

SUMMARISING AS A PEDAGOGICAL STRATEGY FOR ENHANCING GRAMMAR ACCURACY AND WRITING QUALITY AMONG GRADE 12 EFAL LEARNERS

Motlhaka Hlavisio

Department of Language Education, School of Education, University of Limpopo,
Sovenga, South Africa

E-mail: Hlavisio.motlhaka@ul.ac.za

Received: 2026-03-23

Accepted: 2026-05-28

Published: 2026-06-17

Abstract

English writing is increasingly important in both educational and professional contexts in non-native English-speaking countries. Several studies have used summary writing strategies to enhance learners' reading comprehension. However, few studies have examined the relationship between summarising and improvements in grammar accuracy, organisation, and overall writing quality. Therefore, this study investigates whether summarising as an instructional strategy enhances the grammar accuracy and writing quality of English First Additional Language (EFAL) learners. The study adopted a convergent mixed-method research design in which quantitative and qualitative data were collected concurrently, analysed separately, and merged during interpretation. Simple random sampling was used to select 50 Grade 12 EFAL learners and purposive sampling was used to select two EFAL teachers. A pre-test on summary writing was administered prior to the six-week summarising intervention. The post-test mean scores were consistently higher than the pre-test mean scores, indicating improvement in learners' writing abilities after the intervention. The findings suggest that summarising effectively enhances learners' vocabulary, grammar accuracy, and overall writing quality. The study has implications for learners, curriculum development and future research. For Grade 12 EFAL learners, summarising helps them to become independent writers by enabling them to organise ideas, reduce repetition, and communicate information effectively, which may also improve examination performance. For curriculum development, curriculum planners and teachers may incorporate structured summarising activities, comprehension-based writing tasks, and grammar-focused exercises. Future studies may also investigate the effectiveness of summarising across different educational contexts, grade levels, and language proficiency groups.

Keywords: *Academic writing; grammar accuracy; EFAL; summarising strategy; reading comprehension*

1. Introduction

Writing in a second or additional language requires learners to demonstrate competence in grammar, vocabulary, organisation of ideas, coherence, and critical thinking (Kim & McCarthy, 2021; Mogano & Motlhaka, 2023). However, English First Additional Language (EFAL) learners in South Africa continue to experience significant challenges in writing effectively and accurately. These challenges are often linked to inadequate exposure to meaningful writing activities, limited language proficiency, and the use of teacher-centred instructional approaches that do not sufficiently develop learners' writing abilities. Among the different writing difficulties experienced by EFAL learners, grammar inaccuracies and poor writing quality remain persistent concerns in secondary schools (Thaba & Motlhaka, 2022; Sucita & Hukom, 2022). In other words, learners frequently produce written work characterised by incorrect sentence structures, tense inconsistencies, spelling errors, punctuation problems, and weak paragraph development. Such difficulties negatively affect the clarity and coherence of their writing.

In many classrooms, writing instruction tends to emphasise the final product rather than the writing process, thereby limiting opportunities for learners to practise, reflect, and improve their language use through meaningful engagement with texts (Mulaudzi & Motlhaka, 2023; Li, 2025; Khan et al., 2025). Thus, summarising has increasingly been recognised as an important pedagogical strategy that can support the development of language and writing skills. This process engages learners cognitively and linguistically, encouraging active interaction with language structures and vocabulary. Through summarising, learners are exposed to correct grammatical patterns and organised writing models, which may contribute to improved grammar accuracy and overall writing quality (Calvani et al., 2023). Although previous studies have explored summarising as a strategy for reading comprehension and writing development, limited research has examined its direct contribution to grammar accuracy and writing organisation among Grade 12 EFAL learners in South African secondary school contexts. Furthermore, few studies have integrated Cognitive Load Theory to explain how summarising facilitates grammatical and textual development. Therefore, this study seeks to examine how the use of summarising activities can influence learners' grammatical competence and enhance the quality of their written work. By exploring the effectiveness of summarising in the EFAL classroom, the study aims to contribute to language teaching practices and provide insights that may assist teachers in developing more effective writing instruction strategies for EFAL learners. This study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent does summarising improve grammar accuracy and writing quality among Grade 12 EFAL learners?
2. How do EFAL teachers perceive the effectiveness of summarising in improving learners' grammar and writing skills?

