
The Application of Summarizing Technique to Improve Students' Writing Ability

Jerikho Tiwa^{1*}, Mister G. Maru², Imelda S. Lolowang³

^{1,2,3} English Education Department, Universitas Negeri Manado, Indonesia

* Corresponding Author: jerikholt@gmail.com

Article History

Submitted : October 29th, 2025
Revised : November 24th, 2025
Accepted : December 12th, 2025

KEYWORDS

Writing skill,
Summarizing technique,
English Language Learning,
Teaching Technique.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the effectiveness of summarizing strategies in improving students' writing ability. Students at SMA N 1 Lembeian Timur continue to experience low writing proficiency, which is marked by limited English vocabulary and weak sentence construction skills. This quantitative study employed a pre-experimental design using a single-group pre-test and post-test format. Purposive sampling was used to select 20 out of 60 eleventh-grade students at SMA N 1 Lembeian Timur as the research sample. The study was conducted over two weeks in May 2023. An expository writing test was used as the research instrument, requiring students to write a short expository paragraph that was evaluated based on content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. To determine the significance of the improvement, the data were analyzed using gain scores and a *t*-test. The results showed a significant improvement in students' writing performance, with the mean pre-test score increasing from 57.50 to 74.00 in the post-test. A statistically significant difference was indicated by the significance value, which was less than 0.05 ($p = 0.000 < 0.05$). As a result, the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) was accepted. These findings demonstrate that summarizing strategies effectively enhance students' writing abilities and should be appropriately applied in classroom instruction to improve students' learning outcomes.

INTRODUCTION

English is one of the most widely spoken languages in the world and is sometimes referred to as the global lingua franca because it brings individuals from many ethnic origins together (Genesee et al., 2005). With more than a billion speakers worldwide, English is crucial for education, professional success, and international communication. English is becoming more and more important in today's interconnected world because the ability to understand, speak, read, and write in it provides access to academic resources, global information, and cross-cultural contacts. Since English is widely used in worldwide trade, scientific research, technology, entertainment, and diplomacy, it is a crucial tool for international cooperation (Coleman, 2011). Furthermore, English is taught in many prestigious universities, where proficiency is often required for opportunities for research and additional education. Because it promotes the possibility of professional advancement and employment abroad, English fluency is highly prized by companies in the global labor market. For these reasons, learning English is essential for those who wish to pursue employment, excel academically, and actively participate in a global society.

Teachers must encourage students to speak and write confidently in the target language since teaching English entails helping students enhance their comprehension, usage, and production skills (Maru et al., 2020). According to (Mokoginta et al., 2024) studying English effectively helps students' academic demands, future careers, and worldwide communication, making language competency a crucial talent in today's society. These objectives are in line with Kurikulum Merdeka, which places a strong emphasis on student-centered instruction, competency-based. Under this curriculum, teaching

English places a high priority on assisting students in understanding and producing a variety of text kinds, effectively communicating ideas, and working together through project-based learning. Learners also benefit from a variety of technology tools and learning resources to meet these goals, such as online platforms and interactive digital materials that support varied learning styles (Santika and Hawa, 2023). All things considered, teaching English using the Kurikulum Merdeka framework encourages adaptable, pertinent, and student-driven learning that gives students the necessary language and communication skills for everyday situations (Lolowang, 2023). In a worldwide society, English proficiency is essential for students to succeed academically, grow professionally, and have meaningful social interactions (Adilah et al., 2023).

According to Kellogg & Raulerson (2007) students need to have excellent writing abilities in order to succeed both academically and professionally. Writing requires precise idea explanation, argument presentation, and thought order. The ability to summarize is a crucial talent that could aid students in becoming better writers. Lamusu (2022) condensing information, emphasizing key points, and providing a succinct synthesis of the original material are all part of summarizing. This method develops students' writing, reading comprehension, and critical thinking abilities in addition to other learning goals. Students often find it difficult to organize their ideas logically and convey them in a clear, ordered way when writing expository essays. Lack of understanding of the introduction, argument development, and conclusion—the essential elements of an expository essay—often causes this difficulty. Additionally, students' limited vocabulary and grammar make it difficult for them to effectively and persuasively convey their views. Additionally, they may need to practice supporting their statements with relevant facts or examples. Poor reading and writing abilities. Additionally, they find it more challenging to understand and apply effective writing techniques while reading expository literature. Because of this, the expository language that is generated often lacks consistency, is unpersuasive, and fails to achieve its intended communication goals. Using pertinent data from the past, this essay offers a thorough summary of how summarizing strategies affect students' writing abilities.

