summary', we are faced with various definitions on it like activity, skill and strategy. Many definitions have led us to call summary as 'a strategy'. This strategy is a high skill which includes using basic language skills: reading, writing and listening.

A student who learns the summary writing strategy means that he or she can use the basic language skills effectively.

"The ability to summarize information is important for understanding and remembering texts, and therefore, the development of this ability in children should be of considerable pedagogical interest" (Brown et al., 1983).

Taylor (1986) states that summaries, in the first years of education life, are generally in a simple book

*Corresponding author. E-mail: asefer2834@gmail.com.

evaluation form including main characters, basic events and the moral of the book. In the upper grades, students are expected to read different kinds and sizes of books and write more complex and long summaries. Summarizing which is a useful skill for students in many ways helps them in many cognitive processes: to categorise, analyse, explain, evaluate and conclude (Erdem, 2012). Also, since summarizing makes remembering easier, it provides retaining information.

According to Wichadee (2014) summarizing helps students to determine the main idea of the text, make generalizations, disuse unnecessary words, integrate ideas and improve memory. Moreover, summary writing education is important since it improves the reading and summarizing skills; but Baleghizadeh and Babapour (2011) emphasize that summarizing is completely different from memorizing. In memorizing, all the information and the words are tried to be memorized; on the other hand, in the summarizing, only important points are determined and written. This skill provides students to focus on the most important ideas in a text and relating these ideas with the others (Leopold et al., 2013).

Yang and Shi (2003) state that students summarize many texts with the aims of integrating concepts discussed in the courses, to get a better grade or to meet the expectations of the instructors. In this context, it can be remarked that summarizing is also an important skill for students to be successful in the education life. However, Messer (1997) pointed that summary writing is a difficult skill to teach, learn and evaluate (Lin and Maarof, 2013). Zipitria et al. (2004) remarked that this skill is one of the best learning strategies to understand whether a student comprehended a taught subject as well (Idris et al., 2007). From a different point of view, Bean (1986) indicated that an effective summary writing instruction prevents egocentrism; because while summarizing individuals concentrate on another person's ideas. Susar-Kırmızı and Akkaya (2011) emphasize that summarizing strategy also activates thinking process.

The aim of the summary is conveying information to the reader with a shorter text without a literary concern. Therefore, anybody can learn the main points of an original text by reading the summary without seeing the original text. In the summarizing process, the summary writer concentrates on the most important ideas in the text and eliminate trivial details. Yasuda (2014) stated that summarizing is not a way of reconstructing meaning, it is rather a process that existing information is restated in a shorter version. While writing a summary we do not reconstruct the meaning or information of the original text, instead, we continue to give the main points of the original text. Endres-Niggemeyer (1998) also emphasized that summarizing requires using an intense cognitive process. Moreover, Kirkland and Saunders (1991) remarked that summarizing is an interactive and repeated process like all the reading-writing activities; because

while writing a summary, individuals interacts with the text directly and experiences rereading and rewriting processes.

Wichadee (2014) has evaluated summaries of the students in his study. According to him, these summaries are poor in some way. Summaries can be a copy of the original text. Wichadee (2013) also stated that since students have difficulty in determining which information is relevent and required for inclusion in the summary, they can not write good summaries. On the other hand, Garner (1984) remarked that when students can not determine relevant information from the trivial details, they can not make an effective study. Mani and Maybury (2001) also emphasized that summarizing is a difficult work; because this process requires to handle original text completely, to focus on important points and eliminate trivial details.

Students experiences two types of summary during their education life. First, summarizing short texts in textbooks, and the second is summarizing a book. Although these summaries seem to be similar, they differ in some ways. Similarly, Frey et al. (2003) determined that there are two types of summaries used by students. The first is précis, a brief summary and the second type is the evaluation summary. Precis summary contains a few sentences; on the other hand, evaluation summary contains writer's opinions and insights. In the literature review, there isn't a discrimination of the summarizing strategy as text summary and book summary. In some of the foreign studies, it is stated that there are two types of summaries: book summary and text summary. Also, these summary types are studied separately. Mihalcea and Ceylan (2007) remarked that there is a significant body of research carried out but most of this work has been concerned with the summarization of short texts. However, books are different in both length and genre, and different summarization techniques are required.

This study is appropriate to 'process-based learning model' since researchers have developed a book summarizing strategy with students in the process. This learning model, according to Ashman and Conwey (1993), is used for getting information about some subjects, developing and reconstructing the information, monitoring and enhancing behaviors by practicing plans widely and continually (Karatay, 2013). In this leraning model, it is important for students to think independently, decide, solve problems, learn learning as well as gaining cognitive awareness on the steps of writing process (Karatay, 2013).

In the present study, student ideas on book summary writing are evaluated, the problems they faced in the writing process and their ideas to solve these problems are also handled. The strategy in this study has been developed with student feedbacks in the process.

In the scope of the study, it is aimed at developing a theory to enable students to write a book summary. In

accordance with this, to make book summary writing easier;

1. Establishing a theory showing the steps of writing a book summary based on student views.
2. Applying book summary writing strategy to class teaching and developing students' summary writing skill along the education.
3. To be able to summarize any book in a lesson time (approximately 40 to 50 min).
4. Developing a rubric to evaluate written summaries are aimed.

