

## THE EFFECT OF EXTENSIVE READING STRATEGY IN IMPROVING VOCABULARY MASTERY AT THE TENTH GRADES NURSING STUDENTS OF SMK KESEHATAN KALTARA TARAKAN

**Maghfirotin, Ridwan**

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Borneo Tarakan University, Tarakan

Email: [maghfirotin.fie97@gmail.com](mailto:maghfirotin.fie97@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

*The purpose of this study was to determine whether there is a significant difference in improving the vocabulary of students who are taught using the Extensive Reading strategy and those taught using the Intensive Reading strategy in the tenth grade of SMK Kesehatan Kaltara Tarakan. This research method is Quasi-experimental. Samples were selected using the purposive sampling technique. There are two classes sampled in this study. The treatment for the experimental class was taught using the Extensive Reading Strategy and the control class using the Intensive Reading Strategy. The research instrument was a multiple-choice written test. The data analyzed were the pre-test and post-test from the experimental and control classes. In analyzing the data, researchers used an independent sample T-test at SPSS 23.0. The results showed that there were differences in the scores of students from the experimental class and the control class. This is evidenced by the results of the student's average score. The test results before being given the treatment (pre-test) of the experimental class obtained an average score of 40.00 and the control class obtained 51.11. Whereas for the posttest results, the experimental class with a mean score of 69.81, and the posttest results for the control class with a mean score of 64.26. This can be seen from the two classes getting a higher increase after giving a treatment by using extensive reading and intensive reading strategies. The results of the independent sample T-test between the posttest in the experimental class and the control class were ( $t\text{-score} = 2.559 > t\text{-table} = 2.007$ ) with a value of 0.13. Based on the explanation above, the results of the data analysis prove that there is a significant difference between students who are taught using the Extensive Reading strategy and students who are taught using the Intensive Reading strategy in increasing student vocabulary.  $H_a$  is accepted when the  $t\text{-score}$  is higher than the  $t\text{-table}$ , while  $H_o$  is rejected.*

**Keywords: Improving student Vocabulary, Extensive Reading, Intensive Reading**

## INRODUCTION

English is an international language that is used as a communication tool between countries. According to Harmer (2002), English is a global language and is used in various fields of life, namely education, technology, socio-culture, economics, and politics. In the global era, English plays an essential role in increasing the human resources required to communicate using English. Therefore, it is necessary to master English for better communication. English proficiency index (2019) reports Indonesia is in low proficiency English level with rank 61<sup>st</sup> of 100 countries in it. The rank of Indonesia is under Honduras, Peru, Brazil, and El Salvador.

The government puts English as a foreign language taught as a compulsory subject for junior high school and senior high school as one of efforts to improve English proficiency in Indonesia. The goal of teaching English at this level is to improve the four skills of English listening, reading, speaking, and writing. Hadfield & Hadfield (2008) states that are listening and reading are receptive skills, and they require only understanding while speaking and writing are productive skills. They need learners to produce something, Furthermore, in learning a language, several aspects support four language skills such as grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and pronunciation that are determined in the English teaching and process. So, vocabulary is a fundamental of a language to improve English skills.

Vocabulary is one of the essential components when learning a language. According to Hornby (2000) vocabulary is defined as all the word that a person knows or uses, all the name is a particular language, the word that people use when are talking about a particular subject, a list of words with their meanings. It means that vocabulary the basic in language to communicate with other people. By learning vocabulary, students can communicate in English. Without a vocabulary, many students difficulty improving their English skills. So, the students must increase vocabulary in learning English and develop their vocabulary to be mastered in learning a language, especially in English.

The preliminary Research at SMK Kesehatan Kaltara Tarakan showed that the students have difficulties in the learning process in the English language. The students have problems in learning vocabulary because they feel bored with the same atmosphere in their classroom. The students have perceptions that English is a difficult subject because they feel difficult to do English exercises. They also were not enthusiastic and hard in remembering the new vocabulary in learning English. It is shown by a few students who reach the minimum criteria of success (KKM) in English lessons, which is 20% of the many students. A lack of students in vocabulary is cause it. Students are not able to remember much of the vocabulary they have learned. It affects the students' achievement in learning English skills. Besides, the students do not understand most of the contents or words of the provided text. It was also proved when the teacher explained the material; the students did not understand what was conveyed by the teacher. The teaching strategy from the teacher, almost the same in every meeting and make the students bored. It shows that when the lesson begins, the way used the teacher only explains a little of the material learned after that asked one

student to write the material on the whiteboard and asked other students to write on the book until the end of the lesson in every meeting. Because of that, the students less interest while learning the process.

