The Effect of Summary Training on Intermediate EFL Learners' Reading Comprehension in Individual and Collaborative Conditions

Zahra Aghazadeh *   Mohammad Mohammadi **

Mehdi Sarkhosh ***

Abstract

Inspired by Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory (SCT), the current study intended to investigate the effect of summary training (i.e., oral and written) on intermediate EFL learners' reading comprehension in different conditions (i.e., individual and collaborative). Data collection tools and procedures encompassed PET test, First Certificate in English (FCE) reading pre-test, and post-test. First, to ensure that the instruments, scoring, as well as summary training procedures were reliable, the researchers conducted a pilot test. During the main study, 120 Iranian EFL intermediate male and female learners aged from 16-18 were considered as the main participants. Learners were divided into 6 groups (i.e., three individual and three collaborative conditions). Furthermore, each condition included three groups with oral summary, written summary groups, and no summary group. A post-test followed the treatment that lasted for 6 sessions. A series of ANOVA with follow up pair-wise comparisons and a series of independent-samples t-tests indicated that: (1) summary training, especially the oral one, was more effective in enhancing the EFL learners' reading comprehension, and (2) members of the collaborative groups outperformed the members of the individual groups regarding their reading comprehension development. The

* PhD Candidate, Urmia University - Email: zahra.aghazadeh.zm@gmail.com, Corresponding author

** Assistant Professor, Urmia University -Email: mohammadi680@yahoo.co.uk

*** Assistant Professor, Urmia University -Email: mdsarkhosh@gmail.com

theoretical and practical implications are discussed concerning enhancing the EFL learners' reading comprehension.

Keywords: Summary training, Reading comprehension, Collaborative learning, Individual learning, Sociocultural theory

In any learning context, reading is regarded as one of the major skills (Akkakoson, 2012; Rahmani & Sadeghi, 2009). Reading comprehension has a significant role in the language acquisition process due to its great role in helping the learners read for varying reasons (Behjat, Yamini & Bagheri, 2012). According to Anderson (1991), despite the importance of reading in EFL contexts, most emphasis is usually placed on speaking and writing. According to Jenkinson (1998), for receptive learning, the reading process is vital and stresses that "books are still a prime source of knowledge" (p. 66).

Reading has a significant role in both learners' professional and academic achievement and in second or foreign language acquisition (Carrell, 1989a). However, most EFL students have problems with reading comprehension. Therefore, applied linguists are trying to develop theoretical and practical techniques to enhance their reading ability. Thus, many research studies have been conducted on reading comprehension to understand what it is and how it is processed (Grabe, 1991). According to Grabe (2009), "reading comprehension can be divided into lower-level and higher-level processes, where lower-level processes include word recognition, syntactic parsing, and semantic-proposition encoding" (p. 21), and as Grabe and Stoller (2002) state "higher-level processes involve a model of text comprehension, where good readers form a summary model of what the text is likely to mean" (p. 91).

Reading includes an interaction between the reader and the texts; therefore, learners should use different reading strategies in order to comprehend the text. One of these strategies, summarizing, is believed to be a valuable technique in testing reading especially in a foreign language context since it accounts for the essential processes required for generating the meaning of a text (Kobayashi, 2002; Yu, 2007a; 2007b). As regards the phenomenal importance of summarizing, Kintsch and Van Dijk (1978)

defined a model of text comprehension, which identifies the leading cognitive processes that operate during summarizing and reading comprehension. Based on this model, three major strategies should be taken into account to summarize efficiently. The first strategy is "deletion", during which unnecessary and redundant information must be removed; the second strategy is "generalization", in which details become generalized; and the third strategy which has roots in inferencing and reading the text between the lines is called "construction" and simply means identifying and generating the main idea of one or more paragraphs (p. 91).

It should be pointed out that, in performing tasks, as Vygotsky (1978) states, individuals should be provided with assistance to move toward Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), that is, "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the potential developmental level as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (p. 86). According to Bruffee (1984), collaborative learning assists the learners to complete tasks they cannot perform independently; however, they can perform with the help of more knowledgeable peers.

