JEELS
(Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)
P-ISSN: 2407-2575 E-ISSN: 2503-2194
https://jurnalfaktarbiyah.iainkediri.ac.id/index.php/jeels

BOOKSNAPS OR MS-WORD: WHICH ONE IS BETTER IN DEVELOPING READING COMPREHENSION ACROSS CRITICAL-CREATIVE THINKING LEVELS?

***Elva Yohana[1]; Bambang Yudi Cahyono[2]; Nunung Suryati[3]; Utari Praba Astuti[4]**
[1,2,3,4] Faculty of Letters, Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia;
[1]English Education Department, UIN Sayyid Ali Rahmatullah Tulungagung, Indonesia
*elvayoohana@gmail.com; bambang.yudi.fs@um.ac.id; nunung.suryati.fs@um.ac.id;utari.praba.fs@um.ac.id
(*) Corresponding Author

Abstract: The study investigates which of the two summary writing techniques (one using BookSnaps and the other using MS-Word) affects reading comprehension performance better than the other. It also examines whether or not level of critical-creative thinking skills affects the results. This study used a causal-comparative design. Two groups of students were involved in this study and after the treatment they were tested on their reading comprehension performance across critical-creative thinking skill levels. The results showed that the reading comprehension performance of the two groups of students were not different significantly regardless of the

[1]**Citation in APA style:**
Yohana, E., Cahyono, B. Y., Suryati, N., & Astuti U. P. (2024). BookSnaps or MS-Word: Which one is better in developing reading comprehension across critical-creative thinking levels? *JEELS,* 11(2), 519-536.
DOI: 10.30762/jeels.v11i2.2791

Submission: April 2024, Revision: May 2024, Publication: June 2024

summary writing techniques used. The results also showed that students with high level of critical-creative thinking skill outperformed the students with low critical-creative thinking skill in each of the two groups. This implies that teachers might use either BookSnaps or MS- Word to train the students in summary writing. However, when dealing with students with low critical-creative thinking level, the teachers might give more time in the process of summary writing or give assistance to students who need it when applying either BookSnaps of MS-Word.

Keywords: *BookSnaps, critical-creative thinking, MS-Word, reading comprehension performance, summary writiny*

INTRODUCTION

Among the four language skills in English, two skills have close relationship, namely reading and writing skills. Due to their close relationship, a term "reading and writing connection" is frequently used (Moran & Billen, 2014, p. 189) in the literature. The term means that learning to read supports to learning to write or vise versa. One of the techniques to connect reading and writing is by making a summary of a reading text. Summarizing involves reducing the text to one-third or one-quarter of its original size, articulating the author's meaning clearly, and retaining the main ideas. It is a crucial skill for any learners as it helps to synthesize the main ideas, arguments, and evidence from various sources and present them in a coherent and concise way.

Summarizing, moreover, requires critical thinking, analysis, and synthesis skills to identify the most relevant and reliable information and integrate it into one's own argument (Bean & Melzer, 2021). Meanwhile, the process involves reading the work first to understand the author's intent, writing the thesis and main ideas in point form, deciding which points are crucial for an accurate summary, editing the summary by deleting extraneous descriptors, details, and examples, and rereading the original work to ensure accuracy.

Therefore, it can be applied to various sources, such as the results of studies, methods or approaches, researchers' viewpoints, points made in an essay, contexts of a text, and historical events leading to the event/ issue/ philosophy being discussed (Birkenstein & Graff, 2018) and many more.

Summarizing can be a challenging task for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students, since it requires two thinking skills: finding the main idea and organizing information so that the main idea is explained surely with reasons and details. Additionally, summarization plays a crucial role in Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) by enhancing reading comprehension, writing skills, and collaborative learning among English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students. Research has shown that summary writing using CALL tools has increased over the last two decades, with studies focusing on various aspects such as mobile learning for EFL learners and the integration of technology in language education.