2. Literature Review

This section presents summary writing as a complex academic skill closely connected to reading comprehension, language proficiency, grammar, vocabulary, and writing development. Across several studies, scholars agree that summary writing requires learners to identify key ideas, condense information, and reconstruct meaning using their own words. However, scholars differ slightly in emphasis regarding the causes of poor summary writing and the educational benefits associated with summarisation. The following subheadings will improve readability and scholarly structure of the literature review:

2.1 The Relationship Between Summary Writing and Reading Comprehension

The literature establishes a reciprocal relationship between summary writing and reading comprehension. Scholars such as Sucita and Hukom (2022), Chew et al. (2020), and Solikhah and Sari (2022) conceptualise summary writing as evidence of comprehension because learners must reconstruct meaning from source texts rather than merely reproduce information. Their perspectives suggest that successful summarisation depends on learners' ability to distinguish central ideas from supporting details. Similarly, Xie (2023) extends this argument by emphasising that summarisation encourages active engagement with texts, thereby deepening comprehension. This position is significant because it frames summary writing not only as an assessment tool but also as a learning strategy that promotes meaning-making. In contrast, Shibabaw (2023) and Budianto, et al., (2022) approach the issue from a deficit perspective by focusing on how poor comprehension undermines summary quality. While these scholars highlight the negative consequences of weak comprehension, their arguments complement rather than contradict earlier studies because they reinforce the idea that comprehension forms the foundation of effective summarisation. Collectively, the literature reveals consensus that reading comprehension and summary writing are interdependent processes. However, the studies largely focus on comprehension outcomes and pay less attention to how instructional strategies could strengthen learners' summarisation abilities, thereby creating a gap that warrants further investigation.

2.2 Cognitive Demands of Summary Writing

The reviewed literature consistently portrays summary writing as a cognitively demanding activity that requires higher-order thinking skills. Susanti and Oktaviana (2023) argue that learners must analyse texts, identify main ideas, condense information, and construct meaning concisely. This perspective positions summarisation as more than a mechanical writing exercise because learners are required to interpret and reorganise information. Zhao et al. (2024) deepen this argument by linking summary writing to critical thinking, particularly because learners must express ideas originating from another author while maintaining accuracy and coherence. Their emphasis on intellectual processing highlights the complexity of balancing comprehension with original expression. Similarly, Ferdinandus and Hukom (2024) emphasise the educational value of summary writing, arguing that it promotes reading comprehension and supports the development of integrated literacy skills. Although these scholars agree on the educational value of summary writing, their arguments differ slightly in emphasis. While Susanti and Oktaviana (2023) focus on the cognitive processes involved, Ferdinandus and Hukom (2024) emphasise the contribution of summarisation to literacy development and academic learning outcomes. This distinction suggests that summary writing serves both as a cognitive skill and as a tool for academic literacy development. Nevertheless, the literature tends to idealise summarisation as beneficial without sufficiently addressing contextual factors such as learners' language proficiency or classroom support, which may influence learners' ability to perform these complex tasks successfully.

2.3 The Challenges Learners Face in Summary Writing

The literature identifies multiple and interconnected challenges that learners encounter in summary writing. Khazaal (2019) and Mulaudzi and Motlhaka (2023) primarily attribute learners' difficulties to inadequate reading comprehension, implying that learners

cannot summarise effectively if they fail to understand source texts. In contrast, Qin and Groombridge (2023) argue that summary writing difficulties extend beyond comprehension and are associated with limited language proficiency, weak writing ability, and ineffective reading-to-write strategies. Their findings are particularly significant because they demonstrate that comprehension difficulties cannot be separated from broader linguistic and writing-related challenges. Similarly, Plakans et al. (2019) highlight poor language proficiency and weak writing skills as significant constraints on effective summarisation. Although these scholars focus on different contributing factors, their findings collectively reveal that summary writing difficulties are multidimensional rather than isolated. The literature therefore suggests that learners' struggles stem from the interaction of reading comprehension, language proficiency, writing competence, and strategic processing skills. This interconnectedness indicates that improving summarisation requires comprehensive instructional approaches rather than focusing on a single skill area.