Furthermore, Sociocultural Theory (SCT) holds that learning is a social activity (Vygotsky 1978). The interaction between a less competent and a more competent peer mediates the learning process, that is, the learner's knowledge develops, and she/he learns by interacting and exchanging ideas meaningfully. Involving the learners in collaborative or group activities, therefore, creates them a socially productive condition for better cognitive and social development and promotes social interaction among learners in the class. The goal of the present study, therefore, was to examine the impact of oral and written summary presentation in individual and collaborative groups on EFL learners' reading comprehension.

Literature Review

According to Dymock and Nicholson (2007), "to define reading comprehension would be to define reading" (p. 10). Gough and Tunmer (1986) state that reading comprehension is "the process by which, given lexical (i.e., word) information, sentences and discourses are interpreted" (p. 7). As Sweet and Snow (2003) argue, "reading comprehension is a process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning" (p. 1). In this view of reading, both the text and also the reader's abilities have critical roles in reading comprehension (Sweet & Snow, 2003).

Regarding the utmost importance of comprehension process, researchers must try to find the best strategies to develop reading comprehension. As a result, the present study investigated summarizing strategy training as the most frequently used reading strategy. As Corder-Ponce (2000) declares, "summarization is probably the most significant and encompassing of all reading strategies available to the learners for effective studying and comprehension" (p. 330). In summarization, the main points of the text are of great importance since they help the readers enhance their comprehension and memory. There are studies that demonstrate that the students can be trained in summarizing (Huan & Thi Kim Ngan, 2017; Huang, 2014; McDonough, Crawford, & De Vleeschauwer, 2014; Mokeddem & Houcine, 2016).

In a transactional view of the reading, the readers are involved in making meaning through having a dialogue with the authors. Some reading researchers stress that reading comprehension never happens without decoding meaning (Dymock & Nicholson, 2007; Gough & Tunmer, 1986; Juel, 1988; Pressley, 2000; Torgesen, 2002).

Nowadays, views on the reading skill have changed. There is a shift from a behavioral perspective to an interactive approach today. According to the interactive view, reading is a cognitive and socially constructed activity. In the past, reading was regarded as a static activity, and the reader was to decode the meaning through the words. However, nowadays, reading is regarded as a dynamic process, and the readers get meaning according to information extracted from the text (Tavakoli, Dabaghi, & Khorvash, 2010).

Social constructivism views reading as a social activity. In this view, a text is viewed as an interaction between reader and writer in which "the writer has to conduct his interaction by enacting the roles of both participants" (Widdowson, 1984, p. 59 as cited in Thompson, 2001). In this process, the reader tries to understand what the writer wants to convey, which Vygotsky calls inter-mental dialogue. The next stage is called intra-mental dialogue, which happens when readers construct their meaning (Zarrati, Nambiar, & Massum, 2012). According to the constructivist view of reading, the reader has an active role in the interaction between the writer and the text (Rasti, 2011).

The current status quo of English reading skill in Iran demonstrates the learners' enormous difficulty in their reading proficiency, since, in most Iranian EFL classes, the traditional reading method still prevails, that is, the teachers are dominant in the class and provide the learners with synonyms, antonyms, and definitions for the unfamiliar vocabulary items found in reading passages. The learners usually requested to read and translate the texts and subsequently find answers to multiple-choice questions and true-false statements. Then the answers to these activities are discussed with the teacher. Moreover, the teachers fail to employ effective strategies that help learners to comprehend the text they read.

It should be stated that most of the instructors are reluctant to use collaborative learning in their classes since they believe that collaborative learning creates a messy situation in the classroom since the learners are not accustomed to sharing or working problems out quietly and calmly with their peers. Furthermore, the learners do not understand how to work collaboratively since collaborative learning is not applied in the classes, and the prevailing educational system is oriented toward competitive and individual learning in the Iranian EFL context. Moreover, collaborative learning may not be a practical methodology for all the learners, that is why some teachers avoid using it when they realize that some learners are prone to working alone and conflict may happen when placed in a group. Besides, more proficient learners are more likely to become impatient with their teammates working too slowly. As Gow and Kember (1990) state,

collaborative learning techniques cannot be applied in Eastern and Asian contexts since the students are assumed to be more passive in these contexts.

