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1. **Introduction**

This module becomes a part of Basic Reading Subject in English Education Department. Making a Summary is the thirteenth topics being discussed of this subject. It discusses how to shorten a text into meaningful paragraph. The module starts with the explanation of the essence of Summary as well as how it is looks like in the perspective of experts. After that, the module gives practice as well as the explanation so the students can learn by themselves. The last part of this session is making summary from several text that have been prepared by the lecturer.

After this session, the students are expected to be able to write Summary and applied to the text.

This module can be used as reference for the students who would like to learn about Making a Summary. The students may practice to use it from reading paragraph so that make students easier to understand the text.

1. **Basic Competence**

Understanding Making a Summary to compund a paragaph

1. **Kemampuan Akhir yang Diharapkan**
* The students will be able to re-explain how to summarize a text.
* The students will be able to make a summary from a text.
1. **Learning Activities 1**

**Making a Summary**

 Summary, like paraphrase, allows you to reproduce another writer's thoughts but in shortened form. In writing a summary, you focus on the most important statements of the original statements of the original passage and eliminate the less important material. Three techniques *selection and deletion*, *note taking*, and *miniaturizing* can help you shorten the material. As you become more adept at summarizing, you will devise your own combination of these techniques for each occasion.

But in all cases the summary must be written in readable prose that reflects the essential meaning of the original text. Like paraphrase, summary can be used for many purposes: to help you understand the main points and structure of the author's argument, to convey understanding to others, to present background information quickly, or to refer to another writer's ideas in the course of making your own original statement.

**Writing a Summary**

Whereas paraphrase writing leads you to examine all the details and nuances of a text, summary writing gives you an overview of the text's whole meaning. If you look over the whole text too rapidly, however, you may overlook important parts. Good summary writing, therefore, requires careful attention to the meaning and shape of the entire text. As you become more skilled at summary writing, you will become aware of just how much meaning can be distorted or lost by too rushed a summary. You will also become aware how much meaning you can convey in just a few words if you write precisely.

Unlike the paraphrase writer, who must discover new ways to restate the meaning, the summarizer looks for the most compact restatement. To highlight the essentials of another writer's idea rather than to provide a complete and detailed restatement is the purpose of summary writing.

A summary will help you understand the major direction, the main points, and the overall shape of the more detailed original. It restates the essence of the original in as few words as possible, but not necessarily in different words. In most cases, when you use an author's original words, you need to put them in quotation marks.

Only when you are writing a freestanding summary for which the source is given and which is labeled as a summary of that source do you not have to use quotation marks. *In all other cases,* when you use a summary in the course of your own writing, you must use your own words or mark the use of the author's words with quotation marks. If in your writing you do not identify the source of the words, ideas, or information used in the summary, you are committing plagiarism.

To rewrite a longer piece in short form, you must first understand the piece you are working with. Begin by reading the piece carefully, making sure you absorb the full meaning. If there are words you do not know, look them up. If some sentences are confusing, paraphrase them. Identify the main ideas and determine how the less important material relates to those main ideas. In short, read.

Once you understand the piece you are summarizing, you must decide which parts you are going to include in the summary and which you are going to leave out. Of course, how much material you select depends on how long you want the summary to be and for what purpose you are going to use the summary. (We will discuss these issues in the latter part of this chapter.) However, unless you have a more specific ratio in mind, you should generally try to create a summary about one-fifth to one-quarter the length of the original.

We will talk about the three methods for choosing the material to include in a summary: selection and deletion, note taking, and miniaturizing. The methods overlap somewhat. By deleting, for example, you in effect select the material that remains. Miniaturizing is only a structurally focused version of note taking. A good summary considers all three methods, and in practice people switch back and forth among them. Because each of these methods emphasizes slightly different skills, however, we will discuss them separately.

Through the somewhat artificial separation and isolated practice of these skills, you will master the art of making concise and exact summaries. After you gain control of all the methods, you will be able to combine them as you see fit. Before we discuss these methods, however, let us briefly examine the steps in writing a summary.