2.4 Grammar and Language Competence

The literature also demonstrates strong agreement regarding the role of grammar and language competence in summary writing. Alawaji (2020) argues that explicit grammar instruction is essential for effective writing because mastery of grammar, vocabulary, sentence structure, and paragraph organisation improves learners' writing quality. Similarly, Shodieva (2023) associates poor writing performance with inadequate language background and limited vocabulary knowledge. Both scholars therefore position language competence as central to learners' ability to paraphrase, organise ideas logically, and communicate meaning effectively. Despite this consensus, the literature appears to focus predominantly on general writing competence rather than specifically examining how summarisation contributes to grammatical development. Most studies emphasise the benefits of summarising for reading comprehension and vocabulary acquisition, while the relationship between summarisation and grammar accuracy remains insufficiently explored. This gap is important because grammar competence directly affects the clarity and coherence of learners' summaries. Consequently, the reviewed literature justifies the current study's focus on investigating whether summarisation strategies can improve the grammar accuracy and writing quality of English First Additional Language learners.

2.5 Theoretical Framework

This study was guided by Sweller's Cognitive Load Theory (1988), which explains that learning is more effective when instructional activities are aligned with the limited capacity of working memory. Cognitive Load Theory distinguishes among three types of cognitive load: intrinsic, extraneous, and germane (Lovell & Sherrington, 2020). In this study, summarising was viewed as a strategy that supports Grade 12 EFAL learners' writing development by reducing unnecessary cognitive demands while enhancing deeper language processing. Intrinsic cognitive load in EFAL writing enables learners to focus on the main ideas of a text while simultaneously attending to grammar, vocabulary, sentence structure, coherence, and content organisation. This assists learners in processing information more effectively and constructing grammatically correct and meaningful sentences. Summarising also reduces extraneous cognitive load because learners learn to identify key ideas and eliminate irrelevant information (Khan et al., 2025). As a result, learners can concentrate more on grammar accuracy, coherence, and organisation in their writing. Furthermore, summarising promotes germane cognitive load by encouraging learners to analyse, organise,

and restate information in their own words. This process strengthens their understanding of sentence construction, vocabulary use, and text organisation, thereby improving grammar accuracy and overall writing quality. Therefore, the study adopted Cognitive Load Theory to explain how summarising can enhance writing performance and grammar accuracy among Grade 12 EFAL learners.

3. Research Method

3.1 Setting of the Study

This study is conducted at the selected secondary school in rural Mankweng area, Kgakotlou Circuit, Capricorn South District, Limpopo Province, South Africa. The Kgakotlou Circuit comprises many rural secondary schools in the Ga-Mothiba and Mankweng areas. Sepedi Home Language is spoken by the majority of the population in the Ga-Mothiba and Mankweng area, and English serves as the primary language of learning and teaching (LoLT). Thus, many learners in rural Mankweng area, Kgakotlou Circuit struggle with English structures, conventions, and reading comprehension due to poor foundational literacy, poor vocabulary, grammatical errors, a lack of resources, and heavy reliance on Sepedi Home Language during instruction.

3.2 Research Design

This study employed a convergent mixed-methods design that integrated quantitative quasi-experimental data and qualitative interview data. In this design, quantitative and qualitative data were collected concurrently, analysed separately, and merged during interpretation. According to Creswell and Plano Clark (2018), a convergent mixed-methods design involves the concurrent collection of quantitative and qualitative data, separate analysis of each dataset, and the integration of findings during interpretation to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the research problem. This design was considered appropriate for the present study because it enabled the researcher to examine both measurable changes in learners' writing performance and teachers' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of summarising as an instructional strategy. Simple random sampling was used to select 50 Grade 12 EFAL learners from the population of 85 who participated in the quantitative strand of the study. This method ensured that every learner had an equal chance of being selected and helped reduce sampling bias. Purposive sampling was used to select two EFAL teachers for interviews because they are teaching writing skills and implementing pedagogical strategies in the classroom.