METHODOLOGY

In this study, grounded theory is used. Creswell (2015) defines grounded theory as establishing or discovering a theory with reference to the research data. Here, the basic point is that the theory is not provided from a ready material, rather the theory is grounded on the participants experiences in the process. In this method, researchers establish a general theory in the framework of many participants' opinions related to the process, performance or interaction. Bogdan and Biklen (2006) states that grounded theory is a specific process developed by Anselm Strauss and Barney Glaser. In this process, researchers collect and analyze data simultaneously. This method also points to develop a theory with induction by using qualitative data.

Grounded theory is a general methodology for developing theory that is grounded in data systematically gathered and analyzed (www.depts.ttu.edu). In the present study, researchers have been active during all the process. Grounded theory is prefered to be able to develop an applicable summarizing strategy with participants and reflect the process of the study clearly. With this aim, the study is applied to one group for 11 weeks. Participants of the study have been active during the process. In the process, creativeness has been encouraged, a productive classroom atmosphere has been generated and the opinions of the students have been taken continually. During the process, with the help of acquired data, analysis have been made, and a book summarizing strategy and a rubric have been developed to evaluate the written summaries. The rubric has been used in the process simultaneously with the theory, and the effectiveness and practicality of them have also been tested.

Study group

The study group of the research is 60 university students studying at Turkish language teaching department in the third grade in İstanbul. But 44 student data is handled since they participated all the process regularly. Creswell (2015) states that in the grounded theory, while collecting data, interviews can be made with 20 to 60 students. The reason for applying the study to 3rd grade Turkish language teaching department students is that the subject is related to their lecture 'Comprehension Techniques'.

Data collection tools

In the study, semi-structured interview forms, in-class observation notes, students' taggings, written summaries and some photos were used to collect the data. Büyüköztürk et al. (2012) remarks that semi-structured interviews provides both getting answers to questions and investigating a subject thoroughly. In the semi-structured interview, what and how the questions will be asked is determined beforehand. However, there is a free space for the interviewer. In the implementation process, four semi-structured interview forms have been used with summarizing simultaneously. There is a list of questions in order. In the first and second interview form there are 7 questions and in the third and fourth interview form, there are 5 questions. With the acquired data from semi-structured interview form, we aimed at updating book summary writing strategy and determining missing points. In the ınterview forms of all the students, some did not participate in all the implementations, and they were also evaluated to make a significant contribution to the study.

During the process, 264 semi-structured interview forms are collected from the students. The questions in the forms have been generated during the process appropriate to the grounded theory based on the requirements. At the end of the study, 20 different open-ended questions have been directed to the students through these forms. In order to understand whether the book summarization strategy works or not, researchers have made in-class observations during the process and noted these observations. Balcı (2013) states that with these notes, the researcher can collect the data in the natural setting first hand. In the present study, 264 summaries written by students are collected with students' taggings. All these summaries have been analyzed but 176 summaries which belongs to regularly participated students, are handled in this study.

Collecting the data

In the research process, The Miserables (Victor Hugo, 2015), Of Mice and Man (John Steinbeck, 2012), The White Steamship (Cengiz Aytmatov, 2003) and The Alien (Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, 2008) are the novels read by students based on the views of 2 Turkish language teachers and 4 scholars. While choosing these books, we remarked that they are nearly same in length, all of them are in the same type (novel) and all are narrative. Since having and reading book takes time, the book list has been given to students three weeks before the implementation. After this three weeks, the study has continued for sequential 8 weeks.

1st week

In the first week of the study, students are asked to summarize the first book 'The Miserables' without any instruction. Students have been free of looking at the book while summarizing. While summarizing, they are observed by 4 researchers. After students have finished their summaries, they have answered the semi-structured interview form including 7 questions.

2nd week

Book summary writing strategy (BSWS) education which is developed through literature review and answers from the last week's interview forms has been instructed to the students by researchers. Four researchers participated in the education program. The strategy includes three basic steps: Pre-summarizing, while-summarizing and post-summarizing. All the processes of the strategy has been shared with students. After then, the education has been discussed in the class and students are asked to criticize the education. Following this criticism, students are given previous weeks' summaries and they are informed about their mistakes (giving so many trivial details, missing important ideas) and missing

points in their summaries. After the education, students are asked to read 'Of Mice and Man' until next week and make preparation for summary writing while reading (tagging).

3rd week

Since students were told to read the novel in a week, researchers asked whether they developed any strategy useful for summarizing and what they did while reading the novel. After then, in-class discussions have been made and observation notes have also been taken. Moreover, students are also asked whether they could apply the book summarizing strategy while summarizing and in which item they had a problem. Each item in the strategy are categorized in the form of 'unusable', 'usable' and 'need development' with students. In some of the items, researchers have persuaded the students and in some other items students have persuaded the researchers. After the discussions with students, book summary writing strategy has been updated.

4th week

While students are writing the summary of 'Of Mice and Man', researchers have observed the students whether they use the strategy or not and took some notes. In order to have students gain awareness in some points, after the second summarizing implementation, researchers have given students summary writing form (Ap.B). After summarizing the book, students are given semi-structured interview form including 7 open-ended questions.

5th week

In accordance with the answers in the interview forms, book summary writing strategy has been updated. Students' summaries written last week are discussed according to the strategy, and the evaluation on their summaries have been shared with them. The evaluation process and weak points in the summaries have also been discussed and brainstorming has been made to overcome these. Students' opinions have also been taken. Strategy education has been proceeded by discussing missing and weak points of the summaries. Afterwards, students are told to read 'The White Steamship' novel for the next week and make some preparation while reading.