Students at SMA N 1 Lembean consistently struggle with writing, especially because of their small vocabulary in English, lack of expertise creating grammatically correct sentences, and poor concept organization skills. These difficulties impair their ability to write coherently and articulate ideas clearly. Because it teaches students to recognize key concepts, choose pertinent supporting details, and rephrase information in their own terms, the summarizing technique offers an effective teaching strategy to solve these problems. Students are naturally driven to practice correct grammatical structures, increase their vocabulary, and rebuild material into coherent sentences as a result of this process. Additionally, summarizing improves their comprehension of text organization, which immediately aids in the creation of coherent paragraphs. Previous studies support the benefits of this technique: Adilah et al., (2023) reported that students who practiced summarizing showed improvement in clarity and organization in their writing; Maru et al., (2020) found that summarizing activities help learners internalize language patterns and enhance sentence construction; and Lolowang (2023) emphasized that summarizing promotes deeper comprehension, enabling students to write more accurately and meaningfully. Therefore, using the summarizing technique in writing instruction is highly relevant and advantageous, as it directly targets the students' limited vocabulary, grammatical difficulties, and challenges in composing well-structured written texts.

Although the use of summarizing strategies to aid students' writing growth has been the subject of several earlier studies, this research is unique due to significant differences. Doni (2022) examined summarizing strategies to enhance junior high school students' writing skills and discovered a notable improvement; however, the study did not address more complicated academic genres and instead concentrated on lower-grade students. Similarly, Nasution (2017) used a summarizing technique to improve writing at the eighth-grade level; however, the study did not particularly look at expository writing or take curriculum changes impacting writing instruction into account. Another study by Sari et al., (2021) showed that summarizing exercises enhance students' paragraph coherence; however, the study was restricted to general writing practice and did not include quantitative metrics like gain score analysis. By applying the summarizing technique to senior high school students, concentrating on expository writing, and placing the investigation within the framework of Kurikulum Merdeka—which emphasizes competency-based learning and has not been examined in previous summarizing-related research.

Previous studies have explored various approaches to improving students' writing skills, yet important gaps remain regarding the role of summarizing in enhancing specific writing components. Sari et al., (2021) for instance, implemented a Problem-Based Learning approach focused on scientific writing and problem-solving, but her research did not investigate summarizing as a writing strategy nor address broader writing competence in typical educational settings. Doni (2022) demonstrated that

summarizing activities could raise students' writing scores; however, the study did not examine how summarizing influences crucial aspects of writing such as organization, coherence, grammar, and content. Moreover, the use of a one-group pretest–posttest design without a control group limited the validity of the findings and made it difficult to attribute improvements solely to the summarizing technique. Nasution (2017) reported that summarizing was more effective than traditional teaching methods, yet the research focused only on overall effectiveness and did not explore the specific ways in which summarizing assists students in organizing ideas, condensing information, or producing clearer and more coherent written texts. These gaps indicate that while summarizing has shown promising results, further research is needed to understand its impact on the more detailed and essential components of students' writing performance.

This study aims to investigate how students' writing skills are affected by the summarizing technique, specifically with regard to organization, clarity, and conciseness. It is anticipated that summarizing will improve students' capacity to produce coherent and well-structured written work by assisting them in identifying key concepts, choosing pertinent details, and restating information in their own terms. The results of this study are meant to make significant contributions to writing teaching by providing a practical method that teachers may utilize in the classroom to address typical challenges with vocabulary usage, sentence construction, and paragraph development. Additionally, by showing how summarizing can help students become more autonomous, analytical, and focused writers, thereby enhancing their overall writing performance, this study is anticipated to contribute to educational practice.

