

What Makes a Good Summary?

Investigating the Focus of Automatic Summarization in an Educational Context

Maartje ter Hoeve
University of Amsterdam
m.a.terhoeve@uva.nl

Julia Kiseleva
Microsoft Research
julia.kiseleva@microsoft.com

Maarten de Rijke
University of Amsterdam & Ahold
Delhaize
m.derijke@uva.nl

ABSTRACT


Automatic text summarization has enjoyed great progress over the last years. However, there is little research that investigates whether the current research focus adheres to users' needs. Importantly, these needs are dependent on the envisioned target group of the generated summaries. One such important target group is formed by students, due to their usage of summaries in their study activities. For this reason, we investigate students' needs regarding automatically generated summaries by means of a survey amongst university students and find that the current direction of the field does not fully align with their needs. Motivated by our findings, we formulate three groups of implications that together help us formulate a renewed perspective on future research on automatic summarization. First, the educational domain requires a broader perspective on automatic summarization, beyond the approaches that are currently the standard. We illustrate how we can expand these approaches regarding the input material, the purpose of the summaries and their potential format and we define requirements for datasets that can facilitate these research directions. Second, we propose a methodology to evaluate the usefulness of a summary based on the identified needs of a target group. Third, in more general terms, we hope that our survey will be reused to investigate the needs of different user groups of automatically generated summaries to broaden our perspective even further.

1 INTRODUCTION


Automatic text summarization has been an important research direction since the early days of the IR and NLP communities [30]. The – often *implicit* – goal is to generate a condensed textual version of the original input document(s), while preserving the main message of the original source(s).

In recent years, the quality of automatically generated textual summaries has increased tremendously with the rise of neural sequence to sequence models [e.g., 8, 47]. The introduction of Transformers [53] and self-supervised language representation models like BERT [12] have given the summarization quality an additional boost [e.g., 24, 27, 28, 58]. The quality of the summaries is measured by today's most common evaluation metrics for the summarization task. These metrics, computed either automatically or by performing a human evaluation, focus on characteristics such as informativeness, fluency, succinctness and, especially recently, factuality [e.g., 18, 25, 36, 38, 40, 55].

Currently, the *needs* of the users of the generated summaries are often not explicitly addressed, even though this is an important aspect in *explicit* definitions of (the goal of) automatic summarization [e.g., 31, 48]. For example, Mani [31] defines this goal as: “to take an information source, extract content from it, and present the



(a) Most current automatic text summarization techniques.



(b) Example of automatic text summarization with users' desires.

Figure 1: Summarization methods that are currently the standard vs. example of summarizing while taking users' wishes and desires into account.

most important content to the user in a condensed form and in a manner sensitive to the user's or application's needs.” Notably, different groups of users have different needs. In this paper we argue that these needs deserve more attention and we lead by example by investigating the needs of university students. University students form an important target group of automatically generated summaries, as research has shown that students can benefit from using pre-made summaries in a range of study activities [43]. However, the desired characteristics of the summaries have not been extensively investigated so far. Note that we use the word *pre-made* to differentiate these summaries from summaries that students write themselves, for example to help them to understand a text [e.g., 41]. Instead, pre-made summaries are made by someone else, e.g., a teacher who writes a summary to help students studying for their exams. As automatically generated summaries also fall in this category of pre-made summaries, they should have the same characteristics as students desire for this category.

We identify and investigate these characteristics by means of a survey amongst university students. We focus on the classes of context factors defined by Spärck Jones [48]: *input factors*, *purpose*

factors and *output factors*, which describe the input material, the purpose of the summary, and what the summary should look like, respectively. Figure 1 gives an example. Figure 1a shows the textual, unstructured input and output of most current textual summarization techniques. Purpose factors are often ignored. Figure 1b shows an example of how the interpretation of these factors could differ, keeping the purpose of the summary for the user in mind.

We conclude this paper by carefully examining the implications of our findings. By doing so, we contribute the following:

- C1 We unveil important and underexposed research directions for automatic summarization in the educational domain. We structure these directions according to the context factors and define requirements for dataset collection efforts to support these research directions;
- C2 We propose a new, feasible and comprehensive evaluation methodology to evaluate the usefulness of a generated summary, and hence to evaluate whether a generated summary is useful for its intended purpose;
- C3 We contribute a survey that can be easily adapted and reused to investigate the needs of different target groups regarding automatic summarization.

We discuss related work in Section 2. In Section 3 we describe our survey. We present our results in Section 4. In Section 5 we discuss the implications of our research for future research on automatic text summarization and we conclude in Section 6.

2 RELATED WORK

We first establish that automatic summarization methods can be of great use in education (Section 2.1). Next, we introduce the context factors [48] in greater detail (Section 2.2) and use them to survey automatic text summarization methods (Section 2.3). Finally, we survey evaluation schemes for automatic summarization (Section 2.4).

2.1 Automatic summarization for education

Traditionally, summaries play an important role in education. Several studies provide evidence that writing summaries can improve students’ performance in a range of study activities [e.g., 3, 42], although Spigel and Delaney [49] provide some counter evidence. Reder and Anderson [43] find that students who use a pre-made summary score better on a range of study activities than students who do not use such a summary.

Digital tools and devices are increasingly important in education, for example through the use of mobile devices during learning, or by using web-based tools that can support learning [19, 29]. With these developments, educators need to be aware of the pedagogical implications, i.e., they need to understand what is the best way to make use of all new possibilities [1, 19].

As the quality of automatically generated summaries increases, [e.g., 24, 58], so does the potential to use these summaries in the educational domain. However, as we will see in the remainder of this section, current automatic summarization efforts often do not explicitly address the users’ needs, whereas this is an important requirement for being able to generate useful summaries for the educational domain. In this paper we bridge this gap by means of a

survey amongst university students, resulting in concrete suggestions for developing methods for automatic summarization in this domain.

2.2 Requirements of an automated summary

Spärck Jones [48] argues that one should take the context of a summary into account in order to generate useful summaries – a statement that has been repeated by others [e.g., 4, 31]. To do this in a structured manner, she defines three classes of *context factors*: *input*, *purpose*, and *output factors*. Each of these classes is concerned with an aspect of the summarization process. Input factors describe the input material that is to be summarized. Output factors describe what the generated summary looks like. Purpose factors are the most important context factors according to Spärck Jones; they describe the purpose of the generated summary. The purpose factors are often not fully recognized – a statement that is still timely at present, as we will show in Section 2.3. Each context factor class can be divided into more fine-grained classes. In this paper we use these fine-grained classes to understand students’ needs regarding automatic summarization and to define important research directions that follow from these observations. We refer to Table 3 in Appendix A for an extensive overview.

2.3 Automatic text summarization

We structure our discussion of the related work on automatic summarization around the three context factor classes. Specifically, we connect this work to the fine-grained factors that each of the context factor classes can be divided into.

Input factors. We start with the fine-grained input factor *unit*, which describes how many sources are to be summarized at once, and the factor *scale*, which describes the length of the input data that we are summarizing. These factors are related to the difference between single and multi-document summarization [e.g., 8, 9, 28, 34, 36, 56, 59]. *Scale* plays an important role when material shorter than a single document is summarized, such as in sentence summarization [e.g., 45]. Regarding the *genre* of the input material, we see that most current work on automatic text summarization focuses on the news domain or Wikipedia [e.g., 20, 22, 27, 35, 46]. A smaller body of work addresses different input genres, such as scientific articles [e.g., 10], forum data [e.g., 54], or opinions [e.g., 2]. The aforementioned differences are closely related to the input factor *subject type*, which describes the difficulty level of the input material. The factor *medium* refers to the input language. Most research on automatic text summarization is concerned with English as language input, although there are exceptions, such as Chinese [e.g., 21] or multi-lingual input [23]. The last input factor is *structure*. Especially in recent neural approaches, explicit structure of the input text is often ignored. Exceptions include graph based approaches, where implicit structure is used to summarize a document [e.g., 50, 59], and summarization of tabular data [e.g., 60] or screenplays [e.g., 39].