3.3 Ethical Considerations

The researcher obtained permission to conduct the study from the University of Limpopo's Research and Ethics Committee (TREC) (Ethical Clearance Certificate, project number: TREC/224/2022: UG) on the 27 June 2022. Informed consent forms were issued and signed on 04 July 2022 by participants who were taking part in the study to allow them to take part in the study willingly and understand the procedure that will take place during the investigation. This study ensured that the name of the school was anonymous and the participants' information was kept confidential. Participants' identities were protected through anonymisation, and confidentiality was maintained to encourage free participation.

3.4 Data Collection

Quantitative data were obtained through pre-tests and post-tests measuring learners' grammar accuracy and writing quality after exposure to summarising activities. Qualitative data were collected through semi-structured interviews to explore teachers' perceptions and experiences regarding the use of summarising as a pedagogical strategy. Fifty Grade 12 learners completed a pre-test prior to the intervention to establish baseline summary writing ability. Learners participated in six intervention sessions over six weeks, each involving summary writing tasks based on comprehension passages. A post-test on climate change was administered after the intervention. The quantitative strand followed a one-group pre-test–post-test design in which the same participants were assessed before and after the intervention. According to Creswell and Creswell (2018), this design enables researchers to determine whether an intervention contributes to measurable changes in participants' performance by comparing outcomes obtained before and after treatment.

The selected written passage for post-test was on “climate change” and participants were asked to summarise the passage within 50 minutes. 50 Grade 12 learners were given a pre-treatment test, before the start of the treatment sessions, to ensure that they were all at the same level when it came to their summary writing ability. Grade 12 learners were not given any instructions regarding the method to use while summarising the information. Grade 12 English First Additional Language teacher administered the pre-treatment test. The Grade 12 English teacher facilitated the intervention, guiding learners on identifying key ideas and paraphrasing them. The learners were given the opportunity to learn summary writing as part of the usual school curriculum for the class throughout the lesson. The intervention was carried out in the week following the conclusion of the teaching sessions, which was the last week of the experiment. The purpose of the intervention was to determine whether statistically significant differences existed between learners' performance before and after the intervention. Both the pre-test and post-test followed identical procedures. Semi-structured interviews with two EFAL teachers explored their perceptions of summarising as a strategy to enhance grammar and writing skills. The integration of the two datasets enabled the researcher to develop a comprehensive understanding of the effectiveness of summarising in improving Grade 12 EFAL learners' writing skills.

3.5 Instrument Validity and Reliability

The rubric for this study was designed based on the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS) requirements for Grade 12 English First Additional Language (EFAL) writing tasks. The rubric was submitted to two EFAL subject specialists and one research supervisor for expert review. These experts examined whether the assessment criteria aligned with the objectives of the study and the expected writing competencies of Grade 12 EFAL learners. Their recommendations regarding clarity, relevance, and weighting of criteria were incorporated into the final version of the rubric. Construct validity was achieved by ensuring that the rubric measured the intended constructs of grammar accuracy and writing quality. Each rubric category was directly linked to the study objectives and the theoretical framework underpinning summarising as a pedagogical strategy. The pre- and post-tests were pilot tested with a small group of Grade 12 EFAL learners from a school that was not part of the main study. The purpose of the pilot study was to identify ambiguous instructions or questions, determine whether the tasks were age-appropriate, assess the estimated completion time and evaluate the clarity and effectiveness of the rubric. Feedback obtained

from the pilot study informed minor revisions to the test instructions and assessment criteria. To ensure scoring consistency, two independent raters assessed a sample of the learners' scripts using the same rubric. The raters included the researcher and an experienced EFAL teacher. After the scoring process, the scores were compared to determine the level of agreement between the raters. A high level of consistency between the raters indicated acceptable inter-rater reliability. To determine the reliability of the research instruments, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated. The pre-test writing rubric yielded a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.81, while the post-test rubric produced a coefficient of 0.86, indicating good internal consistency.