METHOD

This study used a quantitative research approach, which is appropriate for examining how a particular intervention affects quantifiable results. In particular, a one-group pre-test and post-test were used in a pre-experimental design. This methodology was selected because it enables the researcher to assess students' writing abilities both before and after the summarizing strategy is put into practice, allowing for the assessment of the strategy's efficacy. The quantitative technique was chosen because it offers numerical data that can be statistically examined to make unbiased judgments about how the intervention affected students' writing abilities.

The study was carried out at SMA Negeri 1 Lembean Timur in May 2023. All students in Class XI, who are regarded as a group with similar features, made up the research population (Sugiyono, 2018). Using a purposive sampling strategy, twenty students from Class XI IPA 1 were chosen as the sample from this population. This method was employed because the researcher wanted to see how the summarizing strategy affected a homogeneous set of students, and the chosen class represented students with a stable academic level. Purposive sampling made sure that the sample was suitable for testing the intervention successfully and that the information gathered would fairly depict the strategy's possible effects.

A writing test that was given as a pre-test and a post-test served as the study's instrument. To guarantee uniformity in assessing students' writing abilities, the identical activities were included in both exams. The students' initial writing skill was assessed using the pre-test prior to the application of the summarizing approach. The post-test was given to evaluate improvements in writing abilities following the intervention. Students' writing was assessed using a standardized scoring rubric that was pertinent to the subject matter and covered topics including content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Each student's writing performance was then measured using scores, which produced accurate data for statistical examination of the summarizing strategy's efficacy. This study used analytical rubric from Brown (2004). A systematic scoring rubric comprising five areas (content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics) was used to assess the students' writing. A scale of 1 to 4 was used to score each component, with 4 denoting exceptional performance and 1 denoting subpar performance. The rubric made guaranteed that students' writing was consistently, objectively, and reliably assessed in both the pre-test and the post-test, enabling precise measurement of gains when the summarizing method was put into practice.

Table 1. Scoring rubric of writing

Aspect	Score	Category	Performance Description
Content	4	Excellent	The topic is complete, clear and the details are relating to the topic
	3	Good	The topic is complete, clear but the details are almost relating to the topic
	2	Fair	The topic is complete, clear but the details are not relating to the topic
	1	Poor	The topic is not clear and the details are not relating to the topic

Organization	4	Excellent	Identification is complete and description are arranged with proper connectives
	3	Good	Identification is almost complete and description are arranged with almost proper connectives
	2	Fair	Identification is not complete and descriptions are arranged with few misuses of connectives
	1	Poor	Identification is not complete and description are arranged with misuse of connectives
Grammar	4	Excellent	Very few grammatical or agreement inaccuracies
	3	Good	Few grammatical or agreement inaccuracies but not effect on meaning
	2	Fair	Numerous grammatical or agreement inaccuracies
	1	Poor	Frequent grammatical or agreement inaccuracies
Vocabulary	4	Excellent	Effective choice of words and word forms
	3	Good	Few misuse vocabularies, word forms, but not change the meaning
	2	Fair	Limiting range confusing words and word form
	1	Poor	Very poor knowledge of word, word form and not understandable
Mechanics	4	Excellent	It uses correct spelling, punctuation and capitalization
	3	Good	It has occasional errors of spelling, punctuation and capitalization
	2	Fair	It has frequent errors of spelling, punctuation and capitalization
	1	Poor	It is dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation and capitalization

Pre-tests and post-tests were the main methods used to gather data, and they were conducted methodically to guarantee accuracy and consistency. The test materials, which included writing prompts and a uniform scoring rubric for both assessments, were first produced by the researcher. After administering a pre-test to gauge students' basic writing skills, the summarizing technique was put into practice, and students were instructed on how to select key concepts, paraphrase, and arrange information in a clear and succinct manner. To assess improvements in writing abilities following the intervention, a post-test with the same format as the pre-test was given. The content, structure, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics of each student's response were all assessed, and the outcomes were documented for statistical analysis. This methodical process made sure that the information gathered appropriately represented how the summarizing technique affected students' writing abilities.

