

Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching

edited by Thomas Tinnefeld

Volume 5 (2014) Issue 1

JLLT

JLLT is an academic organ designed for the worldwide publication of scientific findings which concern the full range between linguistics on the one hand and language teaching on the other. At the same time, it is a basis of discussion for linguists and practitioners of language teaching.

JLLT is a refereed journal. All manuscripts, apart from those having individually been requested by the editor, have to be positively evaluated by two referees, this procedure being totally anonymous on both sides (authors and referees). Only then will they be published.

Addressees of *JLLT*:

- linguists and foreign language methodologists - from university professors to PhD students and teachers at universities and all types of schools;
- young scientists who will find a publication platform for their academic projects which they can open up for discussion so as to get fruitful advice from the community of readers and authors.

Which text types will be accepted?

- articles
- book reviews
- reports about scientific projects and conferences
- reports about innovative study programmes
- reports about Ph.D. projects (for the publication and the protection of intermediate research results) as pre-publications.

The publication process can formally be described as follows:

1. Receipt of a manuscript
2. Pre-screening of the manuscript (editor)
3. Evaluation of the manuscript (editorial board)
4. Positive result: publication of the article on a separate page of the Journal's website. Thus, quick publication of the manuscript (about six to eight weeks after receipt) and availability for the academic world.
5. After receipt of all the parts of the given issue of the Journal: publication of the article in the PDF format, the web page version of the text being kept. Completion of the publication process.

Date of publication: July 30th, 2014

Editorial Board (in alphabetical order)

Prof. Dr. Klaus-Dieter Baumann - Universität Leipzig, Germany

Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Wolfgang Blumbach, M.A. - Hochschule für Technik und Wirtschaft des Saarlandes, Germany

Prof. Dr. Didi-Ionel Cenuser - Lucian Blaga University, Sibiu, Romania

Prof. Dr. Wai Meng Chan - National University of Singapore, Singapore

Prof. Dr. Shin-Lung Chen - National Kaohsiung First University of Science and Technology (NKFUST), Taiwan

Prof. Dr. Inez De Florio-Hansen - Universität Kassel, Germany

Prof. Dr. Frank Kostrzewa - Pädagogische Hochschule Karlsruhe, Germany

Prof. Tsailing Cherry Liang, Ph.D. - National Taichung University of Science and Technology, Taiwan

Prof. Dr. Heinz-Helmut Lüger - Universität Koblenz-Landau, Germany

Prof. em. Dr. Heiner Pürschel - Universität Duisburg-Essen, Germany

Prof. Dr. Günter Schmale - Université de Lorraine-Metz, France

Prof. Dr. Ulrich Schmitz - Universität Duisburg-Essen, Germany

Prof. Dr. Christine Sick - Hochschule für Technik und Wirtschaft des Saarlandes, Germany

Prof. Dr. Veronica Smith, M.A. - Alpen-Adria Universität Klagenfurt, Austria

Prof. Dr. Bernd Spillner - Universität Duisburg-Essen, Germany

Table of Contents

Foreword to the Issue	5
------------------------------------	----------

I. Articles

Shing-lung Chen 陳欣蓉 (Kaohsiung, Taiwan): Modell zur Entwicklung von Rettungsmechanismen für Sprachlernprogramme - am Beispiel von Systemfehlschlägen bei der Spracherkennung	11
Chris Merkelbach (Taipeh, Taiwan): Die Vermittlung von Lesefertigkeiten im Chinesischunterricht - ein Diskussionsbeitrag	31
Nina Daskalovska (Stip, Republic of Macedonia): Incidental Vocabulary Learning through Reading	57
Andrew Schenck and Wonkyung Choi (both Daejeon, South Korea): Determining the Best Pedagogical Practices for Diverse Grammatical Features	67
Anna Krulatz (Trondheim, Norway): Electronic Requests in Native and Non-Native Russian: Insights into Foreign Language Learners' Sociolinguistic Competence	87
Patrycja Golebiewska / Christian Jones (both Preston, UK) The Teaching and Learning of Lexical Chunks: A Comparison of <i>Observe</i> <i>Hypothesise Experiment</i> and <i>Presentation Practice Production</i>	99

