Improving Students' Vocabulary Learning through Extensive Reading (A Study of Students in Muhammadiyah University of Makassar)

Ariana
Muhammadiyah University of Makassar
ariana_nasya@yahoo.com

Abstract

This research aims at finding out whether or not using of extensive reading was effective to develop the English vocabulary of the fifth semester students of Muhammadiyah University of Makassar. It was quasi experimental research design. This research took place at Muhammadiyah University of Makassar in academic year 20105/2016. The population of the research was 313 students. The sample of this research consisted of 52 students, 28 students as the control group and 24 students as the experimental group, which was chosen by using cluster random sampling technique. The instrument of collecting data was vocabulary test. The data were obtained through pretest and posttest for both groups and the result of the test was analyzed by using SPSS 17.0 version. The result of the data analysis showed that the application of extensive reading was effective to develop the English vocabulary of the fifth semester students of Muhammadiyah University of Makassar, proved by the mean score of control group in pretest was 29.31 and the mean score of experimental group was 41.64. While the mean score of control group in posttest was 47.07 which was taught intensive reading and the mean score of experimental group was 59.86, which was taught extensive reading. It means that the improvement of vocabulary achievement in control group from pretest to posttest was 17.76 and in experimental group were 18.22. It means that Incidental vocabulary occurred both of Intensive Reading and Extensive Reading, but the improvement of incidental vocabulary learning in extensive reading was greater than that of intensive reading (18.22>17.76).

Key words: *Extensive Reading, Intensive Reading, Incidental Vocabulary*

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui efektif atau tidaknya penggunaan membaca ekstensif untuk meningkatkan kosakata bahasa Inggris mahasiswa semester lima Universitas Muhamadiyah Makassar.

Penelitian ini menggunakan metode penelitian *quasi-experimental*. Penelitian ini dilaksanakan di Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar tahun akademik 2015/2016. Populasi penelitian ini adalah 313 mahasiswa. Sampel dalam penelitian

ini terdiri dari 52 mahasiswa, 28 mahasiswa dikelompok kelas control dan 24 mahasiswa dikelompok kelas eksperimental, pengambilan sampel dengan menggunakan *cluster random sampling*. Data penelitian ini dikumpulkan dengan menggunakan tes kosakata sebagai instrument penelitian. Data diperoleh melalui *pretest and posttest* untuk kedua kelompok kelas dan hasil dari tes dianalisis dengan menggunakan SPSS versi 17.0.

Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa penerapan membaca ekstensif efektif untuk meningkatkan kosakata bahasa Inggris mahasiswa Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar. Hasil ini ditunjukkan berdasarkan nilai rata-rata *pretest* pada kelas control 29.31 dan kelas eksperimental 41.64. Sedangkan, nilai rata-rata *posttest* pada kelas control 47.07 dan kelas eksperimental 59.86. Hal ini berarti bahwa peningkatan kosakata mahasiswa pada kelas control dari *pretest* ke *posttest* adalah 17.76 dan kelas eksperimental adalah 18.22. Sehingga disimpulkan bahwa pembelajaran kosakata secara tidak sengaja terjadi baik pada membaca intensif maupun membaca ekstensif, tetapi peningkatan pembelajaran kosakata secara tidak sengaja pada membaca ekstensif lebih besar dibandingkan dengan membaca intensif (18.22>17.76).

A. INTRODUCTION

English is not our language, it's a foreign language, but we have to learn it because the use of English nowadays is getting more general in everywhere in the society. Students now realize that English is on demand and needed in the international communication. Besides that English is one of the languages used as a means of sharing idea on setting information from other people in the world. Therefore the government of Indonesia has put English as a compulsory subject from Elementary School to higher Education.

As a foreign language, many students in Indonesia think that English is not easy. They misplaced their attention in studying the language. Because of this, English teachers always try to find right strategies in learning to make the teaching of the language more integrating for the students. If the method of teaching of English is appreciated by student, they will enjoy it. If so, it can improve their skill in the language. Because of this reason, we need to figure out an effective strategy in English teaching to make it more interesting, particularly for reading activities.