The efficacy of the summarizing technique was assessed by analyzing the gathered data using SPSS software. Students' writing performance before and after the intervention was initially summarized using descriptive statistics, such as mean scores, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum values. A paired sample t-test was used to compare the mean pre-test and post-test scores in order to determine whether the technique had a significant impact on writing abilities. The Shapiro-Wilk test was used to determine whether the data distribution was normal before the t-test. Based on these analytical procedures, the following hypotheses were tested to determine the effectiveness of the summarizing technique on students' writing ability: the null hypothesis (H_0) stating that the summarizing technique does not improve students' writing ability, and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) stating that the summarizing technique leads to a significant improvement in students' writing ability.

FINDINGS

In the first meeting, the researcher administered a pre-test and a post-test to see how the summarizing technique affected the students' writing abilities. While the post-test sought to evaluate students' performance following summarizing exercises, the pre-test was intended to gauge students' pre-intervention writing skills. Twenty students in all took part in the study, making up the sample used to gather data. The researcher can ascertain how much summarizing improved general writing ability, clarity, and organization by comparing the pre-test and post-test outcomes. Each student's results on both exams are shown in the accompanying table, which offers a clear foundation for further research and evaluation of the strategy's efficacy.

Table 2. Students' Score in Pre-test

Students	Aspect					Total	Score	Classification
	Content	Organization	Grammar	Mechanics	Vocabulary			
1	2	3	2	3	2	12	60	Poor
2	3	3	4	2	4	17	85	Excellent
3	2	4	2	3	4	17	85	Excellent
4	1	2	2	2	3	10	50	Poor
5	4	2	2	4	4	16	80	Good
6	2	2	2	2	3	11	55	Poor
7	2	1	2	2	2	9	45	Poor
8	1	2	3	2	3	11	55	Fair
9	2	2	2	3	3	12	60	Fair
10	3	2	3	3	2	13	65	Fair
11	1	2	2	2	1	8	40	Very Poor
12	2	1	2	3	3	11	55	Poor
13	2	1	1	2	3	9	45	Poor
14	2	2	4	3	2	13	65	Fair
15	4	3	4	2	4	17	85	Excellent
16	1	1	2	2	2	8	40	Very Poor
17	2	1	2	2	2	9	45	Poor
18	1	1	1	1	1	5	25	Very Poor
19	1	2	3	3	3	12	60	Fair
20	1	2	2	3	2	10	50	Poor
Mean						57.50		
Min Score						25		
Max Score						85		
Std. Deviation						16.50		

According to the pre-test findings, students performed poorly on all five writing criteria: content, organization, grammar, mechanics, and vocabulary. Only a small percentage of students were able to provide pertinent and significant information, and the majority of students found it difficult to express concepts fully and clearly. Additionally, the concepts were poorly organized because many students struggled to organize their paragraphs or produce a coherent flow of thinking. With frequent mistakes in sentence construction and the usage of proper verb forms, grammar seems to be one of the most challenging areas. Punctuation, capitalization, and spelling were all used inconsistently, which made the students' work even less clear. Additionally, many students relied on basic and repetitious word choices, which reduced the quality and accuracy of their utterances. Overall, the pre-test results make it abundantly evident that students lacked adequate writing abilities in every category, underscoring the necessity of an instructional strategy like the summarizing technique to aid in their development.

Table 3. Students' Score in Post-test

Students	Aspect					Total	Score	Classification
	Content	Organization	Grammar	Mechanics	Vocabulary			
1	2	4	2	3	4	15	75	Excellent
2	3	4	3	4	4	18	90	Good
3	4	4	2	3	4	17	85	Excellent
4	3	1	2	2	3	11	55	Poor
5	4	4	4	3	4	19	95	Excellent
6	3	3	3	2	3	14	70	Fair
7	3	2	2	2	3	12	60	Fair
8	2	3	2	2	2	11	55	Poor

9	2	1	4	3	3	13	65	Good
10	3	2	4	3	3	15	75	Good
11	2	1	2	3	3	11	55	Poor
12	4	4	3	3	3	17	85	Excellent
13	4	2	3	2	3	14	70	Good
14	4	4	3	3	3	17	85	Excellent
15	4	4	4	3	4	19	95	Excellent
16	4	3	3	4	3	17	85	Excellent
17	2	2	2	3	2	11	55	Poor
18	3	2	2	4	3	14	70	Good
19	4	3	2	2	3	14	70	Good
20	3	3	4	4	3	17	85	Good
Mean							74.00	
Min Score							55	
Max Score							95	
Std. Deviation							13.63	