II. Book Reviews

Heinz-Helmut Lüger (Koblenz-Landau): Zofia Bilut-Homplewicz: Prinzip Perspektivierung. Germanistische und polonistische Textlinguistik – Entwicklungen, Probleme, Desiderata. Frankfurt/M.: Lang 2013	119
Elisabeth Kolb (München): Daniel Reimann & Andrea Rössler (Hrsg.): Sprachmittlung im Fremdsprachenunterricht. Tübingen: Narr 2013	125

László Kovács (Szombathely, Ungarn): Erzsébet Drahota-Szabó: Realien – Intertextualität – Übersetzung. Landau: Verlag Empirische Pädagogik 2013	131
---	-----

Incidental Vocabulary Learning through Reading¹⁵

Nina Daskalovska (Stip, Republic of Macedonia)

Abstract

A lot of studies on vocabulary learning have demonstrated that one of the ways of acquiring vocabulary is through reading. The purpose of this study was to replicate the study conducted by Zahar, Cob and Spada (2001) and compare the results with the original study and another replication study using the same design. The study was conducted with university students who were in their first year of studying English language and literature. In order to establish the participants' vocabulary size, Nation's Vocabulary Levels Test (1990) was used. The effect of the reading treatment was determined by using a pretest-posttest design. The results of the posttest showed that the participants learned one in three previously unknown words. There was a positive relationship between the participants' vocabulary size and the relative gains as well as between the frequency of the words in the text and the relative gain scores. The findings suggest that learners' general knowledge and cognitive abilities may be significant factors that affect the rate of vocabulary acquisition through reading.

Key words: vocabulary acquisition, incidental learning, reading, vocabulary size, word frequency

1 Introduction

It is believed that reading is one of the best ways of enriching one's vocabulary knowledge. The credibility of this belief has been confirmed by studies which have demonstrated that during their primary and secondary education, children learn about 3.000 words a year (Nagy & Herman 1987: 21). On the other hand, direct instruction in the classroom enables children to learn about 200-300 words per year (Nagy et al. 1987: 237). These findings suggest that most of the vocabulary is acquired through listening and reading. Comparing the distribution of words in oral and print language, Cunningham & Stanovich (1998: 10) found out that the average frequency of the words in oral speech was in the 400-600 range, and came to the conclusion that compared to written language, oral language was "lexically impoverished". This implies that reading can greatly contribute to vocabulary development, which has been confirmed in first language acquisition studies (Saragi et al. 1978, Jenkins et al. 1984, Nagy et al. 1985, Nagy et al. 1987).

Krashen's Input Hypothesis, which postulates that children acquire language by being exposed to comprehensible input which is a little beyond their current level of competence and that listening and reading are of primary importance for language acquisition (Krashen 1982; Krashen & Terrel 1983), has prompted researchers to investigate the possibility of

¹⁵ The present study was first presented at the *3rd International Conference on Foreign Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics in Sarajevo (FLTAL)*, Bosnia and Hercegovina, in 2013.

L2 learners to acquire vocabulary through reading. There is now a substantial body of research which demonstrates that L2 learners can also learn vocabulary incidentally while reading for meaning (Brown et al. 2008, Cho and Krashen 1994, Day et al. 1991, Dupuy and Krashen 1993, Elley & Mangubhai 1981, Grabe & Stoller 1997, Hafiz & Tudor 1989, Horst 2005, Horst et al. 1998, Horst & Meara 1999, Pellicer-Sánchez & Schmitt 2010, Pigada & Schmitt 2006, Pitts et al. 1989, Waring & Takaki, 2003, Zahar et al. 2001). However, these studies have sparked a debate about the effectiveness of reading for vocabulary learning. Some researchers remark that some of the studies at times lacked control of the research design (Nation 2001: 155) and were “methodologically flawed” (Horst et al. 1998: 210). Others point out that these studies lack validity because learning vocabulary from context was not compared with other techniques, which would determine the effectiveness of different methods (Raptis 1997: 573). However, we should bear in mind that some techniques are quite different and cannot be compared easily. Moreover, the aim of studies on vocabulary acquisition should not be finding the best way of learning vocabulary, but finding several effective ways which can be combined for achieving the best results. This is especially true if we know that learners have different learning styles and preferences, and one method will not be suitable for all learners. Thus, we should strive to determine which methods enable learners to acquire vocabulary knowledge effectively, and it is up to learners and teachers to determine which methods they will use and how they will combine the recommended ways of vocabulary acquisition.