To overcome this problem, this Research will apply the strategy to improve students' vocabulary. The approach that can be applied is using an extensive reading strategy. By using an extensive reading strategy, the students will enjoy the English class.

According to Day et al. (1992) states an extensive reading strategy is able the learners to meet new words in the texts, by looking at the new word at these unfamiliar words they will deduce the meanings since they have encountered the words before. It means that the learners can store all new words which they have learned in their memory quickly. Thus, most EFL teachers believe that extensive strategy is one of the best teaching strategies which can endorse learners' vocabulary growth continuously. Furthermore, based on Bell (2001) states that extensive Reading is a reading instruction program that has been used in ESL or EFL settings as an effective means of developing reading fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary development. It means that they can quickly determine the main idea of a reading text. They can also identify topics based on their understanding and read deeply related reading books. On the other hand, the students can develop their words by reading the text. Moreover, through extensive Reading, the students clearly understand terms in the book or implicit meaning.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that an Extensive Reading strategy can increase vocabulary knowledge, develop word based on a book or their word, and get new vocabulary in to improve English proficiency. Besides, the students can find the same words repeatedly in contexts that result in increased vocabulary learning. They can also identify topics based on their understanding and read deeply related reading books. So, any activity in a reading that can use more varied to increase students' vocabulary.

The researcher was conducted the research to investigate differences in improving the students' vocabulary mastery through an extensive reading strategy. The researcher would like to attend the Research entitled "the effect of extensive reading strategy to improve students' vocabulary mastery in tenth grades of nursing students of SMK Kesehatan Kaltara Tarakan. Therefore, the researcher employed an extensive reading strategy to improve students' vocabulary mastery.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

The research design was used in this research was an experimental design by using a quantitative approach. According to Cresswell (2012:294) states an experimental design is a traditional approach to conducting quantitative research. Use an experiment when you want to establish possible causes and effects between independent and dependent variables. An experimental study is a research that can test to determine cause and effect relationships and is the strongest reasoning path for the

relationship between two variables (Gay et al., 2012). The experimental design indicates a test. It also categorized into four types, such as pre-experimental design, true experimental research, factorial design, and quasi-experimental design.

The researcher was using a quasi-experimental design in this research to experiment; quasi-experiment is the method when the researcher not possible to assign subject to groups randomly states by Gay et al. (2012: 270). It means that a quasi-experiment is a research design that has treatment, and in determining the sample, the researcher may choose the class, which was the control class and experiment class.

According to Gay et al. (2012: 270) state that quasi-experiment divides into three types. There are the nonequivalent control group design, counterbalanced design, and time-series design; in this research, the researcher uses the nonequivalent control group design. Gay et al. (2012: 270) state that the nonequivalent control group design is like the pretest-posttest control group design except that the nonequivalent control group design does not involve random assignment. In this research, the experimental class was taught using an extensive reading strategy, while the control class was taught using intensive reading strategy in the classroom.

**Table. Nonequivalent Control Group Design** (Gay et al, 2012)

Group	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
Experiment	O	X1	O
Control	O	X2	O

(Source: Gay et al, 2012:268)

Note:

X1 = Extensive Reading Strategy

X2 = Intensive Reading Strategy

O = Pre-Test

O = Post-Test

Based on the table above, the researcher used the extensive reading strategy and intensive reading strategy in this research. Extensive reading strategy is teaching approach the learners to read as many texts as possible in order to improve their reading fluency and vocabulary in the target language, while intensive reading strategy is teaching and learning process refers to the kind of learning done in the reading class under the teacher's supervision.