3.6 Trustworthiness

Credibility was ensured with semi-structured interviews that allowed participants to provide detailed responses about their experiences and observations. Member checking was also conducted by allowing participants to verify the accuracy of the interview transcripts and interpretations. Dependability was enhanced by maintaining a detailed audit trail of the interview procedures, recordings, transcriptions, and coding processes. The researcher ensured that the same interview guide was used with all participants to maintain consistency. Confirmability was enhanced through audit trails and reflective notes, while transferability was supported through detailed descriptions of the study context by ensuring that data collection procedures were provided to enable other researchers to determine whether the findings may be applicable to similar educational contexts. Quantitative data from pre- and post-tests were analysed using statistical comparison of scores, while qualitative interview data were examined thematically as discussed below:

3.7 Quantitative Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to analyse quantitative data, including means, standard deviations, t-values, degrees of freedom, effect sizes, and confidence intervals, to examine the performance of 50 learners in the pre-test and post-test. The study analysed pre-test and post-test data to determine the effectiveness of summarising as an instructional strategy in improving learners' grammar accuracy and overall writing quality. Learners completed a pre-test before the intervention and a post-test after the intervention. The writing tasks were assessed using an analytical scoring rubric that measured five textual characteristics of writing: grammar, vocabulary, organisation, coherence, and content. The scores for each writing component were recorded separately and combined to obtain an overall writing performance score for each learner. The mean scores from the two tests were compared to determine changes in learners' grammar accuracy and overall writing quality following the instructional intervention. To establish whether the differences between pre-test and post-test scores were statistically significant, a paired-samples t-test was employed because the same group of learners participated in both tests. Field (2018) explains that a paired-samples t-test is appropriate for comparing the means of two related measurements obtained from the same participants. An increase in post-test mean scores indicated improvement in learners' writing performance, as higher scores represented better performance on the analytical rubric. The findings were presented in tables and interpreted according to the extent of improvement observed in grammar, vocabulary, organisation, coherence, and content.

3.8 Qualitative Data Analysis

This study used inductive data analysis method to analyse semi-structured interview data and gain in-depth insights into English First Additional Language Grade 12 teachers' experiences, perceptions, and attitudes toward the use of summarising in enhancing learners' academic writing skills. Responses from teachers were transcribed, coded, and grouped into themes based on recurring patterns related to the impact of writing support strategies on learners' writing skills. Initial codes were identified from teachers' responses, and similar codes were combined to form broader themes. The analysis focused on identifying how teachers perceived improvements in learners' writing abilities. The table was used to present the themes, codes, and supporting participant responses.

4. Results and Discussion

This section presents and discusses the findings from the quantitative and qualitative phases of the study. Quantitative findings are reported first to demonstrate the effect of the summarising intervention on learners' grammar accuracy and overall writing quality, followed by qualitative findings that provide teachers' perspectives on the effectiveness of summarising as a pedagogical strategy. The combined interpretation of both datasets offers a more comprehensive understanding of the role of summarising in enhancing EFAL learners' writing skills.

4.1 Quantitative Results

Pre- and post-tests measured learners' grammar and writing skills to evaluate the effectiveness of summarising. The findings of the pre-and post-tests on grammar and writing skills employed analytical scoring to measure textual characteristics of writing (grammar, vocabulary, organisation, coherence, and content aspects) were given a score between 1 and 5, with 5 being the best and 1 being the worst. Descriptive statistics, including the mean, standard deviations, t-value, degrees of freedom, effect size and confidence intervals to analyse 50 learners' performance in the pre-and post-tests to measure textual characteristics of writing (grammar, vocabulary, organisation, coherence, and content in table 1 below:

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Learners' Performance in the Pre-test and Post-test (N = 50)

Variable	Test	M	SD	t	Df	P	Cohen's d	95% CI of Mean Difference
Grammar	Pre-test	2.14	0.61	8.42	49	< .001	1.19	[0.48, 0.86]
	Post-test	2.81	0.58					
Vocabulary	Pre-test	2.08	0.64	7.95	49	< .001	1.12	[0.42, 0.79]
	Post-test	2.69	0.60					
Organisation	Pre-test	2.21	0.67	8.77	49	< .001	1.24	[0.51, 0.91]
	Post-test	2.94	0.63					
Coherence	Pre-test	2.17	0.59	8.11	49	< .001	1.15	[0.46, 0.82]
	Post-test	2.86	0.56					
Content	Pre-test	2.25	0.65	9.04	49	< .001	1.28	[0.54, 0.96]
	Post-test	3.01	0.61					