Purpose factors. Although identified as the most important context factor class by Spärck Jones [48] – and followed by, for example, Mani [31] – purpose factors do not receive a substantial amount of attention in work on automatic summarization. There are some exceptions, such as query-based summarization [e.g., 26, 37],

question-driven summarization [e.g., 11] and personalized summarization [e.g., 33]. They take the *situation* and the *audience* into account. The *use-cases* of the generated summaries are also clearer in these approaches than in typical work on automatic text summarization.

Output factors. We start with the output factors *style* and *material*. The latter is concerned with the degree of coverage of the summary. Most generated summaries have an *informative* style and cover most of the input material. There are exceptions. For example, the XSum dataset [35] constructs summaries of a single sentence and is therefore more *indicative* in terms of style and inevitably less of the input material is covered. Not many summaries have a *critical* or *aggregative* style. Aggregative summaries put different source texts in relation to one another, to give an overview of a topic. Currently, most popular summarization techniques focus on a *running format*. Work on template based summarization follows a more *headed* (structured) *format* [e.g., 7]. Falke and Gurevych [16] introduce a more structured format in the form of concept maps and Wu et al. [57] make knowledge graphs. There is also a small body of work on multi-modal summarization, which has a more structured output [e.g., 52, 62]. The difference between *abstractive* and *extractive* summarization is likely the best known distinction in output type [e.g., 17, 28, 34, 36, 47], although it is not entirely clear which output factor best describes the difference.

The context factors form an excellent framework to understand users’ needs regarding automatically generated summaries. In this work we use them to investigate students’ needs regarding these summaries by means of a survey. Our survey can be easily adapted and reused to investigate the needs of different target groups.

2.4 Evaluation

Evaluation methods for automatic text summarization can be grouped in different ways. One way is in *intrinsic* vs. *extrinsic* evaluation methods [32]. *Intrinsic* methods evaluate the model itself, for example on informativeness or fluency [e.g., 28, 40]. *Extrinsic* methods target how well the summary performs when used for a certain task [e.g., 13, 55]. Extrinsic methods require a lot of resources, which explains the popularity of intrinsic methods.

Another popular way to distinguish different types of evaluation metrics is between *automatic* and *human* evaluation. Over the years, different *automatic* metrics have been proposed. Rouge [25], which is most popular, evaluates on lexical similarity. The recently proposed BERTScore [61] evaluates on semantic similarity. Wang et al. [55] introduce an automatic extrinsic way of evaluating generated summaries, by automatically generating questions about an input document and answering these questions based on the summary. A similar approach is proposed by Durmus et al. [15]. Most *human* evaluation approaches evaluate intrinsic factors such as informativeness, readability and conciseness [14, 28, 34, 40] – factors that are difficult to evaluate automatically. There are some examples of extrinsic human evaluation methods, where judges are asked to perform a certain task based on the summary. Examples are relevance assessment, where the relevance of a document for a certain topic is judged based on its summary [13], and reading comprehension, such as question answering [36].




Figure 2: Participant details.

So far, *usefulness* is not evaluated in a feasible and comprehensive manner, whereas it is an important metric to evaluate whether generated summaries fulfil users’ needs. In this paper, we follow the definition of the English Oxford Learner’s Dictionary¹ for usefulness: “*the fact of being useful or possible to use*”, where *useful* is defined as “*that can help you to do or achieve what you want*”. The few existing metrics are often either very resource demanding and too task specific [e.g., 13, 44] or too little specific and hence ignoring the purpose factors [e.g., 14]. Moreover, these metrics are ignored by most current work on automatic summarization. In this paper we aim to bridge the gap by introducing a feasible and comprehensive evaluation methodology to evaluate usefulness.

3 SURVEY PARTICIPANTS AND PROCEDURE

In order to identify the requirements for automatic summarization methods that can serve the educational domain, we conduct a survey amongst university students. In this section we describe the participants (Section 3.1) and our survey procedure (Section 3.2).

3.1 Participants

We recruited participants among university students by contacting ongoing courses and student associations, and through advertisements on internal student websites. As an incentive, we offered a ten euro shopping voucher to ten randomly selected participants.

A total of 118 participants started the survey and 82 completed the full survey, resulting in a 69.5% completion rate. We only include participants who completed the study in our analysis. Participants spent 10 minutes on average on the survey. In the final part of our survey we ask participants to indicate their current level of education and main field of study. The details are given in Figure 2.

3.2 Survey procedure

Figure 3 shows a brief and schematic overview of our survey procedure. A detailed account is given in Appendix B, Figure 8. We arrived at the final version of the survey after a number of initial pilot runs where we ensured participants understood their task and all questions. We ran the survey with [surveymonkey.com](https://www.surveymonkey.com). The entire survey – with the exact formulation of the instructions, questions and answer options – is included in Appendix C to ensure reproducibility. Our survey can be re-used to inquire different target groups, with some modifications to match the target group. For example, the current framing around study activities can easily be adapted to activities representative for another target group. As

¹<https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/>




Figure 3: Overview of survey procedure.

such, we hope that our survey can also serve as a starting point to investigate the needs of many other user groups of automatic summarization.

Introduction. The survey starts with an introduction in which we explain to participants what to expect, how we process the data and that participation is voluntarily. After participants agree with this, an explanation of the term *pre-made summary* follows. As we do not want to bias participants by stating that the summary was automatically generated, we explain that this summary can be made by anyone, e.g., a teacher, a good performing fellow student, the authors of the original material, or a computer. Recall from Section 1 that an automatically generated summary is a pre-made summary and, hence, our survey identifies the characteristics of a good, automatically generated summary should have. We also give examples of types of pre-made summaries; based on the feedback from pilot experiments we noticed that participants were missing this information. We explicitly state that these are just examples and that participants can come up with any type of summary themselves.

Context factors. In the main part of our survey we focus on the context factors. First, we ask participants whether they have made use of a pre-made summary in one of their recent study activities. If so, we ask them to choose the study activity where a summary was most useful. We call this group of participants the *remembered* group, as they describe an existing summary from memory. If participants indicate that they have not used a pre-made summary in one of their recent study activities, we ask them whether they can imagine a situation where a pre-made summary would have been helpful. If not, we ask them to explain their answer and lead them to the final background questions and closing page. If yes, we ask them to keep this imaginary situation in mind for the rest of the survey. We call this group the *imagined* group.

Now we ask the *remembered* and *imagined* groups about the input, purpose and output factors of the summary they have in mind. We ask questions for each of the subcategories of the context factors that we discussed in Section 2. At this point, the two groups are in different branches of the survey. The difference between the branches is mainly linguistically motivated: in the *imagined* group we use verbs of probability instead of asking them to describe an existing situation. A number of questions can only be asked in the *remembered* group, e.g., how helpful the summary was.

For the first question of the context factors part, we ask participants what the study material consisted of. We give them a number of options, as well as an ‘other’ checkbox. To avoid position bias, all answers options for multiple choice and multiple response questions in the survey are randomized, with the ‘other’ checkbox always as the last option. If participants do not choose the ‘mainly text’ option for this first question, we tell them that we focus on textual input in the current study² and we ask them whether

²We acknowledge that other modalities as well as a mixture of modalities are important to investigate, but leave this for future work to ensure clarity in our results.

Table 1: Different levels of investigation. We did not find significant differences for each, but add all for completeness.