In addition to conducting new studies, replicating existing studies can help us gain deeper insights and can enable us to make stronger conclusions about a particular phenomenon. The purpose of this study was to replicate the study conducted by Zahar et al. (2001), to compare the results of the present study with the original study and another replication study and draw conclusions about the effectiveness of reading for vocabulary learning.

2 The Original Study

The study (Zahar et al. 2001) was conducted with 144 grade seven ESL (English as a second language) students in Canada who read the text *The Golden Fleece*, which contains 2,387 words. In order to determine the participants' vocabulary size, they were given the Vocabulary Levels Test (Nation 1990) at the five levels. The pretest / posttest consisted of 30 words which appeared with various frequencies in the text. Before the treatment, the participants knew the meaning of 19.66 of the target words, which increased to 21.82 after the treatment. Thus, the participants learned the meaning of 2.16 words from the remaining 10.34 unknown words or 20.88% of the available words. The correlation between the frequency of the words in the text and the absolute learning gains was 0.36. As the effect of frequency of the words in the text was expressed most clearly for the participants with the smallest vocabulary sizes, the authors suggest that the role of frequency is greater for learners with smaller vocabulary sizes.

3 The First Replication Study

In the first replication study (Daskalovska 2014), the participants were 83 secondary

school students, aged 16, who had been studying English as a foreign language for six years. The study design was the same as in the original study. The results of the Vocabulary Levels Test showed that the participants knew 54.88% of all the tested words. Because of the big differences in their vocabulary sizes, they were divided into three groups: Group 1 knew 76.58%, Group 2 knew 57.54% and Group 3 knew 34.33% of the words. The posttest revealed that on average, the participants learned 3.02 words or 25.98% of the previously unknown words, which is about one in four words. The correlation between the participants' vocabulary size and the learning gains was not significant, while the correlation between word frequency and learning gains was $r=0.34$, which showed that the frequency of the words in the text played a certain role on the rate of acquisition of the unknown words, but unlike the original study, it was less significant for the participants with smaller vocabulary sizes. The learning gains in this study were slightly higher than the learning gains in the original study, even though the vocabulary sizes of the participants in this study were slightly lower than those in the original study. Since the participants in the replication study were four years older, the author suggests that the suitability of the text, the readers' general knowledge and their cognitive abilities may be significant factors in incidental vocabulary learning.

4 Research Design

The present study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. How does reading affect vocabulary acquisition?
2. What is the effect of participants' vocabulary size on the acquisition of unknown vocabulary?
3. What is the relationship between word frequency in the text and the rate at which words are acquired?

The participants in this study were 94 university students in the first year of their undergraduate degree in English Language and Literature in the Republic of Macedonia. They had studied English as a foreign language for eight years in primary and secondary school. This age group was selected because it was considered that their vocabulary sizes would match rather closely the vocabulary sizes of the participants in the original study who were learning English as a second language. By excluding the factor of vocabulary size, the effects of age difference between the participants in the original study, the first replication study and the present study could be seen more clearly. The results of the Vocabulary Levels Test, which was administered before the treatment, showed that there were considerable differences in participants' vocabulary sizes. In order to determine the effect of vocabulary size on the acquisition rate of vocabulary more clearly, the participants were divided into three groups.

As in the original study, the participants read the text *The Golden Fleece*, which is a Greek myth taken from an intermediate ESL reader and contains 2,387 words. The computer analysis of the text showed that 91% of the words in the text belong to the first 2,000 most frequent words, 1% of the words are from the University Word List, and 8% are off-list words half of which are proper nouns (Zahar et al. 2001). As most of the participants were

familiar with the words belonging to the 2,000-word-level list, it was assumed that the coverage of known words would at least be 95%, which would enable the learners to understand the text and infer the meaning of unknown words from the context (Hirsh and Nation 1992, Hu and Nation 2,000, Laufer 1997).

In order to determine the effect of the participants' vocabulary size on vocabulary acquisition, it was necessary to establish their vocabulary size prior to the treatment. For this purpose, Nation's Vocabulary Levels Test (1990) was used. It measures learners' knowledge of words at five levels: 2,000, 3,000, 5,000, 10,000 and University Word Level.

