THE READING COMPREHENSION OF TEXT WITH DIFFERENT LEXICAL DENSITY AND TOPIC FAMILIARITY OF GRADE TEN STUDENTS OF SMA SW KATOLIK BUDI MURNI 2 MEDAN.

*Laura Esterlita br Sinuhaji

** Prof. Dr. Berlin Sibarani, M.Pd

**Tiarnita Maria Sarjani Siregar,M.Hum

ABSTRACT

This study aims with reading comprehension of grade ten students of SMA SW Katolik Budi Murni 2 Medan. The objective of this study is(1) describe the students reading comprehension across text of different lexical density and topic familiarity and (2) to find out the effect of lexical density and topic familiarity in reading comprehension. The research was conducted bydescriptive qualitative with non-parametric statistic research. The research was conducted in SMA SW Katolik Budi Murni 2 Medan at the grade ten classroom. the sample of the research were 10 students. The instruments for collecting data used in this research were six reading text with different lexical density and topic familiarity and of reading comprehension test.The result of the analysis showed that: (1) Familiar text is easier to comprehend for the students than the unfamiliar text when they both have low lexical density, while familiar text with medium and high lexical density is the same difficult for the students to comprehend as the unfamiliar text. (2) Text with low lexical density is easier for the students to comprehend than text with medium and high lexical density when the texts are both familiar. While texts with low and medium lexical density is the same difficult for the students to comprehend as the text with high lexical density when the text are unfamiliar.

Keywords:Key words : *Lexical Density, Reading Comprehension, Reading Text, Topic Familiarity.*

INTRODUCTION

Background of The Study

Reading is one of the most important skills in learning English. Reading is process to get information and to understand the meaning of the some words fromatext. Reading, enhance individual enlightment. It increases academic knowledge, expands the general culture, provides socialization. It has an important place in the learning of ethical values, in the raising the level of moral and the winning aesthetics. Reading is the most effective communication tool which is used throughout life, starting from first class average of five years-.

Information is an effective way to develop skills.

In Indonesian school, when learning English specifically in reading skill, students are provided with some reading texts while. Reading text is one of devices of transferring message and information. Tiediman (2011) defines reading text is a tool of reading, because it is an instrument that is used to read. Harmer (1998:68) reading text provides opportunities to study vocabulary, grammar, punctuation and the way to construct paragraph, sentence and text. According to Nunan (2003:68) reading is fluent process of a readers combining information from a text and their own background knowledge to build meaning. Moreover, Murcia (2001:187) mentions the purpose of reading for purposes of reading for students are to search for information, for general comprehension, to learn new information and to evaluate information.

In senior high school, there are some kinds of text. they are narration, recount, procedure, description, news item, analytical exposition, hortatory, exposition, explanation, discussion, review and spoof.

It is common to find reading texts followed by questions related to the text. In order to be able to answer the questions, students need to comprehend the text. Reading comprehension as a thinking process is one of the keys to get knowledge and information because in general a lot of knowledge and information which written and only by reading it we can get a knowledge of what has been written it either from books, newspaper, magazines or other print media.

In comprehending the text there are some factors to consider in a text. Firstly is lexical density of a text. Lexical density is a term used often in text analysis. Ure defines lexical density as the proportion of words carrying lexical values (member of open-ended sets) to the words with grammatical values (items representing terms in closed sets). Lexical Density is a measure of how much information there is in a particular piece of language. Lexical words (content words) are words which carry information. Texts which have a high proportion of lexical items compared to function words (grammatical items) are said to have a high lexical density. Secondly is topic familiarity of a text. Text with familiar topic most likely easier to comprehend because readers already familiar with the words in the text and the time of thinking process to understand the meaning of the words is shorter.

Based on the explanation above, the writer is interesting in analyzing students' comprehension of reading text with different lexical density and topic familiarity for grade ten students in SMA Swasta Katolik Budi Murni 2 Medan.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

According to Wixson, Peters, Weber, and Roeber (1987), reading is the process of creating meaning that involves: (a) the readers' existing knowledge; (b) the text information; and (c) the reading context. Reading is an activity to get ideas between the writer and the reader to understand what they read. In English Foreign Language (EFL) reading is one of the most important factors in assessing learner's linguistic competence.

However, it is skill for reader should be master in good reading skills to get information or ideas from the act of communication. Reading should include comprehension, understanding, interpretation and thinking. According to Sandra Silberstein, reading is a complex information process skill in which the readers interacts with text in order to re (create) meaningful discourse.