**Informative and Descriptive Summaries**

Having selected the material to include in your summary, you must then decide whether your summary will be informative or descriptive. *Informative summaries* adopt the tone of the original full text, simply presenting the information it contains in shorter form. *Descriptive summaries* adopt a more distant perspective, describing the original text rather than directly presenting the information it contains. An informative summary of the Declaration of Independence might begin as follows:

*“When people declare themselves independent of their political ties, they should give reasons. Governments are formed to protect equality and rights, including life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. If government does not do this, people can change the government.”*

A descriptive summary of the same passage might begin as follows:

“Jefferson opens the Declaration of Independence by stating that a country declaring independence needs to give its reasons. He goes on to discuss the purposes of government in protecting individual rights and the legitimacy of change if government does not live up to its obligations.”

Note that the informative summary does not mention the author or title of the piece but rather gets right down to the content. Thus it can present more information more compactly and more precisely. To convey the content of a source, informative summaries are preferable to descriptive summaries. (Most of the summaries in this chapter are informative.) In addition, when research material is simply reported for its factual content.

On the other hand, descriptive summaries give a more nearly complete picture of the structure of the original. They also establish a certain distance between the writer of the summary and the writer of the original piece. This sense of objectivity is useful whenever the summarized material is to be analyzed, evaluated, or otherwise discussed. For critical or evaluative purposes, descriptive summaries are preferable. Hence descriptive summaries should be used in book reviews, in essays of analysis, and in other essays discussing a text.

**The Summary as Writing**

The key to writing an effective summary is combining the material you choose to include into concise, coherent sentences and paragraphs. If your sentences are carelessly formed, not only will the summary be unreadable, you will also lose the connection among the pieces of information in the summary. You could simply wind up with tossed word salad. On the other hand, carefully written sentences can help show how the separate facts and ideas fit together to build the meaning of the whole. Thoughtful word choice and sentence structure can help you reduce a summary by half with no loss of information, ideas, or clarity. Incidentally, because the summary form places such a premium on conciseness and clarity, writing summaries provides excellent practice for the improvement of your general writing style.

Because you are taking information from many parts of the original text, you could easily lose sight of the logical structure of the whole piece. You need to pay close attention to the new transitions and paragraph structure of the summary. Rather than running all the information together in a series of seemingly unrelated sentences, you can use transitions to show the con-nection between sentences, and you can create new paragraphs to reflect large divisions in the original material.

Finally, in your finished draft of the summary, be sure you identify the source of the original material in a heading, an introductory phrase, or a footnote. When summaries stand by themselves, the source usually appears in the heading. When summaries are worked into the course of longer arguments, you can cite the source of your material in an introductory phrase or a footnote without interrupting the flow of your argument.

**Steps in Writing a Summary**

***1. Read the original carefully.***

***2. Choose material for the summary.***

***3. Decide whether your summary will be informative or descriptive.***

***4. Rewrite the material in concise, coherent sentences and paragraphs.***

***5. Identify the source of the text.***

**Methods of Choosing Material for the Summary**

***Method 1: Selection and Deletion***

Because a summary moves quickly through the main points of the original, you need to focus on the most important ideas and details and leave out less important material. In preparing to write your summary, you can identify important material by underlining, circling, or highlighting it and can eliminate less important material by deleting it—crossing it out.

Look for key words to identify: those that express substantial information or make major statements. Ask yourself, “What is central here? What is the author's specific point? What statements draw the whole piece together?” Cross out digressions, repetitions, nonessential background information, extended examples, interest-provoking anecdotes, and other minor supporting details. Thus, by selection and deletion, you make the most important material emerge, while you push the less important to the background. This method of choosing material works best where there are direct statements of main ideas, accompanied by much detailed elaboration, wordy examples, digressions, or other clearly less important material.

**A STUDENT EXAMPLE FOR DISCUSSION**

The following passage is taken from an article by Katherine Corcoran in the *Washington Journalism Review.* Corcoran, a San Francisco-based reporter, evaluates how well the press— especially the women of the press—reported on Hillary Rodham Clinton during the 1992 presidential campaign. The passage is given first in its original form, then with its secondary and superfluous material crossed out and key words circled.

Finally, one possible informative summary is presented. In order to involve yourself in the student example and the discussion that follows, read through the original passage, decide what material you would select for a summary or delete, and write your own informative summary of the passage from Corcoran's article. Then compare your results with the example.

**Sample Summary**

“Pilloried Clinton,” by Katherine Corcoran

Although Hillary (Rodham) Clinton is the first wife of a presidential candidate to have a career of her own, media coverage of the 1992 presidential campaign focused more on her devotion to husband and family, her appearance, and her personality than on her career. While some stories raised serious questions about her influence over the presidential candidate and about the possibility of an official role in a Clinton administration, many others were full of loaded language that conjured up negative images.