Reading is a complex, multi-faced activity, involving a combination of both lexical and text progressing skill that are widely recognized as being interactive (Rumelhart,

(l977). So, in this case, the relationship between vocabulary and reading is closely related. In learning a foreign language mastering, vocabulary is one of the important aspects. If anyone has a limited vocabulary, she also has a limited comprehension in texts of reading. It is true that it is challenging to learn a language without mastering vocabulary because sometimes it is difficult to group the idea transmitted to them. The mastering of a large number of vocabularies can help students to comprehend reading text. Students who know more vocabularies will have opportunities to do well on an English test.

The quality of language skill depends on the quality and quantity of vocabulary that someone has. The more vocabulary we have, the bigger possibility to use skillful language. Knowing vocabulary is the ability to receive or to get a lot of words. We will comprehend the meaning of vocabulary in the context if we have and mastery vocabulary. Mastering words help to avoid misunderstanding. It's the reason why students must have enough vocabulary. And one way to learn vocabulary is through incidental vocabulary learning. Incidental vocabulary learning has some advantages over direct instruction. For one reason, reading and word learning occur at the same time. For another, a more vibrant sense of a word is learned through contextualized input. But in fact, reading is usually a tedious activity for students. Teacher hard to find ways to make reading fun, particularly for advanced students. So, the teacher has to find another approach in teaching reading. And one way to learn reading is using extensive reading.

B. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Previous Related Research Findings

Seipel (2011) stated that explicit vocabulary instruction from an educator can help grow a student's vocabulary. However, with increasing demands on already limited instructional time, it is difficult for educators to teach just new and critical vocabulary to students explicitly. Students often need to and do incidentally learn new

vocabulary from context through inference generation. With increasing demands on instructional time, there may be a greater need for students to acquire new vocabulary without explicit instruction from educators. Knowledge of a student's implicit learning ability could potentially help an educator facilitate the processes of incidental vocabulary acquisition.

Kweon and Kim (2008) confirm that second language learners acquire vocabulary incidentally through extensive reading and the acquired vocabulary is retained without much attrition.

Elley (1989) claims that there is a considerable increase in the word knowledge by reading a single story three times without any teacher explanation for words during the treatment period.

2. Some Pertinent Ideas

a. Reading

Cline (2006: 2), state that "reading is translating and understanding written texts". Comprehending is determined by the objective for reading, the context, the nature of the text, and the readers' strategies and knowledge. Further, Cline (2006: 2) in their second definition states that"reading is the act of deriving meaning from the text". This process involves decoding written text for the majority of readers, Braille or authorization is adapted to support the decoding process. Comprehending is determined by the goal for reading, the nature of the text, the context, and knowledge and the reader's strategies.

There are three models of the reading process: ***a. The Bottom-up Model of reading,***

In a bottom-up model of the reading process, the reader is seen to move progressively from smaller to larger units of language in his way to understanding. In other words, a reader starts first by reading letters, then associating these letters with their appropriate sounds, and then they combine the letters to read words, then sentences then paragraphs and so forth. ***b. The Top-Down Model of Reading,*** The top-down

model of reading reverses the order in that thinking and meaning are included at a very early stage and the processing sequence proceeds from prediction to progressively smaller units. ***c. The Interactive Model of Reading,*** The interactive model is not dictating the direction of processing information during the act of reading. Moreover, the reader is seen to be able to draw simultaneously, but selectively, upon a range of sources of information: schematic, visual, Semantic orthographic, syntactic, and lexical.