## FINDINGS

### 1. The Students' Vocabulary Mastery Score of Pretest and Posttest

In the research, the researcher described the result of pretest and posttest for the treatment class as below:

#### a. Pre-Test

The pretest was conducted on Tuesday, May 19<sup>th</sup>, 2020, at 09.35 AM until done. The instruments were given to the X Keperawatan A, which consisted of 27 students. On the pretest, the researcher gave a vocabulary test to answer the questions. There were 20 questions about the students' knowledge of recount text. The students were difficult to answer the questions because they did not know the meaning of the questions and lacked vocabulary.

Based on the students' score from pretest, the researcher concluded the result to determine the number of students in a frequency distribution. The students' pretest score is presented in table.

**The result Students' Score of Pretest**

No	Category	Range	Experiment Class		Control Class	
			Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Verry Good	90-100	0	0%	0	0%
2	Good	80-89	0	0%	0	0%
3	Fair	71-79	1	4%	3	11%
4	Poor	0-70	26	96%	24	89%
<b>Total</b>			27	100%	27	100%

(Source: SMK Kesehatan Kaltara Tarakan's Standard Score)

Based on table 4.3, above showed four classifications for students' score. Those classifications were very good, good, fair and poor. From the table, the students' score in the experimental class showed 26 students (96%) who got poor category, and there was one student (4%) who got a fair classification. Meanwhile, three students (11%) in the control class got a fair category, and 24 students (89%) got a poor variety. Overall, the highest percentage for the pretest were classified in a low score because they did not know the meaning of the questions and lacked vocabulary.

**b. Post-Test**

The posttest was conducted on Saturday, June 27<sup>th</sup>, 2020, at 11.42 AM until done. On the posttest, the researcher gave a vocabulary test to answer the questions. There were 20 questions about the students' knowledge of recount text. Some students feel difficulty to answer. The difficulties caused by the same problem on the pretest for instance, the students lack vocabulary and did not know the meaning of the questions. To find out the number of the students in a frequency distribution, the researcher describes the students' score posttest at table below:

**The result Students' Score of Posttest**

No	Category	Range	Experiment Class		Control Class	
			Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Verry Good	90-100	0	0%	0	0%
2	Good	80-89	4	15%	1	4%
3	Fair	71-79	13	48%	9	33%
4	Poor	0-70	10	37%	17	63%

<b>Total</b>	27	100%	27	100%
--------------	----	------	----	------

(Source: SMK Kesehatan Kaltara Tarakan's Standard Score)

Based on table above showed four classifications for the students' score. Those classifications were very good, good, fair and poor. From the table it can be seen that the students' score in experimental class showed there were four students (15%) who got good category, there were 13 students (48%) who got fair category, and there were ten students (37%) who got poor category. Meanwhile, in control class there was one student (4%) who got good category, there were nine the students (33%) who got fair category, and there were 17 the students (63%) who got poor category. Overall, the highest percentage for the pretest is classified in a poor score. In this section, half of the students had problems in indicators. The students were difficult to answer the questions because they did not know the meaning of the questions and lacked vocabulary.

## 2. Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Pretest and Posttest

The result of this research was presented to show the mean score between the pretest and posttest score in the treatment class. The result of mean score and standard deviation of pretest and posttest are presented in table as follows:

### Descriptive Statistic

Score	Pre-Test		Post-Test	
	Experimental Class	Control Class	Experimental Class	Control Class
<b>N</b>	27	27	27	27
<b>Mean</b>	40.00	51.11	69.81	64.26
<b>Std. Deviation</b>	10.190	12.960	8.260	7.684

Based on the data on table above, it can be seen that the result of pretest and posttest mean and standard deviation in experiment and control class. From the result above, the mean score was significantly to increase between the result of pretest and posttest in treatment class. The result in pretest of experimental class shows that the mean score was 40.00 with standard deviation 10.190 and the result in pretest of control class was 51.11 with standard deviation 12.960. Meanwhile the result in posttest of experimental class indicates that the mean score was 69.81 with standard deviation 8.260 and the result in posttest of control class was 64.26 with standard deviation 7.684. Based on the result between both of the test it can be concluded that the students' score in posttest was higher than pretest. The researcher also counted the improvement from mean score both of test before and after being given the treatment. The mean score of pretest and posttest were 40.00 and 69.81. It means that the mean score improvement from the pretest to posttest is 29.81 in the experimental class. Meanwhile, the mean score of pretest and posttest in the control class were 51.11 and 64.26. It means that the

improvement of mean score from the pretest to posttest is 13.15. It shows that the posttest score has better progress than the pretest score. There was significant improvement after the researcher implemented the extensive reading strategy in improving students' vocabulary mastery. It can be concluded that the experimental class's improvement means the score was 69.81 at the poor categories. While, the control class was 64.26 at the poor categories too, but even though it was in the poor category, this technique was able to increase students' vocabulary after being given treatments.