6th week

Students are asked to summarize 'The White Steamship' novel. While summarizing they have been decontrolled in using the book summary writing strategy. Here, the aim is to observe whether students use their old ways or not. During this process, researchers have observed the students and taken some photos. After the students finished summarizing they are asked to fulfill the interview form including 5 questions. The questions in the interview form have been varied weekly, with the implementation requirements.

7th week

BSWS has been updated by the researchers with reference to the semi-structured forms' answers. Then feedback has been given to the students about previous summaries. The summary writing education is practiced to the students, not only their weak points but also the strong points are emphasized. Afterwards researchers

brainstormed with students on the usefulness of each BSWS items. Followingly, students are remarked that they will summarize the novel "The Alien" for the next week, and thus they need to make preparation.

8th week

Students' objections and suggestions in the brainstorming of the previous week have been recorded by researchers, and BSWS education has been updated. Summary writing implementation process has been observed for the last time by four researchers in the last week of the education. After the summary writing education has finished, the semi-structured interview forms were apllied to the students.

Analyzing the data

In the process of analyzing the data, researchers studied by questioning all the concepts with new data without prejudicing. The coding process are as follows:

1. Data is collected
2. A copy of the data is written to the computer
3. Data is reviewed and read to get a general idea
4. Codes are determined from the data
5. Themes are determined and defined (Creswell, 2008).

In accordance with the steps earlier mentioned, student views are analyzed with open coding. While generating the strategy, 50 open codes are determined. These codes are analyzed and according to the relation among them, axial coding process is practiced. According to the similarities and differences of codes, 18 axial codes are generated. After determining the axial codes selective coding process is handled. In the selective coding, general rules for summarizing, pre, while and post-summarizing processes to do lists are determined. Afterwards, these lists are developed with the literature review and book summary writing strategy coding is finalized as shown in Table 1.

According to the authors in this analysis, researchers may requestion concepts with all the new data and may be free of any prejudice. In constant comparison method, the concepts are labeled, and each labelled concept is compared with previous concepts and grouped. In the present study, as a result of this weekly repeated analysis, the BSWS and an assessment tool is developed.

The tool which is developed in order to evaluate the book summaries is a rubric. While preparing the rubric, literature review is made on writing a book summary and item pool is created. Afterwards, these items are developed and have been made clear with the suggestions from students on a weekly basis. Reference to the suggestions from students again, disfunctional substances were removed in rubric less functioning substances which were treated in the education process. Moreover, new useful items are added. While ensuring the validity of the rubric, opinions of 3 Turkish language teachers, 4 domain experts and 2 scholars of educational sciences have been received. For the reliability of the rubric, randomly selected 5 summary texts are copied and sent to 4 independent researchers. Their results are evaluated. Consistency between researchers rating results are calculated formula of concordance percentage ("P= Na: (Na + Nd) x 100" "concordance percentage = quantitative of concordance: (quantitative of concordance + quantitative of discord) x 100") (Türnüklü, 2000).

In this study, concordance percentage is 85%. Rubric has four sub-dimensions: tagging, style, content and format. And it has 20

Table 1. Summary writing strategy coding.

Open coding	Axial coding	Selective coding
Undetailed expression; Short expression; Expressing basic events; Giving the main points; Expressing outline; Expressing general framework of the book	Expressing main points shortly (trivial details are not included)	
Expressing with a new style; Expressing the info that is remembered; Expressing the read text originally	Summary writer uses his/her sentences	
Avoiding subjectiveness; Giving the message of the writer directly; Expressing objectively and without commenting	Giving the original writer's idea	General rules for summarizing
Expressing in the summary that the work belongs to another writer; It should be understood that the original text was written by another writer ; Not to summarize as if a character of the book	Summarizing with third person-singular	
Subject integrity; Coherence; Cohesion	Cohesion	
The difference between summarizing a novel and a scientific book	Book type	
Information on book cover; Writer of the book; Preface of the book ; Final word of the book	Book tag	
A common program in group implementation where everyone is responsible; The duration given for reading a book	Reading plan	Pre-summarizing to do list
Taking short notes while reading; Important points should be noted for summary while reading	Tagging	
Reflecting the notes on the summary; Utilizing the notes on events, characters, place and time	Tagging should be reflected on the summary	
General subject should be mentioned in the beginning; The time of the events; The place of the events	Beginning with a general introduction of the book	
Character features of the main character; Physical appearance; The situation of the character in the beginning and at the end of the book	Mentioning the main characters in the beginning	
Features of the supporting character; Relation with main character; Conflict with main character	The relationship of the supporting characters with the main character	While-summarizing to do list
Events that have changed in the process; Main conflicts	Plot	
A paragraph based on one idea; Giving one point in one paragraph	Cohesion in the paragraphs	
Paragraphs giving the chronologic order of the events; Coherence of the paragraphs	Cohesion among the paragraphs	
Conclusion of the book; Final point, the main character has reached	Inference of the reader	
Rereading for cohesion		
Controlling trivial details and eliminating them		Post-summarizing to do list
Spelling and punctuation control	Rereading for control	
Peer assessment		

items that measure these dimensions. Each item contains scoring and classification [weak (1 point), insufficient (2 points), medium (3 points), good (4 points), excellent (5 points)]. The highest score is 100 points in the rubric. From this perspective, rubric scoring system is convenient for scoring system used in the schools (100 points).