Reading text is one of devices of transferring message and information. Tiediman (2011) defines reading text is a tool of reading, because it is an

instrument that is used to read. Harmer (1998:68) reading text provides opportunities to study vocabulary, grammar, punctuation and the way to construct paragraph, sentence and text. According to Nunan (2003:68) reading is fluent process of a readers combining information from a text and their own background knowledge to build meaning. Moreover, Murcia (2001:187) mentions the purpose of reading for purposes of reading for students are to search for information, for general comprehension, to learn new information and to evaluate information.

Reading comprehension as a thinking process is one of the keys to get knowledge and information because in general a lot of knowledge and information which written and only by reading it we can get a knowledge of what has been written it either from books, newspaper, magazines or other print media.

As quoted from Sağilri Reading comprehension is one of the most important indicators of reading success. It can be obtain an idea of a student's comprehension skills by way of explaining read (Aykolet all. 2014:14). Comprehension is the essence of reading and the active process of constructing meaning from text (Durkin, 1993). Reading comprehension is a complex interaction among automatic and strategic cognitive process that enables the reader to create mental representation of the text (Van den Broek &Espin, 2012). Comprehension depends not only on characteristic of the reader, such as prior knowledge and working memory, but also on language processes, such as basic reading skills, decoding, vocabulary, sensitivity to text structure, interferencing and motivation. Comprehension also requires effective use of strategic processes such as metacognition and comprehension monitoring. As readers mature in their comprehension skills, they are able to progress efficiently from the stage of learning to read to the ultimate goal of reading to learn (Yovanoff, Duesbery, Alonzo & Tindal, 2005).

Topic Familiarity also can be expected to influence how searchers select pages for examination. When reading a text for comprehension, readers closely attend to topic introducing sentences and compute their relationships to previously established text topics (Hyona, 1995; Lorch, Lorch, & Matthews, 1985; Lorch, Lorch, &Mogan, 1987). Upon rereading the text, processing of topic sentences is

facilitated more than processing of non topic sentences (Hyena, 1995; see also Mayer, 1983, and Millis et al.,1998). These findings have been interpreted as demonstrating that readers construct a representation ofthe text's topics and its organization as they read (Gernsbacher , 1990, 1997; Lorch et al., 1985). The availability of a topic structure representation should have a substantial influence on text search because it can be used to guide the reader's page turning strategy. If the text is unfamiliar, searchers must begin with the first page and inspect each successive page until they locate the target information.

Lexical density is a term used often in text analysis. Ure defines lexical density as the proportion of words carrying lexical values (member of open-ended sets) to the words with grammatical values (item representing terms in closed sets).

Since all the words have grammatical values, this is a part: whole relation" (Ure& Ellis 1977:201) moreover, Halliday (1985) developed and further refined lexical density. He points out the importance of discriminating between lexical items and grammatical items. An item may consist of more than one word. Johansson (2008:65) states that lexical density is the terms which is most often use for describing the proportion of content words (noun, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs) to the total number of words. Nunan in Sitiholicatun (2011) stated that "lexical density referred to the number of lexical density content of function words per clause". Based on the explanation above, lexical density is a measure of text that is known from the percentage of the content words or lexical items in the analyzed text.

In addition, Halliday (1985:63) gives more detail explanation about lexical density. He points out the importance of discriminating between lexical items and grammatical items. He defines lexical density as the number of lexical items or content words as the proportion of the number of running words. He refers to use lexical items than lexical word because they may consist of more than one word, for example, stand up, sit down, lay down, take off and other phrasal verbs all functions as single lexical items.

Lexical items consist of words such as nouns, adjectives, and adverbs. Grammatical words, on the other hand come from closed set of options. There are words such as preposition, conjunction, auxiliary verbs, modal verbs, pronouns, and articles. Lexical items called as open system because it is possible to add new members in to the class and we cannot close off it class membership. Grammatical items are called as closed system because we cannot add any words or items for example the personal pronoun. There are no more items in these classes and grammatical items may have only or two letters in them, whereas lexical items require a minimum of three.

In measuring the density first we have to determine the lexical items or content word, and then count how many lexical items and clause in the text thus, put them in the following formula:

$$= \frac{}{\text{THE NUMBER OF CLAUSE}}$$

In deciding the "lexical density" of students' text we should first analyze text and then determine the lexical items and clause consist in the text, and then calculate the lexical density by using the determined formula.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In conducting this study, the researcher will use descriptive qualitative research with non-parametric statistics. Patton and Cochran (2012) stated that qualitative research is characterized by its aims and its methods which generate words, rather than numbers as data for analysis. It means that the data of the study is analyzed in the form of description, identification and analysis of the text. Descriptive research means that the data of this study is described and explained. The reading comprehension of text with different lexical density and topic familiarity of grade ten students of SMA Sw Katolik Budi Murni 2 Medan would be described by using the words produced during the process as data.