### 3. Hypothesis Testing

Before the researcher conducted the hypothesis testing by using t-test, the data in pretest and posttest were calculated to know the normality and homogeneity of variance of the data.

#### a. Normality of Data

#### The Result of Normality Test Variance in Experimental Class

Treatment class	Sig	The Criterion	Decision	Result of normality distributed
Pretest	0.052	Sig>0.05	H <sub>a</sub> is accepted	Normal
Posttest	0.197	Sig>0.05	H <sub>a</sub> is accepted	Normal

Table showed that the pretest and posttest values in experiment class were 0.052 And 0.197. Meanwhile, the level of significance was 0.05. It can be inferred that in pretest 0.052 was higher than 0.05, the alternative hypothesis (H<sub>a</sub>) was accepted. In posttest 0.197 is higher than 0.05 means the alternative hypothesis (H<sub>a</sub>) was accepted. It can be concluded that the data from both pretest and posttest in the experiment class were distributed normally.

#### The Result of Normality Test Variance in Control Class

Treatment class	Sig	The Criterion	Decision	Result of normality distributed
Pretest	0.061	Sig>0.05	H <sub>a</sub> is accepted	Normal
Posttest	0.167	Sig>0.05	H <sub>a</sub> is accepted	Normal

Table showed that the significant values of pretest and posttest in the control class were 0.061 And 0.167. Meanwhile, the level of significance was 0.05. It can be inferred that pretest 0.061 was higher than 0.05. It means the alternative hypothesis (H<sub>a</sub>) was accepted. In posttest 0.167 is higher than 0.05, it means the alternative

hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) was accepted. It can be concluded that the data from both pretest and posttest in the control class were distributed normally.

b. Homogeneity of Variance in Pretest and Posttest

**The Result of Homogeneity of Variance**

	Levene Statistic	df 1	df 2	Sig.	Decision	Result of Homogeneity
Experimental Class	0.256	1	52	0.615	$H_a$ is accepted	Homogeneous
Control Class	3.481	1	52	0.068	$H_a$ is accepted	Homogeneous

Based on table above, the researcher measuring the homogeneity of variance in experimental class, the table showed a probability value (sig.) was 0.632. the result means that the homogeneity of variance that the experimental class's significant value was higher than the level of significant ( $0.615 > 0.05$ ). On the other hand, in measuring the homogeneity of variance in control class, the table shows the probability value (sig.) was 0.068. The result means that the homogeneity of variance that the control class's significant value was higher than the significant level ( $0.068 > 0.05$ ).

It indicates that  $H_a$  was accepted because  $H_a$  stated the sample has homogeneous variants. Meanwhile,  $H_o$  was rejected because  $H_o$  said the sample has no homogeneous variants. Based on the result, it can be concluded that two class experiment and control class were homogeneous.

4. Test of Difference

**Independent Samples T-Test of Pre-Test in Experimental and Control Class**

**Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Students Score	Equal variances assumed	1.353	.250	-3.502	52	.001	11.111	3.173	-17.478	-4.744
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.502	49.260	.001	11.111	3.173	-17.486	-4.736



Independent test was used to measure the mean score between two independent clauses. In this case, the researcher does not need to see the positive sign (+) or a negative sign (-). Based on the table above it could be seen in two ways, the first way was the sig. (2 tailed) was lower than the level of significant ( $0.001 < 0.05$ ) and the second ways based on the result of data analysis of the degree of freedom was 52, the t-table score was 2.007. From the table, that t-test score was 3.502. if t-test higher than t-table ( $3.502 > 2.007$ ) means that there is a significant difference between the experimental class and the control class. However, there is a difference in the mean score between the experimental and control classes, where the experimental class scored lower than the control class. So, the experimental class was given treatment using the extensive reading, and the control class was given treatment using the intensive reading.