Researchers evaluated summary texts with this measurement tool. All the summary texts are collected in the process (264), and has been evaluated to see results accurately and to improve reliability. However, based on the regular attendance of the students, of these, only 176 summary texts are handled in the study for evaluation / comparison. Summarizing skills of the students are quantified by rubric scores. Afterwards, development of the skills in the items are monitored and compared week by week. Thus, developing skills and fixed skills have been determined.

Results of the semi-structured interviews are divided into themes based on the questions and content analysis. Since interview forms are semi-structured, participants have been given the answer of a question to another question occasionally. Furthermore, some participants have also given more than one answer to one question.

Therefore, there can be seen an increase in the frequency rate of the interview forms. Thus, inductive data analysis is used in the quantitative data analysis (Büyüköztürk, 2012). According to the author, the researchers do not determine the hypothesis precisely and clearly in this analysis. Data is collected in a long period of time, after then to make generalizations, these data is synthesized inductively. The direct way is from part to the whole. In addition, this research is very significant to find new ways for understanding and comprehending.

In the present study, the data is subjected to classification

according to their similarities and differences. Then the data is coded and categorized and these codes, according to the frequency levels are combined under the themes describing them best. The data are then, interpreted. The data collected from in-class observations are analyzed descriptively.

FINDINGS

In this section, book summary writing strategy which has been based on in-class implementations and literature review has been given.

Theory: Book summary writing strategy (Bsws)

1. General rules:

a. The summary should consist of our own words.
b. The message of the original text should be given in the summary text.
c. The summaries should be written in third-person singular.
d. The summary length depends on the length of the book but the trivial details or unnecessary information should not be given in the summary text.
e. The tense suffixes should be used to ensure the cohesion between sentences and paragraphs.

Pre-summarizing stage

a. The type of the book should be determined before the book is read. For example, the conflict between the characters and events are important in narrative books whereas in the informative books, ideas and their influences are important.
b. The clues for providing information about the content of the book, cover of the book, the author, translation, publication date, edition number, should be collected.
c. Book reading schedule should be determined. The duration for reading the book must be equal for all the students. When reading is finished, before students have not forgotten the topic, summary should be written immediately.
d. While reading the book, the important points should be tagged.

While-summarizing stage

a. While writing the summary students should benefit from tagging that they wrote while reading the book.
b. The first sentence of the summary should be giving a general information of the book, location and time should also be given in the introduction.
c. In the begining part of the book summary main characters should be mentioned. Moreover, characteristic

features, physical appearance, first situation and last situation should be mentioned.
d. From the second paragraph, supporting characters should be mentioned. Features of the supporting characters first and last situations, relationship with the main character, conflicts with the main character should be explained.
e. In the body paragraphs the events which are caused by the main caharacters should be explained. Moreover, changing events and elements of conflicts should be mentioned. In this part, for coherence "suddenly, contrary, oppositely, whenever" conjunctions can be used.
f. Every paragraph should include on opininon. It should be formed around this idea without giving trivial details. In the summary text for providing cohesion, statements like "This part is written on that subject" should not be used.
g. While summarizing a book including many chapters, for every part one summary paragraph should be written. For example, while summarizing a book including 9 chapters, 9 paragraphs should be written.
h. The paragraphs created for the summary should be reread sequentially and evaluated at the end. After the evaluation, the paragraphs including the same ideas can be connected to each other by adding a transition sentence.
i. In the conclusion paragraph, how the book has finished should be stated and an inference should be made.
4. Post-summarizing Stage
a. The summary should be read to check the cohesion and integrity of the paragraphs.
b. In the summary text, if sentences includes trivial details and unnecessary information they should be removed; if there are missing sentences, they should be added.
c. In the summary text, style, grammar, punctuation marks should be checked, if necessary, they should be corrected.
d. If possible, summaries should be read by a peer and peer-assessment can be made.

1. Findings from the rubric and semi-structured interview forms are handled in this section.

Findings on book summary writing skill

The findings obtained from the rubrics have been evaluated in four sub-headings, including tagging, content, style and format. Each book summary collected from students are given in the tables comparatively.

The items on tagging

According to the Table 2, each sub-items of tagging skill have been improved regularly from the first to the fourth

Table 2. Items on tagging.

Items	1. Summaries $\bar{x}$	2. Summaries $\bar{x}$	3. Summaries $\bar{x}$	4. Summaries $\bar{x}$
The length of the tags is convenient	1.04	2.21	3.80	477
Main conflicts are given in the tags	0.88	2.23	4.02	468
Tags are in the form of word or phrase	0.93	1.62	3.77	463

book summary implementation. While the average rate on the first item of the book summary is $\bar{x}$1.04, the rate of the fourth one is $\bar{x}$4.77. Second item's rate is also increased from $\bar{x}$0.88 to $\bar{x}$4.68 and third item's rate is increased from $\bar{x}$0.93 to $\bar{x}$4.63. According to that, it can be said that they have learned regarding the length of the tags, use keywords, restrict content in tags. When the book summaries are compared weekly, the weakest items are the second item ($\bar{x}$0.88) in the first summary, the third item in second ($\bar{x}$1.62), third ($\bar{x}$3.77) and fourth ($\bar{x}$4.63) summary.