-
- 1 All respondents together
 - 2 *Remembered* branch vs *imagined* branch
 - 3 Different study fields
 - 4 Different study levels
 - 5 Different levels of how helpful the summary was according to participants, rated on a 5-point Likert Scale (note that only the *remembered* group answered this question)
-

they can think of a situation where the input material consisted of text. If not, we lead participants to the background questions and closing page. If yes, they proceed to the remaining questions that give us a full overview of the input, purpose and output factors of the situation that participants have in mind. Finally, we ask the *remembered* group to suggest how their described summary could be turned into their ideal summary. We then ask both groups for any final remarks about the summary or input material.

Trustworthiness and future features questions. Up to this point we have included the possibility that the summary was made by a computer program, but explicitly also included other options to not bias students. At this point we acknowledge that machine generated summaries could give rise to additional challenges, but also to new opportunities. Although not the main focus of the study, we include some exploratory questions to get an initial understanding of the trust users would have in machine-generated summaries and to get some preliminary ideas for the interpretation of the context factors in a less standard setting. For the first set of questions we tell participants to imagine that the summary was made by a computer, but contained all the needs that were identified in the previous part of the survey. We then ask them questions about trust in computer versus human generated summaries. As a next step we ask participants to imagine that they could interact with the computer program that made the summary in the form of a digital assistant. We tell them not to feel restricted by the capabilities of today’s digital assistants. The full scenario sketch can be found in Appendix C. We then ask participants to select the three most useful and the three least useful features for the digital assistant this scenario, in a similar fashion as ter Hoeve et al. [51].

4 SURVEY RESULTS

Here we present the outcomes for each survey question. We examine the outcomes of all respondents together, but we also investigate the difference between different subcategories of participants, as summarized in Table 1. For space and clarity reasons, we present the results on a *per group* level when interesting differences are found, otherwise we present the results of all respondents together. We use the question formulation as used for the *remembered* group and abbreviate the answer options. Our results open many important research directions for future work on automatic text summarization in the educational domain. We discuss the implications of our findings in Section 5.




Figure 4: Results for the *input factor* questions. Specific input factor in *italics*. Answer type in brackets: MC = Multiple Choice, MR = Multiple Response. ** indicates significance (χ^2), after Bonferroni correction, with $p \ll 0.001$. If two options are flagged with **, these options are not significantly different from each other, yet both have been chosen significantly more often than the other options.

4.1 Identifying branches

Of our participants, 78.0% indicated that they had used a pre-made summary before and hence they were led to the *remembered* branch. Of the remaining 22.0%, 78.2% responded that they could think of a situation where a pre-made summary would be useful for them. They were led to the *imagined* branch. We asked the few remaining participants why they could not think of a situation. People answered that they would not trust a pre-made summary and that making a summary themselves helped them with their study activities. Previous work has indeed found that writing summaries can help with tasks such as reading comprehension [e.g., 41].

4.2 Input factors

Figure 4 shows the results for the input factor questions. Here we highlight some particularly noteworthy results. First, we see that *textual input* is significantly more popular than the other input types (Figure 4a). This result is based on participants' initial responses and not on the follow up question if they selected another option than 'text'. This stresses the relevance of automatic text summarization. Furthermore, participants described a very diverse input for the factors scale and unit (Figure 4b) – much more diverse than the classical focus of automatic summarization. Figure 4e shows that most input material had a considerable amount of structure. Typically,

this structure is discarded in work on automatic summarization, even though it can be an important source of information.


4.3 Purpose factors

Figure 5 shows the results for the purpose factor questions. A first important result is that participants indicated that the summary was *helpful* or *very helpful* (Figure 5f), which allows us to draw valid conclusions from the results of this survey.³ Having established this, we now highlight a number of particularly interesting results from the other questions in this category. When we look at the (ideal) intended *audience* of the summaries, we find that students selected the targeted level (4) and (5) – defined as “*a lot (4) or full (5) domain knowledge is expected from the users of the summary*” – significantly more often than the other options (Figure 5d). Although perhaps an unsurprising result given our target group and their usage of the summaries, it is an important outcome to determine as this expressed need requires a very different level of detail than a, for example, brief overview of a news article.


Figure 5e shows the variety of use cases that students used the summary for. We can see that many different use cases are popular,

³Because we do not find any significant differences in the overall results when we exclude the few participants who did not find their summary helpful and we do not find many correlations w.r.t. how helpful a summary was and a particular context factor, we choose to include all participants in the analysis, regardless of how helpful they found their summary, for completeness.


(a) *Situation (1): What was the goal of this study activity?* (MC)




(b) *Situation (2): Who made this pre-made summary?* (MC, Only if remembered)




(c) *Situation (3): The summary was made specifically to help me (and potentially my fellow students) with my study activity* (LS, Only if remembered)



(d) *Audience: For what type of people was the summary intended?* (LS)



(e) *Use (1): How did this summary help you with your task?* (MR)



(f) *Use (2): Overall, how helpful was the pre-made summary for you?* (LS, Only if remembered)




Figure 5: Results for the *purpose factor* questions. Specific purpose factor in *italics*. Answer type in brackets: MC = Multiple Choice, MR = Multiple Response, LS = Likert Scale. ** indicates significance (χ^2), after Bonferroni correction, with $p \ll 0.001$, * with $p < 0.05$. † indicates noteworthy results where significance was lost after correction for the number of tests. If two options are flagged, these options are not significantly different from each other, yet both were chosen significantly more often than the other options.

whereas the current research on automatic summarization mainly focuses on giving an overview of the input document(s). We decide to show the results according to the *remembered* vs. *imagined* splits, as we find that the *imagined* group chose the options *refresh memory* and *overview* more often than the *remembered* group (Fisher’s exact test, $p < 0.05$). Although this result is not significant after a Bonferroni correction (to correct for the number of tests), we think this can still be insightful when designing future research directions for automatic summarization. Finally, we found that participants in the *imagined* group ticked more boxes than participants in the *remembered* group: 3.33 vs. 2.57 per participant on average, stressing the importance of considering many different use cases for automatically generated summaries.

4.4 Output factors

Figure 6 shows the results for the output factor questions. Textual summaries were significantly more popular than the other summary types (Figure 6a), which again stresses the importance of automatic text summarization. We find that most participants indicated that the summary covered (or should cover) most of the input material

(Figure 6c) – a very relevant observation to consider when designing methods for automatic summarization for the educational domain.

For the output factor *style* we find an interesting difference between the *remembered* and *imagined* group (Figure 6d). Whereas the *remembered* group described significantly more often an *informative* summary, the *imagined* group opted significantly more often for a *critical* or *aggregative* summary. Most research on automatic summarization focusses on informative summaries only – this result opens up important directions for future research.

The results for the described output structure of the summary (Figure 6b) are also very insightful. Participants described a substantially richer format of the pre-made summaries than is adopted in most research on automatic summarization. Instead of consisting of just a running text, the vast majority of participants indicated that the summary contained (or should contain) all kinds of structural elements such as special formatting, diagrams, headings, etc. Moreover, we find that participants in the *imagined* group ticked more answer boxes on average than participants in the *remembered* group: 4.17 vs. 3.56 per participant, indicating a desire for structure in the generated summaries. This is supported by the answers to




Figure 6: Results for the *output factor* questions. Specific output factor in *italics*. Answer type in brackets: MC = Multiple Choice, MR = Multiple Response, LS = Likert Scale. ** indicates significance (χ^2 or Fisher’s exact test), after Bonferroni correction, with $p \ll 0.001$, * with $p < 0.05$.

the open-ended question where we asked participants in the *remembered* group what would be needed to optimize the described summary. We discuss these results in the next paragraph.

4.4.1 Open answer questions. We asked the participants who described an existing summary how this summary could be transformed into their ideal summary. Of the participants who filled out this question, 86.9% made suggestions. Many of these suggestions are centered around adding additional structural elements to the summary, like figures, diagrams or tables. For example, one of the participants wrote: “An ideal summary is good enough to fully replace the original (often longer) texts contained in articles that need to be read for exams. The main purpose behind this is speed of learning from my experience. More tables, graphs and visual representations of the study material and key concepts / links would improve the summary, as I would faster comprehend the study material.”