While some stories addressed Hillary Clinton's views, others, many written by women presumably as career-oriented as their subject, addressed Hillary Clinton's changing public image. Either these reporters didn't know how to write about this “new woman” in line to become first lady or it is simply the nature of the press to oversimplify.

After her first appearance in January, responding to allegations of her husband's infidelity on “60 Minutes,” the press took a traditional approach to covering Hillary Clinton because that is how she appeared. Even though Hillary's “Tammy Wynette slur” was labeled a “gaffe” by the press, early coverage was straightforward and serious compared to later stories.

**COMMENTS ON THE SUMMARY**

In the opening paragraphs of the article, Corcoran contrasts two types of coverage: serious reports on Hillary Clinton's career, views, and potential role as first lady and sensational reports on her superficial public image. In this section examples and details are deleted and key terms are circled in order to play up the general contrast between the two types of coverage. The first paragraph is deleted because it is not essential to the author's main argument. The middle paragraphs of the passage offer two possible explanations for the press treatment of Hillary Clinton. A key phrase and a key word representing these two explanations-*didn't know how* and *oversimplify*-are circled.

The rest of the article details the history of the press coverage of Hillary Clinton during the campaign and gives specific examples of the progression from serious to sensational accounts. In the passage cited here, press coverage during the early stages of the campaign is described. The paragraph on the 1988 campaign is deleted because it serves only as background. The main ideas in the paragraphs detailing press coverage in the early stages of the campaign appear in key words and phrases in topic sentences or in concluding phrases and are circled.

Rewriting material from the key words and phrases involves combining several sentences (or even several paragraphs) into a single sentence in order to present main ideas more concisely and show connections between them.

For example, the second and third sentences of the summary combine and categorize the examples in paragraphs three through five of the passage in order to emphasize the contrast between two types of press coverage. The last sentence in the first paragraph of the summary brings together the key terms from paragraphs six through eight of the passage in order to condense and clarify why women of the press covered Hillary Clinton the way they did. The two sentences in the second paragraph of the summary combine the key points of the final paragraphs of the passage and give a skeletal history of press coverage at the beginning of the campaign; details illustrating the general nature of this coverage are given but not elaborated on. In each of the summary sentences, much of the original wording is used; but in some places, rephrasing has made the new sentences shorter and more to the point.

**Method 2: Note Taking**

Taking notes on the key ideas for each of the sections of the original reveals the logic of ideas in the whole piece and the connections among them. As you write down the key idea for each paragraph or so of the original, you will be concerned more with large chunks of meaning than with specific details. As you look over your notes, you may notice that each paragraph has its own meaning, which is related to the meaning of the paragraph before or after it. You will become aware of the whole piece as a series of ideas, one following another.

**A STUDENT EXAMPLE FOR DISCUSSION**

This method may be useful when summarizing a piece that clearly develops an idea in each paragraph but seems to change from paragraph to paragraph, as a more complex idea builds from each of the parts or a large idea breaks into many subsections. The notes then become an outline of the flow of the author's thought. Before reading the sample and comments, work through the following passage on your own. The passage is an excerpt from Daniel Boorstin's *The Image* that discusses “pseudo-events” or what are now called “media events.”

**Notes on the Passage**

Pseudo-events, or false events, are flooding our experience. Example: Hotel wants to increase prestige and business. Instead of improving facilities, it stages anniversary celebration, with prominent people and press coverage. Event itself makes it appear that the hotel is distinguished. Report of event in news media makes an impression on potential customers. Making event makes experience. But event is not quite real.

Characteristics of pseudo-events:

1. Planned, planted, or incited

2. Scheduled for media convenience

3. Ambiguous relationship to reality

4. Self-fulfilling prophecy

**Sample Summary**

“News-Making: The Pseudo-Event,” by Daniel Boorstin

*The hotel that, in order to boost its prestige and business, stages an anniversary celebration instead of improving its facilities exemplifies the pseudo-event, or false event, which now floods our experience. The news reports of the event, involving prominent citizens, make the hotel appear distinguished and impresses potential customers. Making the event makes an experience, but the event is not quite real Pseudo-events like this one have four characteristics: they are planned, planted, or incited; they are scheduled for media convenience; their relationship to reality is ambiguous; and they are self-fulfilling prophecies.*