There are several types of reading; they are: Independent Reading**,** Reading Aloud to Students, Guided Reading, and Shared Reading

b. Intensive Reading

Intensive reading means that the readers take a text, study it line by line, and refer at very moment to the dictionary about the grammar of the text itself. "a classroom-oriented activity in which students focus on the linguistic or semantic details of a passage is called as Intensive reading. Intensive reading calls students' attention to discourse markers, grammatical forms, and other surface structure details to understand literal meaning".(Brown (2007, p.373)).

There are three principles of intensive reading namely Overview, Reading, and Questions.

c. Extensive Reading

Long and Richards (1971, p.216) identify extensive reading as "occurring when students read as much as possible of concentrating on meaning, high-interest material, "reading for gist" usually out of class, and skipping unknown words."
There are several the principles of extensive reading:

a. The reading material is not difficult. Learners should read material that consists of few or no unfamiliar items of grammar and vocabulary.

b. A variety of material on a large amount of topics is available. The kind of materials should be available in the library for students to choose what they really want
c. A reading text is chosen by the learners.
d. Learners read a large amount of reading text. Quantity of reading is the language learning advantages of extensive reading.
e. Using extensive reading make reading speed is faster rather than using intensive reading.
f. The goal of reading is usually related to enjoy and get general comprehending.
g. Reading is individual and silent. Learners read at their own way. Sometimes silent reading stages may be reserved from class time when students read the books that they select in the classroom.
h. Reading its own appreciation. The goal of reading is reader's own experience and joy of reading.
i. The teacher orients and guides the students. Before starting an extensive reading programme students have to be familiarized what it is, why they are doing it, what benefits it will bring them and how are they going to proceed.
j. The teacher is a role model of a reader. Teacher gives students a model of what is to be a reader e.g. during the silent reading periods teacher should read as well.

Teacher's roles in extensive reading area: *a. introducing the ER to students*, teachers' task is to introduce Extensive Reading (ER) programme to their students and to familiarize them with its aims and benefits. *b. Helping students to choose books*, before the students read really easy and finish them quickly they should look for the books first. They should read quickly (after reading a minimum of ten and maximum of fifteen books) to the level that is comfortable for them and continue reading at this level. *c. Encouraging students to read*, Giving example is the best motivation. Therefore, teacher should be familiar with all titles that are in ER library so that he/she can talk with students about their reading and recommend titles according to

students' needs with knowledge and enthusiasm. Students will be very pleased to discuss their own experience with the teacher. *d. In-class activities,* the most basic activity in a book report is asking the students about their personal feeling of the way of their reading e.g. whether they found the material enjoyable or interesting and why, whether they liked what did reading make them think of or some characters from the book. *e. Monitoring students' reading*, teacher may use one-to one interview to check sensitively whether students are reading. Another possibility is to tell the students to finish sentences that describe events in the story they read. *f. Rewards*, students are not given grades for reading but everybody who reaches the target number of books is rewarded. The reader who reads most titles is given a special award.

d. Vocabulary

According to Burton (1982:98), that "without a large vocabulary, it is impossible to use English language precisely and vividly".

Kinds of vocabulary according to Jo Ann Aebersold and Mary Lee Field (1997), classified vocabulary with topic-specific or content- specific vocabulary. The words that appear frequently in a particular text are topic-specific or content-specific vocabulary because they are related to the topic of the text.

e. Incidental Vocabulary

Incidental vocabulary mastery is a common means of learning new vocabulary, especially for proficient readers. Students who read a variety of texts have strong reading skills may realize substantial gains in their vocabulary without direct instruction. Through independent reading some incidental vocabulary gains may getting by high-risk students.

Annette De Groot, (2011) stated that the vocabulary learning that occurs when the participants perform particular language-processing tasks that are not directly aimed at committing lexical information to memory is incidental vocabulary learning. The

participants are not informed that their retention of testing vocabulary afterwards and they are therefore unlikely to focus on the meaning and form of individual words. Studying Incidental vocabulary learning have included, In addition to "pure" reading conditions where reading was combined with vocabulary enhancement techniques such as the provision of glosses in the margin of the text. Even though these conditions explicitly draw attention to vocabulary, as long as the reader's goal is to comprehend the text, and *not* to commit the attended words to memory they are still regarded incidental learning conditions.