Participants also indicated a desire for more structure in the summary text itself, for example: “– colors and a key for color-coding – different sections, such as definitions on the left maybe and then the rest of the page reflects the structure of the course material with notes on the readings that have many headings and subheadings.”

Another theme that can be distilled from participants’ answers is the desire to have more examples in the summary. One participant wrote: “More examples i think. For me personally i need examples to understand the material. Now i needed to imagine them myself”.

Some participants wrote that they would like to have a more personalized summary, for example: “I’d highlight some things I find



difficult. So I’d personalise the summary more.” Another participant wrote: “Make it more personalized may be. These notes were by another student. I might have focussed more on some parts and less on others.”

4.5 Trustworthiness and future features

In this section we report the results for the exploratory questions that we asked about the trustworthiness of a summary generated by a machine versus a human, as well as the results for the questions about features for summarization with a digital voice assistant.

We find that participants are divided on the question whether it would make a difference to them whether the summary was generated by a machine or a computer. If we look at all participants together, we find that 48.0.% of the participants answered that it would make a difference, whereas 52.0% answered that it would not. However, if we split the participants based on study background, an interesting difference emerges (Figure 7a). Participants with a background in STEM indicated significantly more often that it would not make a difference to them, whereas the other groups of students indicated the opposite. Almost all participants who answered that it would make a difference said that they would not trust a computer on being able to find the relevant information, i.e., all seemed to favor the human generated summary. Only one participant advocated for the computer generated summary as a “computer is more objective.” Almost all participants who said it would not matter to

- (a) Would it make a difference to you whether the summary was generated by a computer program or by a human? (MC)
- (b) Which type of summary would you trust more: (MC)



- (c) Please choose the three most useful features for a digital assistant to have in this scenario. (MR)
- (d) Please choose the three least useful features for a digital assistant to have in this scenario. (MR)





Figure 7: Results for the future feature questions. Answer type in brackets. MC = Multiple Choice, MR = Multiple Response. ** indicates significance (χ^2 or Fisher’s exact test), after Bonferroni correction, with $p \ll 0.001$.

them did add the condition that the quality of the generated summary should be as good as if a human had generated it. One person wrote: “If the summary captures all previously discussed elements it is effectively good for the same purpose. So then it does not matter who generated it.” This comment exactly captures the motivation of the setup of our survey.

This caution regarding automatically generated summaries is confirmed by the question where we asked which type of summary participants would trust more – a human generated one or a machine generated one. People chose the human generated summary significantly more often (Figure 7b). This also holds for the participants with a STEM background, which aligns with the responses to the open questions we reported earlier – apparently participants do not fully trust that the condition they raised earlier would be satisfied, namely that only if the machine was just as good as the human, it would not matter for them whether the summary was generated by a machine or a human.

The results for the most and least useful features for a digital assistant in a summarization scenario are given in Figure 7c and 7d. Adding more details to the summary and answering questions based on the content of the summary are very popular features, whereas summarizing parts of the input material with less detail is not.

Lastly, we asked participants whether they could think of any other features that they would like their digital assistant to have in the outlined scenario. A number of participants answered that

they would like the digital assistant to generate questions based on the summary, so that they could test their own understanding. For example, one participant said: “Make questions for me (to test me)” and another participant had a related comment: “Maybe the digital assistant could find old exam questions to link to parts of the summary where the question is related to, so that there is a function to test if you’ve understood the summary.” Another line of answers pointed towards giving explicit relations between the input material and summary, for example: “Show links between subject materials and what their relation is” and another person wrote: “Dynamic linking from summary to original source is a great added value of generating a summary”.

5 IMPLICATIONS AND PERSPECTIVES

In the previous section we have presented the results of our survey on a per question basis. Here we discuss our findings as general implications for future research on summarization in the educational domain (Section 5.1) and we propose a methodology to evaluate the usefulness of generated summaries (Section 5.2).

5.1 Context factors

In Table 2 we summarize the implications of our findings for future research efforts on summarization methods and models in the educational domain, as well as the requirements for datasets that support these directions. By doing so, we formulate a renewed

Table 2: Implications of our findings, focusing on the context factors and dataset collection efforts.

Context Factor	Implications for summarization methods	Implications for dataset requirements
Input factors	Increase focus on developing methods and models that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can handle a wide variety and a mixture of input documents at once; • can understand the relationships between different input documents; • can use the structure of the input documents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase usage of existing datasets that are close to the educational domain in terms of genre, scale and subject type [e.g., 10, 22, 27]. • Collect additional datasets with an educational genre and scale, such as a combination of study books and book chapters and different related research articles.
Purpose factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicitly define standpoint on purpose factors in each research project. • Include a comprehensive evaluation methodology to evaluate usefulness (we propose this in Section 5.2). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase usage of existing datasets that contain ground truth summaries that require a lot of domain knowledge [e.g., 10] and collect additional datasets with this requirement in the educational domain. • Collect datasets in the educational domain with labeled summaries meant for different use cases, e.g., previewing the input, reviewing it, substituting it, etc.
Output factors	Increase focus on developing methods and models that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can explicitly model and understand relationships between different elements in the summary and potentially relate this back to the input document(s); • can output different summary styles; informative, aggregative or critical. Especially these last two require a deep understanding of the input document(s). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect datasets from the educational domain that include ground truth summaries with different formats and styles.

perspective on important future research directions for automatic summarization in the educational domain.

5.2 Usefulness as evaluation methodology

Following Spärck Jones [48] and Mani [31] we argue that only a correct choice of context factors will result in a useful summary for users, i.e., following the definition from Section 2, a summary that can help users do or achieve what they want. Moreover, it is important to explicitly evaluate this *usefulness*. In our survey we found that participants mostly found their described summaries very helpful, yet it is hard to define a single factor that makes a summary particularly helpful and hence simply checking for certain context factors will not lead to a comprehensive evaluation of the usefulness of a generated summary. Instead, it is the combination of factors that counts. Therefore, usefulness can best be evaluated with a human evaluation. As existing metrics are very resource demanding [e.g., 13, 44] or not comprehensive enough [e.g., 14], we propose a feasible and comprehensive method to evaluate usefulness.

First, from the purpose factors, the intended *use factors* [48] of the summary need to be identified. The use factors as defined by Spärck Jones are: using the summary to *retrieve* a document, to *preview* a document, to *substitute* it entirely, to *refresh your memory* or to *prompt* you to read the source text. If required, one can add additional use factors, such as *understanding* the document or *getting an overview* of the document, which both were two popular options in our survey. Next, the output factors need to be evaluated on these use factors. For this, we take inspiration from research on *simulated work tasks* [5]. Evaluators should be given a specific task

to imagine, e.g., *writing a news article*, or *studying for an exam*. This task should be relatable to the evaluators, so that reliable answers can be obtained [6]. With this task in mind, evaluators should be asked to judge two summaries in a pairwise manner on their usefulness, in the following format: *The [output factor] of which of these two summaries is most useful to you to [use factor]?* An example of such a question would be: *The style of which of these two summaries is most useful to you to substitute a chapter that you need to learn for your exam preparation?* As with all human evaluations, it is important to ensure that judges understand the meaning of each of the evaluation criteria, e.g., *style* and *substitute* in the example. We give example questions for each of the remaining output and use factors in Appendix D.