The present study, thus, intends to investigate whether training Iranian EFL learners in summarizing and providing them opportunities for writing and telling summaries in reading tasks can play a significant role in developing the Iranian EFL learners' reading comprehension. Accordingly, the following research questions were posed:

1) Do different types of summary training in individual performance influence the Iranian Intermediate EFL learners' reading comprehension ability?

2) Do different types of summary training in collaborative performance influence the Iranian Intermediate EFL learners' reading comprehension ability?

3) Is there a significant difference between collaborative and individual groups regarding learners' reading comprehension enhancement?

Method

Design

According to Mackey and Gass (2005), "quantitative study can be divided into two types: associational and experimental" (p. 137). To be more precise, the present study took up an experimental Pretest-Posttest Design. In other words, a pretest was given to ensure the comparability of the control group and experimental groups before the treatment; then the experimental groups received the treatment, however, the control group didn't receive any treatment. Finally, a post-test was administered to measure the extent to which the treatment was effective.

Participants

Employing PET test, 120 homogenous intermediate EFL male and female learners in the Shokouh English Institute (SEI) in Salmas, Iran formed the main participants of this study. The participants had at least 3 year-experience of learning English at a language institute and a secondary school, and they ranged in age from 16-18. Also, their native languages were Kurdish and Azari. The participants were randomly assigned into two main groups, namely, collaborative (N= 60) and individual (N= 60). Furthermore, each leading group (i.e., collaborative and individual) was divided into three groups receiving different types of summary training, namely, oral summary, a written summary and no summary (20 participants in each class). Moreover, the participants didn't have any prior experience in summary telling and writing since there was no requirement to tell and write summaries in the language institute and the secondary school curriculum. Besides, none of the participants had participated in collaborative learning activities before this study.

Instruments

In order to smoothly run toward achieving the study's intended objectives, the researchers used the following instruments:

1) A proficiency test (PET),
2) First Certificate in English (FCE) reading pre-test and post-test

Preliminary English Test (PET). PET is used to see whether participants can use every day written and spoken English at an intermediate level. It tests all four language skills and consists of 67 items, that is, reading (35 items), writing (7 items), and listening (25 items). The researchers calculated the reliability of the test, which was 0.81.

Pre-test. The researchers used the First Certificate in English (FCE) reading test to determine the participants' reading ability. The test contained 34 items with four reading tasks: matching headings to paragraphs, answering multiple choice questions, choosing which sentence fits into gaps in a text, and deciding which of the short texts contain the given information. Before any treatment, the researcher made

statistically sure that all the participant groups (i.e., experimental and control ones) were not significantly different from each other in their reading comprehension ability. Before administering the test to the main population of the study, the researcher piloted the test with a sample similar to the main population and calculated its reliability, which was 0.79.

Post-test. Finally, the post-test (i.e., the same test used in the pre-test) was administered to close the solid phase of the study in order to explore the effect of treatments. The researchers used the same test twice, both in the pre-test and the post-test stages to ensure comparability regarding the difficulty of the comprehension questions and enhance the reliability of the results. However, using the same test twice could make the learners learn from the test. Therefore, to eliminate this practice effect, the researchers did not check and discuss the answers of the pre-test with the learners, and the learners were not given further access to the pre-test material. Moreover, to eliminate the memory effect, there was a two-month break between the pre-test and the post-test stages.

Procedure

At the outset of the study, due to the need to obtain some insights about the reliability of the instruments, scoring, and summary training procedures, the researcher conducted a pilot test with a sample similar in their characteristics to the ones that took part in the primary research. Having calculated the reliability of the tests, the researchers made sure that they were reliable enough to be used in the main study.