**COMMENTS ON THE SUMMARY**

This excerpt develops a definition of the pseudo-event through the discussion of one main example. By developing a set of notes, I discovered how the more general opening and closing paragraphs led into and out of the specific case. In the first sentence of the summary, I was able to show that connection by directly tying the example to the general topic. In the last sentence I was again able to clarify the link to the example with the phrase *like this one.*

The excerpt itself proceeds from a direct description to an analysis to more general conclusions. Again the notes help trace the flow of thought, which I can then recapture in the written summary. Some important details, first described and then analyzed (such as the news reporting and the participation of prominent people), could be combined with the analysis. The contrast of ideas in the next to last sentence of the summary reflects the two levels of analysis in the fourth and fifth paragraphs of the original. Note also that the summary, like the outline, preserves the list structure for presenting the four characteristics of pseudo-events.

**Method 3: Miniaturizing**

As you read through the original, pay attention to the various parts of the structure: the order of ideas, their relative lengths, and their relationships. Think of a large photograph reduced to wallet size. In a relative sense all the parts remain the same; only the scale has changed. Notice the shape, flow, and overall impression of the original passage so you can create a miniature version of it in your summary. As in the note-taking method, you should jot down the main ideas and key statements of the original, but you should also try to keep the size of your notes in rough proportion to the size of the original. Follow the logic of one idea flowing from another, and re-create the transitions and structure of the original.

When the arrangement, logical development, and balance of parts of the original are important, miniaturizing will help you retain the overall meaning and impression. Generally this method is most appropriate for more complex and subtly argued originals, whose parts fit together in unusual ways or in ways that are difficult to follow.

**A STUDENT EXAMPLE FOR DISCUSSION**

Attempt your own summary of the following discussion by Howard Wolinsky and Tom Brune of a controversial article about a mercy killing before reading the sample notes, summary, and comments. The article about mercy killing originally appeared in the *Journal of the American Medical Association*

**JAMA's Jam**

It all started when someone sent an unsolicited essay to the *Journal of the American Medical Association* last year. It could have happened to any publication. Newspapers, magazines and scientific and medical journals get manuscripts they haven't commissioned all the time. The difference in this case was the subject matter of the essay. The essay—500 words or so—was a first-person account of how a groggy gynecology resident in an unnamed hospital was awakened at 3 a.m. to ease the pain of a suffering, sleepless 20-year-old ovarian cancer patient. The resident ended her pain by giving her what he believed to be a fatal injection of morphine.

The essay ... was a description of a mercy killing, and, in effect, a confession to a murder. And it had been submitted to JAMA for publication on one condition-that the author's name be withheld. Editors have many choices when they get a piece like this. Dr. George Lundberg, a physician and the editor of JAMA for the past six years, chose a course that landed the AMA in court-and reaped angry denunciations from physicians, ethicists and many journalists and the editors of other medical journals.

Lundberg plunked the piece into the essay section of the January 8 edition of JAMA without listing the author's name, without verifying that the event actually took place, and without running a preface explaining *why* he was publishing the essay or that he was uncertain about the essay's veracity.

Lundberg later explained that he wanted to stir up a debate over a controversial subject. That he did. But he also stirred up a discussion about his own 'actions, raising questions of medical and journalistic ethics for which there are no ready answers. And, through his actions and statements, he illustrated that editors of medical and scientific journals operate in a culture that is largely foreign to the world of journalists who gather news for a general audience.

The 105-year-old *Journal of the American Medical Association,* published in Chicago, claims to be the most widely circulated medical publication in the world, with 383,000 readers of the English language edition and 250,000 readers of its 10 foreign-language editions. Published by the most powerful doctors' organization in the country, JAMA also is one of two top medical publications in the United States. The popular press looks to JAMA and the *New England 10urnal of Medicine* each week for the latest medical news.

JAMA's January 8 edition was no exception. Graced with a portrait of a woman by the 19th-century painter Ingres on its cover, JAMA included two items many newspapers picked up: a study of a syndrome in which people's blood pressure shoots up at the sight of a doctor's white coat, and an article and editorial saying tighter controls and better counseling need to accompany Human Immunodeficiency Virus antibody testing, commonly known as AIDS testing. The issue also included “It's Over, Debbie.”