Items on content

According to the Table 3, while an increase in all of the items regarding with the content seen, this increase is very clear, especially in the second item. While the success of the fifth item is $\bar{x}$2.38 in the first book summary, it is $\bar{x}$5 in the fourth book summary. The success of the third item is increased from $\bar{x}$2.13 in the first book summary to $\bar{x}$4.65 in the fourth book summary. When the success of the items is compared weekly, the weakest items are fourth item ($\bar{x}$2.06); in the first summary, third item ($\bar{x}$3.37) and fourth item ($\bar{x}$3.31) in the second summary, third item ($\bar{x}$4.06) in the third summary, fourth item in the fourth summary.

Items on style

According to the Table 4, there is a regular increase in all of the items but the maximum increase ($\bar{x}$1.68) is in the sixth item. When the success in the items is compared weekly, the weakest one is the sixth item ($\bar{x}$2.70) in the first summary, the first item ($\bar{x}$3,89) in the second summary, the sixth item ($\bar{x}$4.11) in the third summary and the sixth item ($\bar{x}$4.38) in the fourth summary.

Items on form

According to the Table 5, the biggest increase is in the first item. While this rate is $\bar{x}$3.20 in the first summary, it is

$\bar{x}$4.77 in the fourth summary. When the success in the items is compared weekly, the weakest one is the third item ($\bar{x}$3.11) in the first, ($\bar{x}$3.56) second, ($\bar{x}$3.95) third, and ($\bar{x}$4.04) fourth summary.

Findings of student opinions

During the education of the BSWS, four individual semi-structured interview forms have been applied to the students after each summary writing implementation to increase the intelligibility of the theory, test the feasibility and identify problematic items. The summarizing duration of the students, number of paragraphs and words they used in the summaries and rubric score is compared weekly and presented in Table 6. According to the Table 6, a significant relationship can not be seen between the duration and the number of words and paragraphs. The question "Do you like your book?" has been asked to the students in the 1, 2, 3 and 4 semi-structured interview forms. The following table shows the findings on this question.

According to the Table 7, the least appreciated book is the third book "The White Steamship" and the most admired book is the first book "The Miserables". Some questions about tagging have been asked to the students in the semi-structured interviews forms. These are: "Did you tag before you start writing your summary?" in the first form, "What challenges have you experienced while tagging?", "Do you observe development on your tagging? If yes, what are they?" in the second and third form. The following table shows the findings on these questions.

According to the Table 8, before the BSWS education is given, most of the students did not tag while summarizing. Beside this, when the points that students have some difficulties while tagging are similar both in the second and third book summaries, but in the third book summary students have difficulties in tagging by omitting the key words. This is remarkable about tagging since it increases the awareness of the students.

According to the Table 9, in three of the book summary implementations, it can be seen that students have given the same answers about the points they have difficulty while summarizing. In the table, the most remarkable

Table 3. Items on content.

Items	1. Summaries $\bar{x}$	2. Summaries $\bar{x}$	3. Summaries $\bar{x}$	4. Summaries $\bar{x}$
Short information is given about the book in the introduction of summary	2.65	3.38	4.58	4.81
The information about the main characters is given in the summary text	2.93	4.23	4.72	4.84
The information about the supporting character is given in the summary text	2.13	3.37	4.06	4.65
The information about duration is given in the summary text	2.06	3.31	4.88	4.38
The information about the place is given in the summary text	2.38	4.84	4.93	5
The plot is compatible with the book	3.04	3.89	4.22	4.90
The main conflicts affecting novel fiction is given in the summary text	2.90	3.57	4.11	4.88
The solution of the book's problem is stated in a conclusion sentence.	2.97	4.17	4.31	4.81

Table 4. Items on style.

Items	1. Summaries $\bar{x}$	2. Summaries $\bar{x}$	3. Summaries $\bar{x}$	4. Summaries $\bar{x}$
The summary text is clear and fluent	3.56	3.89	4.22	4.95
The tense suffixes are used compatibly	3.93	4.28	4.52	4.81
The summary text has been written by the reader's own sentences	4.25	4.86	4.88	5
The students used third-person singular in their summaries	4.29	4.78	4.90	5
The message of the original text is given in the summary text.	4.09	4,68	4,79	4,95
The details or unnecessary information isn't given in the summary text	2.70	4.07	4.11	4.38

Table 5. Items on form.

Item	1. Summaries $\bar{x}$	2. Summaries $\bar{x}$	3. Summaries $\bar{x}$	4. Summaries $\bar{x}$
Spelling and punctuation are used correctly	3.20	4.10	4.22	4.77
There is no incoherency	3.18	3.97	4.13	4.56
The order of paper is regarded	3.11	3.56	3.95	4.04

Table 6. The summary writing skill average rates.

Item	1. Summaries $\bar{x}$	2. Summaries $\bar{x}$	3. Summaries $\bar{x}$	4. Summaries $\bar{x}$
The duration	61.65	44.95	61.88	63.53
The number of paragraphs	7.5	5.7	9.20	7.8
The number of words	539.38	411.04	616.71	537.52
Rubric score	55,13	75.04	86.88	94.71

Table 7. Findings about the approval rates of the students.

Do you like your book?	1. Book (%)	2. Book (%)	3. Book (%)	4. Book (%)
Approval rates of the students who liked	93.44	89.04	71.92	87.67

Table 8. The findings on tagging.