C. METHOD

1. Design and Samples

The research employed Quasi-experimental design. This research involved two groups; an experimental class and control class. The samples in this research are 28 students as the control class and 24 students as the experimental class. They were sixth year students of Muhammadiyah University of Makassar in academic year 2015/2016. The same pretest and posttest were given in both of two classes. The researcher also gave them the same reading text. The difference here, the control class was be taught by the teacher using intensive reading while the experimental class was taught using extensive reading.

2. Instrument and Procedure

The researcher used vocabulary test as an instrument of both pretest and posttest. The students read the text given by the researcher. The test was used to measure students' incidental vocabulary; the researcher used three kinds of instruments namely Definition Supply Test, Picture Recognition Test, and Word Recognition Test.

To collect the data, the researcher used pre-test before doing treatment, the researcher administrated a pretest. The researcher gave a vocabulary test to students and asked

the students to answer. The researcher administrated posttest to see the students' progress and their achievement.

3. Data Analysis

The steps are undertaken in quantitative analysis by using SPSS 17 version:

In analyzing the data collected through the pre-test and post-test.

D. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The Improvement of Students' Incidental Vocabulary Mastery Using Extensive Reading

The Frequency and Percentages of Students' Vocabulary Achievement on Pretest and Posttest of Control Group and Experimental Group in Definition Supply Test

Table 1

Frequency and Percentage of Students' Pre-Test in both Group.

No	Score	Category	Control		Experimental	
			Freq	%	Freq	%
1	96-100	Excellent	0	0	0	0
2	86 - 95	Very good	0	0	0	0
3	76 – 85	Good	0	0	0	0
4	66 -75	Fairly good	0	0	0	0
5	56-65	Fair	0	0	0	0
6	36-55	Poor	0	0	1	4.2
7	< 35	Very poor	28	100	23	95.8
Total			28	100	24	100

The table 1. Shows that the pretest of the control group were 28 (100%) student who were in very poor category, and no student were in poor, fair, fairly good, good, very good and excellent category. On the experimental group were 23 (95.8%) students

were in very poor category. There was 1 (4.2%) students who was in poor category and no student were in fair, fairly good, good, very good and excellent category.

Table 2

Frequency and Percentage of Students' Post-Test in both groups

No	Score	Category	Control		Experimental	
			Freq	%	Freq	%
1	96-100	Excellent	0	0	0	0
2	86 - 95	Very good	0	0	0	0
3	76 – 85	Good	0	0	0	0
4	66 -75	Fairly good	0	0	1	4.17
5	56-65	Fair	1	3.57	6	25.00
6	36-55	Poor	13	46.43	14	58.33
7	< 35	Very poor	14	50.00	3	12.50
Total			28		24	

The table 2. The result of post-test shows that the control group was 14 (50.00%) Students who were in very poor category. There were 13 (46.43%) Students who were in poor category. There was 1 (3.57%) students who was in fair category, and no student were in fairly good, good, very good and excellent category. While in the experimental group, there was 3 (12.50%) students who were in very poor category. There were 14 (58.33%) students who were in poor category. There were 6 (25.00%) students who were in fair category. There was 1 (4.17%) students who was in fairly good category, and no students were in good, very good, and excellent category.

The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students' Pretest in Control Group and Experimental Group in Definition Supply Test

Table.3

Variables	Mean score	Standard deviation
Control group	16.29	6.452
Experimental group	20.75	6.948

Table 3 above explain that the means score of the students' pretest of control group was 16.29 and standard deviation was 6.452, which are categorized as very poor classification and the means score of the students' pretest of experimental group was 20.75 and standard deviation was 6.948 it was categorized as very poor classification. It means that the students' mean score between experiment group and control group was relative same. In this case, the experiment group and control group have the same prior knowledge before treatment.