“Debbie” appeared in a section called “A Piece of My Mind,” which Lundberg portrays as “an informal courtyard of creativity,” a place where poems, anecdotes and unscientific matters are published.

Lundberg refuses to to reveal many specifics of the editorial process, and he forbids interviews with his staff. But he does note that JAMA articles are put through a peer-review process. Lundberg, however, won't disclose the number, names or occupations of the reviewers who looked at the Debbie piece, or the contents of their reviews. Nor will he talk about the number of JAMA staffers who opposed publishing the piece.

He also declines to say whether he asked lawyers for the AMA to review the piece. However, Kirk Johnson, the AMA's general counsel, said Lundberg didn't discuss the essay with him prior to publication.

Lundberg also refuses to say whether he consulted with medical ethicists in advance of publication, though AMA attorney Johnson said the essay had been reviewed by an ethicist.

**Notes on the Passage**

1. INTRODUCTION: sets up the situation and describes the controversial article.

2. THE CHOICE: The editor's choice landed the AMA in court and caused angry denunciations from physicians, ethicists, journalists, and medical editors. The choice was to publish without author's name, verification, or explanation in order to stir up debate.

3. PLACEMENT: In Jama, old, respected, most widely circulated medical journal, containing technical information that journalists watch for news. “It's Over, Debbie” appeared in an informal opinion section. The editor will not discuss any details about how the article was reviewed or edited.

**Sample Summary**

“JAMA's Jam,” by Howard Wolinsky and Tom Brune

When an unsolicited essay about how a doctor assisted in the mercy killing of a cancer patient was submitted to the *Journal of the American Medical Association,* the editor decided to publish the article. He published it without identifying the author, without veri-fying the facts, and without explaining his reasons for publication. That decision landed the AMA in court and brought down angry denunciations from physicians, ethicists, journalists, and editors. The editor wanted to stir up debate on the controversial issue of mercy killing, but he also stirred up debate about the ethics of publication.

JAMA is 105 years old, claims to be the most widely circulated medical publication in the world, and is one of the press's sources of medical news. “It's Over. Debbie” appeared in a special section of the journal devoted to informal responses and thoughts. The editor refused to say how the article was reviewed or edited.

**COMMENTS ON THE SUMMARY**

The original selection has three sections: a description of the situation created by the receipt of the article, a discussion of the editor's choice and the choice's consequences, and a description of the article's appearance in the journal. Since the situation created by the article and the choice made in that situation are closely linked, I was able to describe both in one opening sentence. I then elaborated the choice and its consequences in the rest of the opening paragraph, and I described the appearance of the article in the journal in a separate paragraph. I kept to the original order throughout, except that I stated the editor's decision right away to decrease suspense. This change led to a clearer presentation of the event and its consequences.

Because ideas in the original are frequently developed over several paragraphs, the notes and summary sentences combine widely separated bits of material and often develop new wording to achieve these combinations.

***WRITING ASSIGNMENT***

Use the method of miniaturizing to summarize further excerpts from the article on the ethics of the JAMA decision. These excerpts present some of the criticisms of the editor and his defense.

JAMA's Jam

*(continued)*

The *New York Post* on January 27 was the first major newspaper to write about the essay. The *Post* reported that New York mayor Ed Koch, alerted by a doctor friend, had sent a letter to U.S. Attorney General Ed Meese. Koch told Meese that the act described in the essay was “what I can only conclude is a murder ....” “I urge you to look into this matter,” he said, “and inappropriate, pursue criminal charges against this doctor.” Meese did nothing, and all was quiet until January 31, when the *Chicago Tribune* ran a page-one article by science writer Jon Van describing the essay and reporting views of doctors and medical ethicists. Van said he heard about the Debbie case from an angry doctor on January 22. “The doctor was really pissed off,” he recalled. Van had contacted prominent medical ethicists to get reactions.

Two days after the *Tribune* piece, the office of Cook County State's Attorney Richard M. Daley, son of the late mayor, informally asked Kirk Johnson, the AMA's attorney, for the author's name.

Daley actually had been made aware of “Debbie” on January 14 by Americans United for Life, a pro-life law firm based in Chicago. But it may have taken the high visibility of the *Tribune* piece to spark action by the prosecutor, whose jurisdiction includes the AMA's Chicago headquarters.

“It [the Debbie essay] would have made a splash and died, if it were not for Daley's office pursuing it,” Van said.