Tagging	1. Summaries $\bar{x}$	2. Summaries $\bar{x}$	3. Summaries $\bar{x}$
Did you tag before you write your summary?	No tagging (68.18%)	-	-
What challenges have you experienced while tagging?	-	Analyzing important and unimportant information (31.81%); Tagging in the same order of the events as in the original book (11.36%)	Analyzing important and unimportant information (34.09%); Tagging in the same order of the events as in the original book (20.45%); Tagging by using key words (11.36%)
Do you observe development on your tagging? If yes, what are they?	-	Number of people who didn't make tagging in the second week (12.32%); Tagging easier (13,69%); Tagging shorter and clearer (8.21%); People who think that tagging is not required in the novel (6.84%)	Coding important information (7.01%); Tagging shorter and clearer (15.78%); Tagging by using key words (10.52%); People who don't make any explanation after the answer of "yes" (57.89%)

point is the variability of the student opinions on tense suffixes. BSWS is updated with the help of these and a change is observed on students after updating. However, the problem of writing introduction sentence could be

Table 9. Findings on the diffculty of summary writing.

Variable	1. Summaries	2. Summaries	3. Summaries
Do you have difficulty in writing summary, if you have what are those?	Regarding the plot (40,90%)	Regarding the plot (22,72%)	Regarding the plot (15,90%)
	Using tense suffixes (11,36%)	Using tense suffixes (25%)	Using tense suffixes (4,54%)
	Eliminating trivial details (25%)	Eliminating trivial details (18,18%)	Eliminating trivial details (20,45%)
	Writing an introduction sentence (6,81%)	Writing an introduction sentence (4,54%)	-
	Remembering the names of the characters and place (22,72%)	Tagging (6,81%)	Tagging (4,54%)
	93,44% while writing summary	95,89% while writing summary	68,42% while writing summary

overcomed in the following weeks. In the 2nd, 3rd and 4th interview forms, students are asked "Do you think that there is a mistake or something missing in the BSWS education?" and "When you become a teacher will you practice the things you have learnt?"

According to the Table 10, in the second implementation of the BSWS education, 36.98% of students states that there is no missing points; this rate is 82.2% in the fourth implementation. Before the second book summary implementation, students are given information on how to tag. Consequently, as can be seen on Table 10, in the third implementation 12.18% of the students remarks that they have diffculty in tagging but in the fourth week, it is significant that they have reported tagging as one of the exercises they like most. When students are asked that "When they become a teacher, will you practice the things you have learnt?" 92,27% said "yes", this shows that this education can be thought to be useful.

According to the Table 11, while 81.81% of the students remark that they write better summaries when compared with the first implementation, in the fourth application, this rate becomes 91.64%. On the other hand, most of the students state that writing summary is beneficial and this rate is 96.72% in the first interview form, it is 100% in the second interview form. The question which is asked to the students to learn in which parts BSWS education was beneficial for themselves is answered as writing in a planned way (38.35%) in the second interview form, and writing a better summary (92.64%) in the fourth interview form.

DISCUSSION

In the scope of the research, a book summary writing strategy and a rubric for evaluating summaries have been developed by the researchers. According to Goulding (1999), grounded theory method that has been used in this study, is used when there is so much information on a case and in a need to add new information to the present information (Kaya, 2014).

In the process of using grounded theory in this study, the instructor guided students properly. In this process, students' confidence to the lecture decreased occasionally. Because while developing this theory students construct the knowledge. In this constructing process, knowledge is reviewed, tested and evaluated according to students' feedbacks and either modified or removed. Students are active and decision-maker during all the process. Moriarty (2011) states that grounded theory is advantegous since it aims to produce information from the data itself instead of using the available hypotheses, providing new information on the subject that has been researched and also it is useful in terms of flexibility of data collection tools (Kaya, 2014).

After implementing the strategy, it is determined that the average achievement of the students' book summary writing skill has increased gradually. According to this, (from assessment tool) they increased their succes with the rates of $\bar{x}55.13$ for the first week, $\bar{x}75.04$ for the second week, $\bar{x}86.88$ for the third week, $\bar{x}94.71$ for the fourth week.

When the duration of writing their summaries is observed, the average is for Les Miserables (180 pages), Of Mice and Men (128 pages), The White Steamship (186 pages), and The Alien (214 pages) which has the largest number of pages are respectively $\bar{x}61.65$, $\bar{x}44.95$, $\bar{x}61.88$ and $\bar{x}63.53$ min. Accordingly, there is no meaningful relation between the period for students to write summary and the number of pages.

In the first book, the rate of the students who eliminate trivial details is the least successfull item ($\bar{x}2.70$). Even though this rate shows increase upwards in the following weeks, it came forward (in the meeting form) as the most challenging material for students as the last one of the questions were asked to the students again in 3 different weeks (20.45%).

This result is compatible with the findings of Wichadee (2013) and Garner (1984). According to these writers, since students can not distinguish whether the information

Table 10. Findings on the BSWS education.

Variable	2. Interview form	3. Interview form	4. Interview form
Do you think that there is a mistake or something missing in the BSWS education?	There is no mistake (36,98%) 1. Uncertainty in using tense suffixes (13.69%) 2. Not personal feedback (12.32%) 3. Not dwelling on the main idea (5.47%)	There is no mistake (70.17%) 1. Practicing in a lesson time (8.77%) 2. Tagging obligation (12.28%) 3. Not giving feedback simultaneously (14.03%)	There is no mistake (82.2%) 1. Practicing in a lesson time (5.47%) 2. Tagging obligation (4.10%)
What do you like the most in BSWS education?	-	-	1. Giving feedback (34.09%) 2. Making application (6.81%) 3. Learning how to tag (29.54%) 4. Reading four different books (11.36%)
When you become a teacher, will you practice the things you have learnt?			1. Yes, I will. (97.27%).