When compared to the pre-test performance, the post-test results demonstrate a notable improvement in all five writing criteria: content, organization, grammar, mechanics, and vocabulary. Many students, including Students 3, 5, 12, 14, 15, 16, and 20, were able to produce concepts that were clearer and more pertinent in the content area. As more students showed that they could properly organize their paragraphs and make seamless connections between ideas, organization also improved. Grammar scores significantly improved, and many students showed improved control over verb forms and agreement as well as a decrease in earlier sentence structure errors. Students in mechanics produced writing that was easier to read and comprehend by using punctuation, capitalization, and spelling more consistently. Additionally, students' vocabulary improved as they started utilizing more acceptable and varied word choices, which helped them communicate their ideas more clearly. Overall, the post-test results show a significant improvement in students' writing ability across all criteria, indicating that the instructional strategy—such as the application of summarizing techniques—successfully supported their growth in idea generation, information organization, and more accurate and clear thought expression.

Table 4. Classification of students' score in the pre-test and post-test

No	Classification	Interval	Pre-test		Post-test	
			F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	86-100	0	0	3	15
2	Good	71-85	4	20	7	35
3	Fair	56-70	5	25	6	30
4	Poor	41-55	8	40	4	20
5	Very poor	40	3	15	0	0
Total			20	100	20	100

According to the pre-test data in the above table, the majority of students received very poor grades, with a frequency of 3 (15%) out of 20 students having trouble putting ideas together and connecting sentences. In addition, 8 (40%) students received a poor score classification, 5 (25%) students were given a fair score grouping, and 4 (20%) students were given a good grade grouping. Three students (15%) received an exceptional grade, seven students (35%) received a good grade classification, six students (30%) received a fair grade classification, and four students (15%) received a low grade classification in the post-test portion. No student received a very poor score, according to the post-test data, and the prior classification of terrible grades was lowered from 8 (40%) to 4 (20%).

Table 5. N Gain Score

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Gain Score	19	,25	.75	.727	.24720
Percentage	19	50,00	75,00	71.709	24.71966

Once the research data was collected, it was statistically examined by comparing the results of the pretest and posttest. The effectiveness of the action was then assessed by calculating the average value between the pretest and posttest using the N-Gain test. They fall under the category of having a moderate average N-Gain score. The pre-test and post-test gain scores are 0.727. Since the gain score is greater than 0.7, it is classified as high. According to the results, the gain score is $0.727 > 0.7$. It is evident that the average score is highly effective because the average values of the N-Gain score before

and after the test fall between 56 and 75. The average n-Gain score of the pre-test and post-test is 71.709.

To determine whether or not the sample's score distribution is normal, a normality test was conducted. The experimental class's students' pretest and posttest results are shown in this table. The students' abilities prior to the treatment are shown by the pretest score, and their abilities following the treatment are shown by the posttest score. The normality test is as follows:

Table 6. Normality Test Shapiro-Wilk

	Statistic	df	Sig.
Pre-test	.938	20	.217
Post-test	.913	20	.072

The pre-test received a significance value of 0.217 and the post-test received a significance value of 0.072, according to the normalcy test results shown in Table 6. The distributions of the pre-test and post-test scores satisfy the condition of normality since both values are higher than the significance level of 0.05. These results show that neither dataset significantly deviates from a normal distribution, indicating that the data are appropriate for additional parametric statistical studies. As a result, the pre-test and post-test results can be regarded as regularly distributed, making them suitable for use in further hypothesis testing processes that call for normally distributed data.

Table 7. Paired Sample t Test

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of The Difference							
				Lower	Upper						
Post-Test - Pre-Test	16.500	13.288	2.971	10.281	22.719	5.553	19	.000			

The following table indicates that, after reaching a significance value (2-tailed) of 0.000, which was less than 0.05, the SPSS output analysis determined that there was a significant difference in production between before and after treatment. Given this significance value, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected, meaning that the summarizing technique did have a meaningful influence on students' writing performance. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis (H_1) is accepted, indicating that the technique contributed to measurable improvement in students' writing ability.