The pretest / posttest consisted of 30 target words which appeared in the text with a different frequency, ranging from 1 to 15. However, the majority of the words appeared from two to five times. The test was designed in the same way as the Vocabulary Levels Test and contained 10 blocks of 6 words (Zahar et al. 2001).

The participants were asked for their agreement to take part in a study, but the goal of the study was not disclosed. The Vocabulary Levels Test and the pretest were administered one week before the treatment. In the original study, the participants listened to the recording of the text and followed it in their books at the same time. A recording of the text was not available for the present study, so the text was read aloud by the instructor and the participants followed it in their copies. The reading treatment lasted 30 minutes. The posttest was administered two days after the reading treatment.

5 Results

The results of the Vocabulary Levels Test show that the participants knew the meaning of 56.37% of the words, with the greatest knowledge of the words at the 2,000-word level and the University Word List, and only 21.93% of the words at the 10,000-word level.

	Mean	Standard deviation	Range
2,000 word level	23.45	6.26	22
3,000 word level	18.5	7.04	23
5,000 word level	15.2	5.14	20
University Word List	20.83	4.90	15
10,000 word level	6.58	3.32	15
Total	84.56 (56.37%)		

Table 1: Vocabulary Levels Test results

However, there were considerable differences between the participants' vocabulary sizes so that in order to determine the effect of vocabulary size on vocabulary learning, they were divided into three groups. The figures in Table 2 show that the first group knew 73.33% of the words while the third group only knew 37.58%.

Group	2000	3000	5000	UWL	10000	Total	%
1	28.42	25.28	20.85	25.71	9.71	110	73.33
2	25.55	20.33	15.22	22.33	6.44	89.88	59.91
3	16.75	10.5	10.25	14.87	4	56.37	37.58

Table 2: Vocabulary Levels Test results by groups

The participants' vocabulary sizes were reflected in their knowledge of the target words on the pretest. Thus, the first group knew 22.75 words or 75.83% of the target words, while the third group only knew 10.75 words or 35.83%. Thus, the number of words available for learning was quite different as well. For the first group, there were only 7.25 words available for learning, for the second group, there were 10.25 words and for the third group, the number of available words was 19.25:

Group	N	Pre-test	SD	%	Post-test	SD	%	Gain	%	Relative gain %
1	31	22.75	1.98	75.83	26.37	1.39	87.9	3.62	12.07	43.84
2	32	19.75	2.96	65.83	25.5	1.81	85	5.75	19.17	54.64
3	31	10.75	3.69	35.83	13.12	4.96	43.73	2.37	7.9	12.77
Total	94	17.75	6.03	59.16	21.66	6.88	72.2	3.91	13.04	37.09

Table 3: Pretest-posttest results by groups

The posttest results show that on the average, the participants were able to learn the meaning of 3.91 words or 31.9% of the previously unknown words, which represents a relative gain of 37.09%. The t-test for paired samples ($t=6.38$, $p<0.01$) shows that the difference between the pretest and the posttest was significantly greater than chance. According to these results, the participants managed to learn one in three unknown words, which is one of the highest scores ever in the research on vocabulary acquisition through reading. The group with the greatest gain was group 2, that learned the meaning of 5.75 words or 54.64% of the available words for learning, which means that they learned more than half of the unknown words. Group 1 had a gain of 3.62 words or 43.84%. On the other hand, the group that had 19.25 words available for learning managed to learn the meaning of only 2.37 words or 12.77%.

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient for the correlation between the relative gain scores and the total scores on the Vocabulary Levels Test for group 1 was $r=0.13$; for group 2, it was $r=-0.40$; and for group 3, it was $r=0.54$. The correlation figures and the posttest results show that the effect of the vocabulary size on learning vocabulary from reading is most clearly expressed for learners with the smallest vocabulary sizes and indicate that probably the main reason for the small learning gains were the considerably small vocabulary sizes of the learners in this group. They knew only half of the words at the 2.000 word level, which implies that they probably had difficulties in understanding the text and inferring the meaning of new words from reading.