Rapid technological advancements have made a wide range of summarizing tools available to the educational environment. AI summarization, for example, not only aids in summarizing texts but also contributes to developing language proficiency, critical thinking, and academic writing skills in EFL learners (Yohana & Anugerahwati, 2023). However, it is essential to note that the use of summarizing tools should be balanced with fostering student agency to ensure that students actively engage with the material and develop their critical thinking and creativity skills. Over-reliance on summarizing tools may limit these skills, as argued by Marzuki et al. (2023) who suggest that excessive dependence on technologies may decrease one's ability to think creatively and critically.

This document aims to compare the use of BookSnap and MS Word for students' reading comprehension across their critical and creative thinking skills. The comparison will analyze the effectiveness of both tools in helping students understand and comprehend the content of texts. By examining the strengths and weaknesses of BookSnap and MS Word in relation to reading comprehension, this

comparison seeks to provide valuable insights for educators and students on choosing the most suitable tool for enhancing their reading skills without decreasing the skill of criticality and creativity. Through this comparison, we aim to shed light on the potential benefits and limitations of both tools in improving students' reading comprehension abilities.

BookSnap and MS Word are widely used tools by students, educators, and professionals for various purposes. BookSnap, developed specifically for reading comprehension, allows users to take pictures of book pages and annotate them with notes, highlights, and multimedia elements. It provides a visual and interactive reading experience, thereby helping students engage with the content and improve comprehension (Haiken & Furman, 2022). On the other hand, MS Word is a versatile word processing software that offers a range of features for creating and editing documents. While it may not be designed exclusively for reading comprehension, MS Word provides tools for highlighting, formatting, and adding comments, which can support students in their comprehension efforts. Understanding the background and context of these tools is crucial for conducting a thorough and meaningful comparison to determine their effectiveness in enhancing students' reading comprehension skills.

Previous studies showing the benefits of summary writing (Chew et al., 2019; Lu et al., 2018; Saddler et al., 2019; Yeh et al., 2020) served as the sources for this research using online platform or software in the teaching and learning of language (Lin & Chen, 2017). Additionally, including computer-assisted learning into summary writing promotes the development of a classroom environment that allows for multilingual learning. Furthermore, adopting it may enhance teachers' and students' confidence in acquiring technical knowledge and pedagogical skills. Studies that compare computer-based language learning approaches to traditional classroom teaching methods have found that employing computer software can increase academic achievement (Chew et al., 2020; Chiu, 2015; Jeong, 2017; Madnani et al., 2013).

This research is conducted to close previous gaps in the field of summary writing, including the improper application of prior knowledge activation, the absence of guidelines for summarizing techniques, the theories included in online tools for summarizing information, and the efficacy of these tools used. Teachers of English as a foreign language must also modify their curricula to reflect the advancements in information and communication technology (ICT) throughout the teaching and learning as well as relevance to lifestyles and the demands of the real world because the Internet is now a part of education (Imelda et al., 2019). Moreover, the research questions are formulated as follows:

1. Is there any difference in reading comprehension performance between students who were taught summary writing using BookSnaps and those taught using MS-Word?
2. Is there any difference in reading comprehension performance between students who have high and low critical-creative thinking levels after being taught summary writing using BookSnaps and MS-Word?

METHOD

Research Design and Participants

This study is to assess how students' reading comprehension performance throughout the critical-creative thinking level is affected when they use BookSnaps and MS-Word for summary writing. The design of the study was a causal-comparative design (Lawrence, 2023). This design aims to compare effects of the application of two independent variables on a dependent variable in two experimental groups. The first group was taught to make a summary by using BookSnaps, while the second group was taught to make a summary by using MS Word. Then the two groups were compared in their reading comprehension performance across their critical-creative thinking levels. Therefore, the impact of utilizing BookSnaps and MS-Word in summary writing was assessed using the paired sample t-test. The design was also chosen owing to limited access; in this study, we were

permitted to hold two sessions with 74 participants. Because it is impossible to assign research subjects at random, we divided the students into two experimental groups: the first 37 students were assigned to the BookSnaps group, while the second 37 students were assigned to the MS-Word group.