At a February 5 news conference, Johnson said the AMA would not voluntarily give the name to prosecutors, but *would* turn the writer in if ordered to do so by a judge.

The *Chicago Sun-Times* followed this up with a string of stories questioning the veracity of the essay as well as JAMA's handling of the case. On February 14, the *Sun-Times* broke the story that the Cook County grand jury had issued a subpoena to obtain the author's name On February 16, the AMA announced that it had been served with a grand jury subpoena for essay documents. The AMA waffled a bit on just how far it would go to protect the author's identity. On February 22, the AMA filed a motion to quash the subpoena.

In its brief, the AMA argued that the prosecutor had failed to follow guidelines set down by the Illinois Reporters Privilege Act and that disclosure of the author's name would jeopardize confidential sources for all publications, which would be an inhibition of free and open discussion guaranteed by the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

The Illinois shield law requires those seeking privileged information to apply in writing to the court to set aside the protection. The act also holds that the court can set aside the protection only after determining that the person seeking the information had exhausted all other available sources and that the information was essential to the protection of the public interest involved. The AMA also argued that it was unclear as to whether the state's attorney had jurisdiction in the case. The actions described in the essay could have been done by any doctor at any hospital in any state or in any country, not necessarily in Cook County.

Finally, the AMA argued that it did not know whether the actions described had actually happened. The Headline Club, the local chapter of The Society of Professional Journalists, Sigma Delta Chi, as well as the Media Institute, the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press and the Radio-Television News Directors Association filed *amicus* briefs in support of the AMA position. The state's attorney's office argued that a homicide had taken place, and that the First Amendment never was intended to protect the identity of a murderer. It argued that the AMA had a duty to turn over the name, Just as a citizen who had knowledge of a person who had committed a crime would.

The court battle was short. After hearing arguments, Richard Fitzgerald, chief judge of the Cook County Criminal Court, dismissed the subpoena March 18. “At the present time,” Fitzgerald ruled, “there is no indication a crime was committed, and the question of whether a crime was committed in Cook County is merely speculative.” The judge also said that the state's attorney had failed to exhaust all other avenues for getting information about the matter and had not proved that obtaining the name was essential to the public interest.

Lundberg hailed the ruling. Not only did it vindicate his decision to print the essay, he said, but it set a precedent by confirming that medical and scientific journals enjoy the same press freedoms and protections that have been normally afforded broadcast news and newspapers.

“I never had any doubt from the day we published the essay that we did the right thing,” Lundberg said afterward.

The decision also saved Lundberg from the need to make the painful decision as to whether he would turn in the author if a court ordered him to do so. He said he was unsure as to whether he would have gone to jail to protect the author's anonymity. He admitted that JAMA had agreed “as a condition of acceptance we would not publish the name of the author.”

But, Lundberg added, “We did not enter into a blood pledge to the author that we would go to jail if subpoenaed, because it didn't come up in the correspondence with the author. We recognized it as a remote possibility, but that was not discussed with the author.”

The possibility of perhaps going to jail has passed, at least for now. Daley has indicated that the matter may be dead legally. But controversy continues to swirl over the medical and journalistic ethics of Lundberg's handling of the essay, not to mention the moral and ethical problems raised by the essay itself.

**Methods of Choosing Material for the Summary**

***1.*** *Select more important information and delete less important material*. This method may be useful when clearly stated mains ideas in the piece are immediately followed by many details or examples.

***2.*** *Take notes on the main ideas*. This method may be useful when the development of a complex idea in the piece is treated in many subsections. The notes serve as an outline of the flow of the author’s thought.

***3.*** *Miniaturize the original*. This method may be useful when the logical development is subtly argued and parts of the piece fir together in unusual ways.

**Summary Length**

The sample summaries in this chapter are about one-quarter the length of the full versions; however, the relative length of any summary is not a fixed proportion. The compactness of the style of the original, the compactness of the summary writer's style, and the purpose of the summary all help determine how short the summary will be.

If the original is densely written (that is, much information is presented in few words), then making the summary too short may destroy the integrity of the ideas communicated. If the original contains subtle relationships, complex sentences, difficult concepts, and relatively few details and examples, it is very hard to eliminate many words and still maintain the sense of the original.