Before any treatment, homogeneity of the participants was assured through the use of a PET test, and 120 EFL intermediate male and female learners were selected for the treatment. Then these learners randomly were assigned into two groups, namely, collaborative and individual groups (60 learners in each group). The learners in each group were randomly assigned into two experimental groups and one control group (20 learners in each class). The same syllabus, material, and texts were used in both the experimental and the control groups. All the groups received identical pre-reading activities; for instance, new vocabulary and

grammatical structures were introduced to the learners. However, the treatments were different. Before the treatment, all the participants were given the First Certificate in English reading as both the test of reading homogeneity and pre-test.

During the study, participants in the first experimental group (both collaborative and individual) received training on summarizing defined by Brown and Day (1983) including "identifying the topic sentences and main ideas of the paragraphs and writing them in their own words, removing redundant and repeated information, eliminating unimportant details, identifying supporting details and stating them in their own words, generalizing the information, changing the order of the ideas, using appropriate linking words to make the text coherent" (p. 98). During the treatment, learners in the individual group were asked to follow pre-reading activities in the class, and then they were involved in silent reading individually. After that, the teacher explained the passage to them and asked reading comprehension questions. Finally, they were asked to answer the reading questions. Having answered the questions, in the post-reading phase, the teacher provided the students with opportunities to write the summaries of the passages individually in the class each session and hand them in to the teacher. In other words, they were not allowed to engage in pair discussions. The same procedure was followed for the collaborative group. However, they were asked to form groups of two students with whom they had to work throughout the sessions. The teacher did not intervene with which students to assign to which groups. In line with our conceptualization of collaborative learning, the teacher played the role of advisor and facilitator besides her knowledge transmitting role during the whole sessions so as to help the students work cooperatively. Therefore, in post-reading phase, the collaborative group was asked to prepare and write summaries of the texts in pairs in the class each session and hand them in to the teacher. In other words, they were allowed to help each other in the process of writing summaries, and to discuss every aspect of the texts together such as the word choice, punctuation, grammatical structures, and appropriateness of the structures.

The participants in the second experimental group received training on summarizing, and they got engaged in oral summarizing of the texts they read. They were asked to prepare the summary for the next session, memorize it, and come to class well-prepared to present it orally. The same procedure used in the first experimental group was followed for pre-reading, reading and post-reading. However, for treatment, learners were asked to prepare an oral summary individually in the individual group and collaboratively in the collaborative group. In other words, the next session, learners in the collaborative groups were asked to come to the board and present their summary together orally, and other students asked them comprehension questions.

In the control groups, the students did not receive any training in summarizing. They just followed the procedure used in other groups for pre-reading, reading, and post-reading without any treatment. The treatment lasted 6 sessions and for the post-test the same test used in the pre-test was administered in the 7th session.

Data Analysis

A series of one-way ANOVA was used in the pretest to establish homogeneity across the participants in both groups (collaborative and individual), and also in the post-test to explore the possible effects of the treatment. Moreover, in the post-test stage, Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test were conducted to figure out where the difference is exactly located among the pairs.

Results

A one-way analysis of variance was used to explain the homogeneity of the learners in the pre-test after the assumptions for parametric tests were met, and no violation was detected. The outcome is illustrated in Table 1.

Differences among Learners in Individual Group (Pre-test)

Table 1.

Descriptive Statistics of the Three Groups: Homogeneity Measures of the Learners (Pre-test)

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
No Summary	20	73.60	3.393	.758	72.0118	75.1882	68.00	79.00
Written Summary	20	72.25	3.126	.699	70.7867	73.7133	68.00	78.00
Oral Summary	20	73.50	3.316	.741	71.9478	75.0522	68.00	79.00
Total	60	73.11	3.283	.423	72.2684	73.9649	68.00	79.00

According to the mean scores, there was no notable difference among the three groups in the pre-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed to confirm it (see Table 2).

Table 2.

ANOVA Results: Homogeneity Measures of the Learners in Individual Group (Pre-test)

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	22.633	2	11.317	1.051	.356
Within Groups	613.550	57	10.764		
Total	636.183	59			

The results of ANOVA showed that there weren't any significant differences ($F = .24$, $p = .78 > .05$) among EFL learners who were assigned into three treatment groups (i.e., oral summary, written summary, and no summary) in the pre-test.