DISCUSSIONS

Since the summarizing strategy is easier to understand and motivates students to be more engaged and enthusiastic in the learning process, students are interested in applying it. The findings of the statistical analysis of students' improved writing skills demonstrate this. According to the statistical analysis of the students' writing skills, no student received an excellent rating on the pre-test, four students (20%) received a good rating, five students (25%) received a fair rating, eight students (40%) received a poor rating, and three students (15%) received a very poor rating. Three students (15%) received an exceptional rating on the post-test, seven students (35%) received a good rating, six students (30%) received a fair rating, and four students (20%) received a poor rating. Others students found it difficult to summarize the text, and others occasionally rewrote the entire text. However, following the treatment, students showed greater attention, activity, and enthusiasm in applying the summarizing strategy. The findings indicate that students' writing abilities are significantly impacted. The average score on the pretest is 53.16, which is deemed sufficient, but the students' post-test score is 66.33, which is deemed good, according to the T-test analysis results, which demonstrate a substantial difference between the pre-test and post-test results. This demonstrates the effectiveness and influence of using summarizing strategies when learning to write. According to the t-test result, Sig. two-sided p was .000, the Sig. (2-tailed) table is below the significance level, according to these findings. These findings suggest that the pre-test and post-test results varied significantly.

After conducting the study, the researcher found that employing the summarizing technique has several advantages, one of which is that it facilitates students' understanding of the text's content. Students are more interested in summarizing the material since they find it easier to understand, more engaging, and less likely to forget. This is demonstrated by the improvement in student learning results after using the summarizing technique as a learning tool. This study had several difficulties, such as students using their phones more and sleeping less, the necessity to repeat information, and the

requirement for the researcher to create new pursuing strategies. It was found that the summarizing technique employed in this study had a major effect on the students' writing abilities at SMA N 1 Lembean Timur.

The findings of the current study are mainly in line with and expand upon those of previous studies. First, this study demonstrates that an active instructional approach (the summarizing strategy) produces measurable gains in writing performance; both studies confirm that pedagogies that engage learners in processing and producing text lead to better writing outcomes. Sari (2021) reported that student-centered instructional models improve writing-related outcomes by increasing students' problem-solving and scientific-writing abilities. Second, the results closely match those of Doni (2022), who discovered a significant improvement in overall writing scores after summarizing instruction. reported a notable pre-post increase and accepted the hypothesis that summarizing significantly affects writing ability; this result is mirrored here by the mean score rise from 53.16 to 66.33 and a statistically significant t-test ($p = .000$). Third, Nasution (2017) found that summarizing was more effective when compared to traditional teaching methods; our study confirms this comparative advantage and provides more detailed evidence by reporting improvements in both overall classifications and specific writing criteria (content, organization, grammar, mechanics, vocabulary).

Despite the fact that the study's conclusions offer insightful information, a number of limitations should be noted. The results' generalizability is limited by the sample size of 20 children from a particular school, and the use of a single treatment period makes it impossible to assess the changes' long-term retention. Furthermore, the five writing criteria's scoring procedure could not have complete inter-rater reliability, which could compromise measurement accuracy. Although they were not rigorously controlled, classroom variables like student motivation, phone use, and differing levels of attention may have potentially affected the outcomes. Strong causal findings must also be made cautiously because the study lacked a randomized or matched control group. Future studies should use a bigger and more varied sample, include randomized or comparison groups, report and improve inter-rater reliability, and use delayed post-tests to gauge long-term effects in order to overcome these constraints. To better understand how the summarizing strategy affects writing development, it would also be helpful to look at classroom variables more methodically and to use mixed-method approaches like observations or interviews. Future research would benefit from these enhancements in terms of validity, reliability, and interpretive depth.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussions, summarizing is a useful technique for raising students' writing proficiency. Students improved their ability to recognize key concepts, arrange data logically, and articulate their ideas in written form with greater clarity and structure as a result of its application. The progress seen following the application of the summarizing technique shows that students improved their critical thinking and understanding abilities in addition to having more control over writing elements such content, structure, syntax, mechanics, and vocabulary. These findings show that summarizing encourages students to interact more actively with the material, promotes deeper comprehension, and aids in the creation of more coherent and significant writing. Therefore, by improving students' writing performance and demonstrating its value as an instructional strategy in the writing classroom, the summarizing technique effectively achieved the goals of this study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researchers would like to express their gratitude for all parties who supported and helped the researchers.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