The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students' Posttest of Control Group and Experimental Group in Definition Supply Test

Table 4

Variables	Mean score	Standard deviation
Control group	35.21	10.218
Experimental group	48.5	9.716

Table 4.above shows that after treatment, the mean score of the students' posttest of control group was 35.21 and standard deviation was 10.218, which is categorized as poor category, while the mean score of the students' posttest of experimental group was 48.5 and standard deviation was 9.716 which is categorized as poor

classification. It means that the mean score of control group increased 18.92 points and experimental group increased 27.75 points. Furthermore, the score of students' learning vocabulary in posttest of the two groups a progress, but the experimental group was greater than the control group was.

The Frequency and Percentages of Students' Vocabulary Achievement on Pretest and Posttest of Control Group and Experimental Group in Picture Recognition Test

Table 5

Frequency and Percentage of Students' Pre-Test in both Group.

No	Score	Category	Control		Experimental	
			Freq	%	Freq	%
1	96-100	Excellent	0	0	0	0
2	86 - 95	Very good	0	0	0	0
3	76 – 85	Good	0	0	0	0
4	66 -75	Fairly good	0	0	1	4.17
5	56-65	Fair	1	3.57	7	29.16
6	36-55	Poor	17	60.71	15	62.50
7	< 35	Very poor	10	35.71	1	4.17
Total			28	100	24	100

The table above shows that the pretest of the control group were 10 (35.71%) student who were in very poor category. There were 17 (60.71%) students were in poor category. There was 1 (3.57%) student was in fair category, and no student were in fairly good, good, very good and excellent category. On the experimental group was 1 (4.17%) student was in very poor category. There were 15 (62.50%) students were in poor category. There were 7 (29.16%) students were in fair category. There was 1 (4.17%) student was in fairly good category and no student were in good, very good and excellent category.

Table 6

Frequency and Percentage of Students' Post-Test in both Group.

No	Score	Category	Control		Experimental	
			Freq	%	9.57	%
1	96-100	Excellent	0	0	0	0
2	86 - 95	Very good	0	0	0	0
3	76 – 85	Good	2	7.14	7	29.57
4	66 -75	Fairly good	8	28.57	16	66.67
5	56-65	Fair	10	35.71	1	4.17
6	36-55	Poor	8	28.57	0	0
7	< 35	Very poor	0	0	0	0
Total			28	100	24	100

The result of post-test shows that the control group was 8 (28.57%) students who were in poor category. There were 10 (35.71%) students who were in fair category. There were 8 (28.57%) students who were in fairly good category. There were 2 (7.14%) students who were in good category and no student were in very poor, very good and excellent category. While in the experimental group, there was 1 (4.17%) students who was in fair category. There were 16 (66.67%) students who were in fairly good category. There were 7 (29.17%) students who were in good category, and no students were in very poor, poor, very good and excellent category.

The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students' Pretest in Control Group and Experimental Group in Picture Recognition Test

Table 7.

Variables	Mean score	Standard deviation
Control group	39.14	9.834
Experimental group	50.91	10.434

Table 7 above explain that the means score of the students' pretest of control group was 39.14 and standard deviation was 9.834, which are categorized as poor classification and the means score of the students' pretest of experimental group was 50.91 and standard deviation was 10.434 it was categorized as poor classification. It means that the students' mean score between experiment group and control group was relative same. In this case, the experiment group and control group have the same prior knowledge before treatment.