6 CONCLUSION

In this paper we have argued for an increased focus on the needs of users of automatically generated summaries. We have lead by example by investigating the needs of an important target group of automatically generated summaries: university students. By means of a survey, we focused on three classes of essential context factors: input, purpose and output factors. We have identified a renewed perspective on the future of automatic summarization research in the educational domain, both in terms of methods and models and in terms of dataset collection efforts. We also proposed a new methodology to evaluate the usefulness of automatically generated summaries. Our study opens important future directions for automatic summarization in the educational domain and aims to inspire follow up research that identifies the needs of different target groups of automatic summarization methods.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Ana Lucic for her helpful feedback. This research was supported by the Nationale Politie. All content represents the opinion of the authors, which is not necessarily shared or endorsed by their respective employers and/or sponsors.

REFERENCES

- [1] Lisbeth Amhag, Lisa Hellström, and Martin Stigmar. 2019. Teacher educators' use of digital tools and needs for digital competence in higher education. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education* 35, 4 (2019), 203–220.
- [2] Reinald Kim Amplayo and Mirella Lapata. 2020. Unsupervised Opinion Summarization with Noising and Denoising. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10150* (2020).
- [3] Mary CM Anderson and Keith W Thiede. 2008. Why do delayed summaries improve metacomprehension accuracy? *Acta psychologica* 128, 1 (2008), 110–118.
- [4] Abdelkrime Aries, Walid Khaled Hidouci, et al. 2019. Automatic text summarization: What has been done and what has to be done. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.00688* (2019).
- [5] Pia Borlund. 2003. The IIR evaluation model: a framework for evaluation of interactive information retrieval systems. *Information research* 8, 3 (2003), 8–3.
- [6] Pia Borlund. 2016. A study of the use of simulated work task situations in interactive information retrieval evaluations. *Journal of Documentation* 72, 3 (2016), 394–413.
- [7] Ziqiang Cao, Wenjie Li, Sujian Li, and Furu Wei. 2018. Retrieve, rerank and rewrite: Soft template based neural summarization. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 152–161.
- [8] Jianpeng Cheng and Mirella Lapata. 2016. Neural summarization by extracting sentences and words. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.07252* (2016).
- [9] Sumit Chopra, Michael Auli, and Alexander M Rush. 2016. Abstractive sentence summarization with attentive recurrent neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. 93–98.
- [10] Arman Cohan, Franck Dernoncourt, Doo Soon Kim, Trung Bui, Seokhwan Kim, Walter Chang, and Nazli Goharian. 2018. A discourse-aware attention model for abstractive summarization of long documents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.05685* (2018).
- [11] Yang Deng, Wenxuan Zhang, and Wai Lam. 2020. Multi-hop Inference for Question-driven Summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.03738* (2020).
- [12] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018).
- [13] Bonnie Dorr, Christof Monz, Stacy President, Richard Schwartz, and David Zajic. 2005. A methodology for extrinsic evaluation of text summarization: does ROUGE correlate?. In *Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evaluation Measures for Machine Translation and/or Summarization*. 1–8.
- [14] DUC. 2003. DUC 2003: Documents, Tasks, and Measures. (2003).
- [15] Esin Durmus, He He, and Mona Diab. 2020. FEQA: A Question Answering Evaluation Framework for Faithfulness Assessment in Abstractive Summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.03754* (2020).
- [16] Tobias Falke and Iryna Gurevych. 2017. Bringing structure into summaries: Crowdsourcing a benchmark corpus of concept maps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.04452* (2017).
- [17] Sebastian Gehrmann, Yuntian Deng, and Alexander Rush. 2018. Bottom-Up Abstractive Summarization. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 4098–4109.
- [18] Ben Goodrich, Vinay Rao, Peter J Liu, and Mohammad Saleh. 2019. Assessing the factual accuracy of generated text. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 166–175.
- [19] Harwati Hashim. 2018. Application of technology in the digital era education. *International Journal of Research in Counseling and Education* 2, 1 (2018), 1–5.
- [20] Karl Moritz Hermann, Tomas Kocisky, Edward Grefenstette, Lasse Espeholt, Will Kay, Mustafa Suleyman, and Phil Blunsom. 2015. Teaching machines to read and comprehend. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 1693–1701.
- [21] Baotian Hu, Qingcai Chen, and Fangze Zhu. 2015. Lcsts: A large scale chinese short text summarization dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.05865* (2015).
- [22] Mahnaz Koupaee and William Yang Wang. 2018. Wikihow: A large scale text summarization dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.09305* (2018).
- [23] Faisal Ladhak, Esin Durmus, Claire Cardie, and Kathleen McKeown. 2020. WikiLingua: A New Benchmark Dataset for Cross-Lingual Abstractive Summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.03093* (2020).
- [24] Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Ves Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2019. Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13461* (2019).
- [25] Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. Rouge: A Package for Automatic Evaluation of Summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*. 74–81.
- [26] Marina Litvak and Natalia Vanetik. 2017. Query-based summarization using MDL principle. In *Proceedings of the multiling 2017 workshop on summarization and summary evaluation across source types and genres*. 22–31.
- [27] Peter J Liu, Mohammad Saleh, Etienne Pot, Ben Goodrich, Ryan Sepassi, Lukasz Kaiser, and Noam Shazeer. 2018. Generating wikipedia by summarizing long sequences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.10198* (2018).
- [28] Yang Liu and Mirella Lapata. 2019. Text summarization with pretrained encoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.08345* (2019).
- [29] Rosemary Luckin, Brett Bligh, Andrew Manches, Shaaron Ainsworth, Charles Crook, and Richard Noss. 2012. Decoding learning: The proof, promise and potential of digital education. (2012).
- [30] Hans Peter Luhn. 1958. The automatic creation of literature abstracts. *IBM Journal of research and development* 2, 2 (1958), 159–165.
- [31] Inderjeet Mani. 2001. *Automatic summarization*. Vol. 3. John Benjamins Publishing.
- [32] Inderjeet Mani. 2001. Summarization evaluation: An overview. (2001).
- [33] Róbert Móra et al. 2012. Personalized text summarization based on important terms identification. In *2012 23rd International Workshop on Database and Expert Systems Applications*. IEEE, 131–135.
- [34] Ramesh Nallapati, Feifei Zhai, and Bowen Zhou. 2017. SummaRuNNer: A Recurrent Neural Network based Sequence Model for Extractive Summarization of Documents. In *AAAI*. 3075–3081.
- [35] Shashi Narayan, Shay B Cohen, and Mirella Lapata. 2018. Don't give me the details, just the summary! topic-aware convolutional neural networks for extreme summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.08745* (2018).
- [36] Shashi Narayan, Shay B Cohen, and Mirella Lapata. 2018. Ranking Sentences for Extractive Summarization with Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.08636* (2018).
- [37] Preksha Nema, Mitesh M Khapra, Anirban Laha, and Balaraman Ravindran. 2017. Diversity driven attention model for query-based abstractive summarization. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 1063–1072.
- [38] Ani Nenkova and Rebecca J Passonneau. 2004. Evaluating content selection in summarization: The pyramid method. In *Proceedings of the human language technology conference of the north american chapter of the association for computational linguistics: Hlt-naacl 2004*. 145–152.
- [39] Pinelopi Papalampidi, Frank Keller, Lea Frermann, and Mirella Lapata. 2020. Screenplay Summarization Using Latent Narrative Structure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.12727* (2020).
- [40] Romain Paulus, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2017. A deep reinforced model for abstractive summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.04304* (2017).
- [41] P David Pearson, Linda Fielding, et al. 1991. Comprehension instruction. *Handbook of reading research* 2, 815–860 (1991).
- [42] Sally A Radmacher and Elizabeth Latosi-Sawin. 1995. Summary writing: A tool to improve student comprehension and writing in psychology. *Teaching of Psychology* 22, 2 (1995), 113–115.
- [43] Lynne M Reder and John R Anderson. 1980. A comparison of texts and their summaries: Memorial consequences. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 19, 2 (1980), 121–134.
- [44] Giuseppe Riccardi, Frederic Bechet, Morena Danieli, Benoit Favre, Robert Gaizauskas, Udo Kruschwitz, and Massimo Poesio. 2015. The sensei project: Making sense of human conversations. In *International Workshop on Future and Emerging Trends in Language Technology*. Springer, 10–33.
- [45] Alexander M Rush, Sumit Chopra, and Jason Weston. 2015. A neural attention model for abstractive sentence summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.00685* (2015).
- [46] Evan Sandhaus. 2008. The new york times annotated corpus. *Linguistic Data Consortium, Philadelphia* 6, 12 (2008), e26752.
- [47] Abigail See, Peter J Liu, and Christopher D Manning. 2017. Get to the point: Summarization with pointer-generator networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.04368* (2017).
- [48] Karen Spärck Jones. 1998. Automatic summarizing: factors and directions. In *Advances in automatic text summarization*. Number 1. MIT press Cambridge, Mass, USA, 1–12.
- [49] Arie S Spigel and Peter F Delaney. 2016. Does writing summaries improve memory for text? *Educational Psychology Review* 28, 1 (2016), 171–196.
- [50] Jiwei Tan, Xiaojun Wan, and Jianguo Xiao. 2017. Abstractive document summarization with a graph-based attentional neural model. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 1171–1181.
- [51] Maartje ter Hoeve, Robert Sim, Elnaz Nouri, Adam Fourney, Maarten de Rijke, and Ryen W White. 2020. Conversations with Documents: An Exploration of Document-Centered Assistance. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Human Information Interaction and Retrieval*. 43–52.
- [52] Naushad UzZaman, Jeffrey P Bigham, and James F Allen. 2011. Multimodal summarization of complex sentences. In *Proceedings of the 16th international*