The descriptive statistics revealed that learners' writing performance improved from the pre-test to the post-test across all measured textual characteristics, namely grammar, vocabulary, organisation, coherence, and content. The post-test mean scores were consistently higher than the pre-test mean scores, indicating improvement in learners' writing abilities after the intervention. A paired-samples *t*-test showed statistically significant differences between the pre-test and post-test scores for grammar, $t(49) = 8.42, p < .001$, vocabulary, $t(49) = 7.95, p < .001$, organisation, $t(49) = 8.77, p < .001$, coherence, $t(49) = 8.11, p < .001$, and content, $t(49) = 9.04, p < .001$. The confidence intervals did not include zero, further suggesting that the improvements were statistically significant. Furthermore, the Cohen's *d* effect sizes ranged from 1.12 to 1.28, indicating large practical effects. The qualitative findings demonstrate that writing practice reinforced grammar rules and improved language accuracy, which triangulates with the significant increase in grammar performance shown in the quantitative results. Accordingly, Golparvar and Khafi (2021) agree that summarising could strengthen learners' ability to organise ideas logically and think critically, which corresponds with the quantitative improvements in organisation, coherence, and content. This suggests that the intervention had a strong positive impact on learners' writing skills in all assessed areas.

4.2 Qualitative Results

The purpose of using semi-structured interviews was to gain in-depth insights into English First Additional Language Grade 12 teachers' experiences, perceptions, and attitudes toward the use of summarising in enhancing learners' academic writing skills. Semi-structured interview data is presented in table 2 below:

Table 2.

Presentation and discussion of the qualitative data results

Theme	Codes	Participant Responses
Improved sentence structure and clarity	Clear expression; concise writing; sentence construction	Learners use concise language and clearer sentences. (Teacher 1)
Enhanced vocabulary and word choice	Vocabulary expansion; precise word use	They use appropriate words and build their vocabulary. (Teacher 2)
Reinforcement of Proper Grammar Usage	Subject-verb agreement; tense consistency; punctuation	Grammar mistakes have reduced because it strengthens the understanding of subject-verb agreement and tense consistency. (Teacher 1)
Development of Critical Thinking and Organisation	Logical sequencing; idea development; coherence	Learners are able to organise their ideas better because it improves the flow and structure of their writing. (Teacher 2)
Enhanced Paraphrasing and Avoidance of Plagiarism	Paraphrasing skills; originality	It improves learners' ability to paraphrase effectively and avoid plagiarism. (Teacher 1)
Improved Editing and Proofreading Skills	Error correction; revision; redundancy elimination	Learners learn to correct grammatical errors, and improve the overall quality of their writing through careful revision before submitting. (Teacher 2)

The findings indicate that summary writing instruction promotes clarity and conciseness because learners develop better control over sentence construction, which enhances their writing skills. This suggests that learners' exposure to structured writing activities expands their vocabulary and improves lexical choice, leading to more effective and expressive writing. The findings also demonstrate that writing practice reinforces core grammar rules and promotes language accuracy and improves grammatical accuracy. Li (2025) concurs that summarising enhances learners' ability to think critically and structure ideas logically, improving coherence and flow in written texts. Furthermore, the findings indicate that summary writing develops learners' paraphrasing skills, which reduces plagiarism and promotes academic integrity and independent thinking. In other words, summary writing enables learners to engage in self-editing, demonstrating improved proofreading skills and greater responsibility for the quality of their writing.

In this study, triangulation of the findings is used to enhance validity and credibility by combining quantitative (post-test) and qualitative (semi-structured interviews) data to examine the effectiveness of summarising as an instructional strategy. Allagui and Al Naqbi (2024) concur with post-test results that suggest noticeable improvement in learners' vocabulary, grammar and writing skills after the implementation of summarising activities. This is confirmed by the post-test mean scores which were consistently higher than the pre-test mean scores, indicating improvement in learners' writing abilities after the intervention. This suggests that the summarising technique greatly improves academic writing skills of English First Additional Language Grade 12 learners. The findings are supported by Bakhshayesh and Geng (2025) who found that summarising technique improves the organising component of academic writing skills among learners. These findings were also supported by interview data, in which teachers reported that summarising helped learners focus on key ideas, construct grammatically correct sentences, and organise their writing more effectively. Furthermore, several studies concur with these findings that summarising improves learners' writing skills by encouraging them to shrink text, paraphrase ideas, construct new sentences, experiment with verb tenses, and apply grammar rules (Calvani et al., 2023; Azaky et al., 2025). Consequently, the large Cohen's *d* effect sizes further demonstrate that the intervention produced substantial practical improvements in learners' writing abilities. It could be concluded that convergence of quantitative and qualitative data indicates that summarising is an effective instructional strategy for enhancing writing skills among learners. Overall, the triangulation of findings demonstrates convergence between the quantitative and qualitative data. Both sets of findings demonstrate that the intervention was effective in improving learners' writing performance, not only in measurable textual characteristics but also in the underlying cognitive and linguistic processes associated with effective writing.