As mentioned above, the frequency of the target words in the text ranged from 1 to 15, and the majority of words appeared from two to five times. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient for the correlation between the learning gain scores and the frequency of the words in the text was $r=0.29$ for group 1, $r=0.30$ for group 2, and $r=0.11$ for group 3. These figures show that the effect of frequency was the least significant for the group with the smallest vocabulary size, which is in contrast with the results obtained in the original study. However, it seems that due to the small vocabulary sizes of these learners, the coverage of known words in the text was much lower, and this was likely to affect learners' text comprehension so that the factor of frequency could not play a more important role in the acquisition of vocabulary.

6 Discussion

The aim of this study, which was a second replication of the study conducted by Zahar et al. (2001), was to find out whether the results obtained in the original study and the first replication study would be confirmed with another group of learners in a different setting. In order to compare the results, we first need to state the similarities and differences between the participants in the three studies.

In the original study, the participants were seventh grade students around the age of 12 who were studying English in an ESL context. In the first replication study, the participants were secondary school students, aged 16, studying English in an EFL context. In the present study the participants were first-year university students, aged 19, who were also

studying English in an EFL context. According to the results of the Vocabulary Levels Test, there was not a substantial difference between the vocabulary sizes of the participants in the three studies, but the participants in the original study on average knew 59% of the words at the five levels, the participants in the first replication study knew 54.88% and the participants in the present study they knew 56.37% of all the words. Thus, the greatest vocabulary size was recorded for the participants in the original study.

In relation to the first question, in the original study the participants learned the meaning of 2.16 words or 20.88% of the previously unknown words, in the first replication study they learned 3.02 words or 25.98%, while in the present study, the participants were able to learn the meaning of 3.91 words or 31.9%, which means that the participants in the present study had the greatest learning gains and learned one in three previously unknown words as compared to one in four words in the first replication study and one in five words in the original study. As the main difference between the participants was age, which implies different levels of cognitive abilities and world knowledge which, according to Hirsh (2003), are important conditions for better reading comprehension, we may conclude that apart from vocabulary size, the suitability of the text, the learners' background knowledge and cognitive abilities are significant factors that influence the rate of vocabulary acquisition through reading.

The second question investigated the effect of vocabulary size on vocabulary learning. In the three studies, the participants with the smallest and the biggest vocabulary size had lower gains than those in the middle. The results suggest that knowledge of around 60% of the words at the five levels of the Vocabulary Levels Test ensures good reading comprehension and an ability to infer the meaning of words from context for texts graded at an intermediate level. The smaller learning gains of the participants with the biggest vocabulary sizes suggest that if the number of unknown words in the text is too low, readers do not focus on them and do not invest too much effort to infer their meaning as they can easily understand the meaning of the text. This confirms Krashen's hypothesis (1982) that in order for input to be beneficial for learners and to create conditions for learning the meaning of unknown words, it has to be slightly beyond the learners' current level.

In relation to the last question whose aim was to find out the effect of word frequency on vocabulary learning, the results in the three studies show a moderate effect, but whereas in the original study, the greatest effect was found for the learners with the smallest vocabulary sizes, both replication studies show smaller effects for the participants with the smallest vocabulary sizes. One of the reasons may be the difficulty of the text for these learners. However, this text does not seem quite suitable for investigating the factor of word frequency as there was not enough variability in the frequency of the target words.

7 Conclusion

This study has investigated the effect of reading on vocabulary acquisition by replicating the study conducted by Zahar et al. (2001). It has demonstrated that EFL learners can learn the meaning of unknown words from reading. The participants in this study learned more words than the participants in the original study and the first replication study even

though their vocabulary sizes were similar. The major difference between the participants was their age, which implies that besides vocabulary size, the learners' cognitive abilities and world knowledge can greatly influence their ability to infer the meaning of unknown words from context. Moreover, the results of the study suggest that if there are only a few unfamiliar words in the text, readers will not put too much effort to learn the meaning of the unknown words, which means that texts should be a bit more challenging in order to be beneficial for learners.

The findings of the study suggest that if EFL learners read texts at the appropriate level for 30 minutes a day, they may learn more than 1,000 new words a year, which means that, combined with direct instruction, reading can greatly improve their vocabulary knowledge. Thus, incorporating an extensive reading component in the language programmes would significantly increase the possibility of acquiring a body of vocabulary that would enable learners to become competent users of the respective foreign language.