Meanwhile, the significance difference in posttest of experiment and control class was illustrated in Table as follows:

**Independent Samples T-Test of Post-Test in Experimental and Control Class**  
**Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
Students score		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Students score	Equal variances assumed	.005	.944	2.559	52	.013	5.556	2.171	1.199	9.912
	Equal variances not assumed			2.559	51.730	.013	5.556	2.171	1.198	9.913

Based on the result above, it can be concluded there was a significant difference in improving the students' vocabulary mastery before and after taught by using extensive reading strategy and intensive reading strategy. In the research hypothesis had been written that there are two types of hypothesis which used in this research, null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) and alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ). ( $H_0$ ) was accepted if there was no significant difference between the students result of the independent computation, in this case t-test is applied to determine the significant differences in the students' reading skill. If the t-test score is lower than the t-table score, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is accepted =  $t\text{-test} < t\text{-table}$ . The extensive reading strategy does not give any distribution to the students' improving students' vocabulary mastery. On the other hand, if the t-test score is higher than the t-table score, the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ )

is accepted =  $t\text{-test} > t\text{-table}$ , means that the extensive reading strategy gives any distribution to the students' improving students' vocabulary mastery.

Based on the table above it could be seen in two ways, the first way was the sig. (2 tailed) was lower than the level of significant ( $0.013 < 0.05$ ) and the second ways based on the result of data analysis of the degree of freedom was 52, the t-table score was 2.007. From the table, that t-test score was 2.559. If t-test higher than t-table ( $2.559 > 2.007$ ) means that there is a significant difference between the experimental class and the control class after being given treatment. It means that the students in the experimental class who were taught using extensive reading were better than the students in the control class who were taught using intensive reading in increasing students' vocabulary mastery. However, both studies have increased.

<b>N-gain Score</b>		
<b>Groups</b>	<b>N-gain</b>	<b>Category</b>
Experimental Class	47.90	Less Effective
Control Class	24.47	Ineffective

The N-gain test calculation results above show that the average N-gain score for the experimental class (extensive reading) is 47.90 or 47.9% is in the less effective category, with an N-gain score of at a minimum of 16.67% and a maximum of 78.57%. Meanwhile, the average N-gain score for the control class (intensive reading) was 24.47 or 24.4% in the ineffective category, with an N-gain score of at a minimum of -28.57% and a maximum of 53.33. Thus, it can be concluded that the use of an extensive reading strategy is less effective in increasing student vocabulary. In contrast, the use of intensive reading strategy is ineffective for improving students' vocabulary.

## DISCUSSION

The objective of the research was to find out whether there was any significant difference in students taught by using extensive reading strategy in the online learning process. In answering the objectives, the research did a pretest to the students to know students' vocabulary mastery. Next, the researcher gave the treatment ten meetings to each class. The experimental class using extensive reading strategy and control class using intensive reading strategy. After providing treatment, the researcher gave post-tests to both classes to know after the treatment using the extensive reading strategy. It is supported by Day and Bamford (1998), Extensive Reading is purposely focusing on students' reading as much as possible: not only in the classroom but also out of the school. Through extensive reading, the students can improve and memories new vocabulary, enjoy the learning process, and increase reading habits.

Based on the research have been conducted, the researcher faced the problem when conducting the research. Some of the students are lazy to do assignments, and also the students respond for very long even hours when applying the treatment, so the teacher reminds them every day to do it. The students are sometimes inactive for days because there is no data package, and the network is sometimes lost because they live outside cities such as Sekatak and Malinau. The student's handphone was also damaged so that he used his parent's handphone and was difficult to contact. Besides, it is a new challenge for the researcher to conduct the research. The use of extensive reading strategy can increase students' vocabulary mastery with ten meetings. The teacher asks students to read the reading text after making a summary of 2-3 sentences and collecting it in each meeting. It can help the students to memorize the new vocabulary that has been taught by using extensive reading strategy. The use of appropriate strategy or method is increasing the students' vocabularies.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the result, the researcher was used extensive reading strategy in improving students' vocabulary mastery at tenth grades of SMK Kesehatan Kaltara Tarakan. This research concludes that extensive reading strategy was to improve students' vocabulary mastery. It was found that the mean score of a vocabulary test between students was taught by using the extensive reading strategy (experimental class) and intensive reading strategy (control class) were relatively different. Before giving treatment, the researcher found pretest score experimental class was 40.00, and control was 51.11. After giving treatment, the mean score of the experimental class was 69.63 and control class was 64.26. The result of computation using independent samples T-test the degree of freedom 52 the significant difference 0.05 and T-table score was 2.007. The independent samples T-test before in pretest was 3.502. The result indicates T-test was greater than T-table ( $3.502 > 2.007$ ). After giving treatment, T-test score was 2.559. T-test was higher than T-table ( $2.559 > 2.007$ ). It means that extensive reading strategy significantly improves students' vocabulary mastery at tenth grades nursing students of SMK Kesehatan Kaltara Tarakan.