On the other hand, if an author introduces only one idea to a page, repeats that idea in different ways, gives many similar examples, and relies on simple sentences that present only one or two bits of information, the summary can eliminate much without distortion or over simplification. The second factor, the tightness of the language in the summary, depends on your skill with sentences and words. In writing more concisely, however, be sure to keep the meaning and sentence structure clear. Abstract and conceptual language, in particular, may become confusing in densely written passages. Compactness in writing should therefore be practiced in moderation; it is important not to jeopardize ease of reading. A clear, simple statement is often most compact.

**Length Depends on the Purpose of the Summary**

How you will eventually use the summary determines what is important to include and what is unimportant. The relative distinction between major and minor pieces of information depends very much on the interests of those who you anticipate will read your summary.

If the purpose of the summary is to give only a general idea of what is in the original—so that the reader can decide whether or not to read the full version—the summary can be quite spare, even less than 1 percent of the original. Some professional journals are simply collections of short abstracts of work published in other specialized journals. Journals such as *Research in Education, Biological Abstracts,* and *Economic Abstracts* help keep professionals aware of new work in their fields. But to obtain substantive information, the researcher must turn to the original. A typical professional abstract might contain bibliographical information, the major thesis or findings, and a suggestion of the method or the argument, as in the following example from *Psychological Abstracts,* which discusses how electronic communications have created problems for copyright laws.

The other extreme is the summary that is so detailed that the reader can get all necessary information without referring to the original. In government and business, higher-level officials who have too many responsibilities” and too little time may make important decisions on the basis of summaries of reports and background documents. Subordinates who sift through the volumes of original material” to prepare such summaries must select all the information that a manager might find useful in making the decision. The informative summary is, in fact, a set part of official reports so that readers can get to the essential findings without having to wade through all the evidence.

On the more popular level, such condensations of best sellers as those published by *Reader's Digest* provide readers who lack the patience to read full books a short version of the originals-although subtlety, style, characterization, and other literary qualities frequently suffer.

In the middle length are summaries created for various reference purposes. A book tracing the development of economic thought might devote a few pages to summarizing Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* in order to introduce the reader to that economist's ideas. Books like *Masterplots,* which summarize the plots of famous plays and novels, serve to refresh readers' memories about books they read long ago as well as to help new readers through the more difficult original. The various kinds of study guides and pamphlets you may be familiar with also serve this last function. They are useful to help you through the original but cannot stand in place of the full work.

**Knowing When to Summarize**

The most frequent and most important use of summary is to refer to another writer's work in the course of a new and original essay. Summary has the advantage over paraphrase in that it allows the writer to pick out and focus on only those aspects of the original that are most relevant to the new points being made. The flexibility of wording in a summary also allows the writer to fit it in smoothly with his or her original, ongoing statements.

When you are incorporating a summary into your own statement, it is important to remember that you should summarize only as much of the original text as is necessary to advance your own argument; do not let the summary overwhelm the direction of your own writing. A fuller discussion of the relative merits and appropriateness of each form of reference-summary, paraphrase, quotation, and name.

Many of the writing assignments that appear in this book rely on summary to introduce material for discussion. In the next chapter, for example, the first paragraph of the sample essay comparing reading and experience presents a summary of two sociologists' discussion of upward mobility. The rest of the essay compares the ideas in that summary to the actual experiences of the student's family.

* 1. Umpan Balik dan Tindak Lanjut

Please match your answers above with answer key of formative test 1 which is located in the end of the module. Measure your topic mastery of learning activity 1 with formula given below:

Level of mastery= (total of right answers: 5) x 100%

Vey good = 90-100%

Good = 80 - 89%

Fair = 70 – 79%

Poor = 0 – 69 %

If level of mastery of the topic is more than 80%, you can continue to learning activity 2 . If level of mastery is less than 80% you need to re-do learning activity 1 especially from you have not understood part.

1. **Kegiatan Belajar 2**
	1. Uraian dan contoh

text

* 1. Latihan

text

* 1. Rangkuman

text

* 1. Tes Formatif

text

* 1. Umpan Balik dan Tindak Lanjut

text

1. **Kegiatan Belajar 3**
	1. Uraian dan contoh

text

* 1. Latihan

text

* 1. Rangkuman

text

* 1. Tes Formatif

text

* 1. Umpan Balik dan Tindak Lanjut

text

1. **Kunci Jawaban**
	1. Tes formatif 1

1. a

2. d

3. b

4. d

5. d

* 1. Tes formatif 2

text

* 1. Tes formatif 3

text

**Daftar Pustaka**