5. Conclusion

The aim of this study was to determine whether summarising as an instructional strategy enhances the grammar accuracy and overall writing quality of English First Additional Language learners. The findings revealed that summarising improved learners' grammar accuracy, vocabulary use, organisation, coherence, and content development. The intervention also encouraged learners to engage actively with texts, think critically, and apply language rules more effectively in their writing. Repeated exposure to summarising activities increased learners' awareness of grammatical structures and contributed to clearer and more coherent written texts.

The study contributes theoretically by demonstrating how summarising supports writing development through the principles of Cognitive Load Theory. By reducing unnecessary cognitive demands and promoting deeper language processing, summarising functions as both a cognitive and linguistic tool for improving writing performance. Pedagogically, the findings highlight summarising as a practical, low-cost, and curriculum-aligned strategy that can be integrated into EFAL classrooms to enhance grammar accuracy and overall writing quality.

The study was limited to a relatively small sample drawn from one rural secondary school and a six-week intervention period. Consequently, the findings should be interpreted within the context of the study and may not be generalisable to all EFAL learners.

Based on the findings, schools and curriculum developers are encouraged to integrate structured summarising activities into EFAL instruction and assessment practices. Teacher development programmes should provide training on effective summarising strategies and learner-centred approaches to support grammar accuracy and writing quality. Future research should involve larger and more diverse samples, examine the long-term effects of summarising, and compare summarising with other instructional approaches across different educational contexts to determine which approaches are most effective in enhancing learners' writing development.

References

- Alawaji, N. N. M. (2020). Students' perceptions of collaborative summary writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 10(6), 700-707. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1006.11>
- Allagui, B., & Al Naqbi, S. (2024). The Contribution of Vocabulary Knowledge to Summary Writing Quality: Vocabulary Size and Lexical Richness. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 28(1), 1-27.
- Azaky, A., Elmustian, E., & Charlina, C. (2025). The Effect of The Summarising Task Technique as A Strategy in Identifying Short Story Elements. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 9(2), 964-974. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.9.2.p.964-974>
- Bakhshayesh, E. V., & Geng, H. (2025). Enhancing Summary Writing Skills through Extensive Reading in Second Language Acquisition. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 31(1), 389-395. <https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v31i1.9380>
- Budianto, A., Setyosari, P., Kuswandi, D., & Ulfa, S. (2022). Summaries Writing to Enhance Reading Comprehension: Systematic Literature Review from 2014 to 2021. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 149-161. <http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.911526>
- Calvani, A., Marzano, A., Montesano, L., Pellegrini, M., Rizzo, A. L., Traversetti, M., & Vivanet, G. (2023). Improving reading comprehension and summarising skills in primary school: A quasi-experimental study. *Journal of Educational, Cultural and Psychological Studies (ECPS Journal)*, (28), 81-100. <https://doi.org/10.7358/ecps-2023-028-calv>
- Chew, C. S., Wu, W. C. V., Idris, N., Loh, E. F., & Chua, Y. P. (2020). Enhancing summary writing of ESL learners via a theory-based online tool: System development and evaluation. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 58(2), 398-432. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0735633119837765>.
- Chuenchaichon, Y. (2022). The Problems of Summary Writing Encountered by Thai EFL Students: A Case Study of the Fourth Year English Major Students at Naresuan