## REFERENCES

- Bamford, Julian & Day, Richard R. (2004). *Extensive Reading Activities for Teaching Language*. United States of America: Cambridge University Press.
- Bell, T. (2001). *Extensive Reading: Speed and comprehension*. The Reading, 1, Retrieved from <http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/bell/index.html>
- Bennetayeb, A. (2010). *Extensive reading and vocabulary teaching*. Revue Académique des Études Sociales et Humaines, 20, 21-22.
- Bromley, K. (2004). *The Language and Literacy Spectrum*. New York: the New York State Reading Association

- Corson, D.J. (1997). *The Learning and Use of Academic English Words*. Pergamon Press: Oxford.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Day, R. R & Bamford, J. (1998). *Extensive reading in a second language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Day, R. R. & Bamford, J. (2004). *Extensive reading activities for teaching language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Day, R. R., Omura, C., & Hiramatsu, M. (1992). Incidental EFL vocabulary learning and reading. *Reading in a foreign language*, 7(2), 541-551
- Elder, S. (2009). *Module 3: Sampling Methodology*. International Labour Office- Geneva: ILO
- First, E. (2019). *English proficiency index*. Retrieved from <https://www.ef.com/wwen/epi/>
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E, & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. America, New York: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications*. Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.
- Hadfield, Jill & Charles, Hadfield. (2008). *Oxford Basic Introduction to Teaching English*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hake, R.R. (1999). *Analyzing Change/Gain Scores*. Tersedia di [www.physics.indiana.edu](http://www.physics.indiana.edu) [diakses 28-12-2016].
- Hanlon, B, & Larget, B. (2011). *Sample and Population*. Department of Statistics: University of Wisconsin - Madison.
- Harmer, J. (2002). *How to teach English*. New York: Edinburg Gate.
- Hiebert, EElfrida H., and Kamil, Michel. (2005). *Teaching and Learning Vocabulary: Perspective and Persistent Issues*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Hoffman, P. R. (1993). *Realms of meaning*. New York: Longman Publishing.
- Hornby, A. S. (2000). *Oxford advance learners' dictionary of current English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Klingner, Janette K. Sharon V. and Alison B. (2007). *Teaching reading comprehension to students with learning difficulties*. New York: the Guilford Press.
- Lehr Fran & Osborn. (2001). *A focus on vocabulary*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Levy, L. S. (2016). *Extensive reading in English as a foreign language/English as a second language context*. Reports from the faculty of clinical psychology, 9(3), 69-85.
- McCarten, J. (2007). *Teaching Vocabulary Lesson from the Corpus, Lesson for The Classroom*. USA: Cambridge University Press.

- McEntire, Jo. (2003). *Read 1: Reading and life skills development*. Longman: Pearson Education.
- Nation, P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Neuman, S. B., & Dawyer, J. (2009). *Missing in action: vocabulary instruction in Pre-K*. *The Reading Teacher*, 62 (5), 384-392.
- Nuttall, C. (2005). *Teaching Reading Skills in A Foreign Language*. Oxford, UK: Macmillan Education.
- Sugiyono. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R & D*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Susser, B. & Robb, T. N. (1990). *EFL Extensive Reading Instruction: Research and Procedure*. *JALT Journal*. 12 (2), pp. 161-185.
- Thornbury, S. (2002). *How to Teach Vocabulary*. England: Person Education Limited.