Table 11. Findings on the BSWS education ımplementation process.

Variable	1. Book Summary	2. Book Summary	4. Book Summary
What are the differences between the summary you write first time and second time?	-	1.Writing summary convenient to the plot (6.81%) 2.Eliminating trivial details (4.54%) 3.Writing summary in a less time (9,09%) 4.Writing a planned summary (6.81%) 5.Writing a better summary than before (81.81%) 6.Tagging (18.18%)	-
Do you think that writing summary is useful, if yes, in what ways it is useful?	1.96.72% of the students think that it is useful 2.Retaining information (22.95%) 3.Help to comprehend the book (11.47%) 4.Improving memory (16.39%)	1.100% of the students think that it is useful 2.Writing introductory, body and conclusion parts (6.84%) 3.Regarding the plot (16.43%) 4.Writing a planned summary (12.32%)	-
What are the changes in your summary writing skill before and after BSWS education?	-	-	1.Writing a better summary than before (91.64%) 2.Eliminating trivial details (12.84%) 3.Tagging (15.06%) 4.Writing a shorter and clear summary (4.10%) 5.Writing a planned summary (4.10%)
Did the BSWS education help you to write summary? If yes, how?	-	1.Writing a planned summary (38.35%) 2.Eliminating trivial details (15.06%) 3.Tagging (12.32%)	-

is necessary or not and whether it needs to be in the summary or not, they explain that they can not write a good summary. 40.90% of the students remark that they had some difficulties in the first book summary and in "regarding the plot" while this rate shows a noticable decrease to the second book summary, they mention that this topic no longer in the third and fourth book summaries. Findings of the rubric supports that the averages of summaries which is related to this item are $\bar{x}$3.04 for the first book summary, $\bar{x}$3.89 for the second, $\bar{x}$22 for the third, and $\bar{x}$4.90 for the fourth one. This result shows that BSWS make students acquired "the skill of writing summary convenient to the plot"

When the findings obtained related to the points that students have some diffuculties while writing summary are evaluated, 11,36% of students remark that they had some difficulties in using consistent tense suffixes in the summaries which are written before the BSWS education is given. This rate increases to 25% after the education and with the last change store in the strategy and the third book summaries, this rate decreases to 4.54%. In the implementation of the last book summary, they do not mentioned this topic. In the rubric, when the findings which are related to the relevant item is observed, the first one is $\bar{x}$3.93, the second one is $\bar{x}$4.28, the third one is $\bar{x}$4.52 and the fourth one is $\bar{x}$4.81.

That condition results from the instruction given to the students in the BSWS education. Through literature, students are given instruction to use present tense in the first week. However, they could not manage to use those instructions in their book summaries. In the second book summary, this item is changed as using consistent tense suffixes. As a result, difficulty for tense suffixes is decreased, and achievement is increased for students.

When answers which students have given related to the condition of appreciation of books they gain to summarize in practice are evaluated, it is determined that the rubric did not overlap the findings. While a steady decrease is being observed by weeks in findings obtained from rubric, the condition of appreciation of the students for the book is said to be directly related to the achivement of the students for summarizing.

One of the remarkable points of the study is that students acquire the skill of summarizing completely. Accordingly, when the findings obtained from the rubric is observed, students are viewed to gain full grades in the point of "giving information about the location in summary, using third-person singular in the summaries, writing the summary with thier own sentences". In this context, after the BSWS education, students have gained those abilities. On the other side, of the 14 items from 17 rubric items, they are determined to get grade upon $\bar{x}$4.50. According to that, after the BSWS education, students have gained three of the book summary writing skills and in many skills they have become in the practising level.

Throughout the strategy education, some items are removed from the rubric and some items are added to the strategy with the opinions of the students. For example, students have hesitated about how to finish the summary in the last paragraph. After this situation, instruction is given to students that they can finish the summary with a question to invite audience to read the book and to state how the problem in the book has been solved should be mentioned in the conclusion sentence (Lake, 2005). Since students could not have a consensus on finishing the summary with a question sentence, with their opinions this instruction is removed from the strategy. When the fourth book summary is observed, the rubric item 'how the problem is solved is expressed in the result sentence' have a rate of ($\bar{x}$4.81). This rate shows that students have been successful in applying this instruction.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the student opinions and the development in the book summary writing skill, when BSWS education is applied in the classroom, it can provide students to gain the ability of writing a book summary. For evaluating summary texts, the rubric which is developed is also determined to be applied by research in the way of function. In BSWS, education is original in showing that students can summarize a book in a lesson time. In this context, with the help of BSWS education, students are determined to write better book summaries. The rates of the rubric of the last practice ($\bar{x}$94.7) also supports this idea.

Suggestions

In the implementation process, it is determined that some students have come to the classroom by writing the summary that they obtained from the internet. To overcome that situation teachers should give a ready form to write the summary in the classroom.