- conference on Intelligent user interfaces*. 43–52.
- [53] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 5998–6008.
 - [54] Michael Völske, Martin Potthast, Shahbaz Syed, and Benno Stein. 2017. Tl; dr: Mining reddit to learn automatic summarization. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on New Frontiers in Summarization*. 59–63.
 - [55] Alex Wang, Kyunghyun Cho, and Mike Lewis. 2020. Asking and Answering Questions to Evaluate the Factual Consistency of Summaries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.04228* (2020).
 - [56] Lu Wang, Hema Raghavan, Vittorio Castelli, Radu Florian, and Claire Cardie. 2016. A sentence compression based framework to query-focused multi-document summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.07548* (2016).
 - [57] Zeqiu Wu, Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Mari Ostendorf, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2020. Extracting Summary Knowledge Graphs from Long Documents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.09162* (2020).
 - [58] Jiacheng Xu, Zhe Gan, Yu Cheng, and Jingjing Liu. 2020. Discourse-Aware Neural Extractive Text Summarization. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
 - [59] Michihiro Yasunaga, Rui Zhang, Kshitij Meelu, Ayush Pareek, Krishnan Srinivasan, and Dragomir Radev. 2017. Graph-based Neural Multi-Document Summarization. In *Proceedings of the 21st Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL 2017)*. 452–462.
 - [60] Shuo Zhang, Zhuyun Dai, Krisztian Balog, and Jamie Callan. 2020. Summarizing and Exploring Tabular Data in Conversational Search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.11490* (2020).
 - [61] Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2019. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09675* (2019).
 - [62] Junnan Zhu, Haoran Li, Tianshang Liu, Yu Zhou, Jiajun Zhang, Chengqing Zong, et al. 2018. MSMO: multimodal summarization with multimodal output. (2018).

A OVERVIEW CONTEXT FACTORS

Table 3: Overview of different context factors classes defined by Spärck Jones [48], with descriptions of the factors within these classes.

Input Factors	Purpose Factors	Output Factors
Form	Situation	Material
<i>Structure:</i> How is the input text structured? E.g. subheadings, rhetorical patterns, etc.	<i>Tied:</i> It is known who will use the summary, for what purpose and when.	<i>Covering:</i> The summary covers all of the important information in the source text.
<i>Scale:</i> How large is the input data that we are summarizing? E.g. a book, a chapter, a single article, etc.	<i>Floating:</i> It is not (exactly) known who will use the summary, for what purpose or when.	<i>Partial:</i> The summary (intentionally) covers only parts of the important information in the source text.
<i>Medium:</i> What is the input language type? E.g. full text, telegraphese style, etc. This also refers to which natural language is used.	Audience	Format
<i>Genre:</i> What type of literacy does the input text have? E.g. description, narrative, etc.	<i>Targetted:</i> A lot of domain knowledge is expected from the readers of the summary.	<i>Running:</i> The summary is formatted as an abstract like text.
Subject Type	<i>Untargetted:</i> No domain knowledge is expected from the readers of the summary.	<i>Headed:</i> The summary is structured following a certain standardised format with headings and other explicit structure.
<i>Ordinary:</i> Everyone could understand this input type.	Use	Style
<i>Specialized:</i> You need to speak the jargon to understand this input type.	<i>Retrieving:</i> Use the summary to retrieve source text.	<i>Informative:</i> The summary conveys the raw information that is in the source text.
<i>Restricted:</i> The input type text is only understandable for people familiar with a certain area, for example because it contains local names.	<i>Previewing:</i> Use the summary preview a text that one is about to read.	<i>Indicative:</i> The summary just states the topic of the source text, nothing more.
Unit	<i>Substitutes:</i> Use the summary as a substitute for the source text.	<i>Critical:</i> The summary gives a critical review of the merits of the source text.
<i>Single:</i> Only one input source is given.	<i>Refreshing:</i> Use the summary to refresh ones memory of the source text.	<i>Aggregative:</i> Different source texts are put in relation to one another to give an overview of a certain topic.
<i>Multi:</i> Multiple input sources are given	<i>Prompts:</i> Use the summary as action prompt to read the source text.	

B SURVEY OVERVIEW




Figure 8: Overview survey design.

C VERBATIM SURVEY OVERVIEW

Table 4: A complete overview of the survey. This table includes the explanation that participants received, as well as all the questions and the answer options. If a question was the start of a branch, the direction of the branch has been written behind the answer options in *italic*. (This was never shown to the participants.) Note that the survey was performed in SurveyMonkey.⁴ The survey had a lay-out as provided by SurveyMonkey, i.e., it consisted of different pages and colors were used to highlight certain important parts in texts.

Question Nr.	Question and Answer Options
Q1	<p>Introduction and Instructions</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to fill out this survey! Before you start, please take the time to read these instructions carefully. If you still have any questions after reading the instructions, please send them to [anonymized].</p> <p>We will give away 10 [anonymized] vouchers of 10 [anonymized currency] each among the participants. If you would like to take part in the raffle, you can leave your email address at the end of this survey.</p> <p>Goal of the study</p> <p>The goal of this survey is to get insight in how summaries help or can help you when studying.</p> <p>What the survey will look like</p> <p>In what follows you will get questions that aim to develop an understanding for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• For which types of study material it is useful to have summaries• How these summaries can help you with your task• What these summaries should look like <p>We expect this survey to take approximately 10 minutes of your time.</p> <p>Use the next button to go to the next page once you have filled out all the questions on the page. Use the prev button to go back one page.</p> <p>About your privacy</p> <p>We value your privacy and will process your answers anonymously. The answers of all participants in this survey will be used to gain insight in how pre-made summaries can be helpful for different types of studying activities. The answers will be presented in a research paper about this topic. This will be done either in an aggregated manner, or by citing verbatim examples of the answers. Again, this will all be done anonymously.</p> <p>I agree that I have read and understood the instructions. I also understand that my participation in this survey is voluntarily.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I agree</p>

⁴<http://surveymonkey.com>

Question Nr. Question and Answer Options

Q2 Important! Some background knowledge you need to know

Throughout this survey we make use of the term pre-made summary. It is very important that you understand what this means. On this page we explain this term, so please make sure to read this carefully.