Quantitative Data Analysis for the Individual Group in the Post-test

Table 3 Shows descriptive statistics indicating the outcomes of three groups in the post-test.

Table 3.

Descriptive Statistics of the Individual Group in the Post-test

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
No Summary	20	75.05	3.103	.69386	77.5977	80.5023	74.00	86.00
Written Summary	20	82.70	3.357	.75079	85.1286	88.2714	75.00	90.00
Oral Summary	20	88.25	3.058	.68393	90.8185	93.6815	87.00	98.00
Total	60	82.00	6.286	.81164	84.3759	87.6241	74.00	98.00

The mean scores indicated differences among the learners in individual groups in the post-test. One-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) checked whether these differences were significant (see Table 4).

Table 4.

ANOVA Results of the Learners in the Individual Group (Post-test)

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1757.100	2	878.550	87.106	.00
Within Groups	574.900	57	10.086		
Total	2332.000	59			

ANOVA results indicated statistically significant differences ($F = 87.10$, $p = 0.00<0.05$) among three groups in the post-test, that is, the group receiving oral summary outperformed the other two groups. Further, the Tukey's *posthoc* test was run to show the exact points of variations among the groups (see Table 5).

Table 5.

Tukey HSD for the Elementary Learners in the Individual Group (Post-test)

Type	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05		
		1	2	3
No Summary	20	79.0500		
Written Summary	20		86.7000	
Oral Summary	20			92.2500
Sig.		1.000	1.000	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 20.000.

The Tukey HSD test revealed significant differences among the groups in the post-test. The results of the Tukey test demonstrated that there was an increase in learners' reading comprehension from the pre-test to the post-test in both oral and written summary groups, however, in the oral summary group, the increase was more.

Differences among Learners in Collaborative Group (Pre-test)

A one-way analysis of variance was used to explain the homogeneity of the participants in the pre-test after the assumptions for parametric tests were met, and no violation was detected. The outcome is illustrated in Table 6.

Table 6.

Descriptive Statistics of the Learners in Collaborative Group (Pre-test)

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minim um	Maxim um
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
No Summary	20	72.75	2.935	.65645	71.3760	74.1240	68.00	79.00
Written Summary	20	71.45	3.590	.80287	69.7696	73.1304	65.00	78.00
Oral Summary	20	71.55	3.425	.76597	69.9468	73.1532	68.00	79.00
Total	60	71.91	3.325	.42935	71.0575	72.7758	65.00	79.00

In addition to descriptive statistics, the researcher used a one-way analysis of variance (Table 7).

Table 7.

ANOVA Results of Homogeneity Measures of the Learners in Collaborative Group (Pre-test)

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	20.933	2	10.467	.945	.395
Within Groups	631.650	57	11.082		
Total	652.583	59			

ANOVA results indicated that there was no statistically significant difference ($F = .95$, $p = 0.39 > 0.05$) among three groups in the pre-test.

Quantitative Data Analysis for the Learners in Collaborative Group (Post-test)

Table 8 shows descriptive statistics indicating the outcomes of three groups in the post-test.

Table 8.

Descriptive Statistics of the Learners in the Collaborative Group (Post-test)

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minim um	Maxim um
No Summary	20	74.90	2.770	.61942	76.6035	79.1965	74.00	84.00
Written Summary	20	89.60	3.662	.81886	83.8861	87.3139	72.00	90.00
Oral Summary	20	94.35	2.455	.54904	90.2008	92.4992	87.00	97.00
Total	60	86.28	6.293	.81248	83.3242	86.5758	72.00	97.00

The mean scores indicated differences among the three groups in the post-test. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) checked whether these differences were significant (see Table 9).

Table 9.

ANOVA Results of the Learners in the Post-test

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1821.700	2	910.850	100.783	.000
Within Groups	515.150	57	9.038		
Total	2336.850	59			

ANOVA results indicated statistically significant differences ($F = 100.78$, $p = 0.00 < 0.05$) among three groups in the post-test, that is, the group receiving oral summary outperformed the other two groups. Further, the Tukey *posthoc* test was run so as to show the exact points of variations among the groups (see Table 10).