Instruments of the study

In this study there are three instruments used. The first one was the critical-creative thinking test which was modified from Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal and Torrance Test of Creative Thinking-Figural to determine the students' levels of critical and creative thinking (Ennis, 1958; Wilson & Wagner, 1981; Kim, 2017). The second instrument was the scoring rubric of summary writing to assess students' summarization (Chew et al., 2020). This rubric assessed five aspects of summary writing namely Main idea (20%), Accurate (20%), Words and style (20%), Concisely organized (20%), and Length (20%). The third instrument was fifty questions reading test adopted from Peterson's Master TOEFL Reading Skills (Davy, 2007).

Data Collection Procedure

This study dealt with primary data and secondary data. The primary data were taken from the students' scores of summary writing and the Reading Comprehension test. The secondary data comprised the students' scores on the measurement test of critical-creative thinking level. The secondary data were collected before the treatment, while the primary data was collected after the treatment.

Data Analysis

The study utilized the critical-creative thinking test to see students' level of critical-creative thinking. Hence, using SPSS 20 for the statistic program to analyze the distribution of students' reading comprehension. The result, then, was analyzed using independent sample t-test to know whether there is a significant effect on students' critical-creative thinking level and their reading comprehension

performance taught by the two summary writing strategies. The summary of how data were obtained is shown in Table 1.

Table 1.
Summary of methodology in this study

No.	Instrument	Data Collection	Data Analysis
1	Critical-Creative Thinking Test	High and low students' critical-creative thinking	Content analysis and categorized under similar level
2	The rubric of summary writing	Students' summary writing score	Scoring rubric of summarizing
3	Reading Comprehension Test	Students' reading comprehension performance	SPSS 20 and independent sample t-test

FINDINGS

This study attempts to explore the effectiveness of summary writing using BookSnaps and MS-Word on reading comprehension across students' critical-creative thinking level.

Comparison of the Scores of Reading Comprehension between the BookSnap and MS-Word Groups

We compared the students' summary writing of the students who used BookSnaps and MS-Word. The post-test was administered to know the effectiveness of both learning tools in summarizing. Therefore, the scores of students from the BookSnaps group were compared initially to the scores of the students in the MS-Word group. The descriptive statistics of the score was shown in Table 2.

Table 2.
Descriptive statistics of reading test of BookSnaps and MS-Word groups

Group	N	Mean	Min	Max	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
BookSnaps	37	55.41	30	86	15.084	2.480
MS-Word	37	61.30	26	90	14.842	2.440

Table 2 shows that the MS-Word group obtained a higher mean (61.30) than the BookSnaps group (55.41); however, the gap is quite high (5.89). It turned out that the standard deviation of the MS-Word group achieves score (14.842) lower than the BookSnaps group (15.084). Besides, the post-test scores were compared using independent sample t-test to know the significant difference of post-test scores (see Table 3).

Table 3.
Comparison of reading score using Independent t-Test in BookSnaps and MS-Word Groups

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
RC	Equal variances assumed	.008	.931	-1.694	72	.095	-5.892	3.479	-12.827	1.043
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.694	71.981	.095	-5.892	3.479	-12.827	1.043

The result of Levene's test as shown in Table 3 indicates that there is no significant difference between Booksnaps and MS-Word groups. It can be known from the significance value p = 0.931 that is bigger than .05. Thus, the skills of both two experimental groups are equal in the terms of reading comprehension. Moreover, the result of independent t-Test in Table 3 shows that the significance value p (.095) is bigger than .05. This means that there is no significant difference between BookSnaps group and MS-Word group. Therefore, it can be assumed that the MS-Word group performs better than the BookSnaps group in the terms of reading comprehension score.

Comparison of Students' High and Low Critical-creative Thinking in BookSnaps Group

The summary writing of the high and low achievers of critical-creative thinking in BookSnaps group were compared. The descriptive statistics of the scores was shown in the following Table 4.