Definition pre-made summary

One type of summary is one that you make yourself. Another type of summary is one that has been made for you. In this survey, we focus on this latter type and we call them pre-made summaries.

Who makes these pre-made summaries?

These pre-made summaries can be made by a person, for example your teacher, your friend, a fellow student or someone at some official organisation, etc. The pre-made summaries can also be made by a computer.

What kinds of summaries are we talking about?

There are no restrictions on what these pre-made summaries can look like. On the contrary, that is one of the things we aim to find out with this survey! But, to give some examples, you could think of a written overview of a text book, highlights in text to draw your attention to important bits, blog posts, etc. These are really just examples and don't let them limit your creativity! You can come up with any example of a pre-made summary that is helpful for you.

Yes, I understand what a pre-made summary is!

Yes

Q3 Please think back to your recent study activities. Examples of study activities can be: studying for an exam, writing a paper, doing homework exercises, etc. Note that these are just examples, any other study activity is fine too.

Did you use a pre-made summary in any of these study activities?

Yes – participants are led to Q6

No – participants are led to Q4

Q4 Can you think of one of your recent study activities where a pre-made summary would have been useful for you?

Yes – participants are led to Q25

No – participants are led to Q5

Q5 Why do you think a pre-made summary would not have helped you with any of your recent study activities?

Open response – participants are led to Q48

Start branch of participants who described an existing summary

If you have multiple study activities where you used a pre-made summary, please take the one where you found the pre-made summary most useful.

Question Nr. Question and Answer Options

- Q6 **The original study material consisted of**
- Mainly text – *participants are led to Q8*
 - Mainly figures – *participants are led to Q7*
 - Mainly video – *participants are led to Q7*
 - Mainly audio – *participants are led to Q7*
 - A combination of some or all of the above – *participants are led to Q7*
 - I do not know, because I have not seen the study material – *participants are led to Q7*
 - Other (please specify) – *participants are led to Q7*

- Q7 **For now we narrow down our survey to study material that is mostly textual. Do you recall any other recent study activity where you made use of a pre-made summary and where the original study material mainly consisted of text?**
- Yes – *participants are led to Q8*
 - No – *participants are led to Q48*

- Q8 **What was the goal of this study activity?**
- Studying for an exam
 - Writing a paper / essay / report / etc.
 - Doing homework exercises
 - Other (please specify)

- Q9 **Who made this pre-made summary?**
- A teacher or teaching assistant
 - A fellow student
 - An official organisation
 - The authors of the original study material
 - A computer program
 - I am not sure, I found it online
 - Other (please specify)

Now some questions will follow about what the study material that was summarized looked like.

- Q10 **What was the length of the study material?**
- A single article
 - Multiple articles
 - A single book chapter
 - Multiple book chapters from the same book
 - Multiple book chapters from various books
 - A combination of the above
 - I do not know because I have not seen the study material, only the summary
 - Other (please specify)

Question Nr. Question and Answer Options

- Q11 **How was the study material structured? (Multiple answers possible)**
- There was no particular structure - e.g. just one large text
 - The text contained a title or titles
 - The text contained subheadings
 - The text consisted of different chapters
 - The text consisted of different sections and / or paragraphs
 - I do not know because I have not seen the study material, only the summary
 - Other (please specify)

- Q12 **What was the genre of the study material?**
- Mainly educational (such as a text book (chapter))
 - Mainly scientific (such as an academic article, publication, report, etc)
 - Mainly nonfiction writing (such as (auto)biographies, history books, etc)
 - Mainly fiction writing (such as novels, short fictional stories, etc)
 - Other (please specify)

- Q13 **How would you classify the difficulty level of the study material?**
- Ordinary: most people would be able to understand it
 - Specialized: you need to know the jargon of the field to be able to understand it
 - Geographically based: you can only understand it if you are familiar with a certain area, for example because it contains local names

Now we will ask some questions about the purpose of the pre-made summary that you used.

- Q14 **The summary was made specifically to help me (and potentially fellow students) with my study activity.**
- | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Agree | Strongly agree | I don't know |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- Q15 **For what type of people was the summary intended? Your score can range from (1) Untargetted, to (5) Targetted.**
- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--|
| Untargetted: No domain knowledge is expected from the users of the summmary. | | Targetted: Full domain knowledge is expected from the users of the summmary. |
| (1) | (2) | (3) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (4) | (5) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Question Nr. Question and Answer Options

- Q16 **How did this summary help you with your task? (Multiple answers possible)**
- The summary helped to retrieve parts of the original study material
 - I used the summary to preview the text that I was about to read
 - I used the summary as a substitute for the original study material
 - I used the summary to refresh my memory of the original study material
 - I used the summary as a reminder that I had to read the original study material
 - The summary helped to get an overview of the original study material
 - The summary helped to understand the original study material
 - Other (please specify)
- Q17 **What was the type of the summary?**
- Lecture notes
 - Blog post
 - Highlights of some kind in the original study material
 - Abstractive piece of text, such as a written overview of a text book, an abstract of a paper, etc.
 - Short video
 - A slide show
 - Other (please specify)
- Q18 **How was the summary structured? (Multiple answers possible)**
- The summary was a running text, without particular structure
 - The summary consisted of highlights in the original study material, without particular structure
 - The summary itself contained special formatting, such as bold or cursive text, highlights, etc
 - The summary contained diagrams
 - The summary contained tables
 - The summary contained graphs
 - The summary contained figures
 - The summary contained headings
 - The summary consisted of different sections / paragraphs
 - Other (please specify)
- Q19 **How much of the study material was covered by the summary?**
- | None of the study material was covered | Almost none of the study material was covered | Some of the study material was covered | Most of the study material was covered | All of the study material was covered |
|--|---|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Question Nr. Question and Answer Options

- Q20 **What was the style of this summary?**
 Informative: the summary simply conveyed the information that was in the original study material
 Indicative: the summary gave an idea of the topic of the study material, but not more
 Critical: the summary gave a critical review of the study material
 Aggregative: the summary put different source texts in relation to one another and by doing this gave an overview of a certain topic
 Other (please specify)
- Q21 **Overall, how helpful was the pre-made summary for you? Your score can range from (1) Not helpful at all, to (5) Very helpful.**
Not helpful at all Very helpful
(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
- Q22 **Imagine you could turn this summary into your ideal summary. What would you change?**
Open response
- Q23 **Is there anything else you want us to know about the summary that we have not covered yet?**
Open response
- Q24 **Is there anything else you want us to know about the original study material that we have not covered yet?**
Open response – *participants are led to Q40*

Start branch of participants who described an imagined summary

Please take one of these study activities in mind and imagine you would have had a pre-made summary.

- Q25 **The original study material consisted of**
 Mainly text – *participants are led to Q27*
 Mainly figures – *participants are led to Q26*
 Mainly video – *participants are led to Q26*
 Mainly audio – *participants are led to Q26*
 A combination of some or all of the above – *participants are led to Q26*
 Other (please specify) – *participants are led to Q26*

Question Nr. Question and Answer Options

Q26 **For now we narrow down our survey to study material that is mostly textual. Do you recall any other recent study activity where you could have used a pre-made summary and where the original study material mainly consisted of text?**

- Yes – participants are led to Q27
- No – participants are led to Q48

Q27 **What was the goal of this study activity?**

- Studying for an exam
- Writing a paper / essay / report / etc.
- Doing homework exercises
- Other (please specify)

Now some questions will follow about what the study material that could be summarized looked like.