Data and The Source of Data

Data of the research are the 6 different reading text with different lexical density and topic familiarity which will be used bas the reading comprehension

test. Data needed to answer research problem one, is the scores of reading comprehension test of text with different lexical density.. Data needed to answer research problem two are the scores of reading comprehension test of a text with different topic familiarity and different level of lexical density. The source of data will be the ten students of grade ten class of SMA Swasta Katolik Budi Murni 2 Medan.

Techniques in Collecting the Data

Data needed to answer research problem one, is the scores of reading comprehension test of text with different lexical density. To collect this data reading comprehension test will be held. Data needed to answer research problem two are the scores of reading comprehension test of a text with different topic familiarity and different level of lexical density. To collect this data a test reading comprehension will be used.

Technique of Data Analysis

To analyze the lexical density, Halliday's formula will be used and to analyze the topic familiarity of the text, a questionnaire will be distributed to group the text as the familiar and unfamiliar. Data of research problem one, descriptive statistics will be used. The score frequency, mean, standard deviation will be calculated. To analyze the data of research problem two, non-parametric statistic will be used. The scores of students' comprehension of familiar topic test with low lexical density will be compared to the score of medium lexical density and the score of high lexical density will be compared to the score of Low Lexical Density. The score of students' comprehension test of Familiar Topic text with Low Lexical Density (LLD FT) will be compared to the comprehension test of Unfamiliar Topic text with Low Lexical Density (LLD UFT), The score of students' comprehension test of Familiar Topic text with Medium Lexical Density (MLD FT) will be compared to the comprehension test of Unfamiliar Topic text with Medium Lexical Density (MLD UFT), The score of students' comprehension test of Familiar Topic text with High Lexical Density (HLD FT) will be compared

to the comprehension test of Unfamiliar Topic text with High Lexical Density (HLD UFT). The score familiar topic text of low lexical density (FT LLD) will be compared with high lexical density (FT HLD), the score of familiar topic text of medium lexical density (FT MLD) will be compared with high lexical density (FT HLD), the score of unfamiliar topic text of low lexical density (UFT LLD) will be compared with high lexical density(UFT HLD) , the score of unfamiliar text of medium lexical density(UFT MLD) will be compared with high lexical density (UFT HLD) .These comparisons are presented in the table.

DATA ANALYSIS

To answer the two research problems, the data were analyzed with non-parametric statistics and the formula applied is "wilcoxson signed rank test"(Bluman in Elementary Statistics 2012) as follow:

Step 1 : State the hypotheses and identify the claim

H_o =
H_a =

Step 2 : Find the critical value from Table K. Since n=10 and α= 0.05 for this two-tailed test, the critical value is 8.

Step 3 : Find the test value

a. Make a table as shown below.

b. Find the difference (before minus after), and place the values in the Difference column.

c. Find the absolute value of each difference and place the results in the absolute value column. (note: the absolute of any number except 0 is the positive value of the number. Any differences of 0 should be ignored)

d. Rank each absolute value from lowest to highest and place the rankings in the Rank column.

e. Give each rank a plus or minus sign, accordingto the sign in the Difference column. The completed table is shown here.

f. Find the sum of the positive ranks and the sum of the negative ranks separately.

Positive rank sum :
Negative rank sum :

g. Select the smaller of the absolute values of the sums (-3), and use this absolute value as the test value w_s in this case, $w_s = (-3) = 3$.

Step 4 : Make the decision. Reject the null hypothesis if the test value is less than or equal to the critical value. In this case, 3>2; hence, the decision is not to reject the null hypothesis.

Step5 : Summarize the result. There is not enough evidence to support the claim that there is a difference in the number of shoplifting incidents. Hence, the security increase probably made no difference in the number of shoplifting incidents.