When teachers make a summary writing study in the classroom, he or she should give a publishing firm to make students read the same book. If students are not informed, they may buy different presses of the same book they may have read the same book in different lengths. In the present study, 'The Miserables' book have different presses from different publishing firms changing from 60 to 1715 pages. The researchers have selected and recommended one among them according to the study group. When teachers make a summarizing study in the classroom, they should determine a reading period of time. Moreover, they should prepare a reading calendar according to the level of the students and the density of the lesson.

The reading calendar can be prepared both by the

teacher and the student. With the help of this calendar, all the students can read and finish the same book simultaneously. Therefore, all of them can write their summaries in the classroom during the lesson time. Teachers, by making the students write the summaries in the classroom can prevent them to acquire a ready summary from the internet.

Conflict of Interests

The authors have not declared any conflict of interests.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

Aytmatov C (2003). Beyaz gemi. Ankara: Elips kitapları.
Balcı A (2013). Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntem, teknik ve ilkeler. Ankara: Pegem Academy.
Baleghizadeh S, Babapour M (2011).The effect of summary writing on reading comprehension and recall of EFL students. Nera J. 47(1):44-48.
Bean JC (1986). Summary writing, Rogerian listening, and dialectic thinking. College Composition and Communication. 37(3):343-346.
Bogdan CR, Biklen SR (2006). Qualitative Research for Education, USA: Pearson International Edition.
Brown AL, Day JD, Jones RS (1983). The development of plans for summarizing texts. Child Development. 54:968-979.
Büyüköztürk Ş, Kılıç Çakmak E, Akgün ÖE, Karadeniz Ş, Demirel F (2012). Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
Cerswell JW (2008). Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research (3rd Edution.). New Jersey: Pearson Internationaal Education.
Cerswell JW, Clark LP (2015). Karma Yöntem Araştırmaları. (Dede, Y., Demir, S., Aydın, E., Güzel, E. B., Bursal, M., Çorlu, S., Delice, A., Güngör, F., Köksal, M. S., Kula, S., Peker, M. Yaman S., çev.) Ankara: Anı Publishing.
Endres-Niggemeyer B (1998). Summarizing Information. Almanya: Springer.
Erdem C (2012). Türk dili ve edebiyatı öğretmen adaylarının özetleme stratejilerini kullanım tercihleri ve metin dil bilimsel bir özetleme çalışması. Dil ve Edebiyat Eğitimi Dergisi. 1(3):36-52.
Frey N, Fisher D, Hernandez T (2003). What's the gist? summary writing for struggling adolescent writers. Voices from the Middle. 11(2):43-49.
Garner R (1984). Rules for summarizing texts: is classroom instruction being provided?. J. Educ. Res. 77(5):304-308.
Hugo V (2015). Sefiller. İstanbul: Serüven kitabevi.
Idris N, Baba S, Abdullah R (2007). Designing heuristic rules to detect student's strategies in summarizing using decomposition of expert-written summaries. 1st International Malaysian Educational Technology Convention, Malezya.

Karaosmanoğlu YK (2008). Yaban. İstanbul: İletişim Yayıncılık.
Karatay H (2013). Süreç temelli yazma modelleri: 4+1 planlı yazma ve değerlendirme modeli. Yazma Eğitimi (21-40). Ed. Murat Özbay. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
Kaya Ö (2014). Eğitimde Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri. Mustafa Metin (Ed.) Temellendirilmiş Teori (s.239-260). Ankara: Pegem Academy.
Kirkland MR, Saunders MA (1991). Maximising student performance in summary writing: Managing cognitive load. TESOL Quarterly pp. 105-121.
Lake L (2005). Writing an effective book summary. http://www.justaboutwrite.com/A_Archive_WritingBookSummary.html Access date: 20.01.2016.
Leopold C, Sumfleth E, Leutner D (2013). Learning with summaries: effects of representation mode and type of learning activity on comprehension and transfer. Learn. Instruction 27:40-49.
Lin OP, Maarof N (2013). Collaborative Writing in Summary Writing: Student Perceptions and Problems. Procedia – Soc. Behav. Sci. 90:599-606.
Mani I, Maybury MT (2001). Advances in Automatic Text Summarization. USA: Massachusstes Institute of Technology.
Mihalcea R, Ceylan H (2007). Explorations in automatic book summarization. Proceedings of the 2007 Joint Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and Computational Natural Language Learning. Prague, 380-389.
Steinbeck J (2012). Fareler ve insanlar. İstanbul: Sel Yayıncılık.
Susar-Kırmızı F, Akkaya N (2011). A qualitative study on the use of summarizing strategies in elementary education. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi 41:267-277.
Taylor K (1986). Summary writing by young children. Reading Res. Q. 21(2):193-208.
Türnüklü A (2000). Eğitim araştırmalarında etkin olarak kullanılabilecek nitel bir araştırma tekniği: görüşme. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi. 24:543-559.
Wichadee S (2013). Improving students' summary writing ability through collaboration: a comparison between online wiki group and conventional face-to-face group. Turk. Online J. Educ. Technol. 12(3):107-116.
Wichadee S (2014). Developing reading and summary writing abilities of EFL undergraduate students through transactional strategies. Res. Educ. 92:59-71.
Yang L, Shi L (2003). Exploring six MBA students' summary writing by introspection. J. English Acad. Purposes. 2:165-192.
Yasuda S (2014). Exploring changes in FL writers' meaning-making choices in summary writing: A systemic functional approach. J. Second Language Writing. 27:105-121.