Table 4.
Descriptive statistics of high and low critical-creative thinking in BookSnaps

Group	N	Mean	Min	Max	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
High of SW-BS	17	57.88	30	84	16.605	4.027
Low of SW-BS	20	53.30	30	86	13.739	3.072

Table 4 figures out that the high critical-creative thinking obtains higher mean than the low critical-creative thinking, the means of which are 57.88 and 53.3 respectively. Moreover, the gap is quite low (4.58). From the standard deviation score, the students of low critical-creative thinking obtained the deviation score (13.739) lower than the students of high critical-creative thinking (16.605). The combination of the means and the standard deviation scores of BookSnap group means that the high critical-creative thinking group performed better than the low critical-creative thinking group in the terms of reading comprehension score. Moreover, the results of the comparison of the

post-test scores were also analyzed using independent sample t-test to know the significant difference of the post-test scores (see Table 5).

Table 5.
The results of the Independent T-Test of high and low achievers in the SW-BS group

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
RC	Equal variances assumed	1.004	.323	.919	35	.364	4.582	4.987	-5.541	14.706
	Equal variances not assumed			.905	31.154	.373	4.582	5.065	-5.746	14.911

The result of Levene's test as shown in Table 5 indicates that there is no significant difference between high and low critical-creative thinking sub-groups. It can be known from the significance value p = 0.323 which is bigger than .05. Thus, the skills of the two sub-groups are equal in the terms of reading comprehension. Moreover, the result of independent t-test in Table 5 shows that the significance value p (.364) is bigger than .05. This means that there is no significant difference between high and low critical-creative thinking groups.

From this finding, it can be inferred that the students of high critical-creative thinking group get more benefit to improve their reading comprehension performance than the students of low critical-creative thinking group when using BookSnaps.

Comparison between Students of High and Low Critical-creative Thinking in MS-Word Group

The summary writing of the students of high and low critical-creative thinking in MS-Word group were compared. The descriptive statistics of the scores is shown in the following Table 6.

Table 6.
Descriptive statistics of high and low of critical-creative thinking in MS-Word

Group	N	Mean	Min	Max	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
High of SW-MS	21	65.05	26	90	15.002	3.274
Low of SW-MS	16	56.38	36	84	13.530	3.382

Table 6 figures out that the high critical-creative thinking group obtained higher mean than the low critical-creative thinking group, the means of which are 65.05 and 56.38 respectively. Moreover, the gap is quite high (8.67). From the standard deviation score, the students of low critical-creative thinking group obtained the lower deviation score (13.530) than the students of high critical-creative thinking (15.002). The combination of the means and the standard deviation scores of MS-Word groups means that the high critical-creative thinking group performs better than the low critical-creative thinking group in terms of reading comprehension score. Moreover, the results of the comparison of the post-test scores were also analyzed using independent sample t-test to know the significant difference of post-test scores (see Table 7).

Table 7.
The results of the Independent T-Test of high and low achievers in the MS-Word Group

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
RC	Equal variances assumed	.050	.825	1.816	35	.078	8.673	4.775	-1.021	18.366
	Equal variances not assumed			1.842	33.93	.074	8.673	4.707	-.894	18.239

The result of Levene's test as shown in Table 7 indicates that there is no significant difference between high and low critical-creative thinking sub-groups. It can be known from the significance value p = 0.825 is bigger than .05. Thus, the skills of the two sub groups are equal in terms of reading comprehension. Moreover, the result of independent t-Test in Table 7 shows that the significance value p (.078) is bigger than .05. This means that there is no significant difference between high and low critical-creative thinking groups. Thus, it can be inferred that the students of high critical-creative thinking group get more benefit to improve their reading comprehension performance than the students of low critical-creative thinking group when using MS-Word.

DISCUSSION

Regarding the findings of the current study, it was empirically proven that the implementation of MS-Word was more effective than BookSnaps for students' summary writing in improving their reading comprehension. It can be inferred that the students' reading comprehension performance of the high and low of critical-creative thinking levels is not due to the teaching strategies employed in both the MS-Word and BookSnaps groups. The contribution of the MS-Word technique by comparing the two groups of summary writing seems to support and partly contradict to a few previous studies.

The reasons why the MS-Word technique was effective for summarizing have been observed by several scholars. The previous finding of Godsey (2000) supports the current finding which revealed that the students who wrote using MS-Word produced their summary writing significantly better than those who used the other BookSnaps. Moreover, teaching summary using MS-Word also offer numerous advantages in improving students' writing (Abdelrahman, 2013; Yaser, 2021). This study supports the findings of Van der Steen et al. (2017), who demonstrated that MS-Word has a positive impact on writing productivity, both qualitative and quantitative. This result, however, contradicts the findings of Torres (2014), who found no discernible difference in student writing on paper and with a computer word processor.