Table 10.

Tukey HSD for the Learners in the Collaborative Group (Post-test)

		Subset for alpha = 0.05		
Type	N	1	2	3
No Summary	20	74.9000		
Written Summary	20		89.6000	
Oral Summary	20			94.3500
Sig.		1.000	1.000	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 20.000.

The Tukey HSD test revealed significant differences among the groups in the post-test. The results of the Tukey test indicated that there was an increase in learners' reading comprehension from pre-test to post-test in the oral summary and written summary groups compared to other groups.

Difference between Collaborative and Individual Writing Groups in Post-test

To find out the possible difference between the scores of collaborative and individual groups in the post-test, the researchers used independent-samples t-test the results of which are shown in Table 12.

Table 11 demonstrates descriptive statistics for differences between the scores of the collaborative and individual groups in the post-test.

Table 11.

Descriptive Statistics for the Difference between Collaborative and individual Groups

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Groups	Collaborative	20	86.24	6.29	.811
	Individual	20	82.00	6.28	.812

According to the mean scores, there was a significant difference between two groups, that is, collaborative and individual, therefore, an independent-samples t-test was used to confirm it (Table 12).

Table 12.

Independent-samples T-test for Post-test Regarding the Difference between Collaborative and individual Groups

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Groups	Equal variances assumed	1.428	.248	22.1	38	.00	31.500	1.419	28.5181	34.4818
	Equal variances not assumed			22.1	38	.00	31.500	1.419	28.4796	34.5203

In a nutshell, an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the scores of collaborative and individual groups in the post-test. There was a significant difference in scores for collaborative group (*M*=86.24, *SD*=6.29) and control group [*M*=82.00, *SD*=6.28; *t* (38) = 22.1, *p*=.00 < .05], that is, the collaborative group outperformed the individual one.

Discussion and Conclusion

The current study aimed at investigating the influence of summary training, that is, oral and written on the EFL learners' reading comprehension. Also, their effect was scrutinized in different conditions, that is, individually and collaboratively in order to find ways in helping students to increase their reading ability. To address the objectives of the research, the researcher set out an experimental study. The results proved the superiority of both summary groups (oral and written); however, the oral group outperformed the other two groups. Moreover, the collaborative group outperformed the individual one. Besides, collaborative groups outperformed their peers in the individual groups regarding reading comprehension in the post-test.

The results of the present study indicated that summary training was very influential in enhancing learners' reading comprehension. Many studies, which are in line with this study, have claimed that summary training is effective in enhancing learners' reading comprehension (Huang, 2014; McDonough, Crawford, & De Vleeschauwer, 2014; Mokeddem & Houcine, 2016). To support the findings of this study, Huan and Thi Kim Ngan's (2017) study indicated that summary training was a suitable and effective technique for optimizing students' text comprehension ability. Moreover, Marzec-Stawiarska's (2016) study emphasized the influence of summarizing on learners' reading development. Following this study, Khoshsima and Rezaeian Tiyar's (2014) study demonstrated that the summarizing had a great impact on the learners' reading comprehension ability.

As Soleimani and Hajghani (2013) state, learners can use reading strategies if they know how to use them; therefore, strategy-based instruction is necessary. As the findings of this study indicated, summarizing strategy is an essential technique in enhancing reading comprehension, and it is still worth to be emphasized. The results of this study revealed that strategy instruction would help learners to enhance their reading comprehension and become proficient readers.

Regarding the third research question, findings indicated that the

collaborative group outperformed the individual one. Concerning the effect of collaboration on learners' summary presentation, the results of the statistical analysis revealed that collaboration improved the learners' oral and written summary presentations. According to SCT, the knowledge of the learners develops as they interact with others (Vygotsky, 1978). Engaging the learners in collaborative activities can increase the interaction among learners in the class. Collaboration is an effective means of improving L2 learners' language skills. The collaborative dialogue in the learning process mediates language learning. The results of this study support the results of other studies conducted on collaborative learning and reading comprehension (Adams, 1995; Jalilifar, 2010; Kazemi, 2012; Masoud Kabir & Aghajanzadeh Kiasii, 2018). According to previous studies, cooperative learning can enhance EFL learners' reading comprehension more than traditional methods. These results support the findings of the study by Hwang, Wang, and Sharples (2007) showing that the collaborative group had a higher level of reading comprehension ability.