Before applying the non-parametric formula, 1. Lexical Density, 2. Familiarity of the text and 3. Reading comprehension scores should be analyzed. To find out the lexical density of the text , ure's formula is used. The result of this calculation is shown in table 4.1The formula is :

$$= \frac{The\ number\ of\ lexical\ items}{\text{the number of words}}$$

To find out the familiarity of the text administered a questionnaire to the students search how familiar the text are for them. the result of the analysis shown the text familiarity in table 4.2

Table 4.1 Classification of Lexical Items in the Reading Texts

No	Text title	Lexical Items				Total Lexical items	Total grammatical items	Total words	LD (TCW/TW) (%)	Category
		N	Adj	v	Ad					
1	W	93	197	68	26	384	180	564	68.08	Difficult
2	M	52	49	59	14	174	381	555	31.35	Easy
3	T.E	158	37	61	8	264	248	512	51.56	Fair
4	A.A	166	54	55	7	282	270	552	51.08	Fair
5	C.I.D	69	34	16	14	143	403	546	26.19	Easy
6	O.I	176	76	35	13	300	299	599	58.08	Difficult

Where:

W : Weathering
M : Magnetism
C.I.D : Compulsive Internet Disorder
N : Noun
Adj : Adjective
LD : Lexical Density
T.E : Theory of Evolution
A.A : Armored Animal
O.I : Optical Illusion
V : Verb
Adv : Adverb

Lexical density category
0% – 33% = easy
34% - 67% = fair
68% - 100% =difficult

Table 4.2 Classification of Topic Familiarity and the Lexical Density

No	Topic Familiarity	Title of the text
1	Familiar Topic	Magnetism
		Optical Illusion
		Theory of Evolution
2	Unfamiliar Topic	Compulsive Internet Disorder
		Armored Animal
		Weathering

The table 4.2 shows the classification of topic familiarity and the level of the lexical density of the reading text. The data shows that texts with familiar topic and different level of lexical density were; Magnetism with low lexical density, Optical Illusion with medium lexical density, Theory of Evolution with high lexical density and text with unfamiliar topic and different level of lexical density were; Compulsive Internet Disorder with low lexical density, Armored Animal with medium lexical density and Weathering with high lexical density.

Procedure of classifying text that the topic is familiar and unfamiliar: Firstly, the students were given a questionnaire which contains the title of six different texts. The questionnaire asks the students to choose which text they find familiar and unfamiliar.

Secondly, the given questionnaires are collected and calculated. The text which has chosen as familiar by most students was counted as familiar and the other texts are counted as unfamiliar.

Table 4.3Reading Comprehension Test Scores

No	Name	Comprehension Score of Reading Test					
		Familiar Text			Unfamiliar Text		
		M	.O.I	T.E	C.I.D	A.A	W
1.	GN	80	100	100	100	100	60
2.	MD	100	100	80	60	80	100
3.	TC	100	100	100	80	100	60
4.	LC	80	100	100	80	100	60
5.	CV	100	80	60	80	60	60
6.	HK	60	100	100	40	100	40
7.	LO	80	100	100	80	100	60
8.	TT	80	60	100	100	80	80
9.	AS	80	100	80	80	80	80
10.	A	80	100	100	100	60	80

Where:

W : Weathering
M : Magnetism
C.I.D : Compulsive Internet Disorder
T.E : Theory of Evolution
A.A : Armored Animal
O.I : Optical Illusion

Table 4.4 Low Lexical Density Text

No	Familiar Text Magnetism X_B	Unfamiliar Text Compulsive Internet X_A	d	D	Rank	Signed Rank
1	100	80	20	20	3.5	+3.5
2	100	80	20	20	3.5	+3.5
3	60	40	20	20	3.5	+3.5
4	80	100	-20	20	3.5	- 3.5
5	80	100	-20	20	3.5	- 3.5
6	80	100	-20	20	3.5	- 3.5
7	100	60	40	40	7	+ 7.5
8	80	80	0	0	40	-7.5
9	80	80	0	0	-	-
10	80	80	0	0	-	-

w_s> critical value = 10.5 > 8, so that the H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. Student comprehension of familiar text is higher than that of unfamiliar text with low lexical density. This means that students comprehend familiar text easier than unfamiliar text.

Table 4.5 Medium Lexical Density

No	Name	Familiar Text Optical Illusion X_B	Unfamiliar Text Armored Animal X_A	d	D	Rank	Signed rank
1	TT	60	80	-20	20	2.5	-2.5
2	CV	80	60	20	20	2.5	+2.5
3	AS	100	80	20	20	2.5	+2.5
4	MD	100	80	20	20	2.5	+2.5
5	A	100	60	40	40	5	+5
6	GN	100	100	0	0	-	-
7	TC	100	100	0	0	-	-
8	LC	100	100	0	0	-	-
9	HK	100	100	0	0	-	-
10	LO	100	100	0	0	-	-

Critical value = 2.5 < 8, so that the H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected. Student reading comprehension of familiar text with medium lexical density is not higher than that of unfamiliar text with medium lexical density. This means that students comprehend familiar text with medium lexical density is the same difficult as unfamiliar text with medium lexical density.