In addition, the notes from the students' assignments on BookSnaps revealed that they learned to express the essential points through various means such as emoji, hand writing, picture, photos to comprehend the problem in the reading text. Then, the students also write the summary and develop their critical-creative thinking skills in reading. In short, the procedures of BookSnaps were not effective to improve the students' reading comprehension performance compared to the MS-Word. The current research is in line with Carr (2020) examined the comparison of using BookSnaps to provide the content understanding. It revealed that the BookSnaps allowed the least level of content understanding compared to Flipgrid and the video-

responses platforms. In other words, the participants perceive that BookSnaps is not able to demonstrate their reading understanding effectively.

Although the current study confirms the superiority of summary writing through the use of CALL, there were no specific studies that use BookSnaps platform and MS-Word to aid the students' summary writing. The results of this study give the additional knowledge and seem supporting the study conducted by Jeong (2017) showing that CALL has been a useful technique to improve reading ability in language teaching and learning without mentioning the specific device used in the learning summary writing. Yeh et. al. (2020) used the computer assisted undergoing Selecting-Organizing-Integrating (SOI) strategy that was able to help students in vocabulary selection, main idea identification, and summaries construction. Therefore, employing integrated reading and summary writing efficiently helped students in improving reading comprehension performance and avoiding comprehension breakdown.

CONCLUSION

This study has compared the effects of two techniques in summary writing the reading comprehension performance of two groups: the one using BookSnaps and the one using MS-Word. The result indicates that there is no significant difference in the reading comprehension performances of between the students who used Booksnaps and those using MS-Word. Thus, regardless of the summarizing techniques, the skills of both experimental groups are equal in the terms of reading comprehension. Further analysis shows that students with high critical-creative thinking level obtained higher scores than the students with low critical-creative thinking level in the two techniques of summary writing. Thus, teachers might use either BookSnaps or MS-Word to train the students in summary writing. However, when dealing with students with low critical-creative thinking level, the teachers might give more time in the process of summary writing or giving assistance to students who need it.

This study has limitations on intact subjects, limiting the ability to assign simple random sampling. The results may be influenced by students' prior learning experiences. The study also used two pivotal tests, the critical-creative thinking test and Reading Comprehension Test, which were adapted from experts and written in English. However, both groups had low reading comprehension scores, possibly due to the readability of the texts. This suggests that the reading comprehension test may be too difficult for EFL students in terms of topic familiarity, vocabulary, idiom expression, and grammar.

REFERENCES

Abdelrahman, O. N. M. B. (2013). The impact of using the word processor to develop EFL learners' writing skill at Al-Imam Mohammad Ibin Saud Islamic University. *IUG Journal of Humanities Research*, *21*(2), 1-26. DOI:10.12816/0013730 http://www.iugaza.edu.ps/ar/periodical/

Bean, J. C., & Melzer, D. (2021). *Engaging ideas: The professor's guide to integrating writing, critical thinking, and active learning in the classroom*. John Wiley & Sons.

Birkenstein, C., & Graff, G. (2018). *They say/I say: The moves that matter in academic writing*. WW Norton & Company.

Carr, J. (2020). Teacher candidate perceptions on alternative asynchronous online discussion boards. *Journal of Educational Technology & Online Learning*, 3(3), 288-310. https://doi.org/10.31681/jetol.752283

Chew, C. S., Idris, N., Loh, E. F., Wu, W. C. V., Chua, Y. P., & Bimba, A. T. (2019). The effects of a theory-based summary writing tool on students' summary writing. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *35*(3), 435-449. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12349

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

Chiu, C. (2015). Enhancing reading comprehension and summarization abilities of EFL learners through online summarization practice. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 1, 79–95. Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/209025

Davy, E. (2007). *Peterson's master TOEFL reading skills*. A Nelnet Company.