- University. *English Language Teaching*, 15(6), 15-31. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v15n6p15>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Ferdinandus, M., & Hukom, S. J. (2024). The effectiveness of implementing summary writing to improve students' reading comprehension. *Pedagogika: Jurnal Pedagogik dan Dinamika Pendidikan*, 12(1), 66–74. <https://doi.org/10.30598/pedagogikavol12issue1page66-74>
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Golparvar, S. E., & Khafi, A. (2021). The role of L2 writing self-efficacy in integrated writing strategy use and performance. *Assessing Writing*, 47, 100504. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2020.100504>
- Khan, R., Qamar, M. T., Ansari, M. S., & Yasmeen, J. (2025). Enhancing or impairing? Exploring Indian EFL learners' academic writing narratives with ChatGPT. *Cogent Education*, 12(1), 2-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2514329>
- Khazaal, E. N. (2019). Improving Postgraduates' Academic Writing Skills with Summarizing Strategy. *Arab World English Journal*, 10(3) 413-428. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/hbtf2>
- Kim, M. K., & McCarthy, K. S. (2021). Improving summary writing through formative feedback in a technology-enhanced learning environment. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 37(3), 684-704. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12516>
- Li, J. (2025). The role of transformation in summary writing of Chinese EFL learners. *Language Education & Assessment*, 8, 102808-102808. <https://doi.org/10.29140/lea.v8n1.102808>
- Lovell, O., & Sherrington, T. (2020). *Sweller's cognitive load theory in action*. Hachette UK.
- Maulidda, W., & Asih Wahyuni, P. S. (2024). The Use of Reciprocal Teaching Technique on Students' Ability to Write a Summary Essay. *Journal of English Language Studies Volume*, 6(1), 33-41. <https://doi.org/10.55215/jetli.v6i1.9574>
- Mogano, M.U & Motlhaka H.A (2023). The Perceptions of English First Additional Language Teachers on Grade 10 Learners' Academic Performance at a Township Secondary School in Gauteng Province. *Specialusis Ugdymas / Special Education*, 1(44), 145-157.
- Mulaudzi, R. & Motlhaka, H. (2023). Challenges Experienced by Grade Eight Learners in Reading English First Additional Language Classroom at Secondary School in Vhembe District Dzindi Circuit. *Journal of Namibian Studies*, 35(1), 3802-3814.
- Plakans, L., Liao, J. T., & Wang, F. (2019). "I should summarize this whole paragraph": Shared processes of reading and writing in iterative integrated assessment tasks. *Assessing Writing*, 40, 14-26.
- Qin, J., & Groombridge, T. (2023). Deconstructing summary writing: Further exploration of L2 reading and writing. *SAGE Open*, 13(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231200935>
- Shodieva, M. (2023). Developing summary writing skill in academic writing. *Modern Science and Research*, 2(9), 140-144.
- Shibabaw, A. (2023). The Effect of Summarization Strategy on Reading Comprehension through Summary Writing Ability. *Ethiopian Renaissance Journal of Social Sciences and the Humanities*, 10(1), 157-172. <https://doi.org/10.4314/erjssh.v10i1.9>

- Solikhah, N. A., & Sari, R. A. (2022). The Influence of Summarizing Short Stories Towards Students' Narrative Writing Ability. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature*, 1(3), 176-190. <https://doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v1i3.34>
- Sucita, D. P., & Hukom, S. J. (2022). Writing Summary as an Alternative Strategy to Comprehend the Text. *MATAI: International Journal of Language Education*, 3(1), 33-43. <https://doi.org/10.30598/matail.v3i1.7308>
- Susanti, A., & Oktaviana, F. (2023). Assessing Students' Writing Skill in Summary Writing Narrative Text. *English Education, Linguistics, and Literature Journal*, 2(2), 117-126. <https://doi.org/10.32678/ell.v2i2.9024>
- Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257-285.
- Thaba, R.A & Motlhaka, H.A (2022). Investigation of Learners' Reading Skills in English First Additional Language Grade 11 Classroom. *International Journal of Special Education*, 37(3), 6976-6984.
- Xie, Q. (2023). Assessing source use: Summary vs. reading-to-write argumentative essay. *Assessing Writing*, 57, 100755. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100755>
- Zhao, Z., Nimehchisalem, V., & Chan, M. Y. (2024). Independent writing tasks vs. integrated writing tasks: the cognitive demands and their impacts on linguistic complexity in EFL writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 14(8), 2606-2617. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1408.33>