As the findings indicated, collaboration in second language classes is an effective means of improving L2 learners' reading skill because it mediates language learning and helps learners to improve confidence and motivation and think critically. Therefore, collaboration with peers not only promotes the level of the learners' reading comprehension, but it also offers them opportunities to communicate with each other, share ideas, and give useful comments and suggestions.

In conclusion, the current investigation showed that summarizing seems to improve the learners' reading comprehension abilities efficiently. Students who practiced oral and written summary presentations were able to achieve high results on reading tests. The findings of this study will be insightful for teachers. Teachers should pay much attention to teaching students how to summarize a text after reading and provide them with opportunities to practice summarizing strategies. Furthermore, teachers should motivate students to integrate this strategy into reading lessons on their own. Also, EFL instructors are recommended not to rid themselves

of the burden of using various summary types (oral and written) in the classes because each type is an essential avenue for students to improve their reading comprehension.

This study supports that cooperative learning is a good option in teaching reading comprehension and can work better than traditional direct instruction in improving the reading comprehension achievement of students. So, teachers should try to develop learners' reading comprehension through small group cooperative skills in reading classes. The findings of this study showed that the use of collaboration in reading comprehension classes could lead to students' higher performance in reading comprehension. Thus, teachers, according to the SCT theory, should develop students' interaction and collaboration in small groups in order to have more autonomous language learners. Collaboration motivates students to become independent and responsible for constructing their knowledge.

The present investigation has some limitations which should be considered. The findings of the current study may be unique to this particular population; therefore, to gain more reliable information, this study can be repeated on a larger scale. Besides, the used tools in this study were reading tests and the questionnaires, and the other useful tools such as observations, diaries, and think-aloud protocols which can add to the reliability of the findings were not used. Thus, researchers should qualitatively and quantitatively triangulate the findings so as to get more reliable data in order to generalize. Finally, a longitudinal study is required to ensure the efficacy of summary types on the learners' reading comprehension ability.

References

Adams, E. T. (1995). *The effects of cooperative learning on the achievement and self-esteem levels of students in the inclusive classroom* (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis).Wayne State University.

Akkakoson, S. (2012). Raising strategic awareness of Thai EFL students of science and technology disciplines through metacognitive strategy training. *3L; Language, Linguistics and Literature, The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, 18*(4), 35-47.

Anderson, N. J. (1991). Individual differences in strategy use in second language reading and testing. *Modern Language Journal, 75*, 460-472.

Behjat, F., Yamini, M., & Bagheri, M. S. (2012). Blended learning: A ubiquitous learning environment for reading comprehension. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *2*(1), 97-105.

Brown, A. L., & Day, J. D. (1983). Macro rules for summarizing texts: the development of expertise. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 22*, 1-14.

Bruffee, K. A. (1984). Collaborative learning and the conversation of mankind. *College English, 28*(1), 181- 8.

Carrell, P. L. (1989). Metacognitive awareness and second language reading. *Modern Language Journal, 73,* 121-134.

Corder-Ponce, W. L. (2000). Summarization interaction: Effects on foreign language comprehension and summarization of expository texts. *Reading Research and Instruction, 39*(4), 329-350.

Dymock, S., & Nicholson, T. (2007). *Reading comprehension: What is it? How do you teach it?* Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Gough, P. B., & Tunmer, W. E. (1986). Decoding, reading, and reading ability. *Remedial and Special Education, 7*, 6-10.

Gow, L., & Kember, D. (1990). Does higher education promote independent learning? *Higher Education, 19*(3), 307-322.

Grabe, W. (1991). Current developments in second language reading. *TESOL Quarterly, 25,* 375-396.

Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2002). Teaching and researching reading. Harlow: Longman.

Huan, N. B., & Thi Kim Ngan, N. (2017). Summarizing strategy: Potential tool to promote English as a foreign language (EFL) students' reading comprehension in a vocational school, Vietnam. *European Journal of Education Studies, 3*(8), 51-72.

Huang, W. C. (2014). The effects of multimedia annotation and summary writing on Taiwanese EFL students' reading comprehension. *The Reading Matrix, 14*(1), 136-153.

Hwang, W. Y., Wang, C. Y., & Sharples, M. (2007). A Study of multimedia annotation of web-based materials. *Computers & Education, 48*, 680-699.

Jalilifar, A. (2010). The effect of cooperative learning techniques on college students reading comprehension. *System, 38,* 96–108.

Jenkinson, R. (1998). *The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing*. London: John Benjamins.

Juel, C. (1988). Learning to read and write: A longitudinal study of 54 children from first to fourth grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80,* 437-447.

Kazemi, M. (2012). The effect of Jigsaw technique on the learners' reading achievement: The case of English as L2. *MJAL, 4*(3), 170-184.

Khoshsima, H., & Rezaeian Tiyar, F. (2014). The effect of summarizing strategy on reading comprehension of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics, 2*(3), 134-139.

Kintsch, W., & van Dijk, T. A. (1978). Toward a model of text comprehension and production. *Psychological Review, 85*(5), 363–394.

Kobayashi, M. (2002). Method effects on reading comprehension test performance: Text organization and response format. *Language Testing, 19*(2), 193–220.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Marzec-Stawiarska, M. (2016). The influence of summary writing on the development of reading skills in a foreign language. *System, 59,* 90-99.

Masoud Kabir, F., & Aghajanzadeh Kiasii, Gh. (2018). The effect of collaborative strategic reading on EFL learners' reading comprehension and vocabulary knowledge. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 3*(1), 1-16.

McDonough, K., Crawford, W. J., & De Vleeschauwer, J. (2014). Summary writing in a Thai EFL university context. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 24,* 20-32.

Mokeddem, S., & Houcine, S. (2016). Exploring the relationship between summary writing ability and reading comprehension: Toward an EFL writing-to-read instruction. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 7*(2), 197-205.

Pressley, M. (2000). What should comprehension instruction be the instruction of? In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 545-562). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Rahmani, M., & Sadeghi, K. (2009). *The effect of note-taking strategy training on reading comprehension and recall of Iranian EFL learners* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Urmia University, Urmia, Iran.

Rasti, I. (2011). *Involving the reader in the text: Engagement markers in native and non-native student argumentative essays* (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). The University of Liverpool.

Soleimani, H., & Hajghani, S. (2013). The effect of teaching reading comprehension strategies on Iranian EFL pre-university students' reading comprehension ability. *International Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences, 5*(5), 594-600.

Sweet, A. P., & Snow, C. E. (Eds.). (2003). *Rethinking reading comprehension*. New York: Guilford Press, pp. 12-30.

Tavakoli, M., Dabaghi, A., & Khorvash, Z. (2010). The Effect of meta-discourse awareness on L2 reading comprehension: A case of Iranian EFL learners. *English Language Teaching, 3*(1), 92-102.

Thompson, G. (2001). Interaction in academic writing: learning to argue with the reader. *Applied Linguistics*, *22*(1), 58-78.

Torgesen, J. K. (2002). The prevention of reading difficulties. *Journal of School Psychology, 41*, 7-26.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Yu, G. (2007a). *Effects of source texts on summarization performance.* Paper presented at the Language Testing Research Colloquium (29th). Barcelona, Spain.

Yu, G. (2007b). Students' voices in the evaluation of their written summaries: Empowerment and democracy for test-takers? *Language Testing, 24*(4), 539-572.

Zarrati, Z., Nambiar, R. M. K., & Massum, T. N. R. (2012). Effect of meta-discourse on reading comprehension of Iranian EFL learners. *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, 20*(3), 27-38.