Table 4.6 High Lexical Density

No	Name	Familiar Text Theory of evolution X_B	Unfamiliar Text Weathering X_A	d	D	Rank	Signed Rank
1	MD	80	100	-20	20	2	-2
2	TT	100	80	20	20	2	+2
3	A	100	80	20	20	2	+2
4	GN	100	60	40	40	5.5	+5.5
5	TC	100	60	40	40	5.5	+5.5
6	LC	100	60	40	40	5.5	+5.5
7	LO	100	60	40	40	5.5	+55
8	HK	100	40	60	60	8	+8
9	CV	60	60	0	0	-	-
10	AS	80	80	0	0	-	-

w_s< critical value = 2 < 8, so that the H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected. Students reading comprehension of familiar text is not higher than that of in unfamiliar text with high lexical density. This means that students comprehend familiar text with high lexical density is the same difficult as unfamiliar text high lexical density

Table 4.7 Familiar Text with Low and High Lexical Density

No	Name	L.L.D Magnetism X_B	H.L.D Theory of Evolution X_A	d	D	Ranks	Signed Rank
1	GN	80	100	-20	20	3.5	3.5
2	A	80	100	-20	20	3.5	3.5
3	LC	80	100	-20	20	3.5	3.5
4	MD	100	80	20	20	3.5	3.5
5	LO	80	100	-20	20	3.5	3.5
6	TT	80	100	-20	20	3.5	3.5
7	HK	60	100	-40	40	7.5	7.5
8	CV	100	60	40	40	7.5	7.5
9	AS	80	80	0	0	-	-
10	TC	100	100	0	0	-	-

w_s< critical value = 11> 8, so that the H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. Students reading comprehension of familiar text with low lexical density is not higher than that of in familiar text with high lexical density. This means that students comprehend familiar textthe same difficult as unfamiliar text.

Table 4.8 Familiar Text with Medium and High Lexical Density

No	Name	M.L.D Optical Illusion X_B	H.L.D Theory Of Evolution X_A	d	D	Rank	Signed Rank
1	MD	100	80	20	20	2	+2
2	CV	80	60	20	20	2	+2
3	AS	100	80	20	20	2	+2
4	TT	60	100	-40	40	4	-4
5	HK	100	100	0	0	-	-
6	LO	100	100	0	0	-	-
7	A	100	100	0	0	-	-
8	GN	100	100	0	0	-	-
9	TC	100	100	0	0	-	-
10	LC	100	100	0	0	-	-

w_s< critical value = 4 < 8, so that the H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected. Student comprehension of familiar text with medium lexical density is not higher than that of familiar text with high lexical density. This means that level of lexical density does not affect students reading comprehension.

Table 4.9 Unfamiliar Text with Low and High Lexical Density

No	Name	L.L.D Text Compulsive Internet Disorder X_B	H.L.D Text Weathering X_A	d	D	Rank	Signed Rank
1	TC	80	60	20	20	3.5	3.5
2	LC	80	60	20	20	3.5	3.5
3	CV	80	60	20	20	3.5	3.5
4	LO	80	60	20	20	3.5	3.5
5	TT	100	80	20	20	3.5	3.5
6	A	100	80	20	20	3.5	3.5
7	GN	100	60	40	40	7.5	7.5
8	MD	60	100	-40	40	7.5	-7.5
9	HK	40	40	0	0	-	-
10	AS	80	80	0	0	-	-

w_s< critical value = 7.5 < 8, so that the H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected. Students reading comprehension of unfamiliar text with low lexical density is not higher than that of unfamiliar text with high lexical density. This means that the level of lexical density does not affect students reading comprehension.