References

- Brown, R., Waring, R. & Donkaewbua, S. (2008). Incidental vocabulary acquisition from reading, reading-while-listening, and listening to stories. In: *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 20, 2, 136-163.
- Cho, K. & Krashen, S. D. (1994). Acquisition of vocabulary from the Sweet Valley Kids series: Adult ESL acquisition. In: *Journal of Reading*, 37, 8, 662-667.
- Cunningham, A.E. & Stanovich, K.E. (1998). What Reading Does for the Mind. In: *American Educator*, 22, 8-15.
- Day, R.R., Omura, C. & Hiramatsu, M. (1991). Incidental EFL vocabulary learning and reading. In: *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 7, 541-551.
- Dupuy, B. & Krashen, S. (1993). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in French as a foreign language. In: *Applied Language Learning*, 4, 55-64.
- Elley, W.B. & Mangubhai, F. (1981). *The impact of a book flood in Fiji primary schools*. Wellington: NZCER.
- Grabe, W. & Stoller, F. (1997). Reading and vocabulary development in a second language: A case study. In: J. Coady & T. Huckin (Eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A Rationale for Pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hafiz, F. & Tudor, I. (1989). Extensive reading and the development of language skills. In: *ELT Journal*, 43, 4-13.
- Hirsh, E.D. (2003). Reading Comprehension Requires Knowledge-of Words and the World. In: *American Educator*. (http://www.aft.org/pdfs/americaneducator/spring2003/AE_SPRNG.pdf)
- Horst, M. (2005). Learning L2 vocabulary through extensive reading: measurement study. In: *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 61, 355-382.
- Horst, M., Cobb, T. & Meara, P. (1998). Beyond A Clockwork Orange: Acquiring second language vocabulary through reading. In: *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 11(2), 207-223.
- Horst, M. & Meara, P. (1999). Test of a model for predicting second language lexical growth through reading. In: *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 56, 308-328.

- Jenkins, J.R., Stein, M.L. & Wysocki, K. (1984). Learning Vocabulary through Reading. In: *American Educational Research Journal*, 21(4), 767-787.
- Krashen, S.D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. & Terrel, T. (1983). *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Nagy, W.E.; Herman, P.A. & Anderson, R.C. (1985). Learning Words from Context. In: *Reading Research Quarterly*, 20(2), 233-253.
- Nagy, W.E., Anderson, R.C. & Herman, P.A. (1987). Learning word meanings from context during normal reading. In: *American Educational Research Journal*, 24, 237-270.
- Nagy, W.E. & Herman, P.A. (1987). Breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge: Implications for acquisition and instruction. In: McKeown, M. G. & Curtis, M. E. (Eds.). *The Nature of Vocabulary Acquisition*. Hillsdale, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Nation, I.S.P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pellicer-Sánchez, A. & Schmitt, P. (2010). Incidental vocabulary acquisition from an authentic novel: Do Things Fall Apart? In: *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 22(1), 31-55.
- Pigada, M. & Schmitt, N. (2006). Vocabulary acquisition from extensive reading: A case study. In: *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 18, 1, 1-28.
- Pitts, M., White, H. & Krashen, S. (1989). Acquiring second language vocabulary through reading: A replication of the Clockwork Orange study using second language acquirers. In: *Reading in a Foreign Language* 5(2), 271-275.
- Raptis, H. (1997). Is Second Language Reading Vocabulary Bets Learned by Reading? In: *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 53(3), 566-580.
- Saragi, P., Nation, I.S.P. & Meister, G.F. (1978). Vocabulary learning and reading. In: *System*, 6, 72-78.
- Waring, R. & Takaki, M. (2003). At what rate do learners learn and retain new vocabulary from reading a graded reader? In *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 15/2.
- Zahar, R., Cobb, T. & Spada, N. (2001). Acquiring vocabulary through reading: Effects of frequency and contextual richness. In: *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 4, 541-572.

Author:

Nina Daskalovska, Ph.D.

Goce Delcev University

Department of English Language and Literature

Krste Misirkov 10-A, Stip 2000

Republic of Macedonia

E-mail: nina.daskalovska@ugd.edu.mk