REFERENCES

Adilah, E. S., Nurtaat, H. L., Aprianto, K., & Soepriyanti, H. (2023). An Analysis of Textbook "English in Mind: Student's Book Starter" for The 7th Year Students of Junior High School Based on Merdeka Curriculum. *Jurnal Ilmiah Profesi Pendidikan*, 8(2), 1074-1080.

Akbary, M., Shahriari, H., & Hosseini Fatemi, A. (2018). The value of song lyrics for teaching and learning English phrasal verbs: a corpus investigation of four music genres. *Innovation in language learning*

and teaching, 12(4), 344-356.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. Pearson Education.

Coleman, H. (Ed.). (2011). *Dreams and realities: Developing countries and the English language*. British council.

Doni, R. (2022). *The influence of summarizing technique towards students' writing ability at SMPN 17 Makassar* (Skripsi, Universitas Bosowa). Universitas Bosowa Repository.

Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2005). English language learners in US schools: An overview of research findings. *Journal of Education for students placed at risk*, 10(4), 363-385.

Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English language learners. *American educator*, 32(2), 8-44.

Jangra, A., Mukherjee, S., Jatowt, A., Saha, S., & Hasanuzzaman, M. (2023). A survey on multi-modal summarization. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(13s), 1-36.

Kellogg, R. T., & Raulerson, B. A. (2007). Improving the writing skills of college students. *Psychonomic bulletin & review*, 14(2), 237-242.

Lamusu, A. S. (2022). Improving students' competence in writing descriptive text by using realia media. *Journal La Edusci*, 3(1), 18-22.

Lolowang, I. S. (2023). A symptomatic reading on Meyer's Twilight series: Some vicarious lessons overview. *Jurnal Ilmiah Universitas Batanghari Jambi*, 23(3), 3568.

Maru, M. G., Nur, S., & Lengkoan, F. (2020). Applying video for writing descriptive text in senior high school in the COVID-19 pandemic transition. *International Journal of Language Education*, 4(3), 408-419.

Mokoginta, S., Rorimpandey, R., & Lolowang, I. S. (2024). The Effectiveness of Tiktok Videos in Improving Students' Listening Comprehension At SMP Negeri 1 Tondano. *JoTELL: Journal of Teaching English, Linguistics, and Literature*, 3(2), 192-205.

Putri, R. D. (2023). *The influence of summarizing technique toward the students' writing ability at MA Muhammadiyah 1 Purbolinggo East Lampung*. Bachelor Thesis, IAIN Metro. <http://repository.metrouniv.ac.id/id/eprint/9026/1/SKRIPSI%20Reni%20Dwi%20Putri%20-%201901051054%20-%20TBI.pdf>

Rahmawati, E. (2016). *Kecenderungan integritas akademik siswa sekolah menengah atas* Bachelor Thesis, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia. URL: <https://repository.upi.edu/25510/>

Santika, L., Hawa, F., & Ardini, S. N. (2023, March). A Pragmatic Analysis on Meghan Markle and Oprah Interview: What Conversational Maxims Existed. In *Proceeding of English Teaching, Literature And Linguistics (ETERNAL) Conference* (Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 292-303).

Sari, Y. I., Utomo, D. H., & Astina, I. K. (2021). The effect of problem based learning on problem solving and scientific writing skills. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(2), 11-26.

Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.

Wahyuni, A. C. (2023). Peningkatan keterampilan menulis dengan media flashcard menggunakan model pembelajaran Think Talk Write pada pembelajaran tematik kelas 1B SDN Manukan Kulon. *Journal on Education*, 6(1), 1162-1173.

Wilson, R. J. (2003). Training for justice: The global reach of clinical legal education. *Penn St. Int'l L. Rev.*, 22, 421.