The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students' Posttest of Control Group and Experimental Group in Picture Recognition Test

Table 8

Variables	Mean score	Standard deviation
Control group	61.21	9.528
Experimental group	72.58	4.951

Table 8. above shows that after treatment, the mean score of the students' posttest of control group was 61.21 and standard deviation was 9.528, which is categorized as fairly good category, while the mean score of the students' posttest of experimental group was 72.58 and standard deviation was 4.951 which is categorized as fairly good classification. It means that the mean score of experiment group increased 21.67 points. Furthermore, the score of students' learning vocabulary in posttest of the two

groups a progress, but the experimental group was greater than the control group group was

The Frequency and Percentages of Students' Vocabulary Achievement on Pretest and Posttest of Control Group and Experimental Group in Word Recognition Test

Table 9

Frequency and Percentage of Students' Pre-Test in both Group.

o	Score	Category	Control		Experimental	
			Freq	%	Freq	%
1	96-100	Excellent	0	0	0	0
2	86 - 95	Very good	0	0	0	0
3	76 – 85	Good	0	0	0	0
4	66 -75	Fairly good	0	0	2	8.33
5	56-65	Fair	0	0	12	50
6	36-55	Poor	11	39.29	8	33.33
7	< 35	Very poor	17	60.71	2	8.33
Total			28	100	24	100

The table above shows that the pretest of the control group were 17 (60.71%) student who were in very poor category. There were 11 (39.29%) students were in poor category and no student were in fair, fairly good, good, very good and excellent. On the experimental group were 2 (8.33%) students were in very poor category. There were 8 (33.33%) students were in poor category. There were 12 (50%) students were in fair category. There were 2 (8.33%) students were in fairly good category and no student were in good. very good and excellent category.

Table 10

Frequency and Percentage of Students' Post-Test in both Group.

No	Score	Category	Control		Experimental	
			Freq	%	Freq	%
1	96-100	Excellent	0	0	0	0
2	86 - 95	Very good	0	0	0	0
3	76 – 85	Good	0	0	0	0
4	66 -75	Fairly good	0	0	4	16.67
5	56-65	Fair	4	14.29	12	50.00
6	36-55	Poor	19	67.86	8	33.33
7	< 35	Very poor	5	17.86	0	0
Total			28		24	

The result of post-test shows that the control group were 5 (17.86%) students who were in very poor category. There were 19 (67.86%) students who were in poor category. There were 4 (14.29%) students who were in fair category, and no student were in fairly good, good, very good and excellent category. While in the experimental group, there were 8 (33.33%) students who were in poor category. There were 12 (50.00%) students who were in fair category. There were 4 (16.67%) students who was in fairly good category, and no students were in very poor, good, very good and excellent category.

The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students' Pretest in Control Group and Experimental Group in Word Recognition Test.

Table 11

Variables	Mean score	Standard deviation
Control group	32.5	7.748
Experimental group	53.25	13.484

Table 11 above shows that the means score of the students' pretest of control group was 32.5 and standard deviation was 7.748, which are categorized as very poor classification and the means score of the students' pretest of experimental group was 53.25 and standard deviation was 13.484 it was categorized as poor classification. It means that the students' mean score between experiment group and control group was relative same. In this case, the experiment group and control group have the same prior knowledge before treatment.

The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students' Posttest of Control Group and Experimental Group in Word Recognition Test

Table 12

Variables	Mean score	Standard deviation
Control group	44.78	8.850
Experimental group	58.5	5.976

Table 12 above shows that after treatment, the mean score of the students' posttest of control group was 44.78 and standard deviation was 8.850, which is categorized as poor category, while the mean score of the students' posttest of experimental group was 58.5 and standard deviation was 5.976 which is categorized as fair classification. It means that the mean score of experiment group increased 5.25 points. Furthermore, the score of students' learning vocabulary in posttest of the two groups a progress, but the experimental group was greater than the control group group was.

The Mean Score of Students' Pretest and posttest in Incidental Vocabulary Learning

Table 13

Group	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Improvement
Control group	29.31	47.07	17.76
Experimental group	41.64	59.86	18.22

Table 13 above shows the mean score of the students' pretest of control group was 29.31 and Post-Test was 47.07, which is the Improvement was 17.76, while the mean score of the students' pretest of experimental group was 41.64 and Post-Test was 59.86 which is the Improvement was 18.22. Furthermore, the score of students' learning vocabulary in posttest of the two groups a progress, but the experimental group was greater than that of the control group was.