Ennis, R. H. (1958). An appraisal of the Watson-Glaser Critical thinking appraisal. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *52*(4), 155–158. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1958.10882558

Godsey, S. B. (2000). *The effects of using Microsoft Word on journal word counts in the high school English classroom.* Unpublished MA Thesis: Master of Arts Action Research Project, Johnson Bible College. Retrieved from https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-Effects-of-Using-Microsoft-Word%5BR%5D-on-Journal-Godsey/dc4de92c0c48214eb7ff6addd0e142405e3d22e0

Haiken, M., & Furman, L. R. (2022). *Personalized reading: Digital strategies and tools to support all learners*. International Society for Technology in Education.

Imelda, Cahyono, B. Y., & Astuti, U. P. (2019). Effect of process writing approach combined with video-based mobile learning on Indonesian EFL learners' writing skill across creativity levels. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(3), 325-340. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12320a

Jeong, K. O. (2017). Preparing EFL student teachers with new technologies in the Korean context. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 30(6), 488–509. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2017.1321554

Kim, K. H. (2017). The Torrance tests of creative thinking-figural or verbal: Which one should we use? *Creativity. Theories–Research-Applications*, *4*(2), 302-321. https://doi.org/10.1515/ctra-2017-0015

Lawrence, F. P. (2023, April 20). *Causal-comparative research.* Power-point Slides presented in the Research Methodology Group UOPX Research Community at the University of Phoenix, Glendale, Arizona, USA. https://www.phoenix.edu/content/dam/edu/research/doc/2023/causal-comparative-research.pdf

Lin, M. H., & Chen, H. G. (2017). A study of the effects of digital learning on learning motivation and learning outcome. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, *13*(7), 3553-3564. https://doi.org/10.12973/eurasia.2017.00744a

Lu, Z., Zheng, C., & Li, Z. (2018). Effects of embedded summary writing on EFL learners' anxiety and oral production in a computer-based testing environment. *Journal of Computers in Education Journal*, *5*(2), 221-241. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40692-018-0105-1

Madnani, N., Burstein, J., Sabatini, J., & O'Reilly, T. (2013). Automated scoring of summary-writing tasks designed to measure reading comprehension. *Proceedings of the 8th Workshop on Innovative Use of Natural Language Processing for Building Educational Applications* (pp. 163-168). Association for Computational Linguistics.

Marzuki, Widiati, U., Rusdin, D., Darwin, & Indrawati, I. (2023). The impact of AI writing tools on the content and organization of students' writing: EFL teachers' perspective. *Cogent Education*, *10*(2), 2236469. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2236469

Moran, R., & Billen, M. (2014). The reading and writing connection: Merging two reciprocal content areas. *Georgia Educational Researcher, 11*(1), 188-208. https://doi.org/10.20429/ger.2014.110108

Saddler, B., Asaro-Saddler, K., Moeyaert, M., & Cuccio-Slichko, J. (2019). Teaching summary writing to students with learning disabilities via strategy instruction. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, *35*(6), 572-586. https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2019.1600085

Torres, R. (2014). *Word processing in support of writing: Effects and implications*. Unpublished MA Thesis: California State University.

Van der Steen. S, Samuelson. D, & Thomson. J. (2017). The effect of keyboard-based word processing on students with different working memory capacity during the process of academic writing. *Written Communication*. 34(3): 280-305. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088317714232

Wilson, D. G., & Wagner, E. E. (1981). The Watson-Glaser critical thinking appraisal as a predictor of performance in a critical thinking course. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *41*(4), 1319-1322. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316448104100443

Yaser, A. (2021). The effect of using word processor in teaching writing skill among secondary students in schools in Jordan. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *16*(7), 272-278. doi: https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2019.3757

Yeh, H. C., Yang, S. H., & Chen, G. L. (2020). Exploring students' integrated reading and summary writing processes through an online system. *English Teaching & Learning*, 44, 21-43. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-019-00026-1

Yohana, E., & Anugerahwati, M. (2023). Researching summary writing through Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL): A systematic review. *MEXTESOL Journal*, *47*(3), n3. https://www.mextesol.net/journal/index.php?page=journal&id_article=46466