Table 4.10 Unfamiliar text with Medium and High Lexical Density

No	Name	M.L.D text: Armored Animal X_B	H.L.D Text Weathering X_A	d	D	Rank	Signed Rank
1	MD	80	100	-20	20	1.5	-1.5
2	A	60	80	-20	20	1.5	-1.5
3	TC	100	60	40	40	4.5	4.5
4	LC	100	60	40	40	4.5	4.5
5	LO	100	60	40	40	4.5	4.5
6	HK	100	40	60	60	4.5	4.5
7	GN	100	60	40	40	7	7
8	TT	80	80	0	0	-	-
9	AS	80	80	0	0	-	-
10	CV	60	60	0	0	-	-

w_s< critical value = 3 < 8, so that the H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected. Student comprehension of unfamiliar text with medium lexical density is not higher than that of unfamiliar text with high lexical density. This means that the level of lexical density does not affect students reading comprehension.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 Conclusions

After analyzing the whole data, it was found out that the student comprehension of reading text with different level of lexical density and topic familiarity, based on the study, the conclusions are drawn as follows:

1. Familiar text is easier to comprehend for the students than the unfamiliar text when they both have low lexical density, while familiar text with medium and high lexical density is the same difficult for the students to comprehend as the unfamiliar text.
2. Text with low lexical density is easier for the students to comprehend than text with medium and high lexical density when the text are both familiar. While texts with low and medium lexical density is the same difficult for the students to comprehend as the text with high lexical density when the text are unfamiliar.

5.2 Suggestions

1. Since familiarity of the text affect reading comprehension when lexical density is kept low, then it is suggested that the teachers of reading comprehension needs to consider the two factors in selecting suitable reading material for the students.
2. This research was conducted with descriptive qualitative reseach with application of non-parametric statistics, it is limited to the non-parametric data. For further research it is suggested to replicate the reserch by apply pure qualitative research to understand the cognitive reason of how the familiarity and lexical density affect the reading comprehension.

REFERENCES

Anderson, L.D., &Krathwohl, D. (2001).*A Taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of educational objectives.* Boston, MA: Addison Wesley-Longman, Inc.

BabakMahdavy.(2011). *The Role of Topic Familiarity and Rhetorical Organization of Texts in L2 Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition.* Published by Elsevier Ltd.

Bloom, B. et al.(1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals:Handbook I Cognitive Domain*. David Mckay. New York.

Bloom, B., Englehart, M. Furst, E., Hill, W., &Krathwohl, D. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain. New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green.

Eggins, Suzanne. 2004. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics, 2nd Edition*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Gelderen, E.V. 2002.*An Introduction to the Grammar of English: Syntactic Arguments and Socio-Historical Background*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company

Gernsbacher, M. A. (1990). *Language comprehension as structure building.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Grabe, W. 2009.*Reading a Second Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, Ruqaiya. 1985. *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Victoria: Deakin University Press.

Harmer, Jeremy, *How to Teach English,* United State: Addison Wesley Longman,1998.

Heilman, A, et.al. 1998. *The Principles and The Practices of Teaching Reading.* Ohio. Charles E, Merill Publishing Co, p.246

Horiba, Y. Fukaya, K. 2015. Reading and Learning from L2 text: Effects of Reading Goal, Topic Familiarity, and Language Proficiency.*Reading in a Foreign Language. Pp. 22-46*

Hyona, J. (1995). An eye movement analysis of topic-shift effect during repeated

reading. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning,Memory, &Cognition,* 21,1365-1373

Johansson, Victoria. 2008. Lexical Diversity and Lexical Density in Speech and Writing: A Developmental Perspective. *Working Press*, 53: 61-79

Lorch, R. F., JR., Lorch, E. P., &Matthews P. D. (1985). On-line processing of the topic structure of a text. *Journal ojMemory&Language,*24, 350-362.

Lorch, R. F., JR.,Lorch, E. P., &Mogan, A. M. (1987). Task effects and individual differences in on-line processing ofthe topic structureofa text. *Discourse Processes,* 10, 63-80.

Nunan, David, *Introducing Discourse Analysis,* England: Penguin Group, 1993.

Pulido,D. 2003. Modeling the Role of Second Language Proficiency and Topic Familiarity in Second language Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition Through Reading. *Language Learning.*Washington State University. pp. 233-284

Reid, Ethna.R. 1981.*Educational Leadership.* Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development p.457

Tiedemann, J.P. 2011. *New Literacies, New Contexts? A Theoretical Definition of Reading Context*.Unpublished Thesis. Tennessee: Faculty of the Graduate School of Vanderbilt University

Ure, J. (1971). Lexical density and register differentiation. *Applications of linguistics*, 443-452.

Van den Broek, P. (1994). Comprehension and memory of narrative texts: Inferences andcoherence. In M. A. Gernsbacher (Ed.), *Handbook of psycholinguistics*(pp. 539–588).San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Bluman, Allan G. *Elementary Statistics: A step by step approach* /Allan Bluman 8_{th} edition (2012) P. 688-690 published by McGraw-Hill, a business unit of The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., 1221 Avenue of the Americans, New York, NY 10020.