E. CONCLUSION

The research result indicates that the use of Extensive reading effective to increase the students' vocabulary achievement, in fifth semester class VG as Control Group and VI as Experimental Group of Muhammadiyah University of Makassar in 2015/2016 academic year. It is proved by the mean score from pretest and posttest after they are taught

In definition supply test, the students' mean score in control group was 16.29 in pretest becomes 35.21 in posttest. In experimental group was 20.75 in pre-test become 48.5 in post-test.

In picture recognition test, the students' mean score in control group was 39.14 in pre-test become 61.21 in post-test. In experimental group was 50.91 in pre-test become 72.58 in post-test

In word recognition test, the students' mean score in control group was 32.5 in pre-test become 44.78 in post-test. In experimental group was 53.25 in pre-test become 58.5 in post-test.

The students' mean score in control group, was 29.31 in pre-test become 47.07 in post-test. In experimental group, was 41.64 in pre-test become 59.86 in post-test. So, the improvement of students' vocabulary in control group was 17.76 and the improvement of students' vocabulary in experimental group was 18.22.

Incidental Vocabulary Learning occur in both of intensive reading and extensive reading, but the improvement of incidental vocabulary learning in extensive reading greater than in intensive reading.

REFERENCES

Aebersold, Jo Ann and Lee Field, Mary.(1997). *From Reader to Reading Teacher*. New York: Cambridge University Press,.

Bamford, Julian & Day, Richard R. (2004).*Extensive Reading Activities.for teaching Language.* United States of America:Cambridge University Press

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by Principles: An interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. (ch. 20, pp. 357 -389). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Brown,R. (2008). Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition from Reading, Reading-While-Listening, and Listening to Stories. *Reading in a Foreign Language,20(2),* 136–163

Day, R.,& Bamford, J. (1998). *Extensive Reading in the Second Language Classroom.* Cambridge, England : Cambridge University Press.

De Groot, Annette M.B. (2011).*An Introduction Language and Cognition In Bilinguals and Multilinguals.*Great Britain: Psychology Press.

Elley, W. B. (1989). Vocabulary acquisition from listening to stories. *Reading Research Quarterly, 24* (2),

Harmer, Jeremy. (1991).*The Principles of English Language Teaching. Essex:* Longman Group UK Limited.

Harmer, Jeremy. (1993). *The Principles of English Language Teaching*. Essex: Longman Group UK Limited

Harmer,J. (2003). *The Practice of English Language Teaching.* Essex: Longman

Kweon & Kim . (2008). Beyond raw frequency: Incidental vocabulary acquisition in extensive reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*. 20 (2) 191-215

Nation, I.S.P. (2001). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Langtuage*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Richard,J., & Schmidt,R. (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics.* Malaysia: Pearson Education.

Rumelhart, (l977). *Toward an interactive model of reading*. In S. Dornic (Ed.), Attention and Performance VI (pp. 573-603). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlaum.

Schmitt, Norbert and Mc Carthey, Micael. (1997). *Vocabulary in language Teaching*, USA: Cambridge University press

Seipel, Benjamin. (2011). *The Role of Implicit Learning in Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition while Reading.* Unpublished Disssertation. Minnesota: The University of Minnesota

S. H. Burton, (1982). "*Mastering English Language,"* London: The Macmillan Press Ltd

Yoshii, Makoto and Jeffra, Faitz. (2002). Second Language Incidental Vocabulary Retention: The Effect of Text and Picture Annotation Types. *CALICO Journal,20(1),33-58*

Yoshii, Makoto. (2006). L1 And L2 Glosses: Their Effects On Incidental Vocabulary Learning. *Language Learning & Technology,10(3),85-101*