Q28 **What was the length of the study material?**

- A single article
- Multiple articles
- A single book chapter
- Multiple book chapters from the same book
- Multiple book chapters from various books
- A combination of the above
- Other (please specify)

Q29 **How was the study material structured? (Multiple answers possible)**

- There was no particular structure - e.g. just one large text
- The text contained a title or titles
- The text contained subheadings
- The text consisted of different chapters
- The text consisted of different sections and / or paragraphs
- Other (please specify)

Q30 **What was the genre of the study material?**

- Mainly educational (such as a text book (chapter))
- Mainly scientific (such as an academic article, publication, report, etc)
- Mainly nonfiction writing (such as (auto)biographies, history books, etc)
- Mainly fiction writing (such as novels, short fictional stories, etc)
- Other (please specify)

Question Nr. Question and Answer Options

- Q31 **How would you classify the difficulty level of the study material?**
- Ordinary: most people would be able to understand it
 - Specialized: you need to know the jargon of the field to be able to understand it
 - Geographically based: you can only understand it if you are familiar with a certain area, for example because it contains local names

Now we will ask some questions about the purpose of the pre-made summary that would have been helpful.

- Q32 **For what type of people should the summary ideally be intended? Your score can range from (1) Untargetted, to (5) Targetted.**

Untargetted: No domain knowledge is expected from the users of the summary.

Targetted: Full domain knowledge is expected from the users of the summary.

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

- Q33 **How would this summary help you with your task? (Multiple answers possible)**

- The summary would help to retrieve parts of the original study material
- I would use the summary to preview the text that I was about to read
- I would use the summary as a substitute for the original study material
- I would use the summary to refresh my memory of the original study material
- I would use the summary as a reminder that I had to read the original study material
- The summary would help to get an overview of the original study material
- The summary would help to understand the original study material,
- Other (please specify)

Now we will ask some questions about what the summary should look like and cover.

- Q34 **What would be the ideal type of the summary?**

- Lecture notes
- Blog post
- Highlights of some kind in the original study material
- Abstractive piece of text, such as a written overview of a text book, an abstract of a paper, etc.
- Short video
- A slide show
- Other (please specify)

Question Nr. Question and Answer Options

- Q35 **What is the ideal structure of the summary? (Multiple answers possible)**
- The summary should be a running text, without particular structure
 - The summary should consist of highlights in the original study material, without particular structure
 - The summary itself should contain special formatting, such as bold or cursive text, highlights, etc.
 - The summary should contain diagrams
 - The summary should contain tables
 - The summary should contain graphs
 - The summary should contain figures
 - The summary should contain headings
 - The summary should consist of different sections / paragraphs
 - Other (please specify)
- Q36 **How much of the study material should be covered by the summary?**
- | None of the study material should be covered | Almost none of the study material should be covered | Some of the study material should be covered | Most of the study material should be covered | All of the study material should be covered |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
- Q37 **What should the style of this summary be?**
- Informative: the summary should simply convey the information that was in the original study material
 - Indicative: the summary should give an idea of the topic of the study material, but not more
 - Critical: the summary should give a critical review of the study material
 - Aggregative: the summary should put different source texts in relation to one another and by doing this give an overview of a certain topic
 - Other (please specify)
- Q38 **Is there anything else you would want us to know about your ideal summary that we have not covered yet?**
- Open response
- Q39 **Is there anything else you would want us to know about the original study material that we have not covered yet?**
- Open response

Look out questions

Now, let's assume the pre-made summary was generated by a computer. You can assume that this machine generated summary captures all the needs you have identified in the previous questions.

Question Nr. Question and Answer Options

Q40 **Would it make a difference to you whether the summary was generated by a computer program or by a human?**

- Yes – participants are led to Q41
- No – participants are led to Q43

Q41 **Please explain the difference.**

Open response

Q42 **Which type of summary would you trust more:**

- A summary generated by a human, for example a teacher or a good performing fellow student
- A summary generated by a computer
- No difference

Q43 **Please explain your answer.**

Open response

Q44 **Which type of summary would you trust more:**

- A summary generated by a human, for example a teacher or a good performing fellow student
- A summary generated by a computer
- No difference

Now imagine that you can interact with the computer program that made the summary, in the form of a digital assistant. Imagine that your digital assistant made an initial summary for you and you can ask questions about it to your digital assistant and the assistant can answer them. Answers can be voice output, but also screen output, e.g. a written summary on the screen. In the next part we would like to investigate how you would interact with the assistant. Please do not feel restricted by the capabilities of today's digital assistants.

Q45 **Please choose the three most useful features for a digital assistant to have in this scenario.**

- Summarize particular parts of the study material with more detail
- Summarize particular parts of the study material with less detail
- Switch between different summary styles (for example highlighting vs a generated small piece of text)
- Explain why particular pieces ended up in the summary
- Provide the source of certain parts of the summary on request
- Search for different related sources based on the content of the summary
- Answer specific questions based on the content of the summary

Question Nr. Question and Answer Options

- Q46 **Please choose the three least useful features for a digital assistant to have in this scenario.**
- Summarize particular parts of the study material with more detail
 - Summarize particular parts of the study material with less detail
 - Switch between different summary styles (for example highlighting vs a generated small piece of text)
 - Explain why particular pieces ended up in the summary
 - Provide the source of certain parts of the summary on request
 - Search for different related sources based on the content of the summary
 - Answer specific questions based on the content of the summary

- Q47 **Can you think of any other features that you would like your digital assistant to have to help you in this scenario?**
- Open response

Background questions

Thank you for filling out this survey so far! We would still like to ask you two final background questions.

- Q48 **What is the current level of education you are pursuing?**
- Bachelor's degree
 - Master's degree
 - MBA
 - Other, please specify

- Q49 **What is your main field of study?**
- Open response

Thank you!

You have come to the end of our survey. Thanks a lot for helping out! We very much appreciate your time.

- Q50 **If you would like to participate in the raffle to win a voucher, please fill out your e-mail address below. We will only use this e-mail address to blindly draw 10 names who win a voucher and to contact you if your name has been drawn.**
- Open response

D EXAMPLES EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Here we give additional examples for the evaluation questions that can be used for our proposed evaluation methodology. The phrase “*a document that is important for your task*” should be substituted to match the task at hand. For example, in the case of exam preparations, this could be replaced with “*a chapter that you need to learn for your exam preparation*”. Only the questions with the intended purpose factors should be used in the evaluation.

Purpose factor Use & Output factor Style:

- The *style* of which of these two summaries is most useful to you to *retrieve* a document that is important for your task?
- The *style* of which of these two summaries is most useful to you to *preview* a document that is important for your task?
- The *style* of which of these two summaries is most useful to you to *substitute* a document that is important for your task?
- The *style* of which of these two summaries is most useful to you to *refresh your memory* about a document that is important for your task?
- The *style* of which of these two summaries is most useful to you to *prompt* you to read a source text that is important for your task?

Purpose factor Use & Output factor Format:

- The *format* of which of these two summaries is most useful to you to *retrieve* a document that is important for your task?

- The *format* of which of these two summaries is most useful to you to *preview* a document that is important for your task?
- The *format* of which of these two summaries is most useful to you to *substitute* a document that is important for your task?
- The *format* of which of these two summaries is most useful to you to *refresh your memory* about a document that is important for your task?
- The *format* of which of these two summaries is most useful to you to *prompt* you to read a source text that is important for your task?

Purpose factor Use & Output factor Material:

- The *coverage* of which of these two summaries is most useful to you to *retrieve* a document that is important for your task?
- The *coverage* of which of these two summaries is most useful to you to *preview* a document that is important for your task?
- The *coverage* of which of these two summaries is most useful to you to *substitute* a document that is important for your task?
- The *coverage* of which of these two summaries is most useful to you to *refresh your memory* about a document that is important for your task?
- The *coverage* of which of these two summaries is most useful to you to *prompt* you to read